| **Student Name:**  Katherine |
| --- |

| **Motion:** TH regrets the glorification of forgiveness as a virtue |
| --- |

| 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:   * Nice hook content; I think it got straight to the issue at hand. Try to make it seem a bit more difficult and complex though - not just that a toy is broken. * There is a hint of confusion at the start. This can be overcome with better mental preparation during the prep time. * It isn’t fully clear what you mean by glorification of forgiveness. This must happen at the earlier half of the speech. * You’ve started talking about ‘consequences’ quite early on. I suggest you reserve that time slot for context/definition/stance more than establishing consequences. * Try to talk to us about what unconditional forgiveness looks like; but also, is forgiveness really unconditional all the time? This seems a bit extreme. * Try to up your stage presence; try to give me more sass and eye contact! * Try to stay structured; I feel as though your set-up and argumentation blurred together a little bit. You want to make a clear delineation between these two aspects! * It is unclear what your arguments are titled. You entered the arguments without telling what the argument is about. * Remember, it's a claim not a contingent! * The examples that you’ve brought in the debate about family matters, though is interesting to bind a context, is quite limiting to the scope of the debate. Can we talk about people that have done something severely wrong like a crime? Are there people included in the community despite doing something fundamentally wrong? Is there a political aspect to this? * Try to tell me about people’s emotions; why do people feel anger? Why is this anger automatically worse when there is no punishment etc? Try to make sure that you are answering these base questions first to make your argument much more credible.   Speaking time: 05:28.17, good work! |
| --- |

| **Student Name:**  Ari |
| --- |

| **Motion:** TH regrets the glorification of forgiveness as a virtue |
| --- |

| 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: | 73 | | | | | |
| 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   * Good use of flipping the other side's argument against the OG! Nice hook. * That hook was quite a ride; good work! Try to make sure that you don’t go too far with the hook though - try to make sure that you are done at 0:30! * Excellent eye contact and hand gestures! * Even if; you have gotten over the pain. Try to tell me about the pain and how the pain can go away with forgiveness exclusively! * Good work for explaining how a lack of forgiveness causes you to think about things that can’t be solved; try to maybe tell me about how this anger is not productive as it also makes your life more miserable. This will really solidify how you are better than the other side! * Structure is a major issue in this speech; you need to make sure that you are actively labelling and signposting each part of your speech! * While the opening response about forgiving your sister was valid, you spent a little too long explaining it (almost 2 minutes). Also, its better to connect it with ideas that have a larger scope in the debate: Can it be linked with:   + How forgiveness has a strong link with cooperation in society? Is there a socio-political element to it? (Example: political representatives forgiving opponents flaws of the past and incorporating them into the newly established system to ensure inclusivity)   + Are individuals better rehabilitated when they are forgiven? Is it the case that individuals become worse when they are labeled as unforgivable?   Speaking time: 05:33.93, good work! |
| --- |

| **Student Name:**  Catherine |
| --- |

| **Motion:** TH regrets the glorification of forgiveness as a virtue |
| --- |

| 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: | 72.5 | | | | | |
| 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:   * Good clarification and call out to the other side; you need to be way more assertive though - especially in the context where a speaker has given a very compelling speech! * Good signposting! * Rebuttal   + Less anger - You are assuming that people will forgive out of pressure; what if someone does forgive out of the goodness of their heart however?   + Try to also talk about why people will know that they are pressured to forgive compared to making the choice for themself; how does that work?   + Silence of the victims - Good point. You can also point out that this can be very abusive too; meaning that people who keep doing terrible things will keep getting away with it. * The point about pressure against the victims is a very interesting one to run in this debate. Can we talk about:   + How victim’s response/need-for-closure is extremely important for justice and you get that more on your side   + How it creates a deterrence against wrong doing as people know that they won’t be easily forgiven for the wrongs that they do   + Also, this argument would largely benefit from a practical example. Currently, there’s interpretation without a practical example. It seems incomplete. * There needs to be a stronger response to opp’s point about how forgiveness helps people become better and more included. Your argument is centered more around those that are bad, however, doesn’t sufficiently respond to the case of those that can become better. * Try to make sure that you are also highlighting how and why your extensions are valuable as you move through each extension. * I like the idea that we ignore the journey of the victim; try to tell me why it is worthwhile for us to go ahead and listen to victims. What might we understand from this? |
| --- |

| **Student Name:**  Kyle |
| --- |

| **Motion:** TH regrets the glorification of forgiveness as a virtue |
| --- |

| 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:   * Try to take a few minutes to start to make sure that you fully have the attention of the judges; take some time to fully ascertain the situation! * Good signposting! * When you argue that it's important to be forgiven for wrong things you do, can you explain more on what examples we’re talking about. Are we also forgiving murderers, frauds, etc? If so, why? What’s the outcome under your side? * Try to make sure that you are explaining what the value of your added material is; try to also do a wrap up! Tell the judge about all that have you said and why it was very valuable. * You argued that there wouldn’t be conflict among people if one person doesn’t care. I don’t think that has been justified, and its a very big burden to take as well. The conclusion lacks a strong basis. It’s better to avoid sentences as such. * Try to make sure that your writing is clear and legible; use a marker if you have to to make sure that you have an accurate view of the content! * The point about conflict resolution is spread across the entire speech. I suggest you don’t repeat. Once mentioned and explained well, its wise to not come back to the same point again. * Try to tell me about real forgiveness; how does it work? Why can people access it? How do people access it? Try to tell me about this process as this actually will provide you with many opportunities to proceed! * Try not to spend too much time on answering the POI; if you don’t get it, move on!   Speaking time: 05:29.63, good work! |
| --- |

