| **Student Name:** Ella Chan |
| --- |

| **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 4 minutes’ long.]  I appreciate the call-outs in the hook, but the accusations need to be super specific, rather than just broad accusations so that the judge agrees with your observations.  In a context where you have a short speaking time, you want to avoid lengthy overviews of your speech. Just use signposting as you go as that will be more efficient.  It’s ironic to say that Prop’s model was fleshed out late but your 1st speaker also did not flesh out your countermodel!   * After asking the questions on the lack of clarity on interactions, go ahead and conclude how this damages the outcomes of their case.   + Go the full mile and make the observation that their model of forcing the parent-child responsibility is also counterproductive and leads to more toxicity! * Good observation on why child abuse is difficult to detect and enforce. Be’re still ignoring the part of their model on exempting children with low financial abilities though. * What is the damage of a claim being assertive? The claims run were intuitive enough to some extent - what was left unproven? You must make your rebuttals more impactful but explaining how this removes the judges ability to believe in these claims.   Good observation that Opp can co-opt a lot of the benefits if your countermodel works! But at this point, there has been no clear defence of your countermodel.   * Actively explain to me why state responsibility is a good enough alternative to deal with the rising ageing population, otherwise Prop will win on the biggest issue of human costs. It's also important to note that at some point, it's less about the model, more about the main crux of the case. * Bear in mind as well that your first speaker did not actually propose this! So spend some time clarifying what the policy is. * The last speaker has also given several rebuttals to explain why the state has inadequate political capital to have an effective system, so we need to respond to this.   By shifting this debate into a model debate, this does you no favours! Your team’s strongest argument is your moral counterclaim that the child owes the parent no obligation, and your model is the weakest component of your case! So we have to be more strategic.  Please offer more POIs today!  4.38 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |