| **Student Name:** Maddie |
| --- |

| **Motion:** During a national emergency, This house would censor information that would harm national security |
| --- |

| 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:  Speaking time:   * I think that the content of the hook was pretty good; but I would like to see you employ a tone that is a bit more sharp and commanding! Try to go louder next time. I also think keeping your hook to around 15 seconds might be beneficial - since you have a lot to say in your content! * Try to make sure that you are making your journey in the debate as easy as possible; this means, telling me about what the incentives of a government is. This means, analysing and explaining that most governments will likely not try to abuse their power and positions, etc. * Very good-set up! * Order; try to make sure to first explain how unique and terrible these situations are - national emergencies are not situations where a brief inconvenience pops up and hurts some people. These are situations where the entirety of society is in danger due to widespread violence and destruction. * I understand where you are coming from when you say that people should not focus on a small problem; but the language of this argument seems to imply that the government should be able to control any information which shows that they made a mistake - which might be dangerous for people in the public! * Try to make sure to first tell me why people are very susceptible to false information and or fake information; you could talk about the rise of deep fakes and the fact that people may not have the best literature (Literacy means, your ability to understand and interpret things accurately.) * Try to be a bit less vague with your reasoning; I would like to see you break down and signpost your argumentation into the CREI structure!   Speaking time: 05:13.62, good work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sonja |
| --- |

| **Motion:** During a national emergency, This house would censor information that would harm national security |
| --- |

| 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 think that you could have highlighted just how important it is for us to have full information about what the government is doing in a time of emergencies; this would have made the hook much more effective! * I like the idea that people should be prepared for what is to come; but try to make sure that your argument takes into account the national security angle! What might people need to be prepared for in an emergency situation? Why might the government not provide this information to them anyway? * Good control over the room and for not taking a POI in the middle of your argument! * Try to go further to explain exactly what you mean by people who will distrust the government; try to start small. You can first explain that people naturally do not trust the government - this could be because of political reasons, social reasons and others. The point is, that there is a good chance for people to be quite suspicious. * In addition to the above, you could also talk about the fact that people will not trust the government when they truly are in danger and the government is attempting to help them. For example, in a hurricane situation, censored information could lead to people not going to evacuation centres, etc. * I like the argument about abuse of power; please do first talk to me about the incentives of the government. It may not be clear to a judge as to why the government might do something wrong and bad like lying. You can explain that governments want to survive politically, etc. * Please have rebuttals next time!   Speaking time: 0453.69, good work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ari |
| --- |

| **Motion:** During a national emergency, This house would censor information that would harm national security |
| --- |

| 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:   * I like the content of the hook; but you need to make sure that you are adding in a sharp tone and or at least a tone that is more energetic! * Nice signposting! * Try to make sure to keep the rebuttals summary part (The part where you explain what your opponents said) as quick and straightforward as possible! Also, I don’t think bringing up North Korea as an example to defend censoring information is a good idea as this plays into what the opposition case is - try to give yourself an easier time with better examples! * You can still answer the POI as you can get the general gist of the question; answer what you understand! * I like the argument about the media abusing its power; make sure that you first explain what the first and foremost priority of a media company is - to make money! Try to make sure to explain how this incentive and desire to gain money might sometimes supersede safety as media owners prioritize profits alone. This makes it much easier to believe the argument! * I like the characterisation of why the media needs to be controlled to some extent; but try to make sure to tell me why the government is likely to be fair and reasonable about the type of information they will be censoring - you need to make it clear that this is not going to be a situation where the government abuses its power (Because of checks and balances, political motivation), but rather one where the government genuinely needs to protect the public!   Speaking time: 05:03.07, good work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Aria |
| --- |

| **Motion:** During a national emergency, This house would censor information that would harm national security |
| --- |

| 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: Speaking time: 05:34.21   * Nice energy and start to the speech! * Good hand gestures! But you need to make sure that you are also making eye contact. * I like the Edward Snowden example; try to extract this information out to link it to the topic; the link is that look, there are actors within a government that can have bad motivations. Therefore, it’s pretty dangerous to give them more power! * Good rebuttal; but I think you need to make sure to give me at least two reasons for why an argument is wrong. I felt as though some of the rebuttals were surface level; at the same time, I think the rebuttals were focused on showing that the argument was bad (E.g., that this argument takes away freedom of speech.) as compared to showing that the argument is untrue. It is not wrong to show that the argument is bad, but you need to make sure that you are coupling it with untrue! * I like the argument about how this may spark further panic; but I think this argument was rather abrupt as I wasn’t very sure as to why this panic would happen to begin with. Try to give me several reasons as to why this is true! * Good best case worst case analysis! * Try not to be so distracted by what is happening in the classroom during your speech; you need to make sure that you are locked in on the judge and the judge alone! * Try to make sure that you are also actively considering what the other side said; you need to show me that people can use their rights well - and that they won’t use it wrongly and for bad reasons!   Speaking time: 04:56.75, good work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Tania |
| --- |

