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| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 to 6 minutes’ long.]  Good reinforcement in the hook on the child’s lack of mental capacity, we can explain here as well why parents often make far better decisions. At this point, Prop has been analysing why parents make bad decisions, so we have to defend the comparative actor as well.   * We dove into a different claim here on children abusing their right to veto. Try to make the hook more succinct, and then dive into the signposting of your speech right after this.   Prop’s clarification that the right to veto is limited to important decisions can be flipped to Opp’s favour still! This is precisely why it’s even more important to make the right decision in this instance. Proceed to give an example of the kind of bad decisions children can make to alter the rest of their lives.  Interesting pushback that parents can just brainwash their children into not exercising their right to veto.   * But bear in mind this also takes out a lot of Opp’s harm that children will exercise the veto excessively to their own detriment! Which is true?   On Prop’s winning point on protecting the agency of children:   * We can’t just keep referencing the harms of these decisions, we still need to prove why children either don’t deserve this right or why parents have the ability to empower the agency of children on Opp’s side.   + Can we actually prove WHY parents have an incentive to listen to their child, instead of just asserting this? Explain the amount of love and care that parents have for their child and why they do want their children to be happy. * We can be more specifically engaging with Prop’s claim about the harms that children suffer from when they have to live with the decision of their parents that they disagree with, e.g. being forced to learn what they do not want to learn.   In response to the POI, we said that abusive parents are an absolute minority. But there’s still children who are harmed in that minority. A more strategic rebuttal is to point out that there are laws to protect children against gravely abusive parents.  We need to work on speech structure and flag all of our clashes explicitly!  Good job offering so many POIs today, well done!   * Don’t take the POI mid-sentence. * Avoid taking a second POI so soon as well.   5.54 - Nice job! Let’s aim for 6 minutes next time. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Renee Yang |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that children should have the right to veto their parents' decisions on matters that directly affect them (e.g., education, medical treatment) |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 to 6 minutes’ long.]  If we just omitted the words “picture this,” it would sound even more impactful! But I like the imagination exercise to illustrate the importance of children having the right to veto.   * We can pick an example that has lifelong harms to children.   As the first speaker, we have to do some set-up before diving into your arguments:   * Explain what the right to veto means, and what it applies to.   + We’re actually explaining a lot about how this works, e.g. parents can find alternatives they are in agreement with after the veto, in the argument itself. * Explain how we’re capable of enforcing this against parents.   We had an excellent start explaining why having a child’s cooperation will maximise their experience.   * But we are lacking analysis to explain why parents were inclined to make damaging decisions to begin with, nor are we explaining why children have the agency to make high-quality decisions pertaining to their future.   + Explain that these decisions have little to do with expertise or maturity, it is often related to their personalities and interests, such as what they would like to study. * We have a strong start for an impact statement, but it’s under-analysed. Rather than just a few lines, characterise how these decisions have the capacity to alter the rest of their lives without their consent. * Why is it important to respect a child’s agency even if they don’t have the most experience or knowledge?   There’s a strong overlap between the first and second argument, because the analysis here is actually filling in the gaps of the first argument!   * While I appreciate the examples in your analysis, we should start with categorical analysis first, and then use the example as a way to prove your analysis.   + E.g. Categorical analysis; Parents have moral biases which may not align with the identity of their children, then example: A trans child who wants to go through gender-affirming surgery.   Good job offering so many POIs today! Keep it up!  5.15 - Nice job! Let’s aim for 6 minutes after this. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Edna Chow |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that children should have the right to veto their parents' decisions on matters that directly affect them (e.g., education, medical treatment) |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 to 6 minutes’ long.]  Good hook focusing on the child having their own individual needs and opinions, but at this point Opp claims that parents will actively incorporate the wants of their children.   * So we can do some work here to explain why parents tend to ignore their child’s wants. * In the signposting, flag your arguments as well instead of just the rebuttal transition.   Excellent pushback that parents should play the role of educating or influencing their child in the process of veto-ing.   * However, this may not go into the dangerous territory of parents brainwashing their children instead. So focus on explaining that most times, children do agree with their parents, but the veto is a final safety net against really terrible decisions.   + Rather than what Opp claims, which is children using the veto many times whenever they are in a bad mood!   Spend more time when you said this veto is for important decisions like medical decisions, explain why children are unlikely to exercise this power just because they do not want to do homework!  We are not engaging enough with the Opposition’s main point which is that children have zero capacity to make the right decision!   * Explain that these decisions have little to do with expertise or maturity, it is often related to their personalities and interests, such as what they would like to study.   The argument has a lot of overlap with Renee’s points!   * We need a lot more examples and grounding in our analysis to bring it to the next level!   + We should start with categorical analysis first, and then use the example as a way to prove your analysis.   + E.g. Categorical analysis; Parents have moral biases which may not align with the identity of their children, then example: A trans child who wants to go through gender-affirming surgery.   Good job offering POIs today!  5.26 - Good timing, let’s go for 6 minutes next time! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jenny Zong |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that children should have the right to veto their parents' decisions on matters that directly affect them (e.g., education, medical treatment) |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 to 6 minutes’ long.]  