| **Student Name:** Kelly Au |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Great clarification at the top that there is no coercion to go to colleges, but we cannot just assert this. We have to prove why society won’t pressure people into this.   * Excellent conclusion that we enable those who actively WANT to go to college.   + An even better conclusion is to say that if the clash is about autonomy vs coercion, on your side, poor people will have more options and can exercise their agency! On Opp, they are coerced by the complete a LACK of options. So you win this clash.   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?   Structure-wise, integrate the rebuttals INTO the clashes.  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 justifying things by helping the poor:   * Aside from stating that poor people cannot afford education, we need to explain why many children are trapped in cyclical poverty precisely because they cannot access tertiary education; and social mobility can only be accessed with tertiary qualifications.   + We can be more comparative here, if the analysis is only limited to poor people, why can’t the Opp address it by only subsidising community colleges, or providing financial aid/scholarships? * On social mobility, we’re still not explaining why only a college degree can break the poverty trap. * We are brushing over the impacts too quickly, what are the human costs of intergenerational poverty? * What exactly is this vague economic benefit of everyone possessing tertiary qualifications?   After explaining that it’s a necessity for people to survive, we can expound this desperation into conning young students into taking out excessive student loans. So we can flip Opp’s argument on the student debt in your favour!   * Which often involves predatory practices that impose lifelong financial liabilities on students, and students can very rarely consent to that.   Please offer more POIs today!  5.05 - Good timing! | | | | | | |