| **Student Name:** Gwyneth 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.  Try to not lose track of your side in the middle of your speech.  Good moral pushback that it is the parent’s choice to have a child, but the same does not apply vice versa. This has already been well-established by previous speakers, as the last speaker, can we first explain the thematic importance of this issue and why the debate is decided by this question?   * 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? * Can we immediately dive into the comparative and explain why the state DOES have an obligation to the elderly?   The speech felt undirected. It would be good if you could set up what the major premise of the other side is, and explain how your case has dealt with it effectively. Furthermore, you want to make sure that the debate shifts away from being a mechanistic clash - your side had rich claims on the responsibility of a child and parent. Focusing on this part, which is your strongest argument anyway, would be better for you.  As the last speaker, please signpost clashes or issues as your main structure!  The second clash also has some repetitive elements to the first clash! Have distinct focal points.  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.   To be fair to the Proposition, they do explain with quite a bit of detail on how abusive parents can be filtered out. You really really need to deal with the expanding layers of how their model works and deals with your case.   * We need to evolve with the debate! At this point, Opp’s winning point is that abuse as a model is difficult to enforce. Otherwise, prop can get away by saying they have mech’ed out this problem.   Please offer more POIs today!  3.54 - Wait until you hear the double bell! | | | | | | |