| **Student Name:** Shawn Nip |
| --- |

| **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: | 70 | | | | | |
| 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:  Right from the get go, you need to characterise what this suffering looks like - and explain how it is incredibly harmful that this exists. This will highlight what the trade off Opp wants to defend is. Good analogies to the status quo that highlight the harm - but be more direct!  Set-up   * In set-up, you need to establish what happens when this person leaves.   + We don’t get to change the way in which Omelas works; it is just about the individual moral choice that we’re making. We don’t get to alter the circumstances. There will presumably be someone else that will take up this role or mantle instead.   + We should establish what happens to Omelas once we leave, presuming that this continues, and if Omelas collapses and becomes a regular society - what would this society look like, and why is this preferable? * Where do we go? In that kind of society do we find ourselves? Why is this a preferable life?   Argument 1   * We need to start by pinpointing how we’ve robbed all personhood from the child; first explain what personhood is - going into detail on all four facets we covered last week - these are autonomy, rationality, dignity and moral agency, and explain how it isn’t just that we’re depriving them of humanity, but rather depriving them of a net neutral existence - we are actively hurting them. * We should talk about how people choose sub-optimal situations because they value a more moral life all the time; they pay taxes rather than evading them, they risk protest even if it means they may lose their life or be thrown in jail; they are asserting their moral agency - this is what we need to say! * We draw lots of analogies, but don’t explain why what is being done here is wrong. You have to explain WHY it is incorrect, and then highlight existing parallels. * We need to explain the comparative. What would it be like to be this person, with this knowledge choosing to stay in Omelas? Happiness built upon the suffering of another is inherently flawed and unsustainable. The knowledge of the child's suffering would create a constant undercurrent of guilt and unease, even if subconsciously, undermining the true happiness of the citizens. * Where is the impacting? What does it mean to live in a world that prescribes to such a moral calculus - explain how accepting the suffering of one for the benefit of many creates a dangerous precedent. Where does the line get drawn? Could this justification be used to sacrifice more individuals in the future?   We need to have more effective conclusions - don’t just summarise everything you did like a list, instead highlight what your path to victory is!  04:45 - we need to hit 5 minimum!  Please ask cleaner and crisper POIs! | | | | | | |

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

| **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: | 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:  We need to start by explaining how there will be suffering in the counterfactual too, it’s just about who suffers and if their suffering matters less. Our opening can also instead spell out our key response to the biggest thing that they say, in this case which is that we are putting an individual through suffering - a child.  Set-up?   * What do you suggest happens instead? The individual stays, with this knowledge, and with this responsibility? * Explain how even if this person leaves, the life in Omelas continues, with a replacement for this child being found.   Rebuttal   * Explain why and how they suffer misery in the real world. We just say this, without an explanation of what this is and looks like! Analyse this! * POI - explain why there will be misery! We need to explain why the child loses autonomy in both worlds - it is just that in our world, not everyone else has to. * Where Proposition hasn’t characterised the counterfactual, you need to build it up in a way that benefits your side instead.   Argument 1   * We need to first explain what the benefit or outcome is; characterise what a utopia is, and in which ways Omelas would be the best place to live. Then - explain why these benefits are only accessible on your side of the house. You have to explain how Omelas breaks down when the person decides to leave/what society looks like on the net in terms of where they are likely to settle. We don’t really go into much detail as to what a utopia is, and how it brings happiness and meaning to everyone who lives within it. Do world-building! Don’t ask the judge to imagine this instead. * We mention crime - why would crime occur, how would crime hurt people? * Following from this, explain the trade-off! Whose autonomy and freedom are we choosing between, and committing to trading off? * Lastly, mitigate - explain how freeing the child and leaving would result in the collapse of Omelas's utopia, leading to suffering for everyone, including the formerly imprisoned child. Explain how this leads to a moral hazard, in the way we discussed in class.   We need to ask POIs consistently. You cannot claim ‘ah I forgot’!  05:41 - we need to end confidently, we can’t just trail off. | | | | | | |

