| **Student Name:** Nathan Sun |
| --- |

| **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!]  Good job with the hook! I do notice that your go-to hook is “In a society...” Try to spice things up with a different approach in the next speech!   * I like the clarification of Opposition’s position in today’s motion, i.e. that you’re still able to protect children even without this policy.   We should signpost the entirety of our speech right after the hook, but I appreciate that we are flagging the rebuttals before we start.  Try to make sure that your speech is written down clearly in your next speech. I noticed that you stumbled when transitioning between different parts of your argument. This can help prevent that.  You must try to engage with the harms brought forward by the first speaker. These harms were, that the internet is a dangerous place and the parent must prevent these harms. What is your response to this?   * You suggested you must teach people right and wrong. Great stuff! How will this work and why will it be effective?   Interesting rebuttal that children may fear to do what they want on the internet, but could this not be a good benefit in the eyes of the Proposition? Because now children will behave more responsibly online.   * So we have to clearly explain what harm the child will suffer from when they cannot act as they please online, e.g. they cannot ask for help if they have a bad home environment.   I like the argument on protecting trust! Can we explain the degree of importance of protecting the parent-child relationship?  On the right to privacy, this is an excellent claim!   * But can we reason out why this right is important for the well-being of children? How will children suffer if they believe their right to privacy is not respected?   I like the clash that parents can simply teach their children to be more responsible online! Can we suggest reasons as to why this will be an effective way to protect children?  Nice conclusion.  3.30 - Excellent job! Let’s aim for 4.00 next time. | | | | | | |