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

| **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:  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   * Good work covering both outcomes that could occur; but do note - 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. We can take this action, and hope change occurs. But this doesn’t guarantee it. 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   * Good work recognising autonomy as the core principle here. * 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. * Good on randomness of choice! * 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 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? * Culpability entered at the last minute! We needed to spend more time unpacking this and how exactly it undermines moral agency.   We need to have a more economical approach. We’re doing four minute speeches, and spent nearly two of these on set-up!  04:02 - We need to ask POIs consistently. How many POIs did we ask today? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Chester Tam |
| --- |

| **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:  Don’t start by saying the motion! Give me a hook - 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? Rebuttal?   * What do you suggest happens instead? The individual stays, with this knowledge, and with this responsibility? * We need to bite the bullet, and jump straight to responses as opposed to mitigating the severity of suffering the child undergoes. * Explain how even if this person leaves, the life in Omelas continues, with a replacement for this child being found. So all this leaving and freeing does is that another child suffers pre-maturely. They actually increase suffering. We eventually do say this - good! * Good on the symmetric nature of knowledge. Good on how it could hurt other people. * Explain why and how they suffer misery in the real world. We need to explain why the child loses autonomy in both worlds - it is just that in our world, not everyone else has to.   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. 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.   Argument 2   * This is repetitive as the mitigation above!   We need to ask POIs consistently. How many POIs did we ask today?  04:13 | | | | | | |

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

| **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.  Rebuttal   * We need to explain how the degree of suffering doesn’t matter - that it is even happening is what is the problem. 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. * Re-integrate - good! Good unpacking of trauma. * You should also 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. Your side can access benefits - not a utopia per say - without this moral sacrifice being needed. This is also the response to the POI Chester asks you.   We have to be mindful of our time split! This is a four minute speech, and we spent more than 3 and a half minutes on rebuttal and the POI.  Argument 1   * Good on responsibility. We need to first establish responsibility! 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 consistently. How many POIs did we ask today?  04:17 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Torres Li |
| --- |

| **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: | 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 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. Link this to the POI Chester asks.  Rebuttal   * Bite the bullet and accept suffering, this is your burden in the debate. You need to trade this off for the benefit on your side the way you were taught to do today!   + 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. * 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! WSDC formats do not have extensions, we need to have a proper new argument! We’re jumping from practical impact to practical impact here. * 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, as explained above. Do world-building! * 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. How many POIs did we ask today?  03:20 - Why aren’t we hitting time? We also need to stop with the ‘I am proud’ conclusions!  Your POI to Kayley needs to be worded far more clearly. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Kayley Cheng |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  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.  Rebuttals need to be organised in the form of clashes. Rebuttals and clashes are not two different things!  Clash 1 - Title? Thesis?   * We need to explain how the degree of suffering doesn’t matter - that it is even happening is what is the problem. 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. * You should also 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. Your side can access benefits - not a utopia per say - without this moral sacrifice being needed. * Good attempt at establishing why suffering is not morally justified. * We need to first establish responsibility! 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. * POI - your side can still access happiness! You need to develop the counterfactual to be able to respond to this! * 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 consistently. How many POIs did we ask today?  03:41 - Why aren’t we hitting time? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Lorelyn Schroeder |
| --- |

| **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:  Good opening, but don’t ask this as a literal question - instead, 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.  Clash names need to be included in signposting!  Your response to their clash needs to be integrated into your OWN clashes. You can engage with their claim on morality in a clash of your own by explaining how everyone suffers in their world - the child, the person, the entire society as well, using Torres’s harms to highlight how bad the average society in the world is.  Clash 1: Should the truth be revealed? Is this a clash?   * 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. * 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.   Clash 2: Prioritisation   * Technically, both this and the above are the same claim. We still need to explain why the counterfactual is doomed!   We need to ask POIs consistently! How many POIs did we ask today?  04:19 | | | | | | |