| **Student Name:** Wendy Zhang |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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.  Argument 1   * Good work identifying which principle euthanasia is linked to, and why choice matters, and how the state cannot intervene. * 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. * 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. * 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.   We should have done set-up, and explained how this would work, for instance that we would use public health campaigns to ensure healthy consent. We need to answer the following questions:   * 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.   01:55  Good attempt at following the structure. We need to speak with more confidence and volume! | | | | | | |

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

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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 explain from the get go why people are unable to make this decision or use this right well - 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?   Argument 1   * Good work identifying how this might be incompatible with autonomy - we need to explain why it would be the case. Explain why coercion is likely to exist, or that we can never consent without coercion to something like this - push that they can never implement this. * 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. * Why would people just do this because they think it is cool. This outcome is a jump! Why would teenagers be inspired by this, especially online? Could we not have Prop regulate against this in the model?   Good attempt at following the structure. We need to speak with more confidence and volume!  02:13 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Karin Yeung |
| --- |

| **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 - explain WHY this is an important right. For instance, 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.  Argument 1   * Good work identifying which principle euthanasia is linked to, and why rationality and autonomy matters, and how the state cannot intervene. * 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. * 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. * We need to impact this argument, and follow the structure discussed with more tightness. You 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. This is a solid observation.   We should have done set-up, and explained how this would work, for instance that we would use public health campaigns to ensure healthy consent. We need to answer the following questions:   * 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.   We have to be more confident! Speak louder!  03:00 | | | | | | |

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

| **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:  Don’t say however - we come very close to saying it is autonomous, but however we don’t think so - we can’t let our own beliefs influence our credibility.  Explain right up top why this choice is an illusion. 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? Good observation here, but let’s unpack it in greater detail!  Argument 1   * We need to explain from the get go why people are unable to make this decision or use this right well - 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? * Good work identifying how this might be incompatible with autonomy - we need to explain why it would be the case. Explain why coercion is likely to exist, or that we can never consent without coercion to something like this - push that they can never implement this. * 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. * Why would people just do this because they think it is cool. This outcome is a jump! Why would teenagers be inspired by this, especially online? Could we not have Prop regulate against this in the model?   Good on the positive alternatives presented in the argument ; we could have presented this in set-up!   * 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?   We should push Prop for never clarifying on what basis we allow people to access euthanasia. 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.  Good attempt at following the structure. We need to speak with more confidence and volume!  03:13 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Tony Huang |
| --- |

| **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 WHY this is an important right. For instance, 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.  Argument 1   * Good work pinpointing autonomy as valuable! I think we want to unpack how this is the principle that underlies euthanasia; 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. * Explain how the counterfactual they support is people committing suicide, or elderly depression rates skyrocketing. 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. * 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. * Excellent work establishing how different allowances in the status quo enable people to opt out of life anyways - but I need examples of this! * Impacting?   We need to explain why people will be able to make informed decisions about euthanasia. We should have done set-up, and explained how this would work, for instance that we would use public health campaigns to ensure healthy consent. We need to answer the following questions:   * 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.   We have to be more confident! Speak louder!  01:51 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Alissa Mak |
| --- |

| **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. 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? Good observation here, but let’s unpack it in greater detail!  Set-up   * Excellent work characterising who this might be - but we need to push Prop to explain why it isn’t just for the elderly - but for EVERYONE. We should push Prop for never clarifying on what basis we allow people to access euthanasia. 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. * 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?   Argument 1   * We need to explain from the get go why people are unable to make this decision or use this right well - 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? * Good work identifying how this might be incompatible with autonomy - we need to explain why it would be the case. Explain why coercion is likely to exist, or that we can never consent without coercion to something like this - push that they can never implement this. * Why would people prescribe to this with such enthusiasm? Why can’t a Proposition team model against this by introducing counselling or consent therapy etc.? * Why do friends and family matter more than the desires of the individual here? * 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 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.  02:49 | | | | | | |

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

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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 WHY this is an important right. For instance, 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   * Excellent work modelling out how this would work. Good work explaining how informed decisions can be made. * 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? Will we weigh heavily on them having young children or family and prevent them from taking action? If so - can we say we defend the unadulterated right to life? We have to explain why these exemptions still support the right to life fully. * 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   * Good work pinpointing autonomy and rationality as valuable! I think we want to unpack how these are the principles that underlies euthanasia; 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. * On rationality, link to your model to explain how your side can protect this to the greatest extent. * Good connection to abortion! You have to defend only giving some people this right, rather than everyone - analogise here, and say how we also put limits on abortion but recognise that this is what people need to access to its core. * Explain how the counterfactual they support is people committing suicide, or elderly depression rates skyrocketing. 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. * 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.   03:36 | | | | | | |