| **Student Name:** Samara Anand |
| --- |

| **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: | 71 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Good hook today, very nuanced!   * Good signposting.   Good job reinforcing that parents may lack merit in setting up the curriculum.   * Go even further and highlight all the ways in which parents lack merit in this process. But try to structure it as categorical layers of analysis, rather than random examples, e.g. lack of training in the field of education vs some parents don’t have a good educational background. * We started off well explaining that schools have a better system, try to structure your analysis and explain all the ways in which schools have better capacity. * Make a proper strategic observation Prop only proved that parents have the INCENTIVE to protect their children, but not the CAPACITY. And that the clash is decided based on merit, not willingness.   Have a more explicit engagement with Prop’s analysis on parents having better incentives than schools in terms of supporting their child’s learning.   * Prove to me why schools also have the same incentives to improve learning outcomes.   Excellent characterisation on parents overpowering this entire process.   * Illustrate even more what this would look like. * We can also point out that the more powerful and wealthy parents will dominate this entire process to the exclusion of other teachers and parents.   On parents being biased, can we illustrate precisely what these biases are, and then link it back to the quality of education.   * E.g. Religious parents who don’t want their children to learn about evolution. * Then try to maximise the long-term impact to students on the quality of education. * We eventually did this in the argument, well done!   + But we didn’t have time to maximise the impact!   Good job offering POIs today!  6.40 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |