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

| **Motion:** This house would ban violent video games |
| --- |

| 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 5 minutes long!]  Good start describing the downfalls of violent video games, we can be a little bit more severe about the worst case scenario in order to make a greater impact.   * Good job signposting!   On the set-up:   * Clear definition, but we suddenly pivoted into the harms of violent video games! * Explain the ban and the punishment for the ban first.   While the claims for addiction are true, we need to spend time reasoning how or why this happens.  On proving desensitisation, we need to be able to use logic to explain why the premise is true, rather than just rely on an unnamed study.   * We have a habit of continuously relying on these unnamed studies.   Good job explaining that this leads to more aggression among children.   * But it isn’t clear why the Opposition needs to defend children playing this! Why won’t they just propose that children should not be allowed to play this?   + We then get to explain that regulations are imperfect, and children can download these games illegally online. So only a ban can ensure zero access.   On the claim of avoiding peaceful resolutions, it isn’t clear what the context of this is. Why can’t they speak to their friends or seek the help of parents and teachers in this process?   * There may be some logical leaps here on how their gaming experience is applied in real life. * Can we explain why the games will have a larger influence on them in contrast to any other counter influence from schools, parents or laws?   Please ask for more POIs today!  3.12 - We are severely under-timed today! Try to reach 4 minutes. | | | | | | |