| **Student Name:**  Sonja |
| --- |

| **Motion:** TH regrets the glorification of forgiveness as a virtue |
| --- |

| 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:   * Nice hook! Keep things composed though. * I like the idea that forgiveness must be earned; be sure to talk to me and tell me about how and why forgiveness can and will be earned. * Try to make sure that you are actively explaining how and why your argumentation of resentment is different from the argumentation of the opening government. When your argument is similar, you need to make sure to point out the specific addition of materials in your side. * Try to talk to me about how and why people will benefit from earning forgiveness; could this possibly put them on a course of betterment? * There's a very good structure you’re following throughout your speech. Good signposting as well. * Tell me more about how and why people will end up getting resentful! * Try to please make sure that you are clearly labelling and signposting each of your argumentation. * The argument about ‘not wanting to forgive them’ can be linked with border ideas such as:   + How victims are socially pressurized to forgive and include their perpetrators and how that’s not justice.   + How the freedom to not forgive allows individuals, especially victims a strong sense of closure.   + Can we link this idea with the social context of marginalized groups? Is it the case that collective groups have to forgive the groups that have been suppressive against them? * The rebuttals are somewhat scattered all over the place. Better categorization required. Once you finish rebuttals, go to your arguments/extensions and try to avoid overlaps. * There is a significant lack of examples throughout the speech. While you opened the speech with a relevant example, you need to have greater frequency of examples in your speech. It is somewhat unclear what sort of acts/crimes/bad-behavior we are talking about in several arguments.   Speaking time: 05:23.63, good work! |
| --- |

| **Student Name:**  Tania |
| --- |

| **Motion:** TH regrets the glorification of forgiveness as a virtue |
| --- |

| 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:   * Make sure to move your hands as you speak! * Good hook! * Good signposting! * While the point about forgiving someone at the start of the conflict is relevant and does give a good perspective of your stance, does that sufficiency cover the wide range of discussion that has happened in the debate? There are examples of people that have committed crimes or shown very bad behavior. Do you think your response covers them as well? It is recommended that you prioritize examples that cover a wider spectrum of the debate. * Rebuttals   + If nobody forgives - Everyone hates each other; fair enough, but this seems a bit extreme. The point of the government is not that forgiveness per say is bad; but rather, it is that forgiveness is something that must be earned.   + CG - Good call out of an extreme argument. Try to also tell me about how and why things can be better even in that extreme scenario however! * When you mention that the stake holders are the general public, that is a little too broad and vague. Is there a specific group that we can bring into the debate as well? Can we talk about individuals with specific experiences? * Try to make sure that you are explaining how and why your arguments are different from what the opening opposition is! * I like the idea that you will end up moving forward and also becoming better; but how does this happen? * Don’t just move on from your claim; you skipped reasoning for the growing part of the argument! Don’t jump straight to the impacts.   Speaking time: 04:55.42, good work! |
| --- |

| **Student Name:**  Maddie |
| --- |

| **Motion:** TH regrets the glorification of forgiveness as a virtue |
| --- |

| 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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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:   * The context that you brought at the start was a little too long. Almost two minutes. Try moving to direct rebuttals or further interpretation of other points. * Try to make sure that you are starting with you and you alone first; make sure to spend your time to explain the unique value and addition of your argumentation. * Try to make sure that you still feature a good hook! * I like that you identified numerous situations where forgiveness is not warranted; however, you could perhaps frame this argument in a way that focuses on society. This could look like, people assume that they will be forgiven and are upset when they are not forgiven, * Can we respond to some important points from the opp:   + The opp has argued that forgiving can transform people and help people cooperate better. Engaging directly with their point and example, can we argue how that isn’t the case? * In BP, timing is everything. You need to make sure that you are being as efficient as possible with your rebuttals. Try to tackle the main issue and the main logic of the other side versus point by point rebuttal. * Try to make sure that you are showing me how and why people will be able to move on and earn forgiveness; this is important given that it is the main assumption of your speech! * Try to make sure that you are telling me how regret hurts you far more compared to being angry. * Try to tell me about why people are likely to exploit your forgiveness! * Good direct comparison!   Speaking time: 05:19.87, good work! |
| --- |

| **Student Name:**  Aria |
| --- |

| **Motion:** TH regrets the glorification of forgiveness as a virtue |
| --- |

| 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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:   * Try not to be so abrupt with the hook; take your time! * Try to make sure to first recap everything said by Tania first; explain what is unique and what is important in this speech. * Good clarification that you are not being forced to automatically forgive; try to give me several reasons for why this is true as this helps to make sure that the judge believes you! * Don’t pull out a definition in the dictionary to justify your point; you gotta pander to logic. Try to explain why you logically prior compared to the speakers on the other side! * You can’t add a counterfactual in a whip speech; pass this over to your extension speaker next time! * Try to tell me about how and why people will be able to deal with all of the harms of the other side; the other side talked about people feeling compelled and pressured to move on and forgive. * Never forget and remember what happened seems a bit contradictory to the overall team stance; try to avoid adding this in as the strategic value is quite limited. * Try not to just go into a rebuttal speech; you need to be directed. Take the time to make direct comparisons to each team in the debate.   Speaking time: 05:36.76, good work! |
| --- |