| **Student Name:** Ashley Hui |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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 Opp’s perspective, it would be a better use of the hook.  Give the counter set-up BEFORE the rebuttals as the first speaker.   * We highlighted that Opp has more economic opportunities, but you need to highlight what economic policies are you implementing that this is exclusively Opp’s benefits. * What is your burden/winning pathway?   On how this could negatively affect the quality of life in rural areas, it’s not entirely clear HOW this is the case.   * Explain first that the lack of economic opportunities in rural areas can never be fixed organically on Prop, and urbanisation attracts more foreign investments to build infrastructure.   Don’t apologise for potential errors, go forth with confidence!  We mentioned that the harms don’t matter as much because you have the resources to support the people in the city. Can we mechanise how this is the case?   * For example, you can collect more income taxes and then actively re-invest it into improving the infrastructure of the city. * We asserted that we can improve the healthcare system, point out why this is exclusive to Opp.   + Very good comparison that more people could die in Prop since they cannot fund the system.   We need a clear transition between the rebuttals and arguments in your speech.  When we highlight that we have more people, explain why this concentration of human capital makes it easy for the government to invest in educating people and upskilling them.  It’s not intuitive to argue that there’s more people in the city so we can protect more of them, as Prop has argued that overpopulation is precisely why it’s difficult to provide these services to them.   * How would you overcome issues like land scarcity when there’s too many people and not enough land?   Please offer more POIs today!  6.45 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |