| **Student Name:** Alex Zhu |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house supports substantial parental oversight and involvement in the development of school curricula that applies to their children |
| --- |

| 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.]  The hook was focusing on the amount of time that children spend in school, but it isn’t clear on what the harm statement is even if parents don’t get a final say on what the children learn. We need to spend more time relating it to the motion.  We clarified the model very late on that the school does not allow parents to have a final say! This is extremely crucial and no one on Opp can engage with this clarification anymore.   * Be sure to confirm that your first speaker explains this. * Strategically, we need to explain the power of making this clarification. Because it doesn’t remove the merit of schools in formulating the entire curriculum, so all of their arguments are no longer contentious.   However, the veto power still means that biased parents can remove essential knowledge that students should be able to learn, e.g. LGBT content that Opp mentioned.   * So we still need some engagement on the loss in quality of education here.   We had some very strong strategic rebuttals today, Alex! Very well done. The only problem is that your case evolved significantly from your teammates, and there wasn’t a proper defense on the constructive case that your teammates provided.   * Your second speaker’s argument was dropped on parents playing a supplementary role in helping teachers.   On your second clash, we need more reasons as to why parents have the CAPACITY to do this, and not just the INCENTIVE to do this. Opp is challenging that Prop has not proven that parents are even qualified on making decisions pertaining to curriculum.   * We are currently asserting the problem without proving it, which is that schools do not actually care about what the children are learning.   + E.g. Is there a reason why schools won’t consider what will maximise the learning outcomes of children, be sensitive to the cultural differences experienced by children, or care about the emotional well-being of students? * On schools not knowing what the child needs, can you illustrate to me what are these harmful forms of curriculum that has the power of causing these children a lot of distress?   Good job offering POIs today, we could offer even more!  6.26 | | | | | | |