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

| **Motion:** This house would walk away from Omelas |
| --- |

| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  We need to read the motion carefully and prep on the right side! We needed to have immediately adjust our speech as soon as Isabella started speaking.  We need a set-up before the rebuttals:   * We should have recharacterised why Omelas would be in ruins without this sacrifice. * Or that this is an actor debate, and the actor would have to sacrifice their entire community if they walked away.   + What is your burden/winning pathway?   While I appreciate the push that the overall duty is to keep the city happy, it isn’t clear why this means that the state should have the ability to do whatever they want in service of this goal.   * We needed to have explained why torturing this child was a necessity.   Good characterisation that Omelas is resource-scarce and they are facing dysfunction, can we explain why the state cannot improve it under these conditions?   * Attempt to weigh the potential suffering of the city versus the suffering of the child.   + We did this later on, good job.   On the sacrifice of one person does not outweigh the happiness of the entire city, we are not necessarily hearing WHY this is the case.   * We need to use the moral justification of equality to explain why the majority ought to matter more. * Try engaging with Prop’s claim that the child is too young to consent, and they are particularly vulnerable. Thus, the sacrifice is not something that can be moralised.   We kept asserting that the practical outcomes outweigh morality, but there is no weighing being done to prove this framing. You have to actively justify why outcomes decides what is most moral.  Please offer more POIs today.  5.52 - We are short for time today! | | | | | | |