| **Student Name:** Anastasia Kavvathas |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  The core justification of why this is necessary is missing. Your opening needs to address this; why do they need to be held accountable?  Signposting missing!  Set-up   * Process - good on linking it to the following; presumably this is about influence. * You can’t say ‘stupid’ at all in your speeches. You need to clarify what the distinction between appropriate and inappropriate content will be. If the bar is legality, why isn’t status quo sufficient? Aren’t there existing norms against criminals/those with past convict records. * 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.? Good on forgetfulness, why does this always happen?   When do we, if at all, transition from set-up into our argument?  We can’t just stop speaking once we run out of written material! You have to force yourself to keep speaking.  Stop fidgeting with your hands whilst you speak! Instead, use hand gestures! **We have to speak louder. I cannot give you feedback if I cannot hear you!**  We need to have proper arguments with claims, analysis and impacts. Why do content creators have a responsibility to be good actors? What does it even mean to be good? Why are licenses the exclusive way to prevent this? Who gets to decide what appropriate and inappropriate is?  We needed to explain the problem in the status quo meaningfully. 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.  04:01  We need to ask POIs diligently. You have to have your POI written out before you ask, so you don’t waste the speakers time! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Lorelyn Schroeder |
| --- |

| **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 opening - but we need to explain why there are existing checks and balances against the harms they spell out.  Set-up   * You need to alter your set-up if Prop never explains it; misinformation is harder to defend against from Opp. Don’t bring it up if Prop doesn’t! Stick to the harms that they have, and explain why existing mechanisms or alternative mechanisms are sufficient. Explain explicitly why cancel culture, for instance, is not the exclusive tool you have access to, or why it works to check creators, as opposed to the analysis coming from Anastasia.   Rebuttal   * Good work challenging relevance. Don’t stuff in misinformation here. * Don’t say it is difficult for you to rebut this - don’t say that! Instead, say they never explain, but even if they somehow did, the impact is irrelevant in the debate.   Argument 1 (time management is off! You’re starting this at 3:55!)   * Don’t say you don’t have much time hence only one argument - stop breaking the fourth wall! The extra commentary is not adding to the value of your speech. * 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. * On the creators themselves, do they have an unadulterated right to create content? 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?   05:07  Good POI to Hon Sum! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Hon Sum Yang |
| --- |

| **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:  So much influence how? How is this bad? What kind of influences are these? Be **specific**. Is it true that people are being pushed into vandalism? How and in what ways does this influence exist? We need to work hard to package our problem definition, to make this sound like a specific problem with a specific solution.  Rebuttal   * We need to engage on existing checks and balances straight away; why are alternatives insufficient? * You need to explain why the problem exists in the first place to explain why there is no limit being placed on free speech - it’s just about ensuring it happens safely. Why isn’t this effectively censorship, or a limitation of free speech as 1O says? You don’t engage at all with this. Don’t just ask questions on ethics - explain why it is ethical! * POI: this highlights the gap in your model. Who decides what is and isn’t appropriate? What is ‘good’ and ‘bad’ content? This is entirely unexplained.   Argument 1   * Why don’t they think before they act in the status quo? You need to set this problem up! * Why does licensing work? What does it do? Why are illegal actions and existing code of conduct policies insufficient to deal with this? * Where is the exclusivity analysis?   We need to sound more confident and assured when we speak! Use hand gestures, sound like you believe in what you are saying!  04:54  We have to ask POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jasper She |
| --- |

| **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! 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. Unpack this in greater detail - on how illegal actions, discourse, social commentary and such are all dealt with in status quo.  Rebuttal   * On those starting up - explain how these matter the least because they have limited influence; use examples to highlight what kind of creators get most impacted by this and how. * Don’t make it on time and effort, make it on what will be decided to be ‘appropriate’ and ‘inappropriate’ and ‘good’ and ‘bad’. Who decides and who gets penalised as a result? You want to push how this is equivalent to censorship. * Don’t justify the wrongful actions of content creators! Just say why alternatives or existing mechs deal with this.   Argument 1   * Why will it occur in this way? You need to build up this claim step by step, otherwise it sounds like a conspiracy theory! * 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. * Good on customisation and consumer choice. Why do we value this experience of customisation so much? Why does it need to be weighed heavily in the round? * Are the platforms deciding? Is that fair? What incentives do they have to promote certain content over others?   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?  05:08  Ask POIs diligently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Torres Li |
| --- |

| **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. 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.  Observations:   1. Say why we don’t think there is an unadulterated right to create content. We are restrictive so we can create a positive environment; why will the government make the right decision on what is appropriate and what isn’t? 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. This isn’t an observation - this is a response! 2. On content creators - is it true there are no regulations? See the POI Jasper asks you! Fair on this being not big enough of a punishment - but we need to explain WHY. What kind of harms are they engaging in such that this is such a big problem?   Clash 1   * Are we following the structure of a clash? * This is repetitive to our first observation. * Clashes cannot just take you 30-40 seconds! * We need to explain what we said about bad influence, what they said - why we need to take action and protect them + why our policy works.   Clash 2   * The same applies. Clashes are not meant to be summaries. Where are the rebuttals to the claims they have made? * We need to explain why we create better environments for content creators, and how a right to just produce content doesn’t exist?   We need to have more efficient conclusions. We also need to change the way we do clashes - they are not meant to be summaries!  04:28 - you have to hit 5!  We need to ask POIs diligently! | | | | | | |