| **Student Name:** Chester Tam |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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.]  We should start our speeches with a high-impact hook, rather than just diving right into the meat of things.   * Nor should we interact with our opponents and ask them questions unless it’s in a POI form.   Interesting pushback and explaining why this allows for stylised learning, but this is a point on the streaming of students into different classes, the methods of teaching utilised, and not necessarily related to the motion about the development of curriculum!  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, or be sensitive to the cultural differences experienced by children?   Good argument about parents playing a supplementary role in the learning process of children!   * We are arguing a benefit without starting with the problem first, do some schools or some students require parents to play this role to begin with?   + So explain first why parents need to hold these institutions accountable as incompetent teachers are aplenty, especially in underfunded public schools. * On the impacting, rather than focusing on stress, the final impact on the child being able to learn better is the better focal point!   + We are under-analysing here, explain why learning outcomes is the number one priority in the debate. How will this impact their entire future and the purpose of schools?   In response to the POI, we continue to reinforce that parents can be quite helpful in the process, but her question is asking you to prove why parents have adequate qualifications to intervene in what the school is doing.  In terms of speech structure, I need signposting after the hook, and clear rebuttals as well as argument. Be sure to have explicit transition points.  Please offer more POIs in the debate!  6.11 | | | | | | |