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

| **Motion:** This house would establish vocational schools and aggressively stream underperforming students into them |
| --- |

| 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 6 minutes’ long.]  Good job phrasing the hook, but we need to expand the emotionally evocative part by illustrating the human costs.  Nice strategic pushback by that Prop’s side has far more options for their future academic pathways.   * But don’t stop at just washing out the students with learning disabilities, you can actually win this comparative. At least, on Prop, hands-on learning makes it more likely for those dyslexic to succeed. * Opp can just as easily encourage and incentivise students to voluntarily enrol into vocational schools, why was it necessary to rob them of their autonomy and entrap them into a vocation they would have never chosen for themselves.   + So we need to explain why they wouldn’t have made these decisions for themselves, e.g. family pressure that the jobs for these vocational schools are not as prestigious as those available if they enrol in college   On prioritising being successful in the future, can we tie everything back to the macro of the purpose of schools to show why this ought to be the priority of the debate?   * Opp would be saying that vocational satisfaction is the preferable outcome, that they ought to be happy with the job they chose; why do you think this matters less than making money?   + Reinforce the analysis as to why financial stability plays a determinant role in future happiness!   Excellent final comparison why “pursuing dreams” is actually a pipe dream on the side of the Opposition.   * Strong analysis as to why students often spiral in a worse fashion when forced to confront their failure. * We can expand the human costs analysis on why these environments would breed long-term impact on their personalities due to the formative years analysis. * But we are making strong claims here about the failure of these students in traditional schools (and that they cannot learn anything), but we’re not mechanising why this is structurally true, beyond relying on the fact that they have poor grades. We cannot just broadly proclaim that their failure is indicative of a lack of passion and career preferences. * Actively counter Opp’s assertion that these students can actively decide for themselves if they can improve. * We need to clearly link the reasons why they underperform as something that is INHERENT only to the traditional educational system that can never be compatible with specific TYPES of students. Otherwise, Opp will argue that we need to keep the door for improvement open.   + E.g. Explain that children with learning disorders do not thrive in exam-oriented settings, and would typically thrive in skills-based hands-on learning.   + E.g. Students all naturally have different types of intelligences, but traditional systems only value the STEM, logic-side of intelligences! If some students have spatial intelligence, enrolling in arts/crafts-type of vocational skills will actually match your natural aptitudes.   Our blind spot in this case is we’re lacking analysis as to why the new system of vocational schools is any better! We have to fully analyse what are the environments of these vocational schools before we can claim all of the better educational outcomes.  I appreciate the justification as to why the state ought to intervene on autonomy.   * Opp would be saying that vocational satisfaction is the preferable outcome, that they ought to be happy with the job they chose; why do you think this matters less than making money? * Conclude clearly as well that they never had any real or meaningful choices anyways in a system that is designed for them to fail! So Opp wouldn’t have been able to argue any meaningful forms of autonomy.   Good job offering POIs today!  Nice rhetoric in conclusion!  6.15 | | | | | | |