

## 附件一：「109 年度全國高中英語辯論比賽區域賽與全國賽」實施計畫

### 一. 目的

- (一) 透過英語辯論比賽，深化學生英語表達及邏輯思辨能力，培養國際溝通長才。
- (二) 辦理全國賽事活動，提供各地師生跨區校際交流與觀摩英語辯論機會。

### 二. 辦理單位

- (一) 指導單位：教育部國民及學前教育署。
- (二) 主辦單位：國立臺灣師範大學英語學系。
- (三) 承辦學校：國立中科實驗高級中學（全國）、桃園市立武陵高級中學（北區）、臺中市立西苑高級中學（中區）、國立臺南女子高級中學（南區）。

### 三. 參加對象

#### (一) 區域賽事

1. 各區公私立高級中等學校為主（國際學校九年級至十二年級視為高中生），以報名先後順序為依據、所屬區域學校為優先，額滿為止。各校以錄取一隊為原則，待報名截止後若尚有餘額，通知錄取同校第二隊。**已於歷年「全國賽」同一賽制中獲得「最佳辯士」獎項者，仍可再次報名參賽，爭取團體獎，但不具角逐個人獎之資格。**各區參賽隊伍為政策性辯論（policy debate）八到十二隊，非政策性辯論（non-policy debate）四到八隊，隊數可視各區情況擴增或變動。政策性辯論每隊辯士正取三至六人、備取二人，由各校指導教師就正取辯士中，自行決定正、反方之辯士組合及出場順序；非政策性辯論每隊正取三至六人，備取一至二人，由各校指導教師就正取辯士中，自行決定正、反方之辯士組合及出場順序。
2. 參加**政策性辯論**比賽之隊伍，每校參賽指導教師至少一位，並請派出一位有評審經驗之英文教師擔比賽當天評審（若為首次參賽學校可事先告知委由主辦單位尋找其他具經驗評審擔任，但仍需指派一位英文教師出席評審會議及賽事，做為未來賽事之儲備評審）。參加**非政策性辯論**比賽之隊伍，每校參賽指導教師至少一位；此外，將視隊伍數多寡，參賽學校亦有可能需指派有賽事指導經驗的老師擔任評審，若有此須要，會再聯絡各參賽學校。評審教師請務必準時參加賽事當天的賽前評審會議。

#### (二) 全國賽事

1. 北中南三區區域性英語辯論賽事獲勝隊伍，政策性有十二隊，非政策性有八隊。若遇參賽隊伍不足時，北中南三區區域賽事承辦學校可出兩隊參賽。
2. **政策性辯論**每隊辯士正取三至六人、備取二人，由各校指導教師就正取辯士中，自行決定正、反方之辯士組合及出場順序；**非政策性辯論**每隊正取三至六人，備取一至二人，由各校指導教師就正取辯士中，自行決定正、反方之辯士組合及出場順序。**已於歷年「全國賽」同一賽制中獲得「最佳辯士」獎項者，仍可再次報名參賽，爭取團體獎，但不具角逐個人獎之資格。**
3. 參加**政策性辯論**比賽之隊伍，每校參賽指導教師至少一位，並請指派一位有評審經驗之英文教師參與評審會議及評分工作。參加**非政策性辯論**比賽之隊伍，每校參賽指導教師至少一位，而視當年度參賽隊伍數量多寡，**不排除須指派一名教師擔任評審之可能。**

### 四. 辯題

## 政策性辯論

Gender-neutral restrooms should be established in schools at all levels in Taiwan.

## 非政策性辯論

Homework should be banned in secondary schools in Taiwan.

### 五. 報名時間及方式

- (一) 南區賽事資訊：109年4月18日(六)假臺南女中（700臺南市中西區大埔街97號）舉行，報名期限即日起至109年3月17日(二)下午五點止，請於線上填妥報名資料（網址連結：<https://shorturl.at/kyDMN>），任何報名訊息異動，自行請在109年4月7日(二)報名系統關閉前完成。
- (二) 北區賽事資訊：109年4月25日(六)假武陵高中（330桃園市桃園區中山路889號）舉行，報名期限即日起至109年3月24日(二)下午五點止，請於線上填妥報名資料（網址連結：<https://shorturl.at/alnyJ>），任何報名訊息異動，請自行在109年4月14日(二)報名系統關閉前完成。
- (三) 中區賽事資訊：109年5月2日(六)假西苑高中（407臺中市西屯區西苑路268號）舉行，報名期限即日起至109年4月1日(三)下午五點止，請於線上填妥報名資料（網址連結：<https://shorturl.at/fCS19>），任何報名訊息異動，請自行在109年4月21日(二)報名系統關閉前完成。
- (四) 全國賽事資訊：待區域賽後另行通知各區獲選代表隊伍。

