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

| **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.]  We should provide a counter set-up BEFORE the rebuttals, so the judge understands the comparative of the debate.  Their point on under-funded systems is a criticism of why the state is not the best actor to take care of the elderly, so you’ll need to explain why the status quo would be effective.  We had no real response to P1’s second argument on moral obligation! Provide a clear counter-claim that it is the parent’s choice to have a child, but the same does not apply vice versa and so children don’t inherit the same obligation.   * Make it clear that the parents should bear the full consequences of their own action, but children who suffered under bad parenting should not bear the same moral responsibility.   On the counter set-up:   * On providing education, this is a fine suggestion but this does not ENSURE effectiveness, so say this last and focus on who would be providing care for the elderly who have been abandoned. * Excellent alternative of the state doing this! Can we explain why the state is able to fund this sufficiently?   + The Prop has stated that there is an aging society issue and the state doesn’t have adequate resources to fund this.   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?   We asserted that past trauma could be damaging, since Prop did not mandate that they have to interact, can you explain first why Prop’s model must require people with strained relationships to interact?   * It would be more strategic here to focus on why it’s morally unjustified to force this, and make this a direct clash to prop’s argument on children owing their parents this obligation!   Please offer more POIs in the debate!   * Your POI to P3 was excellent, it should come up sooner!   4.50 - We are under-timed, try to reach 5 minutes in your next speech! | | | | | | |