| **Student Name:** Ellie Fu |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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 public health campaigns to ensure healthy consent. Clear on how consent is a pre-requisite, as is counselling and therapy. * 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   * We need to explain firstly what the value of choice is; good on the harm principle and how it is victimless; even if it did, explain why the decision of the person matters more than say, their family’s opinion. * How does limiting or banning euthanasia hurt our freedom? Where is the impacting? * Your starting point could be that 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.   Argument 2   * 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. You could point to suicide, and how for those looking for a way out will find one - we might as well give it to them in dignity.   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.  05:08 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Josephine 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: | 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:  Why is it at their lowest point, or why will it always be by people who are in this position; explain how they are unable to engage in autonomous decision-making up top. Why do we take action against this, or how is a legitimate ‘right’ for the state to defend?  We need to do set-up! What do we support on Opp?   * 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. 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   * Why do the feelings of the family members factor higher than the individual and their suffering etc. Why must they prioritise others feelings above their own? * 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   * Why are they desperate to find happiness? Why would no one else ever want to pursue euthanasia? * Even if this is true, what alternatives do we support that make their lives better - what kind of policies or rights do we enshrine in our world instead? * The return to loved ones is slightly repetitive, and we’re not further answering the questions as per above. * Isn’t the solution to lack of choice in existence to now provide choice as a means of restoration?   The principle here must be 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.  We have to sound more confident! We also have to ask more POIs!  04:25 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Cyrus Yuan |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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, clear response to loved ones. You should word this with more harshness and explain why the priority in this round must be towards the primary stakeholder. Deal it with up top, rather than going back to this as your first rebuttal - it ends up becoming repetitive.  Rebuttal   * On desperation, reiterate your model, and explain why you will have checks and balances. * Explain why it is justified for them to make this choice; explain the kind of pain and suffering Opp forces them to live through. Illustrate the comparative and why it is so bad.   Will this be only accessible to the elderly or terminally ill, i.e. do they have to justify why they want to do this, or does anything work?  Argument 1   * On families, finances is too contingent on characterising a very specific family situation; the same also applies to carers. * I need you 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. * Your starting point could be that 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. * We need to impact this argument, and follow the structure discussed with more tightness. You could point to suicide, and how for those looking for a way out will find one - we might as well give it to them in dignity.   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.  05:01 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ethan Woo |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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:  Explain right up top why this choice is an illusion, as opposed to only saying you will, criticising the other side and then moving on. Why is it at their lowest point, or why will it always be by people who are in this position; explain how they are unable to engage in autonomous decision-making up top. Why do we take action against this, or how is a legitimate ‘right’ for the state to defend?  Rebuttal   * Trade off fees and family - this relies on specific characterisations of families. In the vast majority of cases, families and carers don’t care about finances or time, they care about their loved ones and making sure they’re still around. Explain why this is a non-issue. * On not giving it to everyone - why aren’t we punishing them for this? Push them to be morally consistent, if they think people deserve the right to end their own life on the basis of pain - there is a slippery slope that exists, pain is subjective and could exist in a number of contexts outside terminal illness. 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. For instance, that death is imminent quite literally, and no intervention can alter or prolong life - characterise the terminal aspect of terminal illness.   Argument 1   * Good work explaining 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. * We have to have alternatives - how do we make their life better? This is the POI Cyrus asks you; some people will not have plausible recovery chances? * 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?   The principle here must be 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.  04:29 | | | | | | |

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

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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 - explain how the counterfactual they support is people committing suicide, or elderly depression rates skyrocketing. I need you 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. Explain why it is justified for them to make this choice; explain the kind of pain and suffering Opp forces them to live through. Illustrate the comparative and why it is so bad.  Clash 1   * Synthesise their contributions quicker! We spend too much time summarising. * On decision-making; we need to explain why autonomy exists. Explain how choices are made with information and enthusiastic consent, bring back your model! * Your starting point could be that 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. * Why and how is it made with determination? * The POI response needed to have come earlier, but still the question of why their pain does not coerce them needs to be answered.   Clash 2   * Clear response to loved ones. You should word this with more harshness and explain why the priority in this round must be towards the primary stakeholder. * On families, finances is too contingent on characterising a very specific family situation; the same also applies to carers.   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.  05:04  PLEASE FOCUS ON YOUR STYLE - YOU NEED TO LOOK AND SOUND MORE CONFIDENT.  We have to ask POIs! | | | | | | |