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

| **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: | 76 (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.]  Good clarification that preference does not amount to coercion, could we clarify how you’re able to find that middle line where parents are not brainwashing their children?  On the set-up:   * Strong emphasis on raising children to be independent, with the use of open communication. * Can we openly acknowledge how parents would react in your world if children actively go against their parents’ preference? Will they be met with disappointment, rejection or shame? This is important to enable the ‘independence’ characterisation. * What is your winning pathway? Is this an actor debate?   + Good emphasis on parents wanting the best for their child and being single is aligned with that.   We can still work on timing, we’re still entering arguments very late at 03:00.  On the argument:   * Massive positive outcomes is a bit too vague as a premise, try to clarify that even more! * It isn’t clear why open communication is exclusive, why can’t Opp still have these same practices? * On children exploring more of their passions, can we explain why this is something they’re only able to work on when they’re single?   + Explain clearly what are the expectations of being in a relationship, and why it is a burden to individuals. * Well done on the premise of people putting their worth on a relationship. * Instead of toxic relationships, the analysis that society puts pressure for people to be in a relationship in the mechanistic analysis of the premise prior to this.   + Go ahead and expand the impact statements of being in a bad relationship.   The analysis became a little bit circular on impeding individual development.   * We need to improve the characterisation on why partners are likely to be unsupportive and a hindrance, rather than the opposite.   We are currently lacking the parental perspective and why it’s so crucial for parents to do this.   * For example, parents have the sufficient authority to overcome the overwhelming societal narratives forcing individuals to settle down, so this would be a strong counter-narrative and enable children to have more choices.   Don’t self-deprecate and say you don’t know if certain parts of your speech is true!  Remember that the BP strategy for the opening is to matter-grab from your closing but we only had one argument today.  Good job offering POIs!   * Good job asking for a POI before going to arguments.   6.13 | | | | | | |