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

| **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.]  Good start that the default for human nature can be quite vengeful, and we need better moral ideals.  Don’t apologise to your opponent for rebutting her!   * When defending forgiveness, explain that glorification does not mean we forgive EACH and every time, but most of the time. * Well done recharacterising glorification, but it’s not done in such a way that is strategic, it’s merely adding clarity in a way that helps Proposition.   + Explain that just because something is a norm, it doesn’t mean there aren’t extraordinary circumstances to opt out of forgiveness in extreme situations like being a victim of violent crime. * Good job on the caveat of having law and order and accountability still!   + We don’t need to mobilise the state here, it’s a value debate so Opp can only defend the status quo as it is. * What is your winning pathway?   Be careful, we’re only entering arguments at 3:50!  It isn’t clear whether we rebutted Prop at all, we need to engage with the idea of victims being shamed into forgiveness, loss of autonomy and loss of accountability.  On the argument of promoting empathy:   * Why can’t we promote humanity and understanding without glorifying forgiveness?   + It isn’t clear at all how glorifying forgiveness is the unique medium in which we achieve this. * We spent so much time on these unique circumstances in court without ever explaining it! * What is the importance of this argument?   + Would society behave in harmful ways if we do not forgive?   + What are the illustrations for when this happens, since you’ve explained that we already have law and order to prevent the worst of human behaviours?   Please offer more POIs!  5.01 | | | | | | |