| **Student Name:** Charles Wang |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would make tertiary education free |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | **N/A** | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | **4** | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | **4** | 5 |
| Competition Score: | 71 | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 minutes’ long due to time constraints.]  Interesting pushback that Opp doesn’t solve poverty either, but they are claiming your policy is gulping large amounts of resources from other policies that would be more beneficial to the poor!   * We reinforced that the scholarship/financial aid counter-model is a failing model, now go and tell me precisely why!!   On the wealth of private universities, how exactly can you flip this to your favour? Their wealth is limited now that they cannot charge any fees to students.   * On donations from alumni, these are often exclusive to prestigious universities! It doesn’t happen for community colleges.   On utilising progressive taxes, I appreciate that you will strengthen taxation laws. Make the observation that these aren’t inherent flaws of the taxation system, and can actually be fixed.   * The contention isn’t whether it’s justified to significantly tax the rich, Opp is accusing you of reallocating resources away from things like the healthcare system and the secondary education system, which is more harmful in comparison. * We need to explain why we can generate adequate funding from progressive taxes ALONE.   On responding to wealth discrimination in admission, scrutiny from the public is already a failing mechanism because they do this now with little changes despite the backlash.   * The better response is to argue that you will fundamentally change the model of universities and prioritise accessibility! So we will take in everyone who wants to!   On society benefiting from having more capable people:   * We are not dealing with Opp’s characterisation that society doesn’t NEED everyone to have degrees, and this harms the workforce. * Instead, counter-characterise the kind of jobs available and why most economies are transitioning to a knowledge economy. Thus there is a necessity to this process.   + We can explain what are high-skilled occupations that only be unlocked with college education, and ground the impacts in certain industries.   + On unlocking specific skill sets, it’s unclear why the development of all of this is unique to a college experience. Why can’t they learn all of this in the workplace?   We completely dropped our strongest argument on the wealth gap and fixing poverty! Focus on where you were winning.  Please offer more POIs today!  5.00 - Good timing! | | | | | | |