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

| **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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  Right from the get go, you need to characterise what this suffering looks like - and explain how it is incredibly harmful that this exists. This will highlight what the trade off Opp wants to defend is. Don’t point out what they say, and then asking a question as to whether the situation is fair. Your job isn’t to ask questions, but to answer them.  We are reading throughout, without any hand gestures, which makes us come across as stiff and under-confident. We have to convey a positive and confident body language!  Rebuttal   * Why would misery not exist, and why even if it did, be a state we are okay with? Don’t just jump to saying we’re okay with misery because at least it doesn’t come at the cost of suffering. You can explain why the city can eventually get it together, or there are systems or mechanisms that can lead to this. Then, explain why it is fundamentally unfair for the city’s happiness to come at this cost. * POI - but why is it morally incorrect? We’re going in circles! We need to start by pinpointing how we’ve robbed all personhood from the child; first explain what personhood is - going into detail on all four facets we discussed, and explain how it isn’t just that we’re depriving them of humanity, but rather depriving them of a net neutral existence - we are actively hurting them. * We need to engage with Boris’s claim that suffering will end up existing on both sides.   Argument 1   * Fair on equality being the key claim here. Why is equality important or valuable? * We shouldn’t say human rights as much; we use this buzzword without explaining why this is a human right, or a right that all are entitled to. * ‘No one in their right mind’ - we cannot claim what others would do, these are just analogies. You have to explain why this is the morally superior action to take. * We could also argue that we need to walk away as we are individually culpable in this situation!   + This person takes a direct action that causes immense suffering to another human being. They are fully aware of the horrific conditions the child endures and the purpose of this suffering. The individual still makes a choice to participate in the system. They are not forced or coerced in a way that completely removes their agency. Their role isn't a one-time action. They are responsible for the *ongoing* captivity and suffering of the child. They actively maintain the system that perpetuates this injustice. * Where is the impacting? What does it mean to live in a world that prescribes to such a moral calculus - explain how accepting the suffering of one for the benefit of many creates a dangerous precedent. Where does the line get drawn? Could this justification be used to sacrifice more individuals in the future?   We need to ask POIs. How many POIs did you ask today?  05:40 | | | | | | |

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

| **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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  We need to start by explaining how there will be suffering in the counterfactual too, it’s just about who suffers and if their suffering matters less. Explain both what Omelas looks like, as well as the general society or world that this person is stepping out into.  Our signposting is too long! The title of an argument needs to be short and snappy - we have a run-on sentence in place instead!  Rebuttal   * We need to first explain what the benefit or outcome is; characterise what a utopia is, and in which ways Omelas would be the best place to live. Then - explain why these benefits are only accessible on your side of the house. You have to explain how Omelas breaks down when the person decides to leave/what society looks like on the net in terms of where they are likely to settle. We don’t really go into much detail as to what a utopia is, and how it brings happiness and meaning to everyone who lives within it. * Why are we claiming we’ll provide statistics? Is this something we’ve been taught to do! * POI - explain how freeing the child and leaving would result in the collapse of Omelas's utopia, leading to suffering for everyone, including the formerly imprisoned child. Explain how this leads to a moral hazard, in the way we discussed in class. Don’t jump to the trade off in the response, minimise suffering for all involved first.   Argument 1   * I want a clear thesis on what you will prove in this argument! We’re claiming lots of practical impacts here, which may make this argument slightly messy. * The jump into numbers is unnecessary - this doesn’t prove anything in specific; we have to justify why this is the correct calculus as opposed to spending twenty seconds going into the mathematics of the situation! * We’re explaining here how people might suffer, but we can talk about how this affects their basic rights rather than jumping to the loss of career; where does this land in the hierarchy of rights? * Following from this, explain the trade-off! Whose autonomy and freedom are we choosing between, and committing to trading off?   We need to ask POIs consistently. You cannot claim ‘ah I forgot’!  We have to hit time. We cannot go overtime! Please time yourself accordingly.  06:04 | | | | | | |