| **Student Name:** Samara Anand |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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 signposting, we would benefit a lot from making some strategic observations in the debate beforehand! This debate is slightly convoluted at this point because both teams are lacking mechanistic analysis on how their model will work.  I like the call-out that their model on detecting abuse in the parent-child relationship would not work. We’re stopping too early by just asking how this will work?   * Go one step further and stating that abuse that happened in the past is often under-reported, and the traumatised child would not be able to prove that abuse DID happen. So a lot of child victims will be forced to undertake this unfair obligation.   Make an observation that Opp can co-opt a lot of the benefits if your countermodel works! But at this point, there has been no clear defence of your countermodel.   * Actively explain to me why state responsibility is a good enough alternative to deal with the rising ageing population, otherwise Prop will win on the biggest issue of human costs. * The last speaker has also given several rebuttals to explain why the state has inadequate political capital to have an effective system, so we need to respond to this.   + They questioned that the state won’t have the funds for a functional system.   We don’t have a principle pushback against Prop’s moral claim that the children are the ones who owe their parents an obligation, but the same does not apply vice versa.   * While I understand the broad claim that parents should bear the full consequences of their own action, we’re not stating HOW this analysis takes down the claim of reciprocity.   + Were these children not beneficiaries of their parents’ sacrifices? * Can we immediately dive into the comparative and explain why the state DOES have an obligation to the elderly?   We had a brand new argument on individual autonomy as the 3rd Opp speaker!   * Based off of your teammates’ arguments, you should’ve been focusing on the clash of the parent-child relationship instead!   + We had a late engagement on state role, this should’ve been in the earlier part of your speech!   Good job offering POIs in the debate!  5.41 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |