| **Student Name:** Ethan Woo |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would legally require children to take care of their parents once the parents reach old age. |
| --- |

| 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 force and emphasis; but this opening tells me your case is contingent on parents being fundamentally good actors. This is quite convenient - what if Opp talks about abuse, or even neglect?  Set-up   * How do they prove abuse? Even if they do - what about poor people, who lack the financial capacity to take action? * Good on care - is this in person care, or visitations once a while - this is important because if you argue children are better able to care compared to homes later down the line, you’d have to explain this out. * In set-up, make sure that you are numbering parts; first, what age is this debate about..second, what does this legal requirement look like, third, what exemptions will we have… This makes sure it is easy for the judge to follow what we say.   Don’t most kids take care of their parents anyways? Which specific context does this debate apply in?  Argument 1   * What if they don’t? This is premised on attentive, caring and good parents - are all parents this way? * Children didn’t consent to being born - why does this still apply in this instance? * Why is the comparison one that is automatically being taken care of by children or a nursing home? Remember that not all elderly parents are the same - it is very possible that there are parents who do not require financial/physical support. How does your case deal with them?   Argument 2   * On emotional care - is it fair for parents to have this expectation? How does once a week visitation cure this? * Why are parents the stakeholder we need to prioritise in the debate?   04:16 - we need to focus on the structure within our arguments; very clearly highlight - what i’m going to prove in this argument…three reasons as to why this is true…the impact of this argument is two-fold etc.  You have to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Emilia Lau |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would legally require children to take care of their parents once the parents reach old age. |
| --- |

| 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:  Our opening is just summarising the motion without giving me any insight into what your stance or position is going to be in the debate. Come out swinging and immediately signal what your stance is.  We must have a counter-model! What does your side support? Do you support nursing homes? Retirement packages? What exactly? What is the comparative on your side? How do you deal with them?  Rebuttal   * Don’t offer a response and then say ‘are you sure xyz can happen’ - you need to prove that they don’t get the benefits they claim; that they’re punishing younger children with older parents. We need to use stronger language. * Why is obligation going to your second speaker? This is important and should be discussed at first. Explain why obligation doesn’t exist. Excellent work pointing out parents consent to have kids - but explain how children don’t consent as the flip. Obligation is the biggest push on Prop - you **must** respond to it. * We need to machine gun responses to the big arguments on their side; Prop tells us 2 things; one - that there is an obligation to help, two - that children provide better emotional care. Then - offer very quick direct responses to these issues.   Argument 1   * Rather than problematising their model, this argument should be that children do not have the capacity to care for their parents; explain age, explain their own personal lives, explain wealth - are we punishing anyone unfairly? * You need to first establish why this care is intensive, and why it disrupts the child’s own life - you assert this, but need to explain this to me.   Argument 2 - in a four minute speech, you won’t have time to do 2 arguments.   * Interesting premise - but you run out of time.   04:08  We need to focus on our tone and sound more confident!  You have to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Theo Kai Yui Lee |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would legally require children to take care of their parents once the parents reach old age. |
| --- |

| 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: | 65 | | | | | |
| 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:  Fair clarification up top - but start with a clean and clear statement on what your biggest push against 1st Opp.  Rebuttal   * You need to go beyond reiterating what your first said - explain to me WHY parents are always likely to be nice to their kids - your obligation argument only stands where parents have done a good job towards their kids; what if Opp brings up neglect, or carelessness? * You had more to respond to - you should’ve responded to their argument on capacity and ability to care!   We needed a second speaker argument!  1:30 - we need to push to keep speaking even if we run out of written material.  You have to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ellie Fu |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would legally require children to take care of their parents once the parents reach old age. |
| --- |

| 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:  Explain why it is forced and why this forcefulness is bad. Point out how most kids, where their parents are good to them, take care of their parents anyways. Who is this debate about?  Just two rebuttals? Don’t say that. You need to start by summarising what the Prop pushes are, and then spending time disproving them; one on obligation, and the second on where care is better. Explain to me what your counterfactual is. Your responses are too glib and shallow - you have the ability to go deeper so do so.  Fair on obligation; explain why children are being punished for what they could not consent to in the first place.  POI - good response. Integrate that analysis earlier.  Pinpoint where abuse doesn’t exist, and go further - there are a number of grey areas - neglect, carelessness, emotional abuse that they can’t account for; but EVEN where they were perfect - no obligation still exists; and unpack why in the direction of - did these kids consent to be born, did they choose to need to do this?  Bring back the analysis from first that has been disregarded entirely on the **capacity** of children to take care of their parents; explain why their responses to this have not been sufficient.  **Try to incorporate some hand gestures into your speech. You could also really benefit from adopting more of an assertive tone. You struck me as unsure and unconfident in your speech.**  The positive comparative on your side is missing - what do you support instead? Who takes care of these parents? Good on the ones who are caring and loving do it anyways - but unpack this in far greater detail - where do those who don’t have children to take care of go? State homes - why are they not bad? Why are these good environments where the elderly can be happy?  05:02 - focus on your tone please!  You have to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Adrian Preston Wong |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would legally require children to take care of their parents once the parents reach old age. |
| --- |

