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

| **Motion:** This house would allow prisoners to consent to experimental medical treatment in exchange for shorter sentence |
| --- |

| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  Good start that what you’re proposing is not different from the existing facets of the criminal justice system, this is where you have to highlight what exactly they are!   * E.g. Community service would also shorten sentences, so does good behaviour in prisons.   Nice job challenging their counter-model!   * But we need to explain what are precisely the limitations of computer simulations, and why it would further harm medical innovation on your side.   We’re stopping too early by just reinforcing why you can obtain consent (without repeating what your model is on how effective this process will be). You have to engage Opp’s analysis specifically on why freedom will lead to false choices.   * So point out Isabella analysed that the risk to their own lives will balance out the benefit of freedom, so prisoners can consider both sides of the coin.   Arguing retribution is slightly bizarre!   * The Opposition already argued that the victims are the ones preferring longer sentences, they wouldn’t want the prisoners released early. * If you truly wanted retribution, then you would just make them go through the medical trials without giving them any form of reward. * We are characterising these criminals as bad people, and yet you’re the side that wants to give them a shorter sentence. These two angles are in tension with one another. Why would you let go the people whom you think are evil?   Before the impact of saving lives, explain the scale in which you are EXPEDITING the process of medical experiments.   * We are stopping too early on the impact of saving lives!   + We should be weighing it exactly against the harms these prisoners have been responsible for in the past, and explain why they have earned the early release by choosing to stake their own lives for a greater social good.   On removing the rights of prisoners being justified, that applies to their incarceration which does not pose the risk of death, and it’s being administered by a fair court. How is this similar to a potential loss of consent to something that could lead to death?  Please offer more POIs today.  7.06 | | | | | | |