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

| **Motion:** This house believes that parents should raise their children to prefer to be single |
| --- |

| 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: | 78 (BP scoring) | | | | | |
| 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 6 minutes’ long.]  You still need a hook before the framing of an extension!   * Well done analysing the mechanistic gap in the OO, and their impacts are contingent on this.   + Here, actively isolate what exactly is the analysis you’re providing that is so important. * Good horizontal extension on stigma.   + Then, immediately explain why this is the most important contribution in the debate.   Excellent pushback that this amounts to coercion by parents instead.   * Well done concluding that this does precisely what the Gov bench wanted to avoid, re: social coercion.   + We can argue the impact that they are unlikely to seek their parents for help now when their romantic relationship sours because they are now in active opposition to their parents’ preference.     - So this flips Gov’s argument on being in bad relationships, because parents can no longer be a safety net to help them exit these bad relationships.     - We eventually said this in some form, good job!   Other than increasing the secretiveness of that familial relationship, point out that the desire to be in a relationship is completely individualistic, and why the parental imposition will likely make them deeply unhappy.  Try to avoid relying on your extension as rebuttals, re: stigmatisation, because it leads to more repetition.  We should’ve observed that CG did not give a new extension, and instead, rehashed all of OG. So all of your prior rebuttals rebut both teams at once.  On your extension:   * This societal stigma is also feeding into their problem of society demanding individuals to settle down prematurely. * While you’re trying to find the middle line, it isn’t clear what parents being neutral on your side will do in protecting their child from being a victim of this stigma. * What exactly is the impact statement of the argument?   + We can refocus back on the role of parents and why parents desire for their child to be less affected by social ostracisation.   On your vertical extension:   * Well done on the claim on creating unwarranted hesitance on individuals to be averse to relationships.   + We didn’t have to conflate this to friendships.   + Even self-sabotage of relationships and the denial of their own happiness is a big enough impact.     - This extension is extremely distinct, we didn’t have to call this a vertical extension.   Good job offering POIs!  6.30 - Watch for time!! | | | | | | |