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

| **Motion**: This house opposes Philanthro-tainment |
| --- |

| 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:  Your opening line is actually the fairest depiction of the narrative so far. This really should have been the main focus of the debate/case. Try to speak up on this next time!  You can mention certain things like how coercion occurs to begin with. Is it because families are likely to be tied together financially, etc which forces some family members to behave in a way that appeases some family members?  I’m not sure why you gave any credence to the idea that parents wouldn’t take care of their children by the Opposition - that is likely to be a constant anyway in this debate! You should have spent more time debunking this particular analysis instead.  You could have answered the POI by pointing towards the fact that your content already directly responds to most of the stuff the speaker was talking about anyway.  Why further characterise the molester angle instead of just pushing this out of the debate? It’s super extreme! You were winning more on the angle of autonomy and healthy relationships anyway.  You missed an opportunity to talk about how this actually makes family relationships better to begin with. For example, if a child does not automatically have to prioritise their parents, will this cause for parents to behave better? Try harder to have a good relationship?  Why does individuality matter in this debate? It's quite vague and unexplained. You gotta try to characterise this further and or explain why this matters quite a bit. | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: In Asian Countries, TH Regrets the Dominant Narrative that family comes first. |
| --- |

| 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 observations of the Opposition in the hook. But this is a very bold claim though - if you’re suggesting that the main claim of the Opp is wrong, you need to get into proving that immediately!  Could it be possible for this narrative to exist in a way that is loving and fair for all actors in the debate? Try to engage with this - it is the best case scenario of the Opp anyway.  I’m not sure what career paths have to do with these debates - I think there will be a premium placed on certain careers regardless of this narrative. This doesn’t sound too exclusive. Even if it is exclusive, does it matter if it's their choice or not, if the choice is one that is going to greatly benefit them?  You should really clean up this whole angle of child molestations - why is it even part of the debate?? The Opposition speaker before you did a good job of cleaning this up anyway!!  Fair angle on that people will still love their parents if they were loving - I think you can also suggest that most people are primed to love their family anyway. This is due to the fact that family members are interacted with the most, that most people want to put their family first. This probably suggests that there is a good reason to not place them first if someone does that.  Children’s autonomy really may not be a part of this debate because it barely exists even without it anyway. You might want to think ahead - careers, university, etc.  Great angle on the angle of office jobs! You might wanna talk about why people do these jobs despite them being horrible, is it because people must place feeding their family first, etc. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jodie Li |
| --- |

| **Motion**: In Asian Countries, TH Regrets the Dominant Narrative that family comes first. |
| --- |

| 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 opening! Very illustrative. Don’t do the blah blah blah part though.  What the narrative is;   * Ignoring all flaws - Not sure if this is really true. Is it really not possible for family members to reform yourself for your family? * Good illustration on what the boundaries of this look like.   When dealing with a counterfactual, you must also explain why your counterfactual is likely to be true. When it comes to narratives changing, you can assume that the narrative will change. You can’t assume that yours will be the narrative that will replace it. That’s where the fiat ends.  Certain depictions of the narrative seem a bit extreme. Is it true that people really expect you to love and respect your family, even if they are paedophiles?  Children being exposed to objectionable behaviours - Good arguments, but I think you can add a layer here which is that certain children (e.g., daughters) are expected to put up with this a lot more. That is a specialised angle that you can exploit quite a bit!  People who are incentivized to follow this narrative don't really need proving. It’s assumed that people will follow the narrative in the long term because it is the dominant narrative anyway.  The case seems to be a bit shallow - there are areas here that are present that go beyond just the racist uncle. This debate also extends to things like life choices, etc. Go deeper!  People will hate their family - need to be more specific on the damage this can do to family relations and also what the comparative is. Isn’t the damage symmetric, considering that you just won’t meet with these people in your world? | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: In Asian Countries, TH Regrets the Dominant Narrative that family comes first. |
| --- |