### 六. 比賽時間及地點

- (一) 北區 109年4月25日(六)—武陵高中（330桃園市桃園區中山路889號）。
- (二) 中區 109年5月2日(六)—西苑高中（407臺中市西屯區西苑路268號）。
- (三) 南區 109年4月18日(六)—臺南女中（700臺南市中西區大埔街97號）。
- (四) 全國 109年6月6日(六)—中科實中（428臺中市大雅區平和路227號）。

### 七. 賽事承辦學校聯絡人

與報名以外其他賽事相關問題，請洽：

- (一) 北區：武陵高中學務處國際教育組廖彩雲組長  
（聯絡資料：[wlsb17@email.wlsh.tyc.edu.tw](mailto:wlsb17@email.wlsh.tyc.edu.tw)，03-3698170#360）
- (二) 中區：西苑高中學務處社團活動組吳國華組長  
（聯絡資料：[fatstonex@sysh.tc.edu.tw](mailto:fatstonex@sysh.tc.edu.tw)，04-27016473#829）
- (三) 南區：臺南女中教務處教學組張馨云組長  
（聯絡資料：[teach@tngs.tn.edu.tw](mailto:teach@tngs.tn.edu.tw)，06-2131928#102）
- (四) 全國：中科實中教務處英文科施勇廷教師  
（聯絡資料：[syt060323@nehs.tc.edu.tw](mailto:syt060323@nehs.tc.edu.tw)，04-25686850#1390）

### 八. 主辦單位免責聲明

參賽者如需更動調整報名資料，請自行在報名系統關閉前完成。除非有無法掌控之特殊狀況，系統關閉後即不得更動報名表資料。主辦單位亦視系統關閉前之報名資料為填表者（含指導老師、參賽學生及派出之評審）已確認後之最後報名資訊。任何賽事證明及獎狀上之姓名誤植，如出自報名表而非主辦單位疏失，將由指導老師及參賽學生自行負責，主辦單位將不予更正及補發。

## 2020 High School English Debate Tournament Implementing Plan

### I. Purposes

- A. To encourage research and active learning, thereby sharpening students' English speaking and logical thinking skills.
- B. To promote interscholastic debating events throughout Taiwan.

### II. Organizers & Hosting Schools

- A. Supervised & sponsored by: K-12 Education Administration, Ministry of Education
- B. Organized by: English Department of National Taiwan Normal University
- C. Hosted by:
  1. Taoyuan Wu-Ling Senior High School (Northern region)
  2. Taichung Shi Yuan Senior High School (Central region)
  3. National Tainan Girl's Senior High School (Southern region)
  4. National Experimental High School at Central Taiwan Science Park (National tournament)

### III. Participants

#### A. Regional competitions:

1. There will be three regional tournaments held respectively in the Northern, Central, and Southern regions of Taiwan. The tournaments are mainly for high school students (for international schools that means grade 9 to 12). Each school can send one team to participate. Registration is on a first-come, first-serve basis. Priority will be given to high schools within their regions. (Each school should enter only one team. The second team from a school will be accepted only when there are spots unfilled after the registration deadline.) **Please note that debaters who have won The Best Debater Awards in the same debate category in past National Tournaments, though can enter the contest to compete for the team award, are not eligible to run for individual awards.** For **policy debate**, there will be 8 to 12 teams for each regional tournament, with 3-6 debaters (and 2 backup debaters) on each team. For **non-policy debate**, there will be 4 to 8 teams for each regional tournament, with 3-6 debaters (and 2 backup debaters) on each team. Among the registered debaters, the coach can decide who will debate as the affirmative and the negative as well as their speaking orders.
2. For **policy debate**, each school should have at least one coach, and send one English teacher to be the adjudicator. For **non-policy debate**, each school should have at least one coach, and an English teacher to be the adjudicator if notified. All adjudicators are required to attend a judges' meeting prior to the tournament (pre-tournament judges' meeting for the Central, Southern and Northern Tournaments are yet to be announced).

