| **Student Name:** Emma Kwok |
| --- |

| **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:  I need your opening to showcase why euthanasia is incredibly important either through a positive affirmation of the right to life and how this is an extension of this, or a negative explanation of what a life without euthanasia looks like, such as for the elderly and why they deserve to choose to die with dignity - describe what it means to live a life without capacities and sense of control over the self.  Set-up - word economy can be more efficient here.   * Clear on how you would use evaluations to ensure healthy consent. Will this be only accessible to the elderly, i.e. do they have to justify why they want to do this, or does anything work? * We need to explain passive and active euthanasia; I think we want to explain why both are not different or distinct from each other, because you can then push that various different rights and freedoms in the status quo already support the principle behind passive euthanasia. This makes Opp have a harder burden.   Argument 1   * What is the thesis or claim of this argument? * Interesting starting point of not consenting to existence, and hence how this is a restoration of this right to existence which was never given to us in the first place. I think you need to spend more time on this and explaining why this is so inherent to us, with connection to autonomy and dignity. * Don’t make it on the basis of a bad quality of life. Focus on this as an important group that needs this especially but this should not be the general justification, as Opp can flip this on saying we instead need to innovate and restore their quality of life - this is the correct affirmation of the right to life. * We need to impact this argument, and follow the structure discussed with more tightness. Good work mentioning suicide, but we need to go into further detail to explain that this the counterfactual and what ends up happening instead in their world.   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.  Good attempt at a principle, well identified, but needs to be unpacked in far more detail.  06:12  We must focus on our flow a lot more to ensure fluency! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jasper She |
| --- |

| **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:  Fair opening, you want to spell out why this is morally incorrect in one sentence which is punchy and then move on. Why do we take action against this, or how is a legitimate ‘right’ for the state to defend?  Set-up   * We want to establish active and passive in relation to a lack of clarification from Prop as to what type of euthanasia they stand against. We need to push there is a distinction, and how there is a difference. We attempt this through the cancer example, but we need to explain WHY it is not the same thing. For instance, that death is imminent quite literally, and no intervention can alter or prolong life - characterise the terminal aspect of terminal illness. * We also 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?   Rebuttal   * Did we engage sufficiently? * Explain why coercion is likely to exist, or that we can never consent without coercion to something like this - push that their model will not work.   Argument 1   * Thesis? You need to spell this out because otherwise the immediate push of your argument is unclear, and it takes time for you to connect the concept of rationality to euthanasia. * On rationality, explain WHY it will always occur without it, or undermine their rationality. The principle here is technically not rationality, but that 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. * It’s easy to problematise the cancer point you talk about and explain how old age is in itself a terminal illness, and hence you technically support this. Focus more on how Prop needs to defend an unadulterated right to this, even though they never really clarify this. * Good attempt at following the structure of this argument; the impact needs to be about other freedoms the state would give us if they had to give us this, and why those would be bad.   05:37 | | | | | | |