We should start with a high-impact hook instead of just affirming your position in the motion!   * Good job signposting.   As the 1st speaker, we need to have a set-up before going into rebuttals!   * Explain what the Opposition supports instead. * Point out there are laws existing to protect children from abusive parents to begin with.   We’re suggesting that children CAN decide on medical decisions, but that is not legally true. We should instead affirm that parents either make better decisions or will incorporate the views of their children.   * Our second rebuttal does this much better! Can we actually prove WHY parents have an incentive to listen to their child, instead of just asserting this? Explain the amount of love and care that parents have for their child. * I understand the example of parents wanting their child to live, but this is an isolated example and we need to engage in scenarios where the views of parents and children would be different.   While I understand that children can make their own decisions at 18, what you learn in high school may also affect things like college admissions.  We can’t burst into a laughing fit in the middle of our speech, our credibility would be in question!  Solid argument on a child’s lack of capacity to make the right decisions.   * We need a lot more characterisation to prove this, such as the nature of children to avoid obstacles and hardships, as well as their lack of life experience and maturity. * We went straight into the impact of the deterioration of the parent-child relationship when this should be a different argument.   + The impact of your argument here should be focused on a child making a bad decision that will permanently damage your lives.   Please offer more POIs in the debate!   * Don’t take the POI when you’re in the middle of explaining something. * Avoid taking a second POI as well if you haven’t finished your first argument. * We should avoid taking THREE POIs in one speech!   We should prepare a conclusion instead of ending abruptly!  5.15 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Christy Yuan |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that children should have the right to veto their parents' decisions on matters that directly affect them (e.g., education, medical treatment) |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 to 6 minutes’ long.]  We should start with a high-impact hook instead of just affirming your position in the motion!   * Good job signposting.   We’re spending too long summarising Proposition’s point without explaining what is your opposition to it.   * Prop’s clarification that this debate is limited to important decisions can be flipped to Opp’s favour still! We eventually referenced the correct rebuttal as a response to the POI which is it’s even more important to make the right decision in this instance. Proceed to giving an example of the kind of bad decisions children can make to alter the rest of their lives.   Interesting rebuttal that parents can just brainwash their children into not exercising their right to veto.   * But bear in mind this also takes out a lot of Opp’s harm that children will exercise the veto excessively to their own detriment! Which is true?   We need to engage with Prop’s winning point on protecting the agency and interests of children. Can we actually prove WHY parents have an incentive to listen to their child, instead of just asserting this? Explain the amount of love and care that parents have for their child and why they do want their children to be happy.   * We can be more specifically engaging with Prop’s claim about being forced to learn what they do not want to learn.   + While I understand that children can make their own decisions at 18, what you learn in high school may also affect things like college admissions.   Solid argument on how children can make bad decisions that will permanently damage your lives.   * We need a lot more characterisation to prove why children will make these terrible decisions to begin with, such as the nature of children to avoid obstacles and hardships, as well as their lack of life experience and maturity. * We’re lacking a lot of grounding here, be sure to characterise the damages in a way that is irreversible.   Please offer more POIs today!   * Don’t take the POI when you’re in the middle of explaining something. * Avoid taking a second POI as well if you haven’t finished your first argument.   5.36 - Good job! Let’s aim for 6 minutes next time! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** James Cao |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that children should have the right to veto their parents' decisions on matters that directly affect them (e.g., education, medical treatment) |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 to 6 minutes’ long.]  Start the speech off with a high-impact hook first before diving into the clashes!   * But good signposting, nice job identifying all of your clashes!   On your first clash:   * I like that we’re challenging Opp’s caveat to have these children make radically different decisions at 18 to escape their parents. We can say more clearly that the kind of decisions they make when they were young would have already limited what options are available to them in adulthood, e.g. what they study in high school would limit what they can apply for in college. * We moved on to the second clash too soon!   + We are not engaging enough with the Opposition’s main point which is that children have zero capacity to make the right decision!     - Explain that these decisions have little to do with expertise or maturity, it is often related to their personalities and interests, such as what they would like to study.   On your second clash:   * This is where we would have benefited from proving why parents often make decisions that are quite harmful to children.   + We need a lot more examples and grounding in our analysis to bring it to the next level!   + We should start with categorical analysis first, and then use the example as a way to prove your analysis.     - E.g. Categorical analysis; Parents have moral biases which may not align with the identity of their children, then example: A trans child who wants to go through gender-affirming surgery.   Your third clash is focusing on something too micro, which is just a clarification on the motion.   * Keep in mind that the Opposition has also flipped this and claim that this is precisely why it’s super important to make sure that every decision the child makes is correct. Since these decisions are so crucial to their lives. * Excellent pushback that parents should play the role of educating or influencing their child in the process of veto-ing. * However, this may not go into the dangerous territory of parents brainwashing their children instead. So focus on explaining that most times, children do agree with their parents, but the veto is a final safety net against really terrible decisions.   Good job offering POIs today!  5.11 - Good job! Let’s aim to reach 6 minutes next time. | | | | | | |