| **Student Name:** Christy 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: | 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 should not be starting our speech with a question. We need to start by characterising the organ donor shortage, and how we need to create an intervention which helps people.  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. These are not ‘rules’ nor ‘defining the motion’. This is set-up. We’ve taken a bit of a break, but we cannot forget all that we have learned.  Argument 1   * Our side is actually the deontological one; we’re the ones that safeguard autonomy, which the state currently prevents us from doing. If we want to run a utilitarian argument, what exactly is the moral sacrifice being made? Whose rights are we trading off in the process? There aren’t any!   Argument 2   * If we do 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. * On the poor, how do you prevent exploitation? Why won’t they be swindled or taken advantage of? We have to introduce safeguards in our model. * On the black market - don’t just say it will exist, but explain how it continues to exist on Opp’s side, which means this debate isn’t about whether or not organs should be sold, but where this can happen in a safer manner. Explain how this is the duty of the state.   We need to learn how to make a proper utilitarian argument! This has a few steps.  Step 1: Explain what the benefits on your side of the debate are, and why these are more important than the potential harms. Consider the scope (how many people are affected) and magnitude (how greatly is this benefit felt by each of these people) to build your cost-benefit analysis. Your benefits must be linked to how it is only your policy/action that achieves this (uniqueness) and that this cannot be achieved through another policy (exclusivity).  Step 2: Explaining why utility is the best approach to take. Policy action in debates requires making a trade-off - it is impossible for a team to satisfy all groups of people. When there are competing rights and interests, someone always ends up losing their rights or interests - this is a debate about whose rights should be prioritised and protected. Once this is established, explain how utility is the most objective way of decision-making - everyone is considered equally, as opposed to being prioritised by the state on an arbitrary basis.  Step 3: Emphasise how you minimise harm and suffering. In the final part of the argument, we explain how our side provides the most quality benefit - how does our argument \*solve the problem\*? How do we prevent harm from occurring?  04:49 - we need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** James Gao |
| --- |

| **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 won’t improve if we don’t drop the bad habits we’ve been told about. We should not have rhetorical questions in our openings, we should not repeat the motion, and we have to do set-up BEFORE rebuttal. What does your side support? What is the comparative?  Rebuttal   * Explain how if they defend autonomy, and the freedom of people to do what they want with their body - then they have to defend this to the extreme. This is the correct attack to make, but the way in which we are doing it is slightly too example heavy and assertive. Just because it happened in Thailand, why would it be used here? Where and how does this slippery slope come from? * On the poor, explain how the poor would be exploited and attacked; for instance how would the wealthy take advantage of them?   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 going to make poor decisions and 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? * On the black market - this undermines us, because it happens in status quo anyways. Presumably a legal channel reduces the likelihood for this on the Proposition’s side.   Our side is utilitarian! 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 follow the utilitarian structure taught to us!  05:01 - we need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **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 had a strong tonal start, but then dropped off in terms of conviction. Have a strong opening ready if we know this is where we might struggle to have a clear and immediate impact. On the issue of a lack of 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   * We have to spend time on plugging the gap in 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. On the poor, how do you prevent exploitation? Why won’t they be swindled or taken advantage of? We have to introduce safeguards in our model. * We also need to justify why it is okay for us to differentiate between the type of organs we allow people to sell. 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.   Argument 1   * If we do 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. * Why can’t we increase donations? Why can’t we use other on the table methods to achieve the outcomes you want? Engage with the comparative!   Our side is actually the deontological one; we’re the ones that safeguard autonomy, which the state currently prevents us from doing. If we want to run a utilitarian argument, what exactly is the moral sacrifice being made? Whose rights are we trading off in the process? There aren’t any!  05:10 - we need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Edna Chow |
| --- |

| **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 need to start by pinpointing a specific response or issue; this general observation has little strategic value. How does this help you win/them lose?  Rebuttal   * 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? * Good on the moral hazard here! * Explain how if they defend autonomy, and the freedom of people to do what they want with their body - then they have to defend this to the extreme. There is no meaningful distinction the other side offers us here.   Argument 1   * Good on rationality 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 also need to explain why organs would sell for egregious amounts of money. * 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?   Our side is technically utilitarian! 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 follow the utilitarian structure taught to us!  05:03 - we need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **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 had a strong tonal start, but then dropped off in terms of conviction. On the issue of a lack of 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.  If we do want our opening to be about the lack of donations, explain to me why people do not donate, and no intervention is likely to increase the amount of donations on Opp’s world/that they never explain how they solve these problems.  I would strongly encourage us to drop all extraneous rebuttals, and JUST have two clashes through which we respond. Our clashes ARE the rebuttal. In the signposting, the judge needs to know the NAMES of the clashes. This cannot be a surprise to the judge!  Rebuttal   * We also need to justify why it is okay for us to differentiate between the type of organs we allow people to sell. 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 plugging the gap in 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. On the poor, how do you prevent exploitation? Why won’t they be swindled or taken advantage of? We have to introduce safeguards in our model. Don’t explicitly model as a third speaker, but point out how - we told you etc etc. Make it sound like it came up earlier; the rules disallow you from doing this at third. * Excellent observation on the black market! * We needed to engage with Edna’s analysis on consent, and how it cannot be informed - that this will be a badly informed or badly rationalised decision. We ignored all this analysis from her speech!   Where were our clashes? The point at which you moved on from general rebuttal into the first clash was unclear! We have to mark our transitions with more clarity. We also cannot start our second clash at 4:55. This is poor time management!  Our side is actually the deontological one; we’re the ones that safeguard autonomy, which the state currently prevents us from doing. If we want to run a utilitarian argument, what exactly is the moral sacrifice being made? Whose rights are we trading off in the process? There aren’t any!  05:24 - we need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |