| **Student Name:** Claudia Yeung |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house will enforce filial responsibility laws |
| --- |

| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  The hook is a clear summation of your position, but we’re definitely lacking impact to start off your speech.   * Good signposting!   On rebutting children being put up for adoption:   * Instead of defending the choice of parents who give up their children, just explain that this stakeholder is excluded in the debate! The financial obligation would actually be to their adoptive parents, not the biological parents who abandoned them.   On attacking the Opposition’s countermodel:   * Excellent rebuttal that the government will not have the political capital to care for the elderly, or the financial ability to fund this well.   + We need far more specificity. How badly will the system fail? What would be the human costs here when we use the Opposition’s system?   + We need to explain why these problems are INHERENT, and cannot be improved upon.   We need a stronger response to Opp’s counter-moral premise on why reciprocity cannot exist when children do not consent to being born!  If these children do not like their parents, could that not be symptomatic of the parents failing their own children as the Opposition asserts?  On the moral obligation of children, what is even the moral premise you’re making?   * Explain the principle of reciprocity, why parents have sacrificed their own lives to protect children, and how vulnerable these parents are now without the care of the child.   + What is the moral impact of violating this principle?   I appreciate the illustrations of the dangers that could befall parents, however, Opposition is not contending with any of this. They are arguing that their countermodel is better in dealing with this.   * So focus on a policy-to-policy comparative instead!   + When we explained that there’s bullying in elderly homes, why can’t this be a problem solved with more supervision?   Please offer more POIs in the debate!  7.23 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |