| **Student Name:** Hanson Ko |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would enforce filial responsibility laws |
| --- |

| 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: | 67.5 | | | | | |
| 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: Speeches are meant to be five minutes in length for today’s class.  The commentary on their main line coming out in second isn’t needed - in a five minute speech, we have too much fluff and preamble preventing our call outs from being as direct as possible; if the point is that the sanctity of the parent-child relationship will be protected, start with that; on our side, the parent-child relationship does not get diluted. Three reasons why 1/2/3 - machine gun these. This is a far more efficient use of 1.5 minutes (this is how long your opening is at the moment)  Rebuttal   * Point out how this debate isn’t about Asian cultures - this is about where children do not care; so the West; correct observation, execution isn’t as strategic as it could be. Same comment applies to the POI you answer. * The reiteration of lack of positive case is eating up your time - instead, make that observation, and then explain why your side achieves the benefits they respond to anyways. We aren’t rebuilding what 1P talks about ages ago re, the lacking welfare system. * On abuse, you have to link all the way back to the POI answered by your teammates - and how this is them just wasting time in the debate. We do this eventually, but take too much time to get here. * We aren’t responding to the point on   What is the structure of this third speech? Where are our clashes? Third speakers MUST have clashes, especially in 3v3 (or 4v4) formats.  05:12 - we need to structure our responses into clashes, we need to be less fluffy, we need to be more direct.  Good work consistently asking POIs! But we’re almost too aggressive in raising the point - be careful next time. | | | | | | |