| **Student Name:** Isabella Zhu |
| --- |

| **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.]  Have a hook, Isabella instead of diving into signposting!  On the counter set-up:   * Excellent job utilising scholarships, financial aid and grants for the poor.   + You can also suggest that the state subsidises SOME universities such as community colleges, instead of proposing a complete takeover of private education.   + We can utilise equal Opp fiat to also INCREASE funding to adequate levels because 1st Prop has already explained that the funding is inadequate.   What was the purpose of making the observation that some people do not want to go to colleges?   * Impact this by stating that they are now all coerced into going, and there’s no stakes. They can fail and not take it seriously while wasting our resources.   + We need to spend more time proving that social coercion will work in such an insidious way.   + On a balance, Prop is allowing the poor to have more choices, so that is still more liberating if we are concerned about coercion.   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.   I like the differentiation between funding secondary vs tertiary, but we need to deal with the demands on modern society.   * We can counter-characterise why this will actively destroy the dynamics of the workforce by having too many people with degrees because there is still much low-skilled labour still required.   + E.g. If no one wants to work low-skilled jobs, 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.   + We eventually said some version of this in the argument, good job!   The better first argument here would have been on the loss of quality of these institutions.   * These are unique harms for the Opposition:   + The inability to hire high-skilled instructors for complex courses,   + Which courses will be damaged by the loss of resources, e.g. STEM courses are resource-intensive and require the highest expertise,   + How university researches are completely decimated and they are the dominant source of innovation in the areas of public good, e.g. development of vaccines,   + Etc.     - We can expound the spillover effect to the rest of society, high-skilled occupations who are in charge of the lives of others will be under-trained and we may even have a shortage of scientists and doctors. The key impact needs to be focused on the unique role that high-quality universities play in society.   There’s a LOT of overlap between the arguments and rebuttals, we need to find ways to attack without repeating our premises.  Good job offering POIs today!  5.09 - Good timing! | | | | | | |