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

| **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: | 71 | | | | | |
| 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.]  In the hook, try to expand the situation in the motion first before identifying that you are on team deontology because the judge will have no understanding on what Omelas is.  On the set-up:   * Good attempt at clarifying what are the needs being met in Omelas, but you should be more strategic! Say that these minimum standards can STILL be met even by walking away from Omelas, the only loss is the absolute, perfect utopia they currently have. * We should also attempt to clarify what kind of suffering this child is going through. * Explain that this is an actor debate and we need to debate from their perspective.   Good start on state obligation!   * Don’t stop by just saying that it exists, we should explain how this state duty is being actively violated and how it’s possible for them to explore alternatives in keeping Omelas safe and happy.   Well done on the characterisation of the child’s suffering.   * We are moving on too fast after stating that the child is young, fragile and innocent. Explain the circumstances that led to them being kidnapped, and what they will be suffering through in captivity.   + I like the claim that they are too young to understand what is happening to them. Point out that a sacrifice of this level needs to be something that a person expressly consents to.   We need to avoid using terms that undercut your own conviction, like “I guess…,” “I will just yap” and giving up on some line of thoughts entirely.  Good job on asking for a POI during the transition point.  On the side of deontology, we need to explain the moral hazard of what happens when we allow these violations.   * What are other abuses that will be legitimised if the state does not care for the treatment of this vulnerable child? * Why is it immoral for the state to deny this knowledge to the citizens of Omelas to decide what is right from wrong?   We were definitely speaking in circles by the end, but I appreciate the effort in reaching the time limit.  Good job offering POIs today!  7.08 - Good timing! | | | | | | |