d

| **Student Name:** Matias |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would prohibit elected officials from pursuing defamation lawsuits against media organisations |
| --- |

| 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 hook! I think that you should drop the never prouder to propose angle as it doesn’t add much value to your case. * Good signposting! I think that you could slow down a little bit (At least at the very beginning of your speech) as it felt like you were speeding through the speech. * Characterization: I think that beyond the angle of these politicians being powerful, you could also point out that most legal battles are actually just a battle of attrition - the politicians are able to bankroll long and lengthy legal battles while a journalist may not. * Freedom of Speech: You want to make sure to first make the connection between defamation and freedom of speech. The reason for this is because allowing defamation =/= disallowing speech, it is just that unfounded speech isn’t allowed. You want to point out here that a lot of things like scandals, etc, are often developing. We don’t get the truth until much later usually; but when you have defamation laws, it has a chilling effect in that people do not speak out of fear of retribution. * I wasn’t too sure about your response to the POI; I think a more accurate answer would just be that media organisations are just organisations that pursue profit and that profit sometimes overlaps with the truth. * There was a lot of effort being put into proving that the politician is powerful; but I think you need to start with the basics here. You need to prove that you don’t have a right to protect your reputation as a politician. This means that you need to explain why this is the case first! It could be because you are in a position of public authority and prominence; which means that you pretty much give up on your right to privacy, etc. * I think that the case assumes the worst of defamation laws; but I think a bit more effort had to be put into proving that even in circumstances where there truly is defamation, there are other avenues to resolve the situation, such as public statements, etc.   Speaking time: 07:11.98, good work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Kevin |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would prohibit elected officials from pursuing defamation lawsuits against media organisations |
| --- |

| 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:   * You need to have a hook Kevin! You can’t just start your speech by telling me what you want to prove, you need to grab my attention. * I’m not so sure about the characterisation that this only involves large organisations; there are plenty of examples of small publishing houses getting sued. Try to deal with both situations! * For the beginning when you were explaining that politicians are only going to sue when there is content that is very problematic, you need to make sure to clarify what you mean by problematic in this case - because the point of the proposition still stands that this is probably content that is bad for the politician, but really good for the public. * You can also go further to explain that suing for defamation itself is pretty controversial because it implies that you have done something wrong/attempting to cover something up. * I think that you really need to make sure that you are structuring; this will help you quite a bit in terms of not losing the judge in the middle of your rebuttals! I recommend just numbering your rebuttals. * I think that you want to first frame and characterise that there is really no other way for politicians to fix their reputation post being defamed; you could mention that misinformation often spreads a lot further compared to corrective statements, etc. You want to show here that courts are unique in that they are able to present a single and compelling judgement - with all the facts, both sides, and findings, all in one judgement. * I think that this speech was far too defensive; I felt as though you were building your case around pre-emptions of what the other say was going to say, and this caused you to not be able to give me a bunch of impacts - such as what the benefits of suing these organisations is! Could it be the case that we encourage people to be more responsible and fact driven in their content and posts?   Speaking time: 07:23.13, good work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Marvis |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would prohibit elected officials from pursuing defamation lawsuits against media organisations |
| --- |

| 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:   * Strong energy at the start of your speech; I wish you had a hook to match with it! * Fair response that politicians are likely to be desperate and want to pursue legal actions, even when it isn’t justified. I think that you want to point out here that it does not matter if the reporters are right or wrong; it is more that politicians can and will drag court cases out for as long as possible in order to bankrupt or force the other side into a settlement. * I appreciate integrated responses; but you need to make sure that you are explaining why your content actually responds to what the other side is saying! Be sure to flag this out next time around. * I don’t buy the idea that rumours cancel each other out as there are some rumours that are far more damaging compared to others. Perhaps a better way to deal with this issue is to show me that there are some actual ways to remedy a situation where you have been defamed as a politician; you have the use of the congress floor, a huge following, media attention, all the core things that you need to do to correct a situation! * I wasn’t too sure about the example of Boris Johnson as that was less to do with defamation compared to just being exposed for being horrible. I think some examples could include Lee Hsien Loong and the PAP party in Singapore that is pretty famous for suing their political opponents into a political death. * I actually feel like you were not exploring the benefits very much; I understand that you are providing freedom of speech, but what does that translate to? Does it translate to more investigative journalism, etc? Be sure to explore this please! * Please don’t call politicians good boys in your speech!! * You have strong rebuttals, but I feel like they are not quite resolving the questions asked by opp; opp basically suggested that there has to be some ability to have recourse - this was the main thing and issue to really hone in on!   Speaking time: 07:03.05, good work! | | | | | | |