| **Student Name:** Ishan Harishankar |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would require professional licensing for all content creators (i.e. video game streamers, online publishers, newsletters authors, podcasters, youtubers) |
| --- |

| 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:  The core justification of why this is necessary is missing. Don’t ask questions of ‘shouldn’t they’; tell me why they shouldn’t instead.  Our argument title needs to be more concise.  Set-up   * Why are licenses the exclusive way to prevent this? If the problem is swearing, why can’t content moderation achieve this? * How does swearing affect mental health? We’re jumping a fair bit here. * Is the entire purpose of licenses to prevent this kind of inappropriate behaviour? Why are existing mechanisms insufficient? For instance call-out or cancel culture, social commentary or discourse, content moderation etc.? * Clear on who is and isn’t a content creator. * Why are we chatting about reprogramming social media apps? What value add does this have?   We need to be more efficient with set-up. It took up over half of our speech, limiting our capacity to deliver a full argument. Time yourself, and make sure you’re being as efficient as possible.  Argument 1 (started at 3:21)   * Why do youtubers or content creators have this responsibility? * Fair on influence, but why do people just internalise it to the extent you claim. Did we explain why this is true? Do people hear a swear word and then immediately feel like they need to use it? * Why is this okay or good? Good is a subjective measurement of content - what makes it better? You need to actually unpack this!   We needed to explain the problem in the status quo meaningfully, going beyond just ‘swearing’. We needed to characterise the harms present, and why there is no other mechanism, such as platform or content moderation that can solve this problem. You have to be specific in your analysis, and actually prove the impact you claim.  05:22  We need to ask POIs diligently! How many POIs did we ask today! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Keshav Mathur |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would require professional licensing for all content creators (i.e. video game streamers, online publishers, newsletters authors, podcasters, youtubers) |
| --- |

| 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:  Start with a hook! Point out how in-exclusive their problem is! Good on how code of conduct takes out most of their harms.  You have to signpost, before jumping into the rest of your speech!  Where is our set-up? Where is our counter-model? What is the comparative I should compare their side to?  Rebuttal   * Challenge the mech - did they ever explain why people internalise it to the extent they claim? People don’t hear a swear word and then suddenly feel an urge to engage in it. * Good on Youtube kids existing - explain how this exists as an alternative properly in set-up!   Argument 1   * We need to first question who gets to decide what is good or bad content. Who gets to decide what is appropriate content or not? Why do they get to decide? Why can’t viewers engage in the action of choice and select themselves. * Good identification that this is a limitation of speech. Why is this speech so valuable or important for us to preserve? You’re not actually justifying the value of this speech, or explaining why we protect or prevent these types of limits. * Good on cancel culture - explain how this is a natural check and balance/accountability mechanism. * The internal structure of this argument is messy - after the cancel culture, we go back to free speech? * What is the impact of this argument?   We cannot stop speaking 3:30 in! You have to push yourself to hit 5, take another POI, spend more time earlier on responses, or impact your argument!  04:26 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Shawn Nip |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would require professional licensing for all content creators (i.e. video game streamers, online publishers, newsletters authors, podcasters, youtubers) |
| --- |

| 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 job asking POIs diligently.  Our opening isn’t taking into consideration the alternatives Keshav talks about. There are alternatives present in the status quo that deal with the problems we’ve highlighted.  Our engagement needs to be why Youtube Kids, or cancel culture, or codes of conduct/content moderation are insufficient mechanisms. Our opening response is entirely uncomparative.  See the POI Daryl asks you!  Rebuttal   * On teens, why is this the only mechanism of protecting them? Why does this mech work?   Argument 1   * The claim from this argument on how ‘bad’ content is immoral to spread can only work if you first explain why the kind of material your side is against is bad in the first place. You assert it is, but I’m not sure why this is true. * The second thing you need to explain is why morality is the basis for what content is good or not/we are happy for people to consume or not? Why isn’t this effectively censorship, or a limitation of free speech as 1O says? You don’t engage at all with this. * POI - this is a non-answer. You need to give a straightforward answer on why this is better.   Argument 2   * What is the situation? What kind of misleading and false information? Be specific! We need to work hard to package our problem definition, to make this sound like a specific problem with a specific solution. * What is the impact? ‘Negative affected by this’ is insufficient!   Why are existing mechanisms insufficient? For instance call-out or cancel culture, social commentary or discourse, content moderation etc.?  04:22 - you need to hit 5 consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Lilianna Poon |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would require professional licensing for all content creators (i.e. video game streamers, online publishers, newsletters authors, podcasters, youtubers) |
| --- |

