| **Student Name:** Christy Yuan |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house supports substantial parental oversight and involvement in the development of school curricula that applies to their children (e.g., allowing parents to vet books, involving them in curriculum-drafting processes). |
| --- |

| 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: | 67 | | | | | |
| 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:  You have to give me a hook - I already know you agree with the motion - you’re Proposition! Instead, start by establishing why this is necessary, or characterising the problem that necessitates this.  Set-up needs to be content focused, as opposed to just a checklist. You need to explain to me what this process is going to look like, what kinds of things they may or may not care about; when are they likely to get involved?  Argument 1   * Why don’t parents know? Why are they unaware of what is happening in the status quo? Jacky’s POI targets this directly. * Why are parents the best suited actors to do this? If this is about children needing extra help, and parents being unable to do so, why can’t the school provide you with extra help? Is this the only or best way to solve the problem of children feeling left behind? * Why are children feeling left behind in the first place? * Good impacting - that they won’t be able to learn in the future; good use of the ‘time’ strategy here!   We’re missing the argument structure we spent all class discussing. You’re missing a title, a thesis, clear structured reasoning (and the rule of three)!  We need to ask ourselves whether the problem we’ve identified is only solvable by the motion, or best solved by the motion. If the answer is that there are other easier ways - then we’ve mischaracterized the problem.  04:52 - good work extending! We’re still reading/sounding like we’re just reading though!  **We need to ask POIs!** | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jacky Xu |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house supports substantial parental oversight and involvement in the development of school curricula that applies to their children (e.g., allowing parents to vet books, involving them in curriculum-drafting processes). |
| --- |

| 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:  Excellent POI to Christy. Our POI quality decreases over the course of debate; your POI to James is too long and unclear - simple questions are better!  Opening is solid, but leaves me on a cliffhanger - why is the worst choice? Give me one clear push as to why it is the worst idea ever.  Rebuttal   * Machine gun rebuttal when you’re first; here you might say something like. Firstly, on parental access and knowledge - one, email bulletins, two, children tell them, three, children tell them… * Target the thesis or central claim of the argument, and flip it as quickly as you can for maximum damage with minimal time.   Argument 1   * Good work establishing the nature of teachers; explain how they are objective, how they know what is needed for kids, why they are more empathetic/likely to privilege the child. * POI - clear response; point out the **need** for expertise. Talk about how if parents are reasonable, they’ll recognise teachers know what they’re doing and reduce involvement, even where given the choice. This is not a debate about them - they don’t use the motion. Who this debate is about, is those who do take interest and intervene - and are unlikely to be reasonable; what books will they want to ban? What kinds of policies will they try to implement? * Argument goes off track sometime in the middle; stay on track! Why is it hard to learn? Is it because parents radically change curriculum? Don’t make it about feasibility, make it about the choices parents are likely to make and how these are bad choices. You’re shying away from actually arguing this.   We’re missing the argument structure we spent all class discussing. You’re missing a title, a thesis, clear structured reasoning (and the rule of three)!  05:01 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jenny Zong |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house supports substantial parental oversight and involvement in the development of school curricula that applies to their children (e.g., allowing parents to vet books, involving them in curriculum-drafting processes). |
| --- |

| 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: | 66 | | | | | |
| 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:  **What is your opening doing in the debate in terms of forwarding your points? Is it spelling out the single biggest issue with the motion? We need to word our hook with more strategic awareness next time.**  What is the structure of this speech? You need to start by telling me what the structure of your speech will be. We’re missing signposting. Structuring our speech is a bare minimum expectation I have of you!  **Rebuttal has to go first, before our argument.**  On parents having this information - why can’t they just tell the teacher…? Why is giving them this substantial oversight the only way, or best way, to solve this problem?  POI - what you’re suggesting is the implementation of streams - advanced, or introductory etc. Is this the motion? Schools already account for this by having more advanced and simpler classes, or keeping certain students in remedial classes, or keeping them in a grade for longer.  Similarly, on the difference in format - why does the motion solve for this?  **Rebuttal** **has to go first, not after our argument.**   * We’ve already claimed that parents know their children best. Why is this true? Why do parents know them best, compared to presumably teachers? * All the responses we have are repetitions of what we’ve already said!   We’re missing out on the argument structure we spent the entire class on, as well as the second speaker structure. If you have a question or you’re confused, you have to **ask me.**  04:57  **We need to ask POIs!** | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Renee Yang |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house supports substantial parental oversight and involvement in the development of school curricula that applies to their children (e.g., allowing parents to vet books, involving them in curriculum-drafting processes). |
| --- |