| 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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  This is a fair opening actually - but point out immediately how this is analogous to the debate we’re having here.  Good on burdens, and what the path to victory is going to be in this instance.  Clash: Obligation   * You need to go beyond reiterating what your first said - explain to me WHY parents are always likely to be nice to their kids - your obligation argument only stands where parents have done a good job towards their kids; what if Opp brings up neglect, or carelessness (they don’t)? * Good attack on their lack of a positive comparative, but does this apply in this clash!   We suddenly transition into the practical - stick to the pre-established one clash on principle and one on practical and go from there…  Clash: Practical ??   * Why is the alternative not the state? On the POI Ellie asks - say exactly - they spent their money on the child, rather than saving for their own retirement. * Push on their lack of a comparative - what do they support instead? Who takes care of these parents? State homes - why are they bad - why do they create terrible circumstances for the elderly? Why are the elderly super lonely, have bad mental health and so forth?   Good work using clashes, and being able to structure your responses within this. Lots of work to do with regards to the structure within, but good work!  03:41 - great tone.  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Cyrus Yuan |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would legally require children to take care of their parents once the parents reach old age. |
| --- |

| 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:  Your opening should highlight to me what the biggest issue in the debate is so far. In this debate at this point, it is that there is no obligation that exists - it doesn’t matter if the parents were the best, if they were neglectful, if they were abusive - we cannot legally hold children responsible for what they could not and did not consent to. You **must** respond to Adrian’s point on obligation and choice right up top  Clash 1: Obligation   * It’s really important for you to evolve along with the debate. By the time it was your speech, the issue of obligation needed to be in context of the responses in 3P’s speech on choice and obligation and the difference; you need to unpack for me how parents don’t often care, are neglectful, do not care etc. pinpoint how most kids take care of their parents anyways!   Clash 2: Finances?   * The positive comparative on your side is missing - what do you support instead? Who takes care of these parents? Good on the ones who are caring and loving do it anyways - but unpack this in far greater detail - where do those who don’t have children to take care of go? State homes - why are they not bad? Why are these good environments where the elderly can be happy? * Bring back the analysis from first that has been disregarded entirely on the **capacity** of children to take care of their parents; explain why their responses to this have not been sufficient.   Clash 3 - not a clash, but a one liner.  You should try to up the energy and assertiveness in your speech.  03:58  We need to ask POIs consistently. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Josephine She |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would legally require children to take care of their parents once the parents reach old age. |
| --- |

| 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:  You want to make your hook as strategically pointed as possible and linked to why you win; we told you that we are not obligated to care for the people who did not care for you; Opposition could not respond - for this, they lose the debate; and then move onto signposting from here.  Clash 1: Obligation   * Why are they entitled to their own lives? Bring back the analysis from first that has been disregarded entirely on the **capacity** of children to take care of their parents; explain why their responses to this have not been sufficient. This is also not a response on obligation, but on where care is better.   Clash 2: Also Obligation?   * It’s really important for you to evolve along with the debate. By the time it was your speech, the issue of obligation needed to be in context of the responses in 3P’s speech on choice and obligation and the difference; you need to unpack for me how parents don’t often care, are neglectful, do not care etc. pinpoint how most kids take care of their parents anyways!   The positive comparative on your side is missing - what do you support instead? Who takes care of these parents? Good on the ones who are caring and loving do it anyways - but unpack this in far greater detail - where do those who don’t have children to take care of go? State homes - why are they not bad? Why are these good environments where the elderly can be happy?  **Try to adopt more of an assertive tone when you’re doing your rebuttals.**  Clash 3: Dependency   * Why will parents behave in this way? This is asserted, not explained.   04:01 - conclusion needs to be punchy!  We need to ask POIs consistently. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Tongtong Lai |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would legally require children to take care of their parents once the parents reach old age. |
| --- |

| 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:  The Opp bloc spelled out how sometimes parents are bad at taking care of their parents - you need to respond to this right away. The blood, sweat and tears point doesn’t respond to this.  Either do clashes, or do the three reasons. Don’t do both.  Clash 1: Title? What is this clash about?   * Is this true? Most kids take care of their parents anyways - who is this debate really about? * Why don’t they have savings? Why can’t they go to state provided welfare homes/nursing homes? Call out the lack of positive comparative from Opp.   Three reasons?   * 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?   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.  You’re making no eye contact in this speech. You have to remember that you’re putting on a persuasive performance.  We need to ask POIs more consistently.  03:51 | | | | | | |