#### B. National competition:

1. Winning teams of English debate tournaments in the Northern, Central, and Southern regions of Taiwan will compete in the national competition. If the team cap is not met, the host schools of regional tournaments may send one more team to participate in the nationals.
2. For **policy debate**, there will be 12 teams, with 3-6 debaters (and 2 backup debaters) on each team. For **non-policy debate**, there will be 8 teams, with 3-6 debaters (and 2 backup debaters) on each team. The name list should be confirmed before a set date. Coaches should decide on the combination of the debaters and their speaking order for each of the 3 debate rounds, and should inform the organizer about their decisions a week before the tournament at the

latest. No change is allowed afterwards (Please note that the change of the combination and the order simply means their debating sequence, and you may not replace any of the debaters already entered in the competition after your confirmation). **Debaters who have won The Best Debater Awards in the same debate category in past National Tournaments, though can enter the contest to compete for the team award, are not eligible to run for individual awards.**

3. For **policy debate**, each school should have at least one coach, and send one English teacher who has experience of judging English policy debate to be the adjudicator for the tournament. On the day of the tournament, a judges' meeting will be held and all adjudicators are required to attend. For **non-policy debate**, each school should have at least one coach, and **depending on the number of teams competing, an English teacher may have to be dispatched by the school to be the adjudicator.**

#### IV. Debate Propositions

##### **Policy debate**

RESOLVED: Gender-neutral restrooms should be established in schools at all levels in Taiwan.

##### **Non-policy debate**

RESOLVED: Homework should be banned in secondary schools in Taiwan.

#### V. Registration

- A. Southern region: Registration has to be completed on the website (<https://shorturl.at/kyDMN>) by 17:00, March 17. Any revision to the registration has to be completed on the above website before the registration system is closed on April 7.
- B. Northern region: Registration has to be completed on the website (<https://shorturl.at/alnyJ>) by 17:00, March 24. Any revision to the registration has to be completed on the above website before the registration system is closed on April 14.
- C. Central region: Registration has to be completed on the website (<https://shorturl.at/fCS19>) by 17:00, April 1. Any revision to the registration has to be completed on the above website before the registration system is closed on April 21.
- D. National tournament: To be announced after the regional competitions.

#### VI. Dates and Venues:

- A. Northern region: April 25, Taoyuan Municipal Wu-Ling Senior High School
- B. Central region: May 2, Taichung Municipal Shi Yuan Senior High School
- C. Southern region: April 18, National Tainan Girl's Senior High School
- D. National: June 6, National Experimental High School at Central Taiwan Science Park

#### VII. Contact

For any further question (excluding registration-related matters), please contact

- A. Northern Region: Ms. Katherine Liao of Wuling Senior High School at 03-3698170#360, [wshb17@email.wlsh.tyc.edu.tw](mailto:wshb17@email.wlsh.tyc.edu.tw).
- B. Central Region: Mr. Yang of Shi Yuan Senior High School at 04-27060314#829, [fatstonex@sysh.tc.edu.tw](mailto:fatstonex@sysh.tc.edu.tw).
- C. Southern Region: Ms. Chang of Tainan Girls' Senior High School at 06-2131928#102, [teach@tns.tn.edu.tw](mailto:teach@tns.tn.edu.tw).
- D. National tournament: Mr. Shih of National Experimental High at Central Taiwan Science Park at 04-25686850#1390, [syt060323@nehs.tc.edu.tw](mailto:syt060323@nehs.tc.edu.tw).

#### VIII. Disclaimer & Participant Agreement

Any revision to the registration has to be completed before the on-line registration system is closed. Unless there is an uncontrollable factor, no changes can be made to the registration once the on-line registration system is closed. All the participation proofs and award certificates issued in wake of the competition will be based on the registration the time the on-line system is closed. For any errors concerning the participant's names on the proofs or certificates, if proven not a mistake made by the English Department of National Taiwan Normal University, no proofs or certificates will be reissued.

## 附件二：「109 年度全國高中英語辯論比賽區域賽與全國賽」比賽規則

### 一. 辯題：

#### 政策性辯論

RESOLVED: That cellphones should be banned in secondary schools in Taiwan.

#### 非政策性辯論

RESOLVED: That high school students in Taiwan should have open campus lunch

### 二. 比賽規則說明

(一) 比賽時間：上午8:30開始報到、9:00賽前說明、9:30開始比賽，遲到之隊伍視為棄權（各賽事當日詳細活動時間及流程最晚於比賽前一週公佈於各承辦學校網站）。

#### (二) 辯論型式

##### 政策性英語辯論（原有辯論型式）

本辯論比賽採以下方式：每場比賽由正方一隊，反方一隊參加，每隊三人。賽制採交叉質詢制，即正反方各兩次的申論中間皆穿插交叉質詢，最後由正反方各自進行結辯。六位辯士上臺順序與辯論時間如下：

1. 正方一辯申論五分鐘
2. 正方一辯接受反方二辯交叉質詢三分鐘
3. 準備時間一分鐘
4. 反方一辯申論五分鐘
5. 反方一辯接受正方一辯交叉質詢三分鐘
6. 準備時間一分鐘
7. 正方二辯申論五分鐘
8. 正方二辯接受反方一辯交叉質詢三分鐘
9. 準備時間一分鐘
10. 反方二辯申論五分鐘
11. 反方二辯接受正方二辯交叉質詢三分鐘
12. 準備時間五分鐘
13. 反方三辯結辯五分鐘
14. 正方三辯結辯五分鐘

若參賽隊伍未依照以上辯論順序進行，該部分將不予以計分。

若前方辯士時間未到即結束時，直接接續下一順序辯士進行。

##### 非政策性英語辯論（2018 年新增之辯論型式）

本賽制為英國議會制及政策性辯論之合體（但大幅簡化其難度），每場比賽由正方二隊，反方二隊參加，每隊三人。正反方每隊輪流做「論點陳述」("Case Presentation")，由正方第一隊開始，之後依序為反方第一隊、正方第二隊、反方第二隊，每隊各有一次「論點陳述」的機會，每次陳述後會有「問與答」("Q&A")，由對方兩隊分別提問（每隊皆有機會先行提問），剛做完論點陳述的一方回答問題，最後由正反方各隊輪流進行「摘要與最後陳述」("Summary & Final Pitch")，由反方第二隊（即後做「論點陳述」的隊伍）先開始「摘要與最後陳述」，之後依序為正方第二隊、

反方第一隊、正方第一隊。每隊可自行指派每位辯士之任務，「論點陳述」、「問與答」和「摘要與最後陳述」等部分可各由一位或多位辯士負責完成，亦可視臨場狀況機動調整，唯每位辯士皆須上場發言，且發言時間長短不可差別過大。任務進行順序與時間長短如下：

1. 正方第一隊論點陳述三分鐘
2. 準備時間兩分鐘
3. 問與答六分鐘（反方第一隊發問三分鐘、反方第二隊發問三分鐘）
4. 準備時間兩分鐘
5. 反方第一隊論點陳述三分鐘
6. 準備時間兩分鐘
7. 問與答六分鐘（正方第二隊發問三分鐘、正方第一隊發問三分鐘）
8. 準備時間兩分鐘
9. 正方第二隊論點陳述三分鐘
10. 準備時間兩分鐘
11. 問與答六分鐘（反方第二隊發問三分鐘、反方第一隊發問三分鐘）
12. 準備時間兩分鐘
13. 反方第二隊論點陳述三分鐘
14. 準備時間兩分鐘
15. 問與答六分鐘（正方第一隊發問三分鐘、正方第二隊發問三分鐘）
16. 準備時間五分鐘
17. 反方第二隊摘要與最後陳述三分鐘
18. 正方第二隊摘要與最後陳述三分鐘
19. 反方第一隊摘要與最後陳述三分鐘
20. 正方第一隊摘要與最後陳述三分鐘

若參賽隊伍未依照以上辯論順序進行，該部分將不予以計分。

若前方辯士時間未到即結束時，直接接續下一順序辯士進行。

- (三) 場次及正反方：**政策性辯論**共有三輪，每隊皆須為正、反兩方辯護。承辦單位最晚於賽前一週公布第一場、第二場比賽之場次與正反方，第三場次則於比賽當日公布。**非政策性辯論**共有三輪，每隊皆須為正、反兩方辯護。承辦單位最晚於賽前一週公布第一場及第二場比賽之場次與正反方，第三場次則於比賽當日公布。
- (四) 賽事裁判：政策性辯論與非政策性辯論每場各有三位裁判，將聘請有英語辯論專業背景之大學教授、高中教師或社會人士擔任評審。
- (五) 評審方式：本賽事採積分制，**政策性辯論部分**，每場比賽各隊最多可獲三分，最少零分。三場賽事得分累積為該隊在本賽事之總分，依照參賽隊伍數量，將取賽事總分最高前三名為優勝隊伍，排名緊接其後之一至兩名者獲選評審團獎。若遇賽事總分相同時，則以評審決議排序積分決定先後順序；若遇排序積分相同時，以三輪對打隊伍之排序積分總和作為判定標準，對手排序積分總和較高者勝出。**非政策性辯論部分**，每場比賽各隊最多可獲四分，最少一分。兩場賽事得分累積為該隊在本賽事之總分，依照參賽隊伍數量，將取賽事總分最高前一至兩名為優勝隊伍，排名緊接其後之一至兩名者獲選評審團獎。若遇賽事總分相同時，則以評審決議排序積分決