| **Motion:** During a national emergency, This house would censor information that would harm national security |
| --- |

| 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:   * Nice hook! Try not to laugh and smile during it though - someone dying does sound pretty serious! * Good signposting! * You need to make sure that you are writing clearly; you can’t misread the rebuttal!! * Try to make sure to show me that there are some situations where transparency is not a good idea; remember to emphasise that this is an emergency situation - meaning, that this is a situation where people are in extreme danger! This helps make the arguments a bit clearer and the purpose of the argument clearer. * At the start of your speech, where you ended up explaining that public security is much more important than transparency; this was really good! But please try to make sure to give me like two to three reasons for why this is true. Doing this is essentially what you need to do to weigh! * Good recap and tracking of the other side in the debate; keep this up! * Don’t get distracted by what your teammates might be saying or doing during your speech! * Try to make sure that you are layering; this means, providing me with numerous and multiple reasons for why your argumentation is true and impactful! * Try to make sure that you are also proving that what you are saying is more important than the other side as well - this is the second component of making a good argument!   Speaking time: 06:31.76, good work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Kyle |
| --- |

| **Motion:** During a national emergency, This house would censor information that would harm national security |
| --- |

| 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:  Speaking time:   * Good usage of the Snowden example! * I think you need to make sure to focus on making sure that you are being perceived and received well; you need to make sure that you are actively signposting and using hand gestures! * Try to make sure that you are actively telling me what the main considerations in the debate are; as the third speaker, your job is to resolve clashes, meaning, that you are telling me about why your side is ultimately more effective and also more true than the other side. Try to focus on doing this next time around! * Good signposting! Try to keep the speaking pace consistent though. * Try to make sure to tell me why it is likely for a government to do something wrong to begin with; this could be explaining things like corruption, etc. This helps quite significantly to believe you that the government can sometimes make the wrong call! * Try to make sure that you explain how and why the media will hold the government accountable; the other side talked about how the media might just think of profits compared to helping the public. Try to make sure that you are rebutting this! * You gotta make sure to project confidence; try not to say things like “I dunno” etc during your speech!   Speaking time: 05:33.20, good work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sonja |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THBT creating new lead characters for minorities is better than recasting them in existing roles already played by other actors/communities . |
| --- |

| 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: 05:01.99, good work!   * Nice personal example in the hook! * Try to make sure that you are targeting the core logic of the speaker; the core logic is that people feel inspired to pursue dreams like being an actor. You could further rebut this by talking about the fact that this relies on the movie being successful. If the movie is unsuccessful, wouldn't minorities be very sad and discouraged if this happens? * Try to explain the unique value of new roles; this could be the idea that people and audiences really want new stories and characters because they are bored of what already exists and they crave creativity. * Also, you wanna make sure to explain that you have a lot more freedom with an original character; you can do more things like new storylines, new designs, etc, that you probably can’t do without a new character! * Try not to get caught up with POIs! Take one and be done with it. * Try to make sure you tell me what the impact of this is on POC actors; if the movies flop will this result in less people wanting to act, etc?   Speaking time: 05:01.99, good work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ari |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THBT creating new lead characters for minorities is better than recasting them in existing roles already played by other actors/communities . |
| --- |

| 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: 05:01.99, good work!   * Nice example in the hook! * Try to make sure that you point out that the other side is arguing through examples only! * Try to make sure that you are recapping the reasons for why your argumentation/team's argumentation was true to begin with; it seems a bit too dismissive right now! Try to take their unique desires and impacts into account. * Try to make sure to tell me why people will not be accepting of the rewrite; it isn’t just because of racism, but it is also the case that minorities may feel like they are being used as props for profit. Besides, it may also be a lot of pressure for the one actor to carry the hopes and dreams of their own community! * I like the way you explained that these original works will produce better outcomes for the people who matter the most; try to make sure to then tell me all about why it is the case that these movies will succeed! It could be the case that people in general!   Speaking time 05:50.32, good work! | | | | | | |