| **Student Name:** Isabella Chau |
| --- |

| **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.]  Good reframing that most people utilise euthanasia as a last resort! However, won’t you still allow anyone who passes the psychological assessment to utilise euthanasia anyways?   * Make a strategic observation here these people will still choose to exit this life under Opp’s world anyways! The only difference is they can utilise a painless, dignified exit pathway on Prop vs an ugly one on Opp.   We explained that his argument on god-given right is not relevant, you’re right but we’re not explaining precisely why it’s irrelevant.   * Point out that he’s presuming this is a religious debate, we are debating from a secular, objective perspective. No one in this debate has to care about what constitutes a god-given right.   Well done explaining why these options will be exercised rationally and carefully!   * Fully optimise your own model to specifically deal with Opp’s stakeholder on critically depressed individuals.   + Point out that these people suffer in silence in Opp’s world and exit this life anyways, so Prop is suffering more options and solutions for them.   We need to rebut Opp’s main argument on the state no longer valuing the life of people, and putting the blame on the very people we should be helping instead.  We shouldn’t just assert this level of suffering that people are going through, we have to deeply characterise the human costs. Why is it impossible for them to improve their quality of life?   * Start with the problem statement first. Why exactly is euthanasia the preferred antidote to unhappiness? Can’t they pursue other things that could hopefully increase their happiness?   + Tell me who these people are! Explain that by making this a deliberate and conscious decision, we can allow them to celebrate their life with their loved one, instead of exiting their life privately and alone.   The argument is strictly focused on those with a terminally ill diagnosis. Be mindful that your stakeholder doesn’t clash with the stakeholder that Opp wants to focus on in this debate. Can you tell me why the focus ought to be on them instead?   * Can you characterise why their end-of-life is quite undignified, and strips them of their very humanity? So allowing them to exit on their terms gives them more humanity and dignity.   Please offer more POIs today!  6.05 | | | | | | |