定先後順序；若遇排序積分相同時，以兩輪對打隊伍之排序積分總和作為判定標準，對手排序積分總和較高者勝出。此外，評審將就各場賽事六位（政策性辯論）/十二位（非政策性辯論）辯士之表現，分別給予個人分數。**政策性辯論部分**，表現最佳者6分、次佳者5分、依序排列至得分1分。依照參賽隊伍數量，三輪賽事結束後，積分最高前二至三名者為最佳辯士，排名緊接其後之二至三名者為優良辯士。**非政策性辯論部分**，表現最佳者12分、次佳者11分、依序排列至得分1分（因辯士人數較多，可視情況給予不同辯士相同分數，若單場有同分情形，則緊接在後之辯士分數需依同分人數往後順延，例如若有兩名辯士拿下十分，則下一位辯士將拿八分）。依照參賽隊伍數量，三輪賽事結束後，積分最高前一至二名者為最佳辯士，排名緊接其後之一至二名者為優良辯士。若遇同分時，依序以「各場次競爭隊伍排序積分總和」（競爭隊伍積分總和較高者勝出）、「該辯士是否同時參與正反方辯論」（同時參與正反方辯論者勝出）及「所屬隊伍排序積分」（所屬隊伍積分較高者勝出）為判定標準。

(六) 計時方式：

**政策性辯論**

辯論當中計時員將舉牌並響鈴，提醒辯士剩下的時間。申論時，計時員會分別於剩下二分鐘、一分鐘及半分鐘時提醒。質詢時，分別於剩下一分鐘及半分鐘時提醒。申論準備時間，於半分鐘時提醒，時間到時，辯士必須立即上臺並開始計時。結辯準備時間，分別於剩下二分鐘、一分鐘及半分鐘時提醒，時間到時，辯士必須立即上臺並開始計時。結辯時，則分別於剩下二分鐘、一分鐘及半分鐘時提醒。時間到時，計時員將響鈴，之後每十秒鐘響鈴一次，一超過三十秒即響長鈴，辯士必須立即下臺；每超過規定時間十秒鐘，扣總分一分；唯交叉質詢時間到時，辯士必須立即下臺。輪到任何一隊做申論、質詢或結辯時，計時員將響鈴並口頭宣布上臺隊伍，口頭宣布後該隊應立即上臺，若不按時間出場，每晚十秒鐘扣總分一分。

**非政策性辯論**

辯論當中計時員將舉牌並響鈴，提醒辯士剩下的時間。論點陳述時，計時員會分別於剩下一分鐘及半分鐘時提醒。問與答時，分別於剩下一分鐘及半分鐘時提醒。論點陳述準備時間，於半分鐘時提醒，時間到時，辯士必須立即從座位上起立開始申論並開始計時。摘要與最後陳述準備時間，分別於剩下一分鐘及半分鐘時提醒，時間到時，辯士必須立即從座位上起立開始進行摘要與最後陳述並開始計時。摘要與最後陳述時，則分別於剩下一分鐘及半分鐘時提醒。時間到時，計時員將響鈴，之後每十秒鐘響鈴一次，一超過三十秒即響長鈴，辯士必須立即結束並坐下；每超過規定時間十秒鐘，扣總分一分；唯問與答時間到時，辯士必須立即坐下。輪到任何一隊做論點陳述、問與答或摘要與最後陳述時，計時員將響鈴並口頭宣布上臺隊伍，口頭宣布後該隊辯士應立即從座位上起立，若不按時間開始，每晚十秒鐘扣總分一分。

(七) 攜帶物品：學生請務必攜帶身份證或學生證以查驗身分。辯論時可攜帶字典及紙本資料，但禁止使用任何電子儀器查閱論點或辯論資料，陳述論點時亦禁止使用視覺輔助道具。參加政策性與非政策性辯論各隊應就比賽中所可能引述之證據準備證據卡（evidence cards），以備對方辯士審查佐證資料之用。對方辯士可於交叉質詢時提



出要求審查某一證據卡或所有申論中所用之證據卡，並當場交由隊友檢視，唯須在該交叉質詢（政策性辯論）或問與答（非政策性辯論）時段後的申論（政策性辯論）或論點陳述（非政策性辯論）結束時交還對方（建議各隊準備兩套證據卡以因應此規定）；此外，裁判於整場辯論後、勝負判決前可要求審查佐證資料。證據卡內容需包涵該則證據之「主旨標題」、「詳細出處（如書籍刊物名稱、冊號、頁碼或網址）」、「發表或取得時間」、「作者人名身分」及「原始引文」等項目。證據使用文字若為中文，毋須翻譯為英文，若為中、英文以外之文字，則需翻譯為英文。一張證據卡僅列一則證據，勿多則並列，以方便評審或對方辯士閱讀。

- (八) 棄權處理：政策性辯論賽隊伍若臨時只有兩人可出賽，將由其中一人負責結辯。只有兩名辯士之隊伍，因無法滿足本賽事一隊至少三人之規定，故只具角逐個人獎項之資格，而無法競爭團體獎項。政策性及非政策性辯論參賽隊伍若無充分理由，報名後棄賽之隊伍，承辦單位將斟酌下一年是否錄取參賽。
- (九) 參賽規範：**政策性辯論**賽事進行中，講臺上的辯士禁止與臺下隊友及觀眾交談互動，唯被質詢者要求相關資料以回答質詢者問題時，隊友可傳遞相關資料（但不可與被質詢者有言語討論），以利質詢順利進行。**非政策性辯論**賽事進行中，若有需要，隊友可彼此協助，唯協助方式應以不打亂賽事進行為前提。參賽隊伍或個人若有失辯士風範之情事，一旦有具體事證，且經評審團會議通過，將取消其獲獎資格，由積分排名緊接在後之隊伍或個人依序遞補。

### 三. 比賽場地注意事項

- (一) 場地內沒有麥克風。
- (二) 比賽選手可自行用手機計時，但不可用手機查閱資料，違反規定者，將取消比賽資格。
- (三) 教室內不得飲食，請勿攜帶食物入內。
- (四) 比賽開始後將關閉後門，除承辦單位的工作人員外，禁止任何人出入。
- (五) 為避免影響辯論同學，比賽開始後請勿走動或交談，並請確實關手機。
- (六) 比賽進行中請勿鼓掌喧鬧。
- (七) 觀眾席師生與家長嚴禁與場上辯士有任何交談、傳遞書面訊息或展示電子產品上所呈現資訊之行為。
- (八) 若欲錄影請於賽前架設完畢，欲照相者切勿使用閃光燈，以免打擾比賽之進行。
- (九) 競賽場地待安排確認後，再行通知各參賽學校。
- (十) 為避免任何可能先設印象，所有賽場隊伍皆以各隊事先選定之英文隊名（而非校名）呈現。

### 四. 比賽當日注意事項

學生請穿著整齊服裝（勿穿著制服），於報到時請學生出示身份證或學生證。各場次活動前也請出示證件以利身分核對。

**2020 High School English Debate Tournament**  
**Rules & Regulations**

I. Debate Propositions

**Policy debate**

RESOLVED: That cellphones should be banned in secondary schools in Taiwan.

**Non-policy debate**

RESOLVED: That high school students in Taiwan should have open campus lunch break.

II. Debate Rules

A. Time: Sign-in at 8:30 AM, briefing on rules at 9:00 AM, and first debate round starting at 9:30 AM. Late-coming teams are automatically disqualified.

B. Format & procedure

1. **Policy debate**

Each match consists of an Affirmative team and a Negative team, with three debaters on each team.

1. First Affirmative constructive speech 5 minutes
2. Second Negative cross examines First Affirmative 3 minutes
3. Preparation Time 1 minute
4. First Negative constructive speech 5 minutes
5. First Affirmative cross examines First Negative 3 minutes
6. Preparation Time 1 minute
7. Second Affirmative constructive speech 5 minutes
8. First Negative cross examines Second Affirmative 3 minutes
9. Preparation Time 1 minute
10. Second Negative constructive speech 5 minutes
11. Second Affirmative cross examines Second Negative 3 minutes
12. Preparation Time 5 minutes
13. Third Negative Rebuttal 5 minutes
14. Third Affirmative Rebuttal 5 minutes

2. **Non-policy debate**

Each match consists of an Affirmative team and a Negative team, with three debaters on each team.

1. Affirmative Team 1 Case Presentation 3 minutes
2. Prep Time 2 minutes
3. Q&A 6 minutes  
Negative Team 1 Ask Affirmative Team 1 Questions 3 minutes  
Negative Team 2 Ask Affirmative Team 1 Questions 3 minutes
4. Prep Time 2 minutes
5. Negative Team 1 Case Presentation 3 minutes
6. Prep Time 2 minutes
7. Q&A 6 minutes  
Affirmative Team 2 Ask Negative Team 1 Questions 3 minutes  
Affirmative Team 1 Ask Negative Team 1 Questions 3 minutes
8. Prep Time 2 minutes
9. Affirmative Team 2 Case Presentation 3 minutes
10. Prep Time 2 minutes
11. Q&A 6 minutes  
Negative Team 2 Ask Affirmative Team 2 Questions 3 minutes  
Negative Team 1 Ask Affirmative Team 2 Questions 3 minutes

12. Prep Time 2 minutes
13. Negative Team 2 Case Presentation 3 minutes
14. Prep Time 2 minutes
15. Q&A 6 minutes
  - Affirmative Team 1 Ask Negative Team 2 Questions 3 minutes
  - Affirmative Team 2 Ask Negative Team 2 Questions 3 minutes
16. Prep Time 5 minutes
17. Negative Team 2 Summary and Final Pitch 3 minutes
18. Affirmative Team 2 Summary and Final Pitch 3 minutes
19. Negative Team 1 Summary and Final Pitch 3 minutes
20. Affirmative Team 1 Summary and Final Pitch 3 minutes

\*If the debater finishes his/her speech or questions before time is up, the unused time is simply lost, and the debate will directly move on to the next segment.

- C. For **policy debate**, there will be three debate rounds, and teams will have to defend both sides of the resolution over the course of the tournament. The first- and second-round school matchups will be posted a week prior to the tournament the latest, and the third-round matchups will be announced on the day of the tournament at the venue. For **non-policy debate**, there will be **three** debate rounds, and teams have to defend both sides of the resolution over the course of the tournament. The first- and second-round school matchups will be posted a week prior to the tournament the latest, and the third-round matchups will be announced on the day of the tournament at the venue.
- D. For each debate match there will have a panel of 3 judges. Professors, senior high school teachers, and experts specializing in relevant fields will be invited to adjudicate.
- E. Scoring system:
  1. The competition will operate on a points-accrual system. For each round in **policy** debate, each team may accrue a score from 0 to 3. The top two to three teams, pending the number of participating schools, ranked by their total points across three rounds, will be the winning teams; the one to two teams ranked after that will be given “Judges’ Choice Award.” For each round in **non-policy** debate, each team may accrue a score of 1 to 4. The top one to two teams, pending the number of participating schools, ranked by their total points across two rounds, will be the winning teams; the one to two teams ranked after that will be given “Judges’ Choice Award.”
  2. If any two teams have the same points, their “ranking scores” will be examined to decide which team wins out. (The “ranking score” is the score given after all two or three rounds have been completed; judges in each panel will rank the teams they have judged and give each team a “ranking score.”) If their “ranking scores” are still the same, the “ranking scores” of their respective opponent teams will determine which team is the winning team.
  3. For each round in **policy debate**, each debater will be given a ranking score from 1 to 6 based on his/her performance by the adjudicators. The top two to three debaters, pending the number of participating schools, ranked by their total points across three rounds, will receive the honor of “Best Debater”; one to three debaters ranked after that will win the honor of “Honorable Mention Debater.” If any two debaters score the same points, the ranking will be determined based on the following criteria (in order of priority): 1) the “ranking scores” of their opponent teams; 2) whether the debater defends both sides; 3) their team’s “ranking score.” For each round in **non-policy debate**, each debater will be given a ranking score from 1 to 12 based on his/her performance by the adjudicators. The top one to two debaters, pending the number of participating schools, ranked by their total points across **three** rounds, will receive the honor of “Best Debater”; the one to two debaters ranked after that will win the honor of “Honorable Mention Debater”. If any two

debaters score the same points, the ranking will be determined based on the following criteria (in order of priority): 1) the “ranking scores” of their opponent teams; 2) whether the debater defends both sides; 3) their team’s “ranking score.”

