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

| **Motion:** In ethnically heterogeneous areas, This house believes that governments should pursue policies to make all schools multiethnic |
| --- |

| 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 | | | | | |
| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  A lot of the analysis in the first rebuttal is focusing more on the rhetoric of stripping these communities of their autonomy and culture. Why does autonomy matter?   * We can relate this back to the role of schools. Does it harm the quality of their learning and thus, their future? How so?   + E.g. The language used in the medium of instruction could make a big difference on how well the students learn the subjects. * Expand on the loss of their sense of belonging, and explain why only parents know best on what their children need. * However, it’s not clear why they cannot have their cultures in their own communities and residential areas. We are only mixing students in schools. * Why can’t parents and communities keep their cultures outside of schools?   In response to the POI, we need to strengthen our counterfactual on integration:   * We needed to offer even more alternatives to organically encourage diverse interactions.   + On your policy that these diverse schools could also teach about unity, etc; but what exactly are they teaching? What is the curriculum?     - Explain that you can co-opt this part of the Proposition model about teaching things that galvanise a national identity. * Go all out and characterise the trend of improvement in these diverse societies   We need to actively attack Proposition’s claim on using schools as a way of integration.   * Point out that students will still self-segregate even within the mixed schools. Explain that students are still living in heterogeneous communities and inheriting the stereotypes of their parents.   + We eventually argued this later on, good job! * We still need to engage with Prop stating that students can see that many of the stereotypes are not true due to the mixed interactions. Otherwise, on scale, even if the change fails, Proposition is still closer to getting integration unless you actively prove there is more harm than good (not just that the policy won’t work).   + Explain that there is always a risk of affirming certain stereotypes, because underprivileged communities lack the kind of support to achieve higher educational goals, and we affirm that they have less merit when they academically underperform in the same schools.   Excellent response to the 2nd POI. On reinforcing the stereotypes, use the example of African-Americans (i.e. Little Rock) faced violent resistance when attending white schools at a time where society hasn’t desegregated.  The argument is a direct overlap with what Ivy is arguing and it is coming across like a rebuttal instead.   * A lot of the analysis is focusing on the policy not working, rather than this being counterproductive.   + The end point on establishing an us versus them mentality and creating even more conflict is where the main focal point should’ve been!     - Can we explain why teachers and schools would not be able to mediate these kinds of conflict?       * We need more grounding as to what this looks like as well!   We can offer even more POIs today!  7.22 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |