| **Student Name:** Matias Li |
| --- |

| **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: | 68 | | | | | |
| 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.  This is a good opening, but slightly too extreme in our depiction of what happens; instead, ask yourself what the most strategic call out for your side is at this point. What are you winning on, what are you losing on?  Rebuttal   * If we call out definitions, on abuse being exempt, explain what the implication of this is; point out how your 1O also points this out, to no response from 2P. Push your team line. * POI: positive case - keep a relationship; why are homes/welfare enough on your side? 1P spends lots of time explaining this, to no response. * We spend time on the parent-child relationship, but this analysis isn’t comparative. Why is the sanctity of this relationship more important than the practical point of care that Prop gets. * What is the structure of this rebuttal? We need to follow the clear - summary - response - weighing/implication structure. The analysis we make, such as on parenting changing to be reciprocal only, gets obscured within the lack of structure.   Where was our second speaker argument?  Our conclusion is too formal - instead, just stop at voting for Opp.  Good work asking POIs, but we need to make sure we refer back to this in our speech; so do you think Prop answers your POI on the poor well enough? Or other POIs asked?  04:42 - our flow has improved lots since I last saw you speak; but we need to work very hard on our analytical rigour. | | | | | | |