| **Student Name:** Ella Chan |
| --- |

| **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.]  Good job flipping their claim on what’s best in terms of helping the poor. But our central claim is that the money comes from other important parts of the federal budget, when Prop is stating that we can increase progressive taxation in order to improve the overall funding.   * While yes, there are loopholes in the taxation system, it’s unclear why these flaws are inherent to the system or unsolvable in general. Prop is suggesting that they will fix all of these loopholes in the taxation system.   On rich people getting spots due to their wealth and connection, the point of Prop’s model is to improve accessibility. So it isn’t clear why their model is not capable of creating enough available spots in their education system! Prove that first, and then we can explain why class discrimination takes place.   * How does this compare to the status quo you support? They are already denied all of these opportunities anyways.   Interesting pushback that many students cannot have a good tertiary experience if their primary and secondary education is under-funded, but we are under-executing by not stating that funding colleges comes at the expense of funding schools.   * Go even further and explain why these students are set up for failure and colleges, and it will be a terrible waste of resources to allow everyone to go into colleges.   The attack on other living costs are mitigated at best, at least Prop is removing one gigantic stumbling block and will still win on the clash of accessibility.   * Instead, we can pushback by arguing that many students cannot have a good tertiary experience if they are lacking sufficient funding to begin with. * Go even further and explain why these students are set up for failure and colleges, and it will be a terrible waste of resources to allow everyone to go into colleges.   Say that the money will also come from primary and secondary education, which will make things even worse!   * The low-income community will be set up for failure in colleges if they had low-quality public education to begin with. This will then be a terrible waste of resources to allow everyone to go into colleges.   We should’ve reinforced our team’s strongest argument on the harms of excessive numbers of people going to college, i.e. the economic angle of devaluing degrees.   * So instead, we need to explain why certain colleges become diploma mills who produce low-quality graduates. * The whole argument on devaluing is mitigatory, actively explain the added HARM of messing up the dynamics of the labour force.   + E.g. If no one wants to work low-skilled jobs, so this will inflate the wages of entry-level workers, which will then inflate the costs of services for essential things like sanitation.   + E.g. Excessive supply of labour at the highest level will deflate wages there and people will be under-compensated.   Good job offering POIs today!  5.36 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |