| **Student Name:** Ishan Harishankar |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  Good clarity and clash starting off the debate.   * Well done on the signposting as well.   + But we should have a counter set-up BEFORE the rebuttals.   On the rebuttal to cost-efficiency, instead of immediately conceding that you cost a lot of money, we should explain that the financial payments to test subjects are a FRACTION of the costs compared to the investments for medical innovation. So the harm posed here is quite insignificant.   * While I appreciate the reinforcement that rights matter more than outcome, bear in mind that Prop is also saving the lives of people. So we have to conduct an actual weighing here. * The counterfactual referenced here on simulations haven’t been set up yet! This is why set-ups have to come first.   On the second rebuttal, good job highlighting that it’s possible that no one dies on your side.   * However, why can’t prisoners choose to consent to risk their own lives the way that regular test subjects are already allowed to.   On the set-up:   * Good job on computer simulations, but it’s highly limited in status quo. So eliminating test subjects entirely would significantly harm feasibility of innovations.   Good choice of a claim in the first argument!   * Nice characterisation as to why their consent is questionable, but we need to be more engaging to Prop arguing that prisoners can weigh the risks as they also have the self-preservation instinct to stay alive. * The impacting is similar to the mechanistic analysis earlier! * Instead, the moral hazard needs to be based on exploitation of rights of prisoners, which feeds into state abuse, as the state has a strong tendency of hurting prisoners, e.g. prison labour.   On the second argument, I appreciate the analysis as to how it is unjust, but we need to place more attention to how this harms victims.   * What is the practical implication of the justice system delivering injustice?   + Explain that society may refuse to reintegrate these prisoners into society upon their early release as they don’t believe that justice has been served. This will then push them back into a life of crime if they are unable to go back to a law-abiding lifestyle.   Well done on offering POIs today.  7.33 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |