| **Student Name:** Jasmine Gao |
| --- |

| **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: | 72.5 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Excellent POI to 2nd Prop! This should be in the first speaker’s set-up.   * Good signposting of the clashes.   On the first clash on providing education to the poor:   * Rather than just stating that state universities exist, since it’s currently inadequate, use Opp fiat to propose INCREASING the funding for these safety nets.   + Interesting characterisation that some of these universities are higher quality compared to private universities, but this is definitely a losing clash. * Excellent pushback on alternative sources of private funding thanks to aligning incentives.   + But this is brand new important matter in 4th Opp! All of the above should be in the checks and balances in the counter set-up. * We can spend more time pushing back 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 loss of quality of universities is exactly the right way to win the comparative on improving society, but this is COMPLETELY new matter coming from the last speaker.   * Spend more time proving the premises first:   + 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.   On the clash of what is better for society, it is still the case that society benefits overall if all workers are more highly skilled.   * 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 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.   Very good job framing why fixing the wealth gap only comes after proving quality education, the problem is that quality education is a brand new case only established in your speech!  Good job offering POIs today!  5.14 | | | | | | |