| 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: | 67 | | | | | |
| 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:  **There is a difference between criticism and rebuttal - I want you to engage in rebuttal from the get-go, as opposed to criticising Prop.**  Rebuttal   * If Opp wants to call Prop out on not setting up the debate; this needs to be done at First Opp; Second is too late. You can say - what we needed to see from 2nd Prop was an explanation of what parental oversight would be, or what it would look like - we’re still pretty confused etc. * On parental knowledge - explain to me why they don’t know their children best actually; explain why kids feel more comfortable with teachers - for instance on gender, pronouns, sexual orientation etc. * We have to engage in more rebuttal - what did you **need** to respond to or challenge?   Argument   * Good work identifying a specific vulnerable stakeholder - but tell me, beyond teachers being professional, why parents are unable to account for them. * Good on minority vs majority - but recognise that students who are neurodivergent are probably a minority… good attempt at impacting argument in detail. * Good work establishing the nature of teachers; explain how they are objective, how they know what is needed for kids, why they are more empathetic/likely to privilege the child. * Talk about how if parents are reasonable, they’ll recognise teachers know what they’re doing and reduce involvement, even where given the choice. This is not a debate about them - they don’t use the motion. Who this debate is about, is those who do take interest and intervene - and are unlikely to be reasonable; what books will they want to ban? What kinds of policies will they try to implement?   We’re missing the argument structure we spent all class discussing. You’re missing a title, a thesis, clear structured reasoning (and the rule of three)!  We can’t just look at our paper. This is not you giving a speech!  04:53 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** James Gao |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house supports substantial parental oversight and involvement in the development of school curricula that applies to their children (e.g., allowing parents to vet books, involving them in curriculum-drafting processes). |
| --- |

| 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: | 67.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Give me a high impact hook! What is your opening doing in the debate in terms of forwarding your points? Point out the biggest issue you have with Opp’s case here.  1 - Experts (good clash identification)   * Explain WHY they don’t need to be experts. In order to this, you need to first establish what the role or purpose of school curriculum is, and why parents can fulfil this. You need to explain to me why the kinds of choices or decisions they will make might not even be about the rules of grammar, but rather whether or not teachers are giving too much homework, or too many assignments etc. No one on Prop is explaining to me what kinds of decisions parents will even make! Look at the examples in the motion as a guide. * Good on them helping - but explain why they won’t intervene, or why they are **likely** to behave reasonably.   Is this about curriculum or teacher strategies/individual care? Schools already account for this by having more advanced and simpler classes, or keeping certain students in remedial classes, or keeping them in a grade for longer.  04:56 - we need to have more than one clash in the debate!  Good POI to Jacky! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Edna Chow |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house supports substantial parental oversight and involvement in the development of school curricula that applies to their children (e.g., allowing parents to vet books, involving them in curriculum-drafting processes). |
| --- |

| 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: | 67.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  On customisation - point out how this is crazy. Why is standardisation important? Why does it matter in the round?  Rather than saying no definition - call them out for the lack of clarification, and how they never explain the way in which this works; when calling a team out, we have to sound far more active and confident - you want to punish them!  Clashes? Immediately after hook and initial observation, you need to tell me what the clashes are and then segway into them.  Fair on how parents already know - pinpoint why this means they have no unique benefit; they already have the information needed.  On individual focus - explain why this still exists on your side; why there are extra classes, extra help etc. dump these reasons to make it sound like you’re super reasonable. We need to establish the nature of teachers; explain how they are objective, how they know what is needed for kids, why they are more empathetic/likely to privilege the child.  Good on why customisation is silly.  Talk about how if parents are reasonable, they’ll recognise teachers know what they’re doing and reduce involvement, even where given the choice. This is not a debate about them - they don’t use the motion. Who this debate is about, is those who do take interest and intervene - and are unlikely to be reasonable; what books will they want to ban? What kinds of policies will they try to implement?  We aren’t following the structure of a third speech! Next time, we must have clashes, and do rebuttal in this manner.  04:55 | | | | | | |