| **Student Name:** Dana Chung |
| --- |

| **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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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:**  [Speeches are five minutes long]  **Opening**   * Please lead with a clear hook! * You could give a direction to your speech here!   **Setup**   * You could take some time to clear up your stance before getting into rebuttals directly!   **Rebuttal 1**   * I appreciate the direct callouts of what is missing in prop! * You could here be a bit charitable and say even if to some extent accountability is done well, why prop should still lose   **Argument 1**   * I like the nuance of potential public distrust! * Good nuance on how the minority voices are the ones that get most affected. * Here, you could explain why the minority voices are the ones that get affected e.g., lower political capital and protection, more vulnerable, and so on. * Surveillance was under-explained. You could talk about why surveillance is done selectively and why that is worse. * A clear impact would help!   **Argument 2**   * This argument could benefit from trading-off the possibility that some news of the media could be done not-perfectly, and why that is still OK! * You could use things like free speech value in making the above trade off!   **Style**   * We need to have clearer pauses when we move from one point to the other! * Some tonal emotion would be useful, we want to soften our tone for example when talking about individual struggles in national emergency!   I appreciate that you had a clear conclusion!  Good job offering to take POI!  Speaking time: 5:22! |
| --- |