| **Student Name:** Kelly Au |
| --- |

| **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.]  Start with a high-impact hook instead of diving right into the rebuttal!   * The counter set-up must also come before responses for the sake of clarity and minimising repetition.   Good moral counter-claim that it is the parent’s choice to have a child, 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? * It's understandable to focus on children of abusive parents, but this is a convenient frame that doesn’t engage with the most compelling version of the prop; what about good parents who did their best? Or the average parent that wasn’t perfect, but did okay?   Good initial start that some parents are terrible at raising their children. 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. So Prop’s model seems fairly reasonable.   Your argument is not being responsive to how strategic Prop’s model is!   * They’ve already excluded children with low financial ability, we need to first explain why this debate MUST include them and why Prop’s model is unreasonable before we can make this argument.   In terms of the parent-child relationship, the financial angle as mentioned above wasn’t the most useful. A more useful context for you to consider is the heaviness of the responsibility of caring for an ageing parent.   * This can look like taking care of your parents ailing health, sacrificing time, careers, holidays, etc. This all can also lead to the resentment you were talking about earlier. You should attempt to argue why this responsibility must be a choice.   The countermodel cannot come in the MIDDLE of your speech!   * Child education does not guarantee the correct outcomes, what happens for the elderly who will still be neglected? * Instead, give a counterfactual on relying on the state in order to care for the elderly instead!   The end of your argument on the child not having an obligation completely overlaps with our rebuttals, try to avoid being repetitive.  Please offer more POIs today!  4.24 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |