| **Student Name:** Jacky Xu |
| --- |

| **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:  Good opening, I think we want to characterise the lack of dignity in this situation; describe what it means to live a life without these capacities and sense of control over the self.  Set-up - word economy can be more efficient here.   * Clear explanation of passive and active; 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. * On model, give examples of how it works in other countries; clear explanation of counselling etc. The point of this should be clearer in terms of enthusiastic consent being required.   Where is the transition marker from set-up into our first argument?  Argument 1   * What is the thesis or claim of this argument? * 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. * What exactly is the argument we are making - we claim that people should be able to die with dignity on their own terms, but we aren’t really explaining why this matters. What is the value of this? * We need to impact this!   Argument 2 - what is the thesis or claim of this argument? What did we prove that is distinct or new here?  Good attempt at a principle, well identified, but needs to be unpacked in far more detail.  06:12 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Bernard Chong |
| --- |

| **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:  Fair opening, you want to spell out why this is morally incorrect in one sentence which is punchy and then move on.  Set-up   * Good work characterising the problem here; we 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? * Good work flagging types of harms that may exist here.   Rebuttal   * We need to explain why they would be able to pursue it in Prop's world; or push them to defend an unadulterated right to it; for instance beyond the old. Engage with the model on Prop - see the POI Jacky asks you; don’t jump to others and how they may feel - their feelings and stake can be weighed off. * On affecting other people - why do these others matter? Weigh this! * Why is information not sufficient for this decision?   Argument 1   * Repetitive with rebuttal. * We need to explain why 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. Focus less on life getting better; this is your best case - in most instances, people’s lives don’t get better. * The impact of bullying is not the most important impact in the round! We need to explain in far greater detail how vulnerable people might feel pressured by family or financial concerns. * The same comment as above on impact on others applies here; how do you weigh this compared to the first person impact? * Is this a principle claim?   We need to manage time better! We also need to ask POIs more consistently!  06:12 | | | | | | |

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

| **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:  How does it affect them? This is a vague and nebulous opening?  Rebuttal   * Synthesise in bits, rather than repeating everything they said up top - break your rebuttals up into 2-3 key issues. * On hardships and suffering - explain why their justification for it could be whatever; you make sure it is informed consent, and that there is no coercion here; and then explain why to deny them this right or capacity would be denying them freedom. * Good call out on relatives etc. matter less. Don’t ask ‘isn’t it really selfish..’ - explain why it is! Don’t say in my opinion either. * On morally incorrectness; explain why we or the state don’t get to pass value judgements on other people’s lives! Explain why we get to decide this, and us alone! * Trade off the third party impact after mitigating it!   Argument   * Excellent identification of choice as the key issue here. Good work linking this back to the model. * 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. * Don’t finish sentences with and yeah!   We have to ask POIs!  05:38 | | | | | | |