| **Student Name:** Isabella Chau |
| --- |

| **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.]  Nice hook, there’s a lot of clarity on what your position is, but I would prefer to have more impact instead at the very start!  On the set-up:   * Good definition, we don’t have to be so rigid and define every single word. Try to combine the meaning of everything in totality and just provide clarity in that way. * Interesting model on excluding problematic parents, however, what about parents with prejudicial views? They’re not outrightly abusive, but their views are not strictly aligned with things like science. * We should clarify our model on whether these parents can outrightly veto what schools are teaching, or can they just give more input? Is it the kind of process where it’s 50/50 input? Does it come down to a majority vote?   + Explaining that parents can be checked and balanced by the school would be very strategic.   We had some good characterisation on what children need and the interests of parents, but this analysis seems to be floating, rather than attached to any particular thesis! What are we meant to prove here? We should restructure our argument so that it logically flows.   * We are arguing in abstract on children benefiting from parental involvement, but how does this apply in the realm of curriculum?   + The comparative isn’t clear as to why schools cannot consider the best interests of their students.   We cannot wait until the 4th minute to go into our argument when it’s a 6 minute speech! Try to integrate the characterisation into our arguments instead.  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?   * We are currently asserting the problem without proving it, which is that schools do not care about the learning outcome of students. Intuitively, it seems like it is the very purpose of schools to ensure that the students learn very well.   + 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? * We need more reasons as to why parents have the CAPACITY to do this, and not just the INCENTIVE to do this. * The impacting needs to be more than just a few sentences as well. Is there even a great difference in learning outcomes?   Good job offering POIs today!  5.57 - We’re slightly under-timed! Wait for the double bell. | | | | | | |