| **Student Name:** Dana Chung |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house regrets the glorification of forgiveness as a virtue |
| --- |

| 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: | 75 (BP score) | | | | | |
| 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.]  I like the reference to the common phrase, we can point to the status of this phrase becoming culturally normative, and we oppose this level of imposition.  On the set-up:   * Good job stating the over-emphasis, but what is the level of glorification that leads to this? * State your counterfactual!   + If people don’t forgive, do they just let the hatred fester within them?   + Explain how people can access closure and move on without forgiveness. Suggest therapy and self-growth! * We went straight into the argument without the metric/winning pathway.   + Explain why individual empowerment is the winning framing!   Good job concluding that this means people forgive even when they shouldn’t.   * We need to further expand the mechanism of glorification to prove that it overrides the individual autonomy to deny forgiveness when necessary. * What exactly is the kind of grounding and illustration when forgiveness ought not be given? E.g. Sexual crimes.   + It isn’t exactly clear what are the harms that are suffered when forgiveness is premature?     - Expand on this idea of victim-shaming!       * Bring in the context of situations like the patriarchy, when women are the ones largely upholding the burden of forgiving when suffering from oppression orchestrated by the men.   Nice argument on lowering accountability when forgiven.   * We have really good mechanistic analysis, but there is no grounding at all!   + Put it in the context of relationships, where your partner constantly crosses your boundaries or fails their commitments.     - Then expound the harm statement when there’s a lack of accountability. * However, just because forgiveness is given, it doesn’t mean there’s no accountability. Are there no punishments for these wrongful actions?   + We know that Opp will run that there’s still law and order, so we can go one step further and explain how forgiveness even messes up with the legal system.     - We can point out that many sexual abusers don’t even get charged, because family members pressure victims to forgive and drop these cases.   Good job offering POIs!  4.49 - We’re a little short! Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |