| **Student Name:** Kayley Cheng |
| --- |

| **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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good opening. Explain to me why this is uniquely possible with your side of the motion. We need to illustrate how important good student experience is.  Set-up   * Fair enough on how direct this is. Are we taking all feedback at face value? Automatic firing is a high burden of proof to defend; warning is fair but doesn’t align with the immediacy here. * We should introduce safeguards to make sure silly and random feedback isn’t being taken seriously.   Argument 1   * Good work identifying that students matter the most. Explain this in greater detail - explain why they are the most important stakeholder. Do schools have a responsibility to them? * What happens in the status quo that showcases this doesn’t actually occur or happen. * What stops the Opposition from factoring in student feedback alongside feedback from other factors? What is unique about this model? We need to analyse why students know best. Why are they the best measures of what is good and not? What kind of characteristics will students reward and not and why?   Argument 2   * Why is this the only check or balance against bad teaching? Is this an exclusive solution? * The impact is clear, but I am unsure why this is exclusive. * Good response to the POI.   03:52 - you have to hit 5!  You’re just reading - do you sound persuasive?  We have to ask POIs! Why do I have to keep reminding you to do this? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Emma Kwok |
| --- |

| **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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  Start by challenging the crux of their case, which is entirely non-exclusive. Your side can support student involvement, but making it the tipping point is disproportionate. Clarify this up top.  Don’t end your current opening with ‘what would you think’ - is this a competitive speech habit? Explain why this is incorrect or wrong instead of leaving it open.  Set-up   * Who else is involved, if students are 20%?   Rebuttal   * Why do students behave in this way? We assert they do, but need to explain why structurally most students behave in this way. * Fair on what students want. Explain why this is the opposite of what students need.   Argument 1   * Explain how this means that your side achieves better learning, which is also what Prop wants cannot materialise, because teachers are so careful as to how or what they teach. Give me detailed explanations of the things they let slide that they would not in counterfactual! * Fair on how teachers change their behaviour. * Don’t take a POI in the middle of a sentence! Finish and then take it - we can explain how unrealistic this is; we’re not just talking about private schools where teachers have to be very qualified and so forth - this debate applies across all types of schools.   We’re eating our words and speeding through our speech. There are full sentences where certain words are hard for me to understand! We have to pay clear attention to our speaking style.  Question whether students will take any of these surveys actually seriously and so forth. Are they a good judge of character and performance, especially when the stakes are so high?  We can argue that inherent biases on the basis of a teacher's race, gender, or other demographic characteristics, could also lead to discriminatory outcomes.  Focus on exclusivity of outcome!  04:51  Good work asking Kayley a POI. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sophia Tan |
| --- |

| **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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  Our opening can have a high impact. You should immediately target whether or not students will make good decisions or bad decisions. This is the biggest obstacle in us being able to prove our outcome. I know this is the first response you have, but you need to address it up top.  Rebuttal   * Good mitigation on this not being based on one opinion; but go further! Explain how there can be checks or safeguards against random students’ decisions. This is the biggest push from 1st Opp - that teachers have incentives to change in bad ways. * We need to also explain how their side prioritises bad teachers, and protects them; point out how learning is worse on their side. * Good on how this is bad for teachers as well.   Argument 1   * Good argument idea; explain why a good relationship matters so much. * Explain how they are the sole recipients of their teaching, why especially at the high school level, students care. You can also argue that the demeanour of teachers matters lots - and being understanding and kind is what matters the most. * The outcome is non-exclusive! You need to explain why the only way of achieving this is through this mechanism. * Doesn’t this feed into the harms of Opp - that teachers change their behaviour and are too nice or too caring rather than being strict where needed?   05:07  We have to speak louder and with more confidence! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Anastasia Kavvathas |
| --- |

| **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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good opening, but you can make it more high impact by challenging the crux of their case, which is entirely non-exclusive. Your side can support student involvement, but making it the tipping point is disproportionate.  Signposting needs to be clearer!  Rebuttal   * Fair on likely behaviour - but why will they all hate the teacher? For what reason? You need to analyse what kinds of choices students are likely to make - and how this translates into certain teaching choices over others. * Good call out on the nature of kids; explain how they’re shirking their burden when they refuse to engage with the actual ways in which kids behave. * We have to focus on exclusivity! What is the counter-model? How does your side make sure that student feedback is factored in, but that this isn’t the sole criteria being used.   Explain how this means that your side achieves better learning, which is also what Prop wants cannot materialise, because teachers are so careful as to how or what they teach. We give examples of this but need to make the clear implication.  Argument 1   * Is this argument different from the rebuttals you’ve just made?   We can also explain how unrealistic this is; we’re not just talking about private schools where teachers have to be very qualified and so forth - this debate applies across all types of schools.  We can argue that inherent biases on the basis of a teacher's race, gender, or other demographic characteristics, could also lead to discriminatory outcomes.  We have to speak louder and make eye contact. Use hand gestures and give me a speech where you are convinced you are right and are trying to convince me you are!  04:23  We need to ask POIs. I should not have to consistently ask you to ask POIs. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Torres Li |
| --- |

| **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: | 68 | | | | | |
| 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:  Why are they not fit for their positions?  Observations:   1. Is this true? That they haven’t responded to ANYTHING? This is a bad faith response.   Clash 1   * You’re just summarising things your side says and then they say. You’re not actually responding to anything here! * We need to also explain how their side prioritises bad teachers, and protects them; point out how learning is worse on their side. * Explain how they are the sole recipients of their teaching, why especially at the high school level, students care. You can also argue that the demeanour of teachers matters lots - and being understanding and kind is what matters the most.   Clash 2   * The same summary comment applies. * What safeguards and what limits? * You should immediately target whether or not students will make good decisions or bad decisions. This is the biggest obstacle in us being able to prove our outcome. They explain why students are immature or why there is a mob mentality which means they make bad decisions. * The outcome is non-exclusive! You need to explain why the only way of achieving this is through this mechanism.   Your POIs need to be more clearly worded.  Why are we still ending our speech with ‘proud to be on Prop’? We’ve identified lots of bad habits, and the need to break them - but we HAVE to push ourselves! Don’t make any sweeping statements, make sure the clashes have actual responses within them.  02:33 - we have to hit 5! | | | | | | |