| **Student Name:** Theodore Wang |
| --- |

| **Motion:** In Asian countries, This house regrets the dominant narrative that “family comes first” |
| --- |

| 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 5.30 minutes’ long.]  Nice start focusing on the harmful things that families can demand of you, but it’s still highly deadlocked so we should utilise something that you can fully execute at the start. Otherwise, it stays unproven.   * Good signposting.   On the kind of sacrifices that parents demand children make, we are not engaging with Opp’s counter-characterisation. Which is MORE likely to happen, progressive parents or unfair parents?   * We can conclude that while SOME parents are bad and some are good, the fact that this is a NORM is what encourages parents to lean into these harmful behaviours because they believe this is what they are entitled to. So you still win on a scale.   + Otherwise, Opp’s characterisation that parents are these altruistic actors who always care for their children first may still prevail in their context of a “progressive” society.   We need to be comparative because Opp claims that under Prop’s climate, children can easily cut off ties with families because no one values their family, and they’re losing the kind of valuable support that they need in order to survive in life.   * We need to weigh what will be lost under both sides, and explain why having the agency on Prop deciding what is in the child’s best interest is superior. * You can also clash with Opp by asking why uniquely only families can play the role of a support system. Why can’t people get support from their other loved ones?   Where is the impacting of the argument on what happens to the child? Expand on the lack of self-actualisation and self-discovery.   * After stating that they lose opportunities, what exactly is the human cost of this unhappiness? Why is this human experience of fulfilment something that everyone deserves?   + We can correlate this back to the quality of relationship within the family. Which is more related to the very purpose of the narrative of “family comes first.”   + On a practical basis, we can expand this cyclically and intergenerationally to people then passing that trauma to their own children.   We initially had structure and then progressive lost it throughout your speech, make sure you hold on to your transitions until the end.  Engage by explaining which is MORE likely to happen, parents sacrificing to protect their child or vice versa? Otherwise, we go back and forth on who is being helped/hurt by this narrative.   * We are emphasising that they shouldn’t do anything that is harmful to them, but the previous speaker has explained that they can still opt out if there are deep harms to themselves. Tell them that they are being contradictory! * Make sure we add a strategic framing to explain that this debate is NOT about situations where their interests align, because then they would do it on both sides of the debate. So this debate is exclusively on scenarios where children suffer from harm.   Please offer more POIs in the debate!  6.12 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |