| **Student Name:** Lilianna Poon |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house 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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good opening with reference to freedom of choice. Why does freedom matter/how is this linked to suffering? If it is because of old age - I think we want to characterise the lack of dignity in this situation; describe what it means to live a life without these capacities and sense of control over the self.  Set-up? You need to explain how this works!   * On model, give examples of how it works in other countries; clear explanation of counselling etc. The point of this should be clearer in terms of enthusiastic consent being required. * Will there be checks and balances to ensure all that do it are making a consensual decision?   Argument 1   * What is the thesis or claim of this argument? * Why are these people suffering? For what reason? We assert that people are without any explanation as to why! * What is the value of choice in this context? How are we deriving the value of choice here? * On impact, we aren’t explaining what the value or impact of this, but rather repeating what we have said about having the right to choose earlier. Why would they have a painful death in the counterfactual?   I think we want to explain what the principle underlying euthanasia is; which is that forcing people to live against their will violates personal freedom. This is an affront on our bodily autonomy. The state already recognises the positive iteration of this right; it criminalises assault, rape, let’s us smoke or treat our bodies poorly through the consumption of junk food etc. This push is strong because it doesn’t rely on people living undignified lives to be able to access this freedom; this option exists anyways.  We need to flesh out the argument in a lot more detail!  We have to speak louder and with more confidence. We aren’t using any hand gestures, nor are we making eye contact.  04:22  Good POI to Ishan - make it more concisely and clearly worded. | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house 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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good opening; explain why the freedom of choice has to be traded off here; why do we not let people choose this?  You don’t get to call your argument well analysed!  Where is the set-up? We have to characterise the problem here; we want to establish our core principled claim here - which is that life is sacrosanct, and cannot be taken away outside the circumstances of natural death - what kinds of rights and policies do you support as a result, for instance UBI or welfare nets?  Rebuttal   * We shouldn't be using our argument to rebut a claim here!   Argument 1   * Is this about doctors taking other people’s lives, or rather a world in which people enthusiastically consent for this to be done to them. Presumably, the codes or principles would change in this new world; it is easy to flip this argument by characterising how this alters. See the POI Lilianna asks you - why are the alternatives better, or for the state to limit? * On families - why do they matter more than the specific individual consenting to or desiring euthanasia? Why do their feelings, or emotions take priority? * Is this a principle claim?   We need to explain why life has inherent value regardless of quality; how and why does the state prevent us from incurring harm on ourselves, such that it is legitimate for them to deny us this autonomy with regards to decision making.  You cannot move while concluding. Wrap up and then sit down.  We need to ask POIs consistently and with more conciseness!  06:12 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Boris Cheung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house 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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  On doctors, explain how norms or values or principles just change in a world in which we recognise this right. You can also talk about the extent that doctors provide quality of life services to patients, this falls into that as well. Our opening needed to be clearer.  Rebuttal   * You need to explain why people desire this in the first place; what does teetering on the verge of death look like and why should they be able to opt out of this. For instance, old people who do not have control over their bodily functions and don’t currently live under dignity. * This is a soft line - you need to defend anyone’s right to access euthanasia, as opposed to just the ill. Explain why their justification for it could be whatever; you make sure it is informed consent, and that there is no coercion here; and then explain why to deny them this right or capacity would be denying them freedom. Explain why we or the state don’t get to pass value judgements on other people’s lives! Explain why we get to decide this, and us alone! * Don’t take a POI in the middle of a sentence.   Argument   * Good work characterising what their lives are like; characterise the lack of dignity in this situation; describe what it means to live a life without these capacities and sense of control over the self. Good example of vomiting and not being able to walk. Link the cutting process short to dignity and why old people deserve to pass in dignity. * Good attempt at a principle! However, the focus of this argument is far too much on families, as opposed to the individual themselves.   I think we want to explain what the principle underlying euthanasia is; which is that forcing people to live against their will violates personal freedom. This is an affront on our bodily autonomy. The state already recognises the positive iteration of this right; it criminalises assault, rape, let’s us smoke or treat our bodies poorly through the consumption of junk food etc. This push is strong because it doesn’t rely on people living undignified lives to be able to access this freedom; this option exists anyways.  We have to ask POIs!  05:09 | | | | | | |