| **Student Name:** Vania Wong |
| --- |

| **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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Work on the hook to be a little bit longer and more impactful!   * Signposting please!   Excellent counterfactual on relying on the state in order to care for the elderly instead!   * However, Proposition argued that there’s insufficient funding for this, how will Opposition overcome this. * Very good moral parallel on parents surrendering the right to their children, and children need to avail of the same mechanism!   + We made some strong strategic observations today, good job!   Strong rebuttal on breaking the moral imperative that children owe to parents.   * However, we cannot just attack the failure of parents, as Prop has also proposed caveats to exempt children who have been mistreated by parents.   + The requirement of financial obligation also seems commensurate to what parents have already provided, which is basic needs while growing up.   While I appreciate the countermodel, at this point, there has been no clear defence of your countermodel. Actively explain to me why it’s a good enough alternative to deal with the rising ageing population, otherwise Prop will win on the biggest issue of human costs.  Some of our attacks have been removed by Prop’s strategic modelling, such as exempting low-income children, as this deals with the intergenerational poverty premise you have.  Good argument on the lack of consent on the child’s part.   * Make a clear observation that this directly clashes and takes down Prop’s first argument. * While I understand the broad claim that parents should bear the full consequences of their own action, we’re not stating HOW this analysis takes down the claim of reciprocity. * Interesting moral parallel on the lack of choice, but we need examples that are more specifically grounded on the parent-child relationship.   We should have a 2nd argument in a 7 mins speech! Focus on how this harms the parent-child relationship, especially since Prop is currently still winning on the clash of the well-being of parents.  Nice job offering POIs today!  7.01 - Good job today! | | | | | | |