| **Student Name:** Kevin Hu |
| --- |

| **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: | 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 6 minutes’ long.]  Excellent job phrasing the hook, good use of rhetoric and emotionally evocative illustrations of students who are different being cramped in the same school!   * Great pacing as well, keep this up!   We are making strong claims about these students not being able to learn anything in traditional schools, but we’re not mechanising why this is structurally true, beyond relying on their poor grades.   * 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.   Opp is arguing that they 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?   * 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.   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.   + We mentioned that they will become the type of students who will lack any goals in life or they become depressed, explain what happens to their future if they carry these attributes forward.   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.   * We argued that everyone is at a level playing field, but why was this unique to vocational schools? Why can’t we stream students based on their performance in traditional schools? * We finally gave analysis on why these vocational skills are relatively easy to learn, but this came after the 6th minute!   We need to tie back this argument back to the macro of the purpose of schools!  We have to weigh the future of these students against the autonomy argued by Opp!   * 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.   Please offer more POIs! Good job offering one to 3rd Opp.  7.08 - Please watch for time! | | | | | | |