| **Student Name:** Gemma Yeung |
| --- |

| **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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  Your opening is trying to do too many things at once - we list out five different problems; pick one, blow it up and make that the focal point.  Set-up   * Don’t stop your speech to criticise yourself, it reduces the judges want to listen to and believe in you. * Safe guards were effective. But it wasn’t clear how exactly filial piety laws would work in your world. How long would these laws be in place? How often would payments be? How much would they be? * I think we can be more formal and effective in terms of how we go about listing out how we’re going to have exemptions; abuse is fine, but you can say that this is a common sense exemption etc. How do you account for the poor? * Consider - some people already provide this kind of care to their parents - in what cultures is that the case? In what cultures does this debate apply?   POI: good call back to the safeguard here.  Argument 1   * The case seems to be rather convenient. It assumes that all parents are unconditional in loving their children.. You do not have to be an abusive parent to be a bad parent. What about those situations? * What is the value of this empathy and or sympathy from a state perspective? Is it the case that the government can no longer afford to care for the elderly via pensions, etc? This must be made clear to create an urgency within the judge. Not having this makes the argument slightly vague. \*This should have been first, not the second argument. * Duty; raise where born; make it clearer how in many circumstances, parents don’t consent to the birth of their kids - but take care of them anyways. My question is - why don’t the kids who presumably love and care for their loving and caring parents a part of this argument - don’t they take care of their parents anyways?   Argument 2   * \*This argument does not strike me as a new argument. Instead, this argument feels like a layer that should have been proven in the first argument. It’s essential to be strategic with recognising the difference between a large part of another argument and a fresh argument. * Good on the rise of apathy - why does this apathy exist, does it exist equally across the world? How does this resolve the burden on the state? Old people don’t stop having the flu and needing healthcare just because their children now take care of them!   06:01 - good!  Ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Hisham Khan |
| --- |

| **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:  Good point out which kind of parents and children this debate is about; point out that they take care of their parents anyways - this is about those who either cannot, or do not want to - unpack why it is that they don’t want to etc. Make sure you don’t make everything about abusive parents though - this is because this has been framed out by the first proposition. It is instead important to acknowledge that abusive parents probably aren’t part of this debate but children should not be responsible for their parents, even if they were loving.  There is a difference between a critique and a rebuttal. When you suggest that the proposition is undermechanized, this is a critique that may reduce their speaker score, but, it does not make the argument unbelievable. You must explain what damage the lack of mechanisation does to the plausibility of the case overall.  Where is the SIGNPOSTING, where is the STRUCTURE? COUNTER SET-UP needs to go BEFORE rebuttal; what does your side support? Whose responsibility do you see the elderly to be?  Don’t beat a dead horse - if the POI and model resolve abuse, give them the benefit of the doubt and move on.  Why can’t the Prop just co-opt the external checks and balances?  POI: answer the question directly; why are there checks and balances against abuse in nursing homes - political will/child oversight/general incentives to make sure this doesn’t happen. You’re running circles around the actual question.  Argument 1 - at 4:07…   * There are several reasons for why children should not care for their parents besides abuse. For example, that it creates resentment in relationships, that it creates financial strain, that it removes opportunities from children, and others. These arguments would have been very timely and valuable in your speech. * Why does it lead to mental trauma? Why? Are you proving this? * Assume that everything is fine, and joyful - the argument needs to be made on this basis; that these children can, and are capable - why is it still bad to obligate their care? This is the strongest version of the argument you can make.   06:07 - structure, discipline - you need to fulfil the speaker's responsibility!  Ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Yeonseo Kim |
| --- |

| **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: | 70 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good call out - good work pointing back to when you’ve already dealt with instances of abuse. You can also point out that all their harms are contingent on hatred and abuse. Ask - do they have a positive case? Do they have any positive reasons as to why the state is better? Link to the POI Gemma asks Hisham.  What is the structure and strategic approach here? Are we doing line by line responses to 1O, do we have issues?  Rebuttals:   * Even if the speaker before you deals with abusive parents exclusively, it is still prudent for you to do an **even if analysis** that deals with their scenario. This shows judges that you are willing to be reasonable and engage and you will be rewarded for it. * Never suggest that a clash is a wash. All clashes will have distinctions between the two sides. Regardless of how small the difference is, it is still an opportunity for you to prove that you are better than your opponent, even if it is a small differences.   POI: is it absolute filial law? Call the POI out - good on what your burden is; point out what this is analogous to in the real world to show how this is reasonable.  Argument   * The most challenging question to answer in this debate is why the state must prioritize the parent over the child. All arguments, such as the parents feeling sad and or missing the child, is contingent on the answer you are able to provide to this question. It would be strategic for you to start here. * Good on loneliness - good on isolation; point out why this is such an endemic problem - that the state must intervene; point to how high suicide and depressison rates amongst the elderly are. * Excellent work spending time analysing why children do regret this - and why even if they don’t realise it now - they do care in the future. * Why is this an exclusive or unique benefit to this law? Presumably, the good or loving parents already get this - who doesn't get this in the status quo that now does by virtue of the motion?   05:58 - well done! This is a good speech. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Shi Qi Ooi |
| --- |

