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

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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 signposting! You have to create a strong and immediate impact from the get go!  Set-up   * We need to speak slower - we’re not enunciating as clearly and it becomes too difficult to track. * We have to spend time on set-up explaining how this legalisation will occur, and which organs we will and will not allow sale, what the processes will be; whether the state will intervene and create price ceilings or protections etc.   Argument 1   * We need to start by establishing how the state is limiting our autonomy and that this is bad. We’re not spending any time establishing this as a universal moral standard the state has no right to restrict. We aren’t explaining how the state loses its moral legitimacy. We jump to analogies, but aren’t explaining the implication of a gut disagreement with this ban.   We jump between our first and second argument? The first needs to be a principle, the second a practical about how this solves the problem of organ shortages?  Argument 2   * If we 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.   I don’t know why we aren’t consistently applying what we are learning in class. We cannot speak undertime.  03:05  We need to ask POIs consistently! You cannot ask POIs out of time so consistently. | | | | | | |

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

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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:  Our opening has to have a very high impact immediately - explain how this isn’t about ‘making money’, but about the poor being systematically exploited - and the wealthy would take advantage of them.  Where is our signposting? Where are our transition markers? We aren’t spending any time clarifying what we will do, but randomly jump into what I assume is set-up and rebuttal?  Rather than penalising people, you can just say we won’t legalise it. The cameras and fines are slightly odd and don’t actually score high on implementability?  If we want to claim that people will sell organs critical to health, you need to explain why they would do this? You can punish them for not including state intervention in the model, but you have to be reasonable about this. You cannot win on these grounds.  Chester, what is the structure of this speech? This is all over the place. You need to have more discipline when it comes to what exactly you’re going to do. This is unacceptable.  We aren’t running any arguments per say? What is happening? Where is the utilitarian claim?  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. 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!  02:51 - you cannot speak so undertime. | | | | | | |

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

| **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 have a strong opening ready. 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   * On the black market, the response to make is that demand for organs doesn't go away. If anything, this means the black market thrives on their side of the house. You legalise it and regulate it, and make it a lot safer for people. Explain how this hurts the poor even more so. * Explain why there will either be state interventions, or people will be rational when they make these decisions. We aren’t engaging at all on how people will make bad decisions, per what the Opp says.   Argument 1   * There is overlap between the rebuttal and the first argument here. There is no modelling on interventions into the black market or crackdown. This needed to come out at first. * Good response to the POI - we need to characterise what legalisation would actually look like! How would it work? Where our first doesn’t do world-building properly, it becomes our responsibility to fill this gap. * Don’t take two POIs in a row. You have to be more disciplined in this manner. * 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!   03:50  We have to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **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 pinpointing a specific response or issue; if this is about the poor, explain HOW the poor get hurt. 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?  Rebuttal   * On model clarification, you need to explain how and why we limit autonomy. Why, despite state intervention, would people engage with this poorly? How would your side solve or help with the lack of organs available. * 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.   Argument 1   * Why would they think or behave in this manner? You have to characterise what likely behaviour is to be like. We’re just asserting they are going to make bad decisions. * 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. * Why and how would they be clogging up the system? Presumably they are selling it to people who need them; if this is not the case, because they are too expensive - you need to explain why this is true. * 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?   You have to slow down and focus on your enunciation. It becomes difficult to track you when you speak too quickly without focusing on sounding clear.  We need to ask POIs consistently!  05:01 | | | | | | |

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

| **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:  What is the purpose of this opening? 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.  Clash 1   * Good first clash identification. Explain how people make rational decisions, or that the state exists to regulate this sale; such that it will not occur in the way in which Opp claims. * Why doesn’t the state have a right to restrict this? Explain how people will behave responsibly such that we aren’t limiting our own autonomy in making this action. You have to engage with them piling on harms. * On income - why is this exclusive?   Clash 2 - what is this mysterious outcome?   * Talk about how your side deals with the black market better - talk about how demand for organs still exists on their side, you reduce this demand by legalising it. Explain how they actually hurt the poor even more when this is the only option that exists. * Explain why cameras or surveillance is absurd and just unlikely to ever work. * Why will people behave rationally? This needs to be explained in far more detail! * 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!   Let’s ask POIs consistently!  05:02 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Hon Sum Yang |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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:  Where is your hook? We need to start by pinpointing a specific response or issue; if this is about the poor, explain HOW the poor get hurt. 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?  As third, you need to have clashes, and have those clashes be present in signposting. There have to be a minimum of TWO clashes. Your responses need to be done WITHIN rebuttals, rather than outside. This is especially confusing because we established how there will be a principle and practical clash in this debate during class.  Rebuttal   * Why won’t people behave rationally? Why does this desperation mean they don’t go through the legal process on Prop? Why would they go to the black market? You are basically conceding that the black market continues to exist on your side. 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. * Why would they think or behave in this manner? You have to characterise what likely behaviour is to be like. We’re just asserting they are going to make bad decisions. * 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.   Clash   * Explain why this is equivalent to self harm, rather than just drawing a parallel to drugs. * 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?   03:39 - why are we speaking so under time?  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **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:  You should only go to the toilet during a speech on your own side, otherwise you will lose out on material from the other side.  As reply, we needed to have clashes - more than one! You can have one principle and one practical.  Why will there be sufficient donations? We just say we support this, with no explanation as to how this will work, or that this will be BETTER. We say we’ll do this later, but you need to resolve this up top. Has this debate been about solving the organ shortage? A reply needs to be reflective of the debate, explaining why your side won. This is a new claim altogether, that has barely been discussed.  We needed to engage on the poor - 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? We eventually talk about this, but don’t deal with this conclusively.  We needed to engage on rationality - why won’t people behave rationally? Why does this desperation mean they don’t go through the legal process on Prop? Why would they go to the black market? You are basically conceding that the black market continues to exist on your side. 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. 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 cannot speak so informally - ‘obviously’, ‘you know’, ‘hella expensive’ etc.  We needed to engage on the principle - 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.  What is the structure of this speech?  03:40  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |