| **Student Name:** Ryan Qian |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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 too round about - if it is about people who have invested in us being ignored - open with this. We have a tendency to speak very fast, and almost slur our words together because of the pacing, and lack of attention to enunciation. This is what we need to pay attention to in our next speech. We also make no eye contact throughout the speech; you’re persuading me, and I can see you, with regards to body movements! We don’t have our video off and speaking online at the moment.  Set-up - is the problem characterisation apathy and a lack of good relationship? If so - we aren’t specifying our set-up or arguments to solve this problem.   * Fair work establishing what minimum standard of care may mean; good use of examples to highlight what decreased attention looks like. * Do we think the Opp attack will be on extreme giving? Is this necessary for us to spend time on? * What about abuse? What about poor children and so forth? 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?   Argument 1   * On drifting and separation - fair contextualisation of the problem at hand. Why is this the only way to promote filial piety? Why is filial piety something we care about in this debate? * At the end of this argument, have you proven that parents and kids drift less?   Argument 2   * Did children consent to be born? Why is this the responsibility of children, as compared to the responsibility of the state? * Is financial investment a proxy for this obligation? * Why won’t the child help the terminally ill mom anyways? * On duties - do these exist regardless of context or circumstance? What happens if the child doesn’t have capacity? * Good on the rise of apathy - why does this apathy exist, does it exist equally across the world?   Argument 3   * You’re forcing utilitarianism in - I’m also unsure if this is a unique argument from argument 1; I think you can potentially talk about the burden on the state due to an increasing demand for welfare, due to ageing populations.   06:56  Ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Monique Cheuk Nam Siu |
| --- |

| **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:  What are these practical limitations? I don’t want to wait to find this out, start out with this in the first place! Easiest way to do this is to question if a duty exists in the first place - what about abused children, what about those who are poor and cannot do anything?  Our signposting is FAR too extensive.  Rebuttal   * 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**. What are these ‘broken bonds’? * On quality - explain why children don’t have the capacity to provide this. Explain what this minimum standard is. Then, go onto raise the bond between parents and children as a third response. * Set-up (?)   + Do we agree that the central problem of this debate is relationships/bonds being broken?   + We can point to the existing welfare system, and why it works; we can then add in the additional stuff we talk about. Why can’t the Prop just co-opt the external checks and balances?   + On burden - fair enough; integrate this into the recharacterisation of Prop, rather than listing it out.   I have no idea where the rebuttal ends and where the argument begins.  POI: explain whose burden it is instead. Who should shoulder this responsibility - the state?  Argument 1   * If we educate them to care, but then don’t help them - * Is there lack of filial piety in the first place? Think about culturally the kind of places in which this applies? * On the state, unpack why exactly it is their responsibility?   Argument 2   * This comes out at 6:30! * Good push on the poor; explain why it is uniquely bad for these individuals; but at the same time - what if they don’t have capacity?   07:18 - you must SLOW DOWN. | | | | | | |