| **Student Name:** Renee Yang |
| --- |

| **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.]  Interesting hook that even pets have access to euthanasia, frame it as a humane and dignified death that humans also wish for themselves.  On the set-up:   * Good job with the definition. * Nice model making therapy and mental health treatment is a necessary prerequisite before they can proceed with euthanasia! * We need to make our burden more strategic than just helping humans enjoy their life to their final moment.   On the first argument:   * 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? * On the additional check of having the correct diagnoses, that should be in the model instead. * It isn’t clear what the moral claim is, we need to explain why people have the right to die and where does this right come from. * I appreciate that we are reframing that this debate is bigger than low-income people, many are privileged but deeply unhappy.   + 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. * We shouldn’t just assert this level of suffering, we have to deeply characterise the human costs. Why is it impossible for them to improve their quality of life?   On the second argument:   * Be careful, it’s quite dangerous to argue death as the solution to problems like poverty!   + Shouldn’t the state focus on fixing poverty, instead of handing the poor an exit ticket to this life? * We need to focus on the uniqueness of this solution, rather than just a poor alternative to a failing solution.   Please offer more POIs today!  6.52 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |