| **Student Name:** Verena Wong |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that the prevalence of sharenting has done more harm than good |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 4 minutes’ long.]  I appreciate the use of illustrations of what sharenting looks like and tying it back to certain harms! There is a clear positioning of what you stand for.   * Before going into the set-up, signpost the rest of your speech first!   On the set-up:   * Good definition and examples of sharenting, well done. * Since this is a value debate, you don’t necessarily need to model any actions, but I appreciate that you’re clarifying your discouragement of sharenting.   + However, it would be extremely difficult to model parents asking for their child’s consent! Can’t parents just fake their consent since they have the right to consent on behalf of their child?     - Children below a certain age cannot even consent. * Do you have any kind of burden or stance?   On your first argument:   * Good description of children being kept in the dark on what information is shared about them online.   + Why is this information important to know about? We should give examples of the kind of information that would deeply embarrass or humiliate these children. * Nice job exploring the concept of digital footprint being left online!   + Can we analyse the harm/impact statement of this?     - Explain how the child may experience a denial of opportunities in the future due to these kinds of footage left behind.   On the second argument:   * Can we try to prove why the kind of parents who engage in sharenting are also helicopter parents?   + Why exactly are helicopter parents harmful?   + We should explain how children feel suffocated, and this leads to harms on their mental well-being, as well as their relationship with their parents.   We should offer POIs consistently.  5.01 - Excellent timing, good job! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Moses Cheuk |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that the prevalence of sharenting has done more harm than good |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 4 minutes’ long.]  Good summation in your hook, we can have even more impact if we can illustrate the precise harms you just outlined.  Good start to your rebuttal that we can have alternative ways of offering help to parents!   * But how do they even begin to find this Wechat group?   + Suggest that private groups can exist on social media, they are easily searchable but still private.   + Offer online forums that also provide anonymity to the child.   We did not rebut her argument on parental autonomy!   * Point out that her own model contradicts her points, because she also did not allow parents to share information on children below 10 years old. * Argue that parental autonomy is not absolute, this is why the law always draws the line on what parents cannot do to children!   On your first argument:   * You did a very good job exploring the kind of information that may humiliate or embarrass children, well done! * However, we still need logical reasoning as to WHY parents have such inclination to share damaging information! Why can’t parents be responsible as per Opp’s characterisation and not share such hurtful information? * After we stated the harm of destroying their image, you have to explore its fullest impact! We are always stopping too early!   + Will they lose jobs?   + Will they be ostracised by their community?   + What happens to them in the future?   You cannot just make claims such as the loss of autonomy or loss of safety in ONE sentence!   * Each one of these claims require at least 30 to 45 seconds of elaboration. * You need multiple reasons as to how this harm will occur, as well as multiple reasons why this harm is the most important harm in the debate.   Good job offering POIs!  3.04 - We are greatly undertimed, try to reach 4 minutes! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Nathan Sun |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that the prevalence of sharenting has done more harm than good |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 4 minutes’ long.]  Good summation in your hook, we can have even more impact if we can illustrate the precise harms you just outlined.   * Remember to signpost the whole speech, including the label of your clashes.   Excellent rebuttal pointing out the contradiction between Opp’s position and their arguments.   * Be more specific and say precisely like in order for Opp to achieve the benefits of sharing information to other parents, they must actively concede the violation of the right of privacy of children.   Good job identifying the clash of parental rights vs children’s rights!   * We should give examples of the kind of information that would deeply embarrass or humiliate these children, otherwise it remains an assertion.   + However, we still need logical reasoning as to WHY parents have such inclination to share damaging information! Why can’t parents be responsible as per Opp’s characterisation and not share such hurtful information? * Can we analyse the harm/impact statement of how this affects the child’s future?   + Explain how the child may experience a denial of opportunities in the future due to these kinds of footage left behind.     - We later pointed out that children may be criticised online, well done! Why will other users do this? Give illustrations to show how this may be likely. * Good job highlighting possible alternatives, but how do they find these WeChat groups?   + Suggest that private groups can exist on social media, they are easily searchable but still private.   + Offer online forums that also provide anonymity to the child.   We did not rebut her argument on parental autonomy!   * Point out that her own model contradicts her points, because she also did not allow parents to share information on children below 10 years old. * Argue that parental autonomy is not absolute, this is why the law always draws the line on what parents cannot do to children!   We can reinforce the other arguments made by your previous speakers, such as harming the parent-child relationship!  We can ask POIs more consistently!  4.26 - Good timing! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Chloe Lit |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that the prevalence of sharenting has done more harm than good |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 4 minutes’ long.]  Our hook should go beyond just repeating the motion, try to have impacts! We should also signpost.  On the set-up:   * Well done clarifying where you stand on sharenting.   + However, the line of 10 years old still seems fairly young for a child to consent.     - Can’t parents still manipulate their consent at this age? * Be mindful that setting this line also undercuts the furthest extent of your benefits as well!   + How will other parents learn information on parenting for YOUNG children if they shouldn’t post anything when the kids are very young?   + Doesn’t this undercut the argument on parental autonomy?   We should rebut Prop’s arguments BEFORE you argue, instead of just relying on your counter set-up to refute their points.  On your first argument:   * Good premise on improving parenting abilities overall.   + Can we illustrate what kind of helpful/insightful advice that they would not have found otherwise? Otherwise, Proposition can suggest alternative methods of parents helping each other out.     - E.g. Very specific problems such as raising children with specific illnesses. * We can have a broader comparison that this improves far more parents overall, and thus this benefits the quality of life of more children.   On your second argument:   * If you believe in the principle of parental autonomy, then why don’t you allow parents to post their children below the age of 10? * Where does this right originate from? Explain that parents know best on what is good for their child. * What is the harm to the parents’ life if they are not allowed to express themselves according to their own lived experiences?   + Point out that this kind of oppression to parents will also hurt their mental health and therefore, their ability to parent will also be reduced.   Good job offering POIs, we can do so more consistently!  5.01 - Good timing, well done! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Yu Bo Peng |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that the prevalence of sharenting has done more harm than good |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 4 minutes’ long.]  Good summation in your hook, we can have even more impact if we can illustrate the precise harms you just outlined.   * Remember to signpost the whole speech, including the label of your argument.   Interesting rebuttal that parents can find the balance through private account settings.   * However, this also undercuts your benefits about helping other parents when these accounts are not public!   + We should also be engaging with Proposition’s alternatives such as using social media groups and WeChat rather than posting their faces online.     - We should highlight that Prop’s suggestions also constitute a form of sharenting!   We did not rebut the rest of the harms argued by the Prop, such as the child’s right to consent, unhealthy parent-child relationship, etc.  You can avoid taking the POI right away, wait until your point is completed.  On your first argument:   * Good strategy that sharenting could have some harms, but there are more benefits.   + We can mitigate this by saying that ALL parental decisions have some downfall, but overall, the parents know best what is good for their children. * It seems like the entire argument is just about blurring the child’s face, what is the premise you are proving in the debate? * If you are trying to prove that parents can find a balance between sharing and protecting their child’s privacy, please provide reasons as to WHY they’re able to do this:   + E.g. parents actually care about the well-being of their child.   + E.g. other parents will call them out for invading their child’s privacy, so they will be more careful next time.   Please offer more POIs consistently!  3.47 - So close! Aim to reach 4 minutes. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Lauren Lui |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that the prevalence of sharenting has done more harm than good |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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 4 minutes’ long.]  Good summation in your hook, we can have even more impact if we can illustrate the precise harms you just outlined.   * Remember to signpost the whole speech, including the label of your clashes.   We should try to look up from our piece of paper, and focus on presenting your point instead!  I appreciate you stating that parents can find the balance between sharing and protecting their child.   * But can we try to provide reasons as to WHY they’re able to do this:   + E.g. parents actually care about the well-being of their child.   + E.g. other parents will call them out for invading their child’s privacy, so they will be more careful next time. * Bear in mind that this may undercuts your benefits about helping other parents when these accounts are not public!   + We should be engaging with Proposition’s alternatives such as using social media groups and WeChat.     - We should highlight that Prop’s suggestions also constitute a form of sharenting!   We did not rebut the rest of the harms argued by the Prop, such as the child’s right to consent, unhealthy parent-child relationship, etc.  I like the pushback that parents can post positive information too, but is this really necessary? What are the benefits of this?   * Instead can we illustrate what kind of helpful/insightful advice that they would not have found otherwise? Otherwise, Proposition can suggest alternative methods of parents helping each other out. E.g. Very specific problems such as raising children with specific illnesses. * We can have a broader comparison that this improves far more parents overall, and thus this benefits the quality of life of more children.   If you believe in the principle of parental autonomy, then why don’t you allow parents to post their children below the age of 10?   * What is the harm to the parents’ life if they are not allowed to express themselves according to their own lived experiences?   + Point out that this kind of oppression to parents will also hurt their mental health and therefore, their ability to parent will also be reduced.   2.52 - Try to aim to reach 4 minutes! | | | | | | |