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

| **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: | 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.]  If we keep stumbling on the word ‘utilitarian,’ it’s going to affect our credibility as a speaker! Otherwise, a fine hook.  On the set-up:   * Good job highlighting informed consent to the fullest extent of the risks involved in the experiments. * On the different types of criminals, we need to make the strategic caveat clear, which is that only prisoners who are eligible for parole can apply for this policy.   + So, those who have committed crimes severe enough to be punished with life imprisonment or death penalty cannot receive this discount. * How significant is the discount in sentencing?   We keep putting characterisation in the set-up when you’re the first speaker, even when it doesn’t belong there. The analysis on why prisoners will be able to rationally consent belongs in an argument pertaining to the exercise of bodily autonomy.   * Good characterisation on why the competing incentives will allow them to understand the consequences of their actions.   + We can input some mechanisms here such as psychological evaluation and a waiting period.   We only entered the first argument at 4:15, that’s too late.  On benefits to the healthcare:   * We need to first explain why we face a unique problem of lacking human volunteers, and what role do human test subjects play in getting these medical innovations. * Good job highlighting that in status quo, at best Opp only has financial incentives, but we need to be explaining why this doesn’t work, rather than just say it saves money.   + What is even the value of saving money here when the tests themselves are very resource-intensive? * Don’t say that your own analysis doesn’t make sense! * Before the impact, 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.   Where is the second argument? We should always aim for 2 arguments in a 7-mins speech.  Please offer more POIs today.  7.00 - Good timing. | | | | | | |