| **Student Name:** Alex Zhu |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would legally require children to take care of their parents once the parents reach old age |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 minutes’ long.]  Make the call-out clearer and explain precisely why the debate is limited to parent-child relationships that are toxic, instead of just asserting it. Otherwise, it’s unproven.  Your argument on financially burdening children is not being responsive to how strategic Prop’s model is!   * They’ve already excluded children with low financial ability, we need to first explain why this debate MUST include them and why Prop’s model is unreasonable before we can make this argument.   In terms of the parent-child relationship, the financial angle as mentioned above wasn’t the most useful. A more useful context for you to consider is the heaviness of the responsibility of caring for an ageing parent.   * This can look like taking care of your parents ailing health, sacrificing time, careers, holidays, etc. This all can also lead to the resentment you were talking about. Then we can relate this back to your claim on why this responsibility must be a choice.   On the parent-child relationship, spend less time focusing on the moral value of it which doesn’t have much impact.   * Instead, spend more time analysing the toxicity of this relationship and why it will be counterproductive to the quality of their relationship. What will this look like? Will they actively abuse their parents?   The second argument is also focusing too much on the moral claim that the parent-child relationship OUGHT to mean something.   * What is the moral impact of this argument? It ends up covering the exact same claim in the first argument on toxic relationships.   Make an observation that Opp can co-opt a lot of the benefits if your countermodel works! But at this point, there has been no clear defence of your countermodel.   * Actively explain to me why state responsibility is a good enough alternative to deal with the rising ageing population, otherwise Prop will win on the biggest issue of human costs. It's also important to note that at some point, it's less about the model, more about the main crux of the case. * The last speaker has also given several rebuttals to explain why the state has inadequate political capital to have an effective system, so we need to respond to this.   Please offer more POIs in the debate!  4.49 - We are under-timed, try to reach 5 minutes in your next speech! | | | | | | |