| **Student Name:** Connor Chung |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that parents should have full access to the internet activity of their children |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 a child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are between 2 to 4 minutes’ long!]  Try to start your speech with a well-planned hook in your next speech, rather than a “so umm…”! You should attempt to start your speech on a more energetic/dramatic note - the hook is your first impression with a judge!  Good questions that we’re asking to the Opposition that we cannot control the actions of every parent, and different parents will behave in subjective ways.   * We’re stopping very early here, we can try to suggest that parents will utilise their parental rights and behave in bad or ineffective ways in the Opposition's world.   We asked why children would even fear their parents because their parents birthed them, but it is not unreasonable for the Opposition to suggest that children fear their parents!   * We need a counter-reasoning in order to take down Proposition’s reasoning that children would not be able to behave as they’d like under strict parental supervision..   The idea of parents being trusted is quite convenient. First, try to prove that this is likely. Secondly, deal with situations where the parent is not trusted. How does that impact the relationship and how will you handle this scenario?  Where are our arguments today, Connor? The second speaker needs to BOTH rebut and argue!  A better comparison would be to suggest that child safety is far more important than the Opposition's arguments on trust and privacy of children!  Try to finish your speech with a clear conclusion.  1.29 - Let’s apply ourselves more next time around, try to reach 2 minutes | | | | | | |