| **Student Name:** Tongtong Lai |
| --- |

| **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:  What is this opening? We need to have a clear hook that spells out the problem with the status quo we need to fix. This can either be autonomy, or the organ donor shortage and how this is the best way to help people in light of this. Our opening at the moment is a prolonged version of the principle.  Set-up   * Why are we saying ‘we decided to say this’ - get to the point! * What is the distinction here? What is the difference between the organs you do allow and the ones you don’t? 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. * 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   * 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. * The positive comparative of how you actually solve this problem is missing. * We jump from this practical benefit to a claim on autonomy? The principle and practical need to be distinct.   Argument 2   * 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.   Our phrasing today was slightly off, in terms of what language we should be using in a competitive debate speech.  We need to ask POIs consistently! How many POIs did we ask today?  04:40 | | | | | | |

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

| **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:  Challenge the analogy straight away, rather than repeating it, criticising it, and then questioning it. We rebut through a rhetorical question, rather than explaining why this analogy doesn’t fit. This leaves the implication up to the judge, not conclusively disproving the other side.  Rebuttal? Where is our direct engagement with the other side?  Is this cost-benefit analysis, or just set-up?   * How do you encourage donations? With what mechanism, what advocacy? Do you mandate participation in this scheme, where we take away the dead’s organs? Also - if they are terminally ill, their organs are likely not usable. * Good on black market crackdowns. * At the end of your set-up, it is doubtful you match the number of organs available. The correct challenge is that they will be too expensive, and hence nothing changes - they don’t alter access - but neither do you.   We spent too much time on the opening and set-up - we didn’t move onto our argument until 3 minutes in.  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. * POI - respond QUICKLY, by saying if the government does limit, Prop is undermining their own case because they are distinguishing between exercises of autonomy. We have to be more economical with our phrasing, and more direct with our responses; we are taking too much time to say simple things! * 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. * 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.   **We have to stop making faces, or having huge gestures whilst someone else is speaking. This is bad from a decorum point of view.**  05:19 | | | | | | |

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

| **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: | 70 | | | | | |
| 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 needs to have clear strategic value. Either, explain why consent exists, or why people would behave in a rational manner, contrary to their central claim. Good work bringing the model back - but what is the distinction here? 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.  Rebuttal   * Explain why donation is unlikely to occur, or why people are apprehensive etc. Point out they have no mechanism as to how they convert people into actually donating? * On black markets - explain why they exist, and why whatever they can do is symmetric - you can also regulate them. 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. Only your side can resolve the need. * 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   * Our responses and our argument are broadly symmetric. * You need to 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. * 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. * Explain how the incentives to traffic and engage in illegal organ trade go away in your world; you can also explain how regulation means you have more control over the way in which this occurs.   05:22  We have to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Theo Lee |
| --- |

| **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 have to have a stronger opening; explain why this harm or risk exists, as opposed to claiming it does but then not breaking it down!  Rebuttal   * Explain why we put limitations on people; under what conditions and in what circumstances! Respond to this in the best case scenario, which is that even with government intervention and regulation, people are likely to make bad decisions. You can talk about the poor being desperate, or people just not thinking this through because of the amount of money on the line. This is the correct challenge, but we are underexplaining the response significantly. * 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. * We need to engage with 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?   Argument 1   * Why would people give these up, or behave in these ways? They explain that they will limit people doing this poorly. Give them the benefit of the doubt and engage in the best case. * 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. 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? The current comparative of just saying ah we will have donations is under-explained.   We need to ask POIs consistently!  04:56 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Renee 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: | 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:  On donations, is it a contradiction? Or is it just unlikely to work? Explain why donation is unlikely to occur, or why people are apprehensive etc. Point out they have no mechanism as to how they convert people into actually donating? Our opening needs to have clear strategic value. You need to ask yourself - what issues is your side winning on/losing on?  The opening should not be as long as it is! Have an opening that takes up 30 seconds, and then immediately move into signposting, where you establish what the names of the clashes of the debate are, and then move onto the first clash.  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.  Call the other side out for not engaging with the model your side presents on checks and balances to make sure this happens safely.  We moved onto our clashes at 2:35, which is halfway through our speech. This is too late!  Clash 1   * Either, explain why consent exists, or why people would behave in a rational manner, contrary to their central claim. * 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. * Good call out on the lack of incentive to donate naturally. * POI - the comparison is not black markets or hospitals, but people doing this legally. On black markets - explain why they exist, and why whatever they can do is symmetric - you can also regulate them. 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. Only your side can resolve the need.   Clash 2   * You need to 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. Explain how the incentives to traffic and engage in illegal organ trade go away in your world; you can also explain how regulation means you have more control over the way in which this occurs. * This is very similar to the end of the first clash!   05:15 - we need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **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: | 70 | | | | | |
| 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 have to have a stronger opening!  Clash 1   * Why do donations work? How do they lead to an increase in access? This is also misplaced, if the first clash is about autonomy and rationality. * We aren’t engaging with the intervention of the state and why this will be done well. See the POI Tongtong asks you! * Good on the lack of rationality with the poor - explain why this supercedes any state intervention. Explain why we need to intervene and protect these people. 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? * 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. 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.   Clash 2   * On rash and reckless decisions - overlap with the first clash. * This clash should be about where the organ shortage is better dealt with. 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? The current comparative of just saying ah we will have donations is under-explained. * Why would people give these up, or behave in these ways? They explain that they will limit people doing this poorly. Give them the benefit of the doubt and engage in the best case. * 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.   We need to ask POIs consistently!  05:12 | | | | | | |