| **Student Name:** Alexander Zhu |
| --- |

| **Motion:** TH supports the right to access euthanasia, i.e medically-assisted suicide |
| --- |

| 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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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 6 minutes’ long.]  Nice hook summarising your opposition! We can expand the human costs to immediately prove the immorality of this solution.  Before the rebuttal, give me the counter set-up:   * What does Opp prefer if euthanasia is not allowed? * Explain that we have hospice care and palliative care to help minimise pain during their final days of life. * What is your winning pathway/burden?   Excellent job calling out Proposition for offering euthanasia as a poor alternative to a failing status quo!   * This would’ve been the best time to give a counterfactual on what policies the state ought to pursue instead, such as funding more safety net policies and welfare systems.   We are making moral counter-claims that the right to death cannot be surrendered in the rebuttal without proving it, keep it for the argument.   * How is claiming something a ‘god-given right’ an acceptable logical reasoning as to why the reason exists? Do we presume that your judge believes in god? The debate must rely on moral reasoning that would appeal to all audiences.   We had a large logical leap to the state justifying policies that actively harm human life!   * We have to establish first what is the moral implication of legalising euthanasia.   + Well done on arguing that we are sanctioning people with low quality of lives to just exit their lives. * On them being a burden to society, explain why the majority of society would engage in these kinds of victim-blaming narratives and embolden the stigma against them.   On the aspect of depressed people being exploited into it, we need to be engaging with Prop’s model that they are requiring all these vulnerable people to go through mental health treatment first.   * So we have to explain why these treatments will never work!   + On all options being exhausted, Prop is still giving them more options, rather than less.   Good job offering POIs today!   * Don’t take the second POI when you’re already at 6 minutes.   7.05 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |