| **Student Name:** Ellie Fu |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 minutes’ long.]  I like the hook and a strong start with the media being liars, but it would be even more impactful if we use an example to illustrate your point.   * Good job signposting.   We’re using a lot of rhetoric that the media spreads false information with AI, but we’re not actually giving out the structural incentives on WHY they will do so, or engage with Opp’s counter-incentives.   * E.g. Explain that the media is profit incentivised, so they exaggerate for more clicks and they will sensationalise all of this information. * E.g. Engage with Opposition about reputation being important, because people who consume tabloid journalism enjoy their brand of sensationalism, so they do not even value credibility. * I appreciate the reinforcement that media organisations cannot call out each other due to echo chambers, and that consumers cannot tell the difference between fact and fiction.   Avoid taking the POI right away, finish out your point first.  Can we engage with the Opposition's argument on democracy?   * Point out that the state will no longer engage in extreme censorship as soon as the crisis is over. So there will be no long-term devolution of democracy. * Explain the priorities of this debate and why the containment of the crisis must be prized above all else? * I understand your reinforcement on public safety, but can we proceed to all of the reasons as to why information becomes a stumbling block to national security? * I need grounding on what are these lies and how in the world does the media get away by saying these obvious lies. * What exactly are these chaotic actions done by the public as a result of too much information? If we don’t explain what people will resort to, then the judge wouldn’t be able to grasp the level of harm.   + What does this information look like that will induce this type of irrational behaviour?     - Eg. It will be invoking fear, paranoia, and even hatred among the people.   We should engage with Opp’s point on state abuse:   * While I understand that the government is trying to protect us during a crisis, we are not explaining how we can trust the state to not engage in abuse when there are political incentives to do so?   + We should highlight mechanisms that information can be shared AFTER the crisis, so the people can still hold the state accountable later on.   Good job asking POIs consistently!  5.00 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Emilia Lau |
| --- |

| **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:  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 minutes’ long.]  I like the hook, but it would be even more impactful if we use an example to illustrate this point.   * Good job signposting!   On the first clash:   * We’re spending way too long simply summarising Opp’s points, keep it to one sentence since we’re not even engaging with the full extent of everything you just summarised. * Good job trying to characterise the kind of information you won’t be sharing with the people, but the Opposition is not suggesting that we divulge ALL classified information. What you’re describing are things that are already classified information to begin with.   + For the harm to be true, we have to illustrate what are the kinds of information that the public would find out that can harm national security?   + It’s simply information that is already public and it’s your state that is actively removing the information that the public would have already known.   + We can try to engage with Opp’s worst case scenario on the kind of information that the state will be censoring from the people, i.e. hiding state failure and abuse.   Good response to the POI, but we’re still lacking engagement with Opp’s point on the spread of fear and paranoia when there is a lack of information from the state.  I appreciate a big picture comparison on national security being the most important thing. Can we proceed to all of the reasons as to why information becomes a stumbling block to national security?   * We have misinformation as the main reasoning, explain what exactly are these chaotic actions? If we don’t explain what people will resort to, then the judge wouldn’t be able to grasp the level of harm.   + What does this information look like that will induce this type of irrational behaviour?     - Eg. It will be invoking fear, paranoia, and even hatred among the people.   On the second clash:   * On misinformation on social media, we cherry-pick the parts that are easy for us to engage with. * Engage with Opposition’s main push on mainstream media behaving responsibly during a crisis.   + E.g. Explain that the media is profit incentivised, so they exaggerate for more clicks and they will sensationalise all of this information. * On the government making better decisions, we aren’t explaining WHY we can trust the actions of the state considering its perverse incentives.   + Point out that we can have the information at the conclusion of the crisis, so the state can still be held accountable later on if they abused their powers.   5.15 - We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Tong Tong Lai |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 minutes’ long.]  As 1st Proposition, it would be more strategic to start off with your own case and problem statement, rather than pre-rebut Opposition’s counterfactual! They haven’t proposed anything yet.   * Can we then have signposting that includes the labels of your arguments?   On the set-up:   * We don’t have to propose censoring classified information, because that wouldn’t be information that the general public would have access to to begin with! * Good definition, but we should propose specific metrics on when the state is allowed to do this!   + E.g. When the state has limited law enforcement officers to manage the crisis.   + We can make it even more clear by suggesting what kind of information you will censor and what you won’t censor.   + Otherwise, the state can abuse the tool of censorship. * A strategic model would be to explain that the state is still providing some information and clarity to the people, but in a controlled manner and we will exclude harmful information. * For a burden of proof, we should highlight that the most important thing in the debate is the containment/ending of the crisis.   