| 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 observation on what your burden is in this debate. You should have gone further to suggest that they don’t actually have a comparative if you think about it. There isn’t really much said as to what this narrative is about in their world.  For the first rebuttal, you might wanna be aware that there is a comeback to the response which is SQ is one where family comes first. They may just respond by suggesting that it's because of a decline in the narrative (This aligns with Prop One’s analysis anyway.)  Is this debate really about toxic families? It’s super extreme! The most reasonable depiction is families who probably try but are quite flawed too at the same time. How do you deal with these families? Besides, aren’t abusive families likely to be abusive in both worlds anyway?  Rebuttal missing for the argument about support structures. How does your side account for support structures?  Credit score? What was that all about?  Argument 1: Stereotypes   * What are the stereotypes we’re talking about here? Also, why are stereotypes the most important thing for me to consider in this debate? This feels like an argument that is easily outweighed, since the other side could prove that this has a direct link on how people are supported. * In the beginning, you suggested that we can’t change the radicals - but your argument is actually about changing the radicals? (I.e., people who support and like stereotypes.) * This argument is a bit off topic - What does the narrative of family come first have to do with this particular part? You at the very least need to make some link here. But also, it’s really really not the relevant. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Stephanie Kwan |
| --- |

| **Motion**: In Asian Countries, TH Regrets the Dominant Narrative that family comes first. |
| --- |

| 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 | | | | | |
| 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:  Not really sure if ungrateful children is the right angle to go for in the hook when Proposition one frames this debate as one where children are being exposed to abusive characters. You might wanna start by expanding/doing some reframing on the context of this debate first!  The first two pieces of characterisations felt like floating characteristics - why is it important for me as a judge to take this into account?  Fair enough that family raises you, but the focus of your speech seemed to be on parents. It’s not wrong, but the debate is larger than just parents. Besides, wouldn’t most people want to take care of their parents to some extent anyway?  By the point of the rebuttal on respect for families, it felt like this wasn’t quite proving anything. You can still respect your parents in the world of proposition - but what is unique about respect and the narrative? How do they link?  The debate isn’t about non-active parents (E.g., parents that let you take drugs.) and good parents. Its about family first - remember to keep this in mind! The depiction of family first narratives seemed like a very low bar. It’s quite certain that families will still have dinner or etc anyway.  Retirement home - Good, this is where the debate is for one context. Where are the impacts of this though? What does this lead to the most vulnerable people in the debate?  Keep an eye on the time!! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: In Asian Countries, TH Regrets the Dominant Narrative that family comes first. |
| --- |

| 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:  Strong opening. Absolutely the right approach.  You should have gone into the characterisation of the narrative first instead of jumping into rebuttals - it really was the most important response anyway! You want to point out that it has nothing to do with being family first anyway.  It’s fair that there is going to be some backlash if a child rejects a racist relative. But the better approach here is to do the weighing; is one offended relative really more impactful compared to support systems existing? (This is because it’s your biggest and most important push!)  By this point, there’s a lot of observations around the flaws of the Proposition - but there isn’t enough being said about the comparative and the weighing. Where is the burden pushing and the framing?  You gotta stop being so impacted by the room! You need to just continue your speech regardless.  What does the more holistic family look like in your world? Why is it more valuable?  Time management is whack, you entered your argument at 6 minutes!  Argument 1: Familial Connections   * This doesn’t feel too different from what Opp 1 said? * The connection you could have focused on is elderly parents living together, etc. Not too sure what the difference in this argument is.   Impact: Good impact, think of some harms here that could apply without a family support network - Could they enter into debt, rely on bad actors, etc? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Joanne Lau |
| --- |

| **Motion**: In Asian Countries, TH Regrets the Dominant Narrative that family comes first. |
| --- |

| 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:  Strawberry donut…on a silver platter? But also the way you described the donut sounds like…a normal donut?  Strategically, you really want to clean up the debate by being very clear about what the debate is about. What children don’t do for their parents doesn’t matter if I believe the Proposition frame of this debate is about abusive actors.  Keep your composure together! But also there is a difference between dealing with the worst case scenario and taking on a crazy burden like defending problematic behaviours!  This isn’t really about the most problematic behaviours of the children - it’s quite likely that these sorts of behaviours are criticised anyway in both worlds. Deal with the stuff that is exclusive for your side!!  When it comes to weighing, you need to structure your clash analysis a bit better. For instance, under each clash, you need to come up with some reasons as to why certain aspects of your case are more true, etc.  Why aren’t you going to get punished without this narrative? Don’t kids live with their parents anyway?  The angle of hope should have come a lot earlier - what does it do for the average person? Make them more confident, etc? You gotta detail this! | | | | | | |