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

| **Motion**: This house would allow people to sell their organs. |
| --- |

| 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 characterising the organ donor shortage, and how we need to create an intervention which helps people. Don’t read out the opening, where you are talking about this - this takes away from the problem characterisation - it doesn’t seem like a problem, just something that is happening.  Set-up   * Good on the types of organs you would sell and wouldn’t. What is the distinction? Is there one? Why don’t we think this is a restriction of autonomy? * Good on state interventions to ensure health. * Will there be price ceilings or protections?   Argument 1   * Good on the analogies to tattoos! Good on there being certain limitations - but remember not to go too hard on this as our side is actually the deontological one; we’re the ones that safeguard autonomy, which the state currently prevents us from doing. * We also need to justify why it is okay for us to differentiate between the type of organs we allow people to sell. A good Opp would tear you to pieces on this, by saying that if you defend autonomy, and the freedom of people to do what they want with their body - then you have to defend this to the extreme. The explanation should be that autonomy is one thing, undermining the right to your own life is another - this is the line that the state draws that is necessary. * If we do want to establish how this helps people, you need to spend time characterising how and why there is a shortage of organs in the first place. Why is there such a scarcity, and why is demand so high? Explain how there is a lack - and how there are no other interventions that can create this supply. This problem characterization is missing. * On the black market - explain how it continues to exist on Opp’s side, which means this debate isn’t about whether or not organs should be sold, but where this can happen in a safer manner. Explain how this is the duty of the state.   We need to learn how to make a proper utilitarian argument! This has a few steps.  04:11  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Emilia Lau |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would allow people to sell their organs. |
| --- |

| 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:  Excellent opening identifying those who are forced to sell. Explain how the poor would be exploited and attacked; for instance how would the wealthy take advantage of them? Explain how consent cannot exist in this situation - hence we have to intervene and protect.  Rebuttal   * Explain how if they defend autonomy, and the freedom of people to do what they want with their body - then they have to defend this to the extreme. This is the correct attack to make, but the way in which we are doing it is slightly too example heavy and assertive.   Argument 1   * We need to identify the specific outcome we want; which is for people to make good decisions without coercion - but in this case, why are they likely to make poor decisions without coercion. Explain how in this case, we need to limit people’s right to autonomy, because of how badly this could go in terms of abuses. * On the children being born to this - saviour siblings technically exist in the status quo anyways. What is the distinction here? * Establish what the better solution would be; how does your side solve the demand and supply problem? Encouraging donation? Or mandating donation with opt out mechanisms? How does your side engage with the problem here? * We need to make it very clear that we take away the right to choose because we think the state has to protect you, because a fair number of people will make uninformed and poor decisions about what to do. Explain how autonomy cannot exist if coercion does.   Let’s ask POIs consistently!  04:10 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would allow people to sell their organs. |
| --- |

| 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 have a strong opening ready if we know this is where we might struggle to have a clear and immediate impact. You could explain that the problem with organs is one of demand or supply. Explain how this debate isn’t about whether or not organs should be sold, but where this can happen in a safer manner. Demand will always exist; this is a debate about how we make supply possible.  Rebuttal   * Good on the state’s ability to intervene - excellent on how sale still technically exists in the black market. However, we cannot use this as a silver bullet against coercion and pressure to sell. You have to, in the worst case, defend that there will be a lack of consent and accept this. * Excellent response on the black market, and how this is incredibly harmful. Explain how they actually hurt the poor even more when this is the only option that exists.   I am unsure where the rebuttal ends, and when the argument starts? Our tone is the exact same throughout the speech! The content is also more or less the same throughout!  We also need to justify why it is okay for us to differentiate between the type of organs we allow people to sell. A good Opp would tear you to pieces on this, by saying that if you defend autonomy, and the freedom of people to do what they want with their body - then you have to defend this to the extreme. The explanation should be that autonomy is one thing, undermining the right to your own life is another - this is the line that the state draws that is necessary.  Why can’t we increase donations? Why can’t we use other above the table methods to achieve the outcomes you want? Engage with the comparative!  04:45  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would allow people to sell their organs. |
| --- |

| 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:  We need to start by pinpointing a specific response or issue; this general observation has little strategic value. How does this help you win/them lose? Our opening also has to be louder, and delivered with more confidence, both in terms of our vocal presentation and our body language. In the opening, we don’t actually engage with the point on the black market.  Rebuttal   * On being forced to sell - explain how the poor would be exploited and attacked; for instance how would the wealthy take advantage of them? Explain how economic desperation could force poor people to sell organs, creating a coercive situation where basic needs trump health. Analyse who is likely to donate - and why this hurts the people they want to help the most. If they are the ones in need of the organs, could they ever afford it? * On the black market - explain how just like they have the capacity to intervene to make this legalisation safe and accompanied with state intervention, so do we to crack down on the black market. * What do we mean by the government funding these people? This is under-explained! * Explain how if they defend autonomy, and the freedom of people to do what they want with their body - then they have to defend this to the extreme. There is no meaningful distinction the other side offers us here.   POI - why is it exclusive? Good on still reducing access to black market.  Argument 1   * On health, we need to engage with the policies Prop presents on how they make this a process where the state can take action to ensure people don’t abuse themselves in this process. * I think the push we need to make is that rationality is being compromised. We need to establish what good decision-making is, and what high quality consent is, and then establish how this will not exist. We also need to explain why organs would sell for egregious amounts of money. * Explain how in this case, we need to limit people’s right to autonomy, because of how badly this could go in terms of abuses. * Establish what the better solution would be; how does your side solve the demand and supply problem? Encouraging donation? Or mandating donation with opt out mechanisms?   05:12  We have to speak louder and with more confidence!  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |