| **Student Name:** Amber Fung |
| --- |

| **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 6 minutes’ long.]  I like the attack on the Opposition being used as hook, good segue into the policy.   * But we should be signposting the rest of your speech first after the hook!   It’s not that China will know everything, it’s that China ought to be sharing the kind of information that they do know and that will be pertinent to public safety.   * Why would it be unethical to inform the citizens when it allows them to exercise informed consent? * Opp is not defending giving citizens EVERY information, but in favour of not censoring the information that is out in the open.   + So a lot of our harm on the state simply giving the people everything, including classified information/secrets, is not necessarily applicable in this debate.   Good pushback that there’s misinformation on social media, but we cherry-picking the parts that are easy for us.   * Engage with Opposition’s main push on mainstream media behaving responsibly during a crisis.   + E.g. The media is profit incentivised, so they exaggerate for more clicks and they will sensationalise all of this information. * On people being irrational, explain to me first HOW this information makes people descend into this state of mind.   + E.g. It will be invoking fear, paranoia, and even hatred among the people.     - 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.   We are not clearly engaging with the Opposition’s main harm on state abuse!   * How do we 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 response to the POI that mainstream media is plagued with biases.   * But why exactly do they want to harm the citizens? The incentives are not clearly analysed here.   Try to work on speech structure, we need clear transitions and thesis. The argument is not clear.  We need to ask POIs consistently!  6.22 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Bernard Chong |
| --- |

| **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 6 minutes’ long.]  I love the grounding of a terrorist attack, and the ensuing chaos that makes it difficult to govern. But you have to link this directly to the oversharting of information and why censorship is the right answer!   * Good job signposting!   On the case set-up:   * I appreciate the framing on why censoring is better for the management of the crisis, but we need to then explain that the most important thing in the debate is the containment/ending of the crisis. * When you mentioned that the state decides when censorship is needed, you 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.   + Otherwise, the state can abuse the tool of censorship. * Good job explaining that the state is still providing information, but in a controlled manner.   + We can make it even more clear by suggesting what kind of information you will censor and what you won’t censor.   We are entering the argument very late at 03:30, try to begin by 02:30 at the latest.  On the first argument:   * Instead of going straight to information making people irrational and chaotic, explain first:   + Why will the media sensationalise this kind of information,     - E.g. The media is profit incentivised, so they exaggerate for more clicks.   + 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. * 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. * Good premise that this buys the state time to calmly find a solution.   + Why is time and controlled behaviour by the people essential to the state’s ability to find the solution?     - E.g. The state needs to collect data on diseases in order to determine the scale of contagion. They cannot do this if people do not cooperate.   Good response to the 2nd POI on how people behaved in a way that led to shortages of important good during the covid crisis.  We were missing a second argument!  Good job asking POIs!  6.14 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jacky Xu |
| --- |

| **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 6 minutes’ long.]  I appreciate the diversity of contexts that you’re willing to engage with! Will this be important for your future analysis if you don’t utilise these contexts?  Don’t forget to signpost your speech!   * Where is your counter set-up?   Well done calling out Proposition for not characterising how the media and the state behaves in this debate.   * Can you then suggest WHY the media would behave responsibly?   + We can mention all of this in the counter set-up to explain why the media will behave responsibly, i.e. competition in the free market, reputation, investments, etc. * Good job using the Trump example to prove that the state behaves irresponsibly and spreads misinformation.   + But don’t rely on examples alone! Give me structural incentive analysis on why the state will abuse the tool of censorship:     - Preservation of political power     - Minimising backlash against state policies     - Easy containment and control. * While I understand what you’re trying to do with the Chinese example, this goes against conventional wisdom because the government was widely known to omit information on the covid crisis.   On the first argument on free press:   * We again mentioned that a lot of states are abusive, without explaining WHY does the state abuse the powers of censorship.   + Examples do not substitute logical reasoning! * We have to move on towards explaining why information is so key for civilians to organise against the state, and hold them accountable.   + 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.   We didn’t have time for the 2nd argument!   * We cannot start new premises after the 6th minute.   Well done on asking POIs consistently!  6.40 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |