| **Student Name:** Stephanie Kwok |
| --- |

| **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.]  I need a hook and signposting, Steph!  On the money being reallocated from other sectors, don’t just throw out things like healthcare. Say that the money will also come from primary and secondary education, which will make things even worse!   * The low-income community will be set up for failure in colleges if they had low-quality public education to begin with. This will then be a terrible waste of resources to allow everyone to go into colleges.   Interesting argument on brain drain, but WSDC motions happen in a global context. So there is an understanding that all states will endeavour to do this, so there’s nowhere else to go in order to escape this.  The characterisation that these grants include living costs is actively contradicting your first speaker by saying that it would be inadequate for them to survive post-college.  What was the purpose of making the observation that some people are coerced into going 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.   On rich people getting spots due to their wealth and connection, the point of Prop’s model is to improve accessibility. So it isn’t clear why their model is not capable of creating enough available spots in their education system! Prove that first, and then we can explain why class discrimination takes place.   * How does this compare to the status quo you support? They are already denied all of these opportunities anyways.   The argument shouldn’t just focus on student debt, because that is something that would be infinitely better addressed on Prop’s side of the debate! We should focus strictly on the economic angle of devaluing degrees.   * 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, so 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.   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.   Please offer more POIs today!  5.05 - Good timing! | | | | | | |