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

| **Motion:** This House believes that developing countries should adopt economic development policies that heavily disincentivize urbanisation |
| --- |

| 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 5 to 6 minutes’ long.]  Good summation in the hook, if we can craft something that emphasises the most impactful harms from Prop’s perspective, it would be a better use of the hook.  On the set-up:   * We’re explaining the logic behind the process of rapid urbanisation and why this lends to the problem in the status quo, but this fits better in your argumentation! * When we say this type of development is not moral, we can rephrase this into your burden of proof instead. * On the world-to-world comparison, use simple points of comparisons and structure it.   + The comparison shouldn’t be based on social harms, that’s better off in the argument!   + It should be a policy-to-policy comparison, explain WHAT exactly are you doing to disincentivise urbanisation.     - For example, limiting migration, and redirecting investments to rural areas.     - After stating “what does it look like,” we never actually clarified our policy actions!   When we pointed out the cost of living crisis, we shouldn’t stop at just mechanising it.   * What is the actual human costs?   + We should’ve characterised the urban slums and how they have terrible sanitation.   + Explain what the collapse of the healthcare system actually looks like.   On hurting rural areas, it isn’t particularly clear why these cultures will be erased, instead being brought over to city centers.   * Point out that these traditions are tied down to the geographical areas. * Or explain the concept of gentrification which leads to cultural erasure.   We had a random tangent to environmental harm, we need to link this clearly to rapid urbanisation.   * On sustainable crop practices, explain why this is exclusive to Prop’s world. * Why is environmental harm important today? Explain the long-term harm to societies.   We’re consistently underimpacting in our speeches, try to aim for 50-50 division next time.  Good job offering POIs!  6.00 | | | | | | |