| **Student Name:** Jasmine Gao |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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 think in the case of short speeches, it may not be the best idea to provide a preview of your speech, as this consumes precious time. It's more efficient to signpost as you go.  The hardest aspect of the Opposition case is to suggest that it is fine to be selfish as a child. You could use Propositions' own argumentation against them - the previous speaker spends time explaining that life is tough in terms of working hours etc. Flip this against them to show that it is legitimate!  I like the pushback on why Prop’s model will fail in detecting abuse to begin with!   * We’re still ignoring the part of their model on exempting children with low financial abilities though. * 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 reinforcement of the moral counter-claim that the moral obligation applies to parents exclusively, but the same does not apply vice versa.   * 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.   + Were these children not beneficiaries of their parents’ sacrifices?   While I appreciate all of the policy attacks 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.   You may want to spend a bit more time explaining what exactly the resources you’re talking about are - you have the fiat to have your own policy, but presumably you are using more funds compared to the Prop. You’re using subsidies, the prop isn’t likely to incur this same cost.  Nice job offering POIs today!  4.15 - Great timing! | | | | | | |