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

| **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: | 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 5 to 5.30 minutes’ long.]  Good pushback on the hook on parents being considerate of their child’s needs, however, this clash goes back and forth because some parents are good and some are bad. We can focus more on structural reasons why this characterisation is more likely than the alternative.   * Signpost your speech first before diving into the material! * Be mindful that limiting the context to “progressive society” may not fully align with the WSDC rule of debating in a global context, so we need to explain why this describes essentially ALL communities. * When we are characterising things like protecting victims of unique circumstances via this narrative, we need to attach this characterisation to something more strategic: are you using this narrative as a final safety net to solve loopholes in society? Relate this back properly to what is the purpose of having narratives, which is not to protect every single individual as per what Prop claims, but to build strong support systems for the majority! Narratives are not meant to serve everyone, but it’s just to build healthy norms for most; those who are incredibly hurt by norms can opt out if it doesn’t serve them.   We need a counter set-up before the rebuttals:   * Good descriptions of Asian families wanting more for their children, can you explain what attributes this narrative includes?   + Prop burden pushed some horrendous sacrifices, we need more examples and illustrations of the worst case for Prop to defend as well.   Where exactly are the rebuttals? If it’s integrated into your positive case, flag it as such!  Excellent characterisation on why parents make reasonable demands, rather than unfair, excessive demands in the process.   * However, we’re making some fairly generic claims that parents always want the best for your child, but it’s fairly logical on Prop to suggest that parents are also self-interested and want what’s best for themselves.   + we need to engage even in scenarios of selfish parents. We can flip this and explain that even selfish parents will NEED their child to be successful in order to use them as a retirement plan. Parents can also see that their children are deeply unhappy if we force them to do certain things, and this would be counterproductive to their child succeeding!     - We eventually said this at the end! Good job!   We need to be comparative because Prop claims that under Opp’s climate, parents are the ones threatening the child if the child doesn’t comply with their demands. So you need to first explain which team gets to claim this harm of severing the relationship.   * Explain why exactly do you think individuals on Prop’s side are encouraged to walk away or cut off from their family members. We can be more reasonable as well, many people can disagree with their family members without having to walk away completely!   + All of our impact statements on the loss of familial support stem from this, so we have to work on this mechanistic analysis first. * On the harm, what is unclear is why uniquely only families can play the role of a support system. Why can’t people get support from their other chosen loved ones?   Prop is highlighting that this debate happens when there are competing interests between parent and child. Why is it exclusive to Opp that only you can have good/healthy communication between parents and children in order to resolve this competing interest?   * Can we analyse why children have the ability and agency to disagree with their parents under your family dynamics of having to obey one’s parents?   Good job offering POIs in the debate!  6.01 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |