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

| **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:  There are two central pushes on Proposition to this motion. The first is autonomy, and how we must respect people’s rights to do what they please with their bodies. The second is the shortage with regards to donors, because people don’t really care. We should push one strongly up top. We choose the latter, but need to highlight why and how acute this shortage is.  Set-up - we do a good job of covering different situations and scenarios, but need to be more word efficient. We took nearly 3 minutes to get through all this!   * Explain how this will be done all above the board - good on how we earn money, that the state oversees it. * Good on counselling and therapy. * Is there a distinction between organs we allow people to sell, and ones that we 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. * Would we set price ceilings or protections? Or is it up to the individual to determine the price they are selling at? * Is there any reason we’re listing out stakeholders at the end?   Argument 1   * Good work starting by establishing the specific principle that matters. Good work explaining how and why people deserve control. Good on how it oversteps; but we need to establish WHY we deserve to decide this; for instance, the state allows us to sell our hair for wigs, to sign up to drug trials in exchange for pay etc. You need more analogies to pump this argument up. * Where is the slippery slope and the victims of circumstance?   Argument 2   * On harm, this should be present within the first argument! This is you explaining why the solution you are offering exists within moral bounds. Our second argument should be about how we solve the organ shortage crisis! 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 up top, and comes in later, but this argument should just be exclusively a practical claim. * We should also talk about black markets - explain why they exist, and why whatever they can do is symmetric - you can also regulate them. The point 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.   05:40  Good work! We should speak with more confidence! | | | | | | |

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

| **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:  Strong opening! Explain why people’s choices are always going to be coerced, meaning an autonomous decision can never be made.  We should engage in set-up first! Do we acknowledge there is a shortage of organs, or is it the case that we reject this? If we do, which is the realistic claim, how do we solve this problem? Do we encourage donations? If so - how?  Rebuttal   * Good on pressure and coercion; explain how this directly takes down the Proposition’s first argument. Explain how any state intervention or regulation is insufficient, also engaging with their principle. * On certain organs versus others - 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. * Don’t say we presume anyone can do this; be more charitable in your engagement with their case. * I think we also want to establish why price gouging would exist, locking those that actually need the organs out of it; only the wealthy benefit on Prop. We eventually say this, but it comes much later. Our rebuttals, especially at 1st Opp, need to be efficient and targeted.   Where is the transition from our rebuttal into our argument?  Argument 1   * We needed to run a clear utilitarian argument, explaining what prevention of harm is occurring. You have the analysis over the course of your speech, but this isn’t being formatted in the step by step way you have been taught. * 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. * 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.   Argument 2   * Affordability is a claim you’ve already made in your speech; your argument here comes across as repetitive. * Analyse who is likely to sell - 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?   05:44 - we need to ask POIs! | | | | | | |