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

| **Motion**: This house would walk away from Omelas |
| --- |

| 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 identification in the opening - that this is unjust and wrong, but we should do this with more punch! Right from the get go, you need to characterise what this suffering looks like - and explain how it is incredibly harmful that this exists. This will highlight what the trade off Opp wants to defend is.  Set-up - our set-up needs to be more word efficient. Remember that this is a five minute speech!   * Rather than repeating that which is in the info-slide, we should detail both outcomes that could occur; but do note - we can take this action, and hope change occurs. But this doesn’t guarantee it. There will presumably be someone else that will take up this role or mantle instead. * We should establish what happens to Omelas once we leave, presuming that this continues, and if Omelas collapses and becomes a regular society - what would this society look like, and why is this preferable? Where do we go? In that kind of society do we find ourselves? Why is this a preferable life?   Argument 1   * Good on how this is morally unjust. We need to highlight right up top that the cost of this utopia is too high, and it is morally incorrect to do this. * We need to explain how exactly this utopia requires us to rob the child of ALL personhood. It isn’t just moral agency, but rather also autonomy, rationality, and dignity. * Good work explaining how consent doesn’t really exist in this situation. * Good on how this is long term and permanent harm we are undoing to the child. * We can explain how it isn’t just that we’re depriving them of humanity, but rather depriving them of a net neutral existence - we are actively hurting them. * We aren’t engaging in the justification of this prioritisation; why does this matter more than the utopia? * Impacting! What does it mean to live in a world that prescribes to such a moral calculus - explain how accepting the suffering of one for the benefit of many creates a dangerous precedent. Where does the line get drawn? Could this justification be used to sacrifice more individuals in the future?   Argument 2   * Presumably - this is a utopia, so the kids don’t know or where even if they do, it doesn’t bother them. Read the info-slide! * Good on the value of trust. Clear explanation, the example of the restaurant highlights this well. Don’t stop at physical and mental health - explain what the moral hazard of this kind of world is.   We need to explain the comparative. What would it be like to be this person, with this knowledge choosing to stay in Omelas? Happiness built upon the suffering of another is inherently flawed and unsustainable.  05:57 - We need to speak with more confidence, and use hand gestures as well! We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would walk away from Omelas |
| --- |

| 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:  Our opening has to be delivered with more confidence, where we use hand gestures and convey surety of what we are saying. We say ummm lots and speak very softly. We’re also not making much eye contact!  We need to have a strong opening! Start by explaining how there will be suffering in the counterfactual too, it’s just about who suffers and if their suffering matters less. Our opening can also instead spell out our key response to the biggest thing that they say, in this case which is that we are putting an individual through suffering - a child.  Rebuttal   * I think we can say outside of their culture, that this information is only available to this one person who does this, rather than everyone. Excellent analogy to Chinese villages - but what is the implication? Explain how morality is subjective - this is what they think is okay/explain why we prioritise the utopia even where they want change. * On the child - fair on how they get used to it, but we also want to explain why these children suffer less on our side - for instance, that for all the children who aren’t suffering live great lives. Explain why and how they suffer misery in the real world - the comparative Prop never develops. We need to explain why the child loses autonomy in both worlds - it is just that in our world, not everyone else has to.   Argument 1   * We need to first explain what the benefit or outcome is; characterise what a utopia is, and in which ways Omelas would be the best place to live. Then - explain why these benefits are only accessible on your side of the house. We reference benefits - best living quality - but what does this mean and look like? We need to compare this to the average society that exists in status quo, and would likely replace this utopia - the comparative Prop has to defend. * You have to explain how Omelas breaks down when the person decides to leave/what society looks like on the net in terms of where they are likely to settle. We don’t really go into much detail as to what a utopia is, and how it brings happiness and meaning to everyone who lives within it. * Explain how freeing the child and leaving would result in the collapse of Omelas's utopia, leading to suffering for everyone, including the formerly imprisoned child. Explain how this leads to a moral hazard, in the way we discussed in class.   04:57 - three more seconds and we could have hit 5!  We have to ask POIs consistently! We have to ask a minimum of two POIs per speaker! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would walk away from Omelas |
| --- |

| 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:  Our opening needs to jump straight into a clear call out of the speaker/problem in the debate at the moment. In this case, it could have been characterisation of what suffering looks like - and explain how it is incredibly harmful that this exists. This will highlight what the trade off Opp wants to defend is. Similarly, with the example you do begin with - that just because this is a cultural practice does not mean it is legitimate. Then signpost, what the structure of your speech will be, and then proceed.  Rebuttal goes BEFORE the argument. Not AFTER.  Argument 1   * We can run this as a principle, on how leaving is morally correct, because it enables the actor to make a morally agent decision. * We must start by establishing how exactly the responsibility or culpability exists; this person takes a direct action that causes immense suffering to another human being. They are fully aware of the horrific conditions the child endures and the purpose of this suffering. They are not forced or coerced in a way that completely removes their agency. They are responsible for the *ongoing* captivity and suffering of the child. They actively maintain the system that perpetuates this injustice. * Impact this! What would it mean for the person to stay, despite knowing they are doing that which is morally bad. * On feasibility - how realistic is the claim that we run out of kids? * We need to justify choosing a less perfect society - we should talk about how people choose sub-optimal situations because they value a more moral life all the time; they pay taxes rather than evading them, they risk protest even if it means they may lose their life or be thrown in jail; they are asserting their moral agency - this is what we need to say! * Where is the impacting? What does it mean to live in a world that prescribes to such a moral calculus - explain how accepting the suffering of one for the benefit of many creates a dangerous precedent. Where does the line get drawn? Could this justification be used to sacrifice more individuals in the future?   Explain how exactly the society develops and becomes perfectly fine in the counterfactual. You should also explain why the city can eventually get it together, or there are systems or mechanisms that can lead to this. Then, explain why it is fundamentally unfair for the city’s happiness to come at this cost. Your side can access benefits - not a utopia per say - without this moral sacrifice being needed. Explain how a society which is imperfect, but doesn’t come at the cost of such high suffering is preferable.  We have to follow the structure of a second speech. We had NO rebuttals in this speech. We’re also speaking under-time!  03:09 - we have to hit 5 minimum!  We have to ask POIs consistently! We have to ask a minimum of two POIs per speaker! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would walk away from Omelas |
| --- |

| 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 - explain how this isn’t even a debate about no suffering vs one person suffering. There will be suffering in the counterfactual too, it’s just about who suffers and if their suffering matters less. Explain both what Omelas looks like, as well as the general society or world that this person is stepping out into.  Rebuttal   * Call out 2nd Prop for not providing any responses to your first speaker! * On the sacrifice - explain how freeing the child and leaving would result in the collapse of Omelas's utopia, leading to suffering for everyone, including the formerly imprisoned child. Explain how this leads to a moral hazard, in the way we discussed in class. * Trade off the suffering for the benefit - characterise what a utopia is, and in which ways Omelas would be the best place to live. Then - explain why these benefits are only accessible on your side of the house. You have to explain how Omelas breaks down when the person decides to leave/what society looks like on the net in terms of where they are likely to settle. We don’t really go into much detail as to what a utopia is, and how it brings happiness and meaning to everyone who lives within it.   Argument 1   * Unpack what the average society looks like - what harms exist? Explain how much people earn, how discrimination exists, and whether or not people are happy. Compare this to the utopia, and how people are meaningfully happy. Analyse what makes people happy - for instance, that we have emotional needs and physical needs fulfilled, that there isn’t discrimination etc. * Question that Prop claims that they can have a good society, even if it isn’t perfect, but they never mechanise this! Challenge their missing comparative! * Explain how freeing the child and leaving would result in the collapse of Omelas's utopia, leading to suffering for everyone, including the formerly imprisoned child. Explain how this leads to a moral hazard, in the way we discussed in class. * Good analysis of how radical and immediate this switch is - walk me through the day to day impact this has on people!   We need to ask POIs consistently. How many POIs did we ask today?  04:08 - we need to hit 5! | | | | | | |