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

| **Motion:** This house believes that student evaluations and feedback should be the sole criteria for retaining a teacher’s employment |
| --- |

| 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 5 to 6 minutes’ long.]  Nice rhetoric in the hook, but it’s almost too generic. Try to nuance it to this motion and how uniquely your policy addresses the low-quality teaching.  While we are reinforcing that teachers will have the incentive to teach better, we need to be more engaging to Opp arguing that they will now have an incentive to make the class about fun and games.   * This will then lead to higher ratings, but less learning. So be more comparative on the point of incentives.   On the teachers not having the autonomy to decide their teaching style, explain that this debate is about the ones that do!   * Also, boring and difficult subjects can still be taught in engaging ways. All they have to do is listen to their students. * The teachers can also then advocate against the school if they are implementing terrible systems that hurt the students.   We are missing an important rebuttal on whether or not students can be trusted to make the right decisions!   * We need to explain what is the psyche of students and why it is in their interest to pick high-quality teachers, and not just fun teachers.   What is unclear at this point is why is this the only way to give teacher feedback? Can’t we demand better quality teaching outside of threatening their employment and asking the students to singularly decide?   * We can be more engaging with the Opp’s countermodel here!   While you had a lot more reasons than Chester on why teachers teach poorly, it is essentially the exact same argument that he made!   * But in his argument, he did not impact it. So we could’ve added value by answering what is the long-term impact of low-quality teaching? * He also did not mechanise the deterrent effect enough, so we should’ve spent more time explaining why financial incentives are the largest motivator for teachers.   Please offer more POIs in the debate!   * Good job asking for a POI before your window closes.   5.45 | | | | | | |