| 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:  Don’t say it isn’t relevant, but say this is entirely in-exclusive. Point out how your side provided a myriad of alternatives that exist in status quo and work perfectly and checks, to no engagement whatsoever in the 2nd Prop speech.  Rebuttal   * We’re spending too much time summarising what they say. Be more concise and quick! This is repetitive from our opening - what laws are you talking about? For instance, Youtube Kids, content moderation, code of conduct etc. Be specific! * We’re ignoring the two arguments coming from 2nd Prop! We need to engage in ‘bad’ content and ‘misinformation’. Who gets to decide what is appropriate content or not? Why do they get to decide? Why can’t viewers engage in the action of choice and select themselves. We should push that this is a form of censorship - it limits freedom of expression and potentially silencing dissenting voices. The criteria for obtaining and maintaining a license could be subjective and open to abuse.   Argument 1   * Why does this fairness matter so much? Why can’t they transition into another job? * We can argue that this creates a barrier to entry - so for instance how including potential fees and training, could create a significant barrier to entry for new creators, particularly those from marginalized communities or with limited resources. This could stifle creativity and innovation in the online content creation space. However, what is the harm of this? * Why should we weigh this argument heavily in the round?   We’re speaking too slowly, and with too many pauses between our words. You have to speak louder, and with more confidence.  Lilianna, we need to go into more detail in our analysis and speech. If we don’t push ourselves we’re not going to be able to improve!  04:37 - you have to hit 5!  We need to ask POIs diligently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Boris Cheung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would require professional licensing for all content creators (i.e. video game streamers, online publishers, newsletters authors, podcasters, youtubers) |
| --- |

| 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:  Why are existing mechanisms insufficient? You need to resolve this up top. Don’t just say you think they aren’t insufficient, explain WHY. There are alternatives present in the status quo that deal with the problems we’ve highlighted, and this is the biggest issue in the debate we are losing on.  Your signposting has to have the names of clashes within it. This is a repeat comment.  Sure, licences help enforcement, but why isn’t existing enforcement sufficient? See the POI Daryl asks you!  We have to speak in full sentences! Don’t just stop in the middle of a sentence with an ‘uhhh’. Good clarification on constant checks.  We assume that what is ‘good’ content is super clear - but this isn’t! You need to explain why there is a standard here, what that standard is, and why it is justified for the state to pursue. Who gets to decide what is appropriate and inappropriate? Good work pointing to status quo - but give me examples.  Fair on influence, but why do people just internalise it to the extent you claim. Did we explain why this is true? Do people hear a swear word and then immediately feel like they need to use it?  Why do they get more credit or trust? What is the justification behind this? Why are credit and trust valuable in this debate?  What is the structure of this speech? As third, have maximum 1-2 observations at the top where needed, and then you have to move onto your clashes. We have to be disciplined in this, otherwise our third speeches will suffer!  05:17    Boris, we can’t not implement the feedback we’re being given on our third speeches consistently!  We also need to ask POIs! How many POIs did we ask in today’s debate? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Daryl Ng |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would require professional licensing for all content creators (i.e. video game streamers, online publishers, newsletters authors, podcasters, youtubers) |
| --- |

| 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:  Good opening; explain what the implication is. The phrasing is slightly messy here; you want to spell out that we have no way of assessing what is appropriate and inappropriate - or who gets to decide and why this is just!  Why can’t viewers engage in the action of choice and select themselves. We should push that this is a form of censorship - it limits freedom of expression and potentially silencing dissenting voices. The criteria for obtaining and maintaining a license could be subjective and open to abuse.  Extraneous:   1. Good clarification; explain now why existing mechanisms work. Don’t just point to them existing, explain why they work at preventing the harms they claim. Give me examples to back this up. 2. Why do we have to say this again? On the n-word. This is repetitive territory. You should challenge their ability to be influenced instead; for instance, you listen to it once and you want to say it? Do they ever explain how influence works? 3. We also say **again** external mechanisms exist. Fair on why hate speech is symmetric.   POI: Don’t accept it! Explain how it doesn’t, or is going away!  I don’t know where the clashes were because your transitions aren’t clear at all. Slow down, use pauses, use emphasis. The tone of your speech is blending together! I only tracked when you moved onto the third clash.  On the creators themselves, do they have an unadulterated right to create content? Why does this fairness matter so much? Why can’t they transition into another job? We can argue that this creates a barrier to entry - so for instance how including potential fees and training, could create a significant barrier to entry for new creators, particularly those from marginalized communities or with limited resources. This could stifle creativity and innovation in the online content creation space. However, what is the harm of this? Why should we weigh this argument heavily in the round?  The point in the third clash on viewer choice is interesting, but because the top of your speech is inefficient, you miss out on explaining this in sufficient detail.  05:19  Good work asking POIs! | | | | | | |