| **Student Name:** Zechariah Chen |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Nice focal point on the moral repugnance of children abandoning their parents without cause in the status quo.   * However, we have to be cognisant of how the 2nd Opposition has shifted the debate towards parents who have specifically mistreated their children, and that’s why those children actively chose to not care for their ageing parents.   + So spend some time re-characterising where the debate mainly happens.   Good decision to focus on why the Opposition's counter-model is unlikely to work!   * I need even more analysis beyond the financial burdens of Opp’s policy.   + We have to conclude why their flaws are STRUCTURAL, and these are not problems that can simply be fixed with more funding.     - E.g. Explain that there will not have the political capital to care for the elderly, so the source of funding will be non-existent.   Don’t agree with the Opposition on flawed parents who traumatised their children! Instead, focus on the parts of your strategic model that children who can prove that they have been abused can be exempted from this policy.   * Excellent moral parallel that at the very least, the parents have financially provided for their child, and this is what your policy demands back from children. * On your moral principle, what is even your moral claim? Explain the principle of reciprocity first.   I appreciate the illustrations of how parents are suffering without the care of their children, however, the Opposition is not contending with any of this. They are arguing that their countermodel is better in dealing with this specific problem.   * So focus on a policy-to-policy comparative instead!   We are referencing the quality of the parent-child relationship, without engaging with Opp’s argument on why forcing the relationship will actually deteriorate the relationship and further the trauma! So try to be comparative.  As a whip speaker, we need to fix our speech structure. Have an issue-by-issue approach instead of many rebuttals compiled.  Nice job offering POIs today!  6.30 - We are undertimed, try to reach 7 minutes! | | | | | | |