F. Timing:

1. For constructive speeches (policy debate) or case presentation (non-policy debate), the timer will flash cards and ring a short bell ring to indicate a 30-second remaining time, a long bell ring when time is up, subsequent short rings for every 10 seconds overtime, and a prolonged bell ring after 30 seconds overtime. When hearing the prolonged bell ring, debaters have to get off the stage immediately. A point will be deducted for every 10 seconds overtime.
2. For cross-examinations (policy debate) or Q&A (non-policy debate), the timer will flash cards and ring a short bell ring to indicate a 30-second remaining time, a long bell ring when time is up, and debaters have to get off the stage immediately.
3. For rebuttal speeches (policy debate) or summary & final pitch (non-policy debate), the timer will ring a short bell ring to indicate a 30-second remaining time, a long bell ring when time is up, subsequent short rings for every 10 seconds overtime, and a prolonged bell ring after 30 seconds overtime. When hearing the prolonged bell ring, debaters have to get off the stage immediately. A point will be deducted for every 10 seconds overtime.
4. For preparation periods for constructive speeches and cross-examinations (policy debate), and case presentations and Q&A’s (non-policy debate), the timer will ring a long bell ring when time is up. For the preparation period for rebuttal speeches (policy debate) and summary & final pitch (non-policy debate), the timer will ring a short bell ring to indicate a 30-second remaining time, and a long bell ring when time is up.
5. When it is time for a speech or questions, debaters for **policy debate** will be called to the lectern and thus must proceed to the lectern immediately, but debaters for **non-policy debate** only need to rise up from the seat and do not need to proceed to the lectern. A point will be deducted for every 10 seconds of delay.

G. Required items:

1. Debaters must bring their Student ID cards or ID cards.
2. Dictionaries and references are allowed, but all electronic devices are prohibited during the debate.
3. Each team needs to prepare evidence cards for cross-examination (policy debate) or Q&A (non-policy debate). Any evidence cited during the debate should have a corresponding evidence card, which may be reviewed upon request by the cross-examiner/questioner and their teammates. The card(s) need to be returned at the end of the constructive speech (policy debate) or case presentation (non-policy debate) following the cross-examination (policy debate) or Q&A (non-policy debate). Teams are advised to bring two sets of cards for this reason. The card(s) may also be reviewed by the adjudicators upon request after each debate round. Each card should contain the following information: tag, publication or website, date of publication or retrieval, name and qualification of the author, and the actual quote. If the evidence is in Chinese, no translation is required. However, if it is in other languages, it needs to be translated into English. Each card should contain only one piece of evidence.

H. For each round, there should be 3 debaters on each team. If, for some reasons, a team only has 2 debaters available, it may proceed with 2 debaters (with one giving both constructive and rebuttal speeches), but will not be able to compete for team awards. If a team drops out without a sound reason, the organizers reserve the right to disqualify the team sent by the same school from the tournament next year.

I. For **policy debate**, the debater on stage is not allowed to discuss with his/her teammates at all

times; but during cross-examination periods, cross-examinees can take the needed evidence from their teammates to facilitate the cross-examination. For **non-policy debate**, debaters can help their teammates at all times as long as it is done in an orderly and unobstructive fashion. All teams/debaters must not behave disrespectfully toward others, or the adjudication committee may invalidate their claim to any prize. The vacancy will be filled by the next ranked team/debater.

### III. Onsite Code of Conduct

- A. The rooms will not have microphones.
- B. Debaters can use their cell phone as a timing device during the debate.
- C. Eating and drinking are prohibited in the classroom.
- D. Doors will be shut right after the competition begins. Any entry is forbidden except for staff members and coordinators of the organizer.
- E. In order not to disturb the speaker, chatting and walking around in the classroom are not allowed during the debate. Please make sure your cell phone is turned off as well.
- F. Clapping is not allowed during the debate.
- G. Members in the audience are not allowed to talk to debaters in the front, nor are they allowed to pass over any information or materials.
- H. If you want to record or take photos, please set up your device before the debate begins. Flash is prohibited.
- I. Participating schools will be notified of the classrooms for debate matches once the information becomes available.

### IV. Dress Code and Identity Check

Debaters should be dressed in formal attire that is not their school uniforms and shall bring with them their student ID cards.

附件三：「全國高中英語辯論比賽區域賽與全國賽」比賽評分表

National High School English Debate Tournament Ballot Sheet

