| **Student Name:** Natalie Ng |
| --- |

| **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!]  Nice hook at the beginning, but try not to let it fizzle out! Begin and end on a strong note.   * We can also focus on the impacts, and not just have a broad summation.   We should signpost with all of our arguments before diving into our first claim!  We have good summative lines on the dangers of the internet, can we list down all of the potential harms on the internet that the child may end up interacting with? E.g.   * Explicit and violent content, * Extremist groups with radical influence, * Age-inappropriate content, etc.   Try to set some boundaries on what the scope of the debate is about. For example, what do you mean by access to all social media? How are the parents likely to do this?  Good premise that parental supervision may prevent all of these harms, but can we explain why parents won’t be able to talk to their children and ask for these types of information?  You must also consider the other side of the arguments you bring; some parents may be quite toxic and not the best parents. How do you deal with these sets of parents? Are they a part of the debate?  We broadly mentioned that children will be potentially harmed, can we impact this argument better by explaining the fullest extent of harm that they may suffer from? Are there any long-term consequences?  Good conclusion in the speech!  I like the initial premise of your rebuttal, try to give clear layers of reasoning to compare why Proposition’s model is more effective than the Opposition’s countermodel!  2.45 - Good timing! Let’s aim to go for 3 minutes in our next speech. | | | | | | |