Rather than beginning with consumers who cannot tell the difference between fact and fiction, we should explain first why the media even spreads misinformation to begin with!   * E.g. Explain that they are profit-motivated, so they sensationalise and exaggerate for more clicks. * We then expanded this with calling out media organisations being ineffective due to echo chambers, as well as low media literacy; even though we signposted that the premise you’re proving is public safety? How does the above relate to your premise? * We have to maximise the impact of the spread of misinformation!   + What exactly are these chaotic actions done by the public that hurts the government? If we don’t explain what people will resort to, then the judge wouldn’t be able to grasp the level of harm.     - We mentioned protests, but why are peaceful protests bad?     - On this being difficult for the state to manage, we need to characterise the state of the crisis and how the state is heavily constrained, e.g. inadequate resources and human capital.   + What does this information look like that will induce this type of irrational behaviour?     - Eg. It will be invoking fear, paranoia, and even hatred among the people.   You should have a second argument.  Offer POIs more consistently in the debate!  4.57 - Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ethan Woo |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 minutes’ long.]  Strong start with the media not having an incentive to lie within a free market, but this would be more effective if you can tell me precisely why not. Otherwise, Prop has conventional wisdom on their side that the media lies for the sake of profit and clicks.   * Signpost your speech right after the set-up!   On the counter set-up:   * Good job clarifying that the Opp is not defending divulging classified information. Good use of example about the state having to divulge all the side effects of vaccination even if they wanted everyone to vaccinate. * The media’s self-correcting mechanism to mitigate all of the harms of the status quo should be here in the set-up, rather than the rebuttals.   + Good job explaining these incentives, i.e. competition in the free market, reputation especially during a crisis, investments, etc.     - Public scrutiny and criticisms online will eventually reveal the full truth. * What is your burden of proof?   In response to the POI, there’s a lot of repetition now on the media behaving responsibly, with the prior rebuttal and hook.   * Nice job flipping the final outcome with speculation being worse when there’s no info!   + However, Prop mentioned that the state will still give them some information.   Work on time management, we only entered the arguments when there’s a minute left.  On the first argument:   * Try to insert a big picture comparison on why societal well-being is better off with information. Otherwise, it isn’t clear why protecting democracy is particularly important during a time of crisis!   + Spend time reasoning out the incentives and capacities of the state to overly censor.     - E.g. Political preservation of power.   + We have to move on towards explaining why information is so key for civilians to organise against the state, and hold them accountable. * We are arguing this generically, what are the larger long-term harms when democracy is devolving that are far worse than the misinformation and chaos argued by the Proposition?   + The harms will then outlast this singular crisis when democratic frameworks of free speech are being derogated, and civilians will suffer from worse abuses.   Spend time asking POIs consistently!  5.13- Good timing. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Josephine She |
| --- |

| **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:  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 minutes’ long.]  I like the rhetoric in the hook, the use of illustrations would really drive the point home, especially on more fear and paranoia will spread when the state deprives them of information!   * Bear in mind that Prop will still give them SOME information, just not the bad ones. * Good job signposting!   On rebutting the spread of misinformation:   * It’s not enough to just observe that some media are educational and constructive, I need counter-incentives to showcase WHY they are committed to the truth.   + E.g. Loss of reputation especially in a time of crisis, competition in the free market, loss of investments, public scrutiny, etc. * On anyone on the internet can scrutinise information, this is good! But spend time mechanising why citizen journalism is powerful enough against mainstream media, and how Proposition has to censor citizens as well.   + However, we have to bear in mind that users online often are the ones getting away with spreading misinformation online.   We should actively question the trustworthiness of the state and explain to me why they will abuse their powers!   * Reason out the incentives of the state, e.g. perverse political incentives to protect their seats of power.   + We have to move on towards explaining why information is so key for civilians to organise against the state, and hold them accountable so we can have better choices available. Provide some grounding of when the state may have changed their crisis policies in reaction to the people collectivising.     - E.g. Germany ignored the needs of healthcare workers until they struck against them. * If the goal is to prevent societal collapse, then you have to rebut Prop’s argument on the inability of the state to govern. We have to explain why the state STILL has the ability to govern even if society is not cooperative.   + Explain that a trusted government can still correct any misinformation that exists, and convince society to be cooperative during a difficult time.   On your argument on the people deserving to have the information:   * The entire argument is premised on the state even choosing to deny the people such crucial information to their health, Prop says they won’t even do this. * Flip this point by explaining that information is key so we can provide more assistance to the vulnerable! * Can we explain why the state has very limited money and human resources, so assistance from the rest of society becomes crucial?   5.10 - We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |