| **Student Name:** Isabella Chau |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house supports the rise of tiger parenting |
| --- |

| 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.]  Signpost your speech right after the hook, instead of diving right into your rebuttals!  While it’s true that children need to prepare for the reality of competitiveness in the future, we need to engage with two things:   * Why this is more important than caring for the mental well-being of the child;   + Your 1st speaker argued that parents have positive, kind intentions. We should instead use this analysis to explain that parents will be responsible and caring even when implementing strict practices! So it won’t be as harmful as the Opp claims.     - Point out that if parents know that being extremely strict will hurt the mental health of children and therefore hurt their studies, then tiger parents will also not be extremely strict to the point of hurting their own child. * Why future success is unique to the strict tiger parenting model.   + Try to be comparative and explain why lenient parenting will result in bad habits and practices on behalf of the child, instead of asserting that children won’t study.   Try to avoid accepting the POI right away! Wait until you’re in a good transition point in your speech.  Good initial claim that children can be quite lazy, expound on this even more to prove it!   * What is the nature of children and why can’t they be self-disciplined in the process of pursuing academic success? * Why can’t a lenient parent also positively encourage them to study? Why won’t their children listen if a parent attempts to guide them without any punishment?   Currently, all of our claims are under-analysed. We need more than just a few sentences. Aim for having just ONE argument as the second speaker, and analysing it for 1 min 30 seconds, rather than 3 short claims.  Your impact on creating more competitive, well-rounded children is not contentious at this point of the debate because the Opposition claims that kind parents could also help students study.   * Can we be comparative to the Opp’s claim that having good mental health is essential for a student to study effectively and develop as a healthy person?   Please offer more POIs in the debate!  Try to verbalise your speech structure when transitioning between ideas.  4.53 - So close to 5 minutes! Let’s aim to reach 5 in your next try. | | | | | | |