| **Student Name:** Sonja Chow |
| --- |

| **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: | 66 | | | | | |
| 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: Speeches are meant to be six minutes in length for today’s class.  Let’s not use this introductory opening, and motion repetition - we aren’t making a strategic use of our first thirty seconds at all! Highlight instead what the core problem with tiger parenting is. This is a far more effective opening.  What strategic value is our set-up adding? Just defining tiger parents isn’t enough - instead, call the Prop out for their very generous description of what a tiger parent is.  Rebuttal   * We’re shadow-boxing; we need to first summarize what the other side says, and then explain why they are wrong (not true/not important); we also don’t really spend enough time explaining why all their benefits are co-optable; and why we do co-opt them and have it better on our side.   Argument 1   * Can we first establish what tiger parents are like - and how this impacts the parent child relationship; our explanation of what the status quo of this relationship is - and how it changes is, is very short. * What is the impact of losing this relationship? Why does this matter?   Argument 2   * Don’t refer to external quotes - not very persuasive analytically. * Rather than just explaining that work and life need to be balanced, explain how or why this balance occurs without tiger parents - and how this balance impacts children in the long run. Impact this argument - explain why it matters or holds value in the debate.   When we go beyond our written material, we sound more natural - let’s try to do more of this!  POI: we can’t just agree with POIs! Instead - point out why tiger parents don’t actually behave in that manner.  04:32 - we need to adjust our wording and style to that of logic-first/persuasion-first; we can drop the opening/quotation usage we’re using at the moment. Good work pushing yourself to speak for longer!  Where are the POIs? | | | | | | |