| **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:  Make sure you don’t make everything about abusive parents - this is because this has been framed out by the first proposition. It is instead important to acknowledge that abusive parents probably aren’t part of this debate but children should not be responsible for their parents, even if they were loving.  What is the structure and strategic approach here? Are we doing line by line responses to 1O, do we have issues? The fixation on abuse is a strategic misstep. Prop explains why this isn’t about abuse, your side asserts it is - and then offers no explanation why Prop’s burden is illegitimate.  Rebuttals:   * You must explain why it is likely for abusive parents to be included in this policy. For example, Prop suggests that there are forms to exclude these types of parents - but why is this policy not effective? This would make your argument sound more reasonable. You suggested that it is tough to identify it - you can go further. Is it the case that society doesn’t believe children and or people who blow the whistle on abuse. * There are several reasons for why children should not care for their parents besides abuse. For example, that it creates resentment in relationships, that it creates financial strain, that it removes opportunities from children, and others. These arguments would have enriched the debate quite a bit. * Good on capacity - who is incapable of helping their parents out? Who does this motion punish unfairly? Go beyond abuse to identify who this is; if this is the poor or poverty - explain why the state is who must be responsible for the elderly. Why should the burden of elderly care lie on their children, as opposed to the state. Give me actual POSITIVE reasons as to why it is the government’s responsibility instead. * Fair on resentment - explain why this is true; why do children feel this way? Why is the analysis Yeonseo provides out of this debate? No actual reasoning on why what she said is untrue, or why you care less about this.   POI: just engage with good faith… the judge is not feeling too kind about the engagement we have with their model at the moment.  Argument (?)   * Why will they behave in this way? What incentive do they have to take such steps. * How likely is Gypsy Rose………???????? Be realistic!   06:03 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Megan Zhang |
| --- |

| **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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good problem identification - why is the solution your side supports the only solution to this problem?  I want you to have a very clear transition into your clashes, after making the big observation on the lack of likelihood re the 2O argument. Good call out on likelihood in terms of why parents have children. What is the structure of this speech? Where are the clashes?  Rebuttal   * You want to avoid using reductive terms like weird when rebutting your opponents. The reason for this is because it cause you to miss the chance to do actual analysis on why the things you’re suggesting is true. * On abuse - call out the lack of good faith engagement from Opp. * The rebuttals you made could have been a lot more efficient. The first two rebuttals you made could have been fitted under a theme of likelihoods. This would save you time and also make it easier for the judge to understand what the issue of the Opposition is.   Clash 1 (at 03:21)   * Clashes need questions evaluating the key issues of the debate - our clash right now is largely just weighing oriented (best case/worst case); the clashes in this debate are probably (a) do children have a responsibility to their parents (b) where are parents better cared for etc. * Good call out on the lack of counterfactual - do more than the call out, highlight how exactly this harms the Opp push; that you are the only side which helps the elderly. * It isn’t recommended for you to default to the policy to defend your argumentation against genuine critiques.   POI: you should have introduced a safeguard on how the state helps out the poor; the reason why lots of people who are wealthy and care about their parents but don’t actually take care of their parents, is because of cultural differences between the east/west - your side makes them care, relieves the burden etc.  Clash 2: (at 5:30)   * Thirty seconds did nothing for you here.   You have a great pace and flow. Keep up the assertiveness in your speaking style! You could use more eye contact with the judges and the audience in general though.  06:12 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jodie 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: | 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:  Good opening, good observation - is it a wash? Make this debate about the poor or vulnerable instead, and why it is the STATE’s responsibility to take care of the elderly, rather than their children.  I want you to have a very clear transition into your clashes, after making the big observation up top. **What is the structure of this speech? Where are the clashes? This is incredibly difficult to track.**  Rebuttal (?):   * If the argument is that this improves parenting, why is this the only means or way to do so? Are there no other incentives for parents to be good..? * Why are you dropping these bars on they had a full lesson on set-up but didn’t understand etc. Do you think the judge takes this kindly? * The speech felt like a missed opportunity due to the speech fully focusing on abuse and problems with the setup of the proposition. There was not enough engagement with the proposition on key issues, such as the needs of the parents, how it benefits the child, etc. * You have to engage in good faith - if your entire speech is about abuse, and they’ve dealt with it - what strategic position are you taking?   POI: you’re spending too much time on a simple - I dealt with this up top and then move on - watch your time! You’re at 05:30, responding to a POI where you have one full clash/issue left to go!  On POI to Gemma: Jodie - LISTEN to the model; this safeguard was already there!  6:06 - you need to slow down. At times, your clarity could use a lot more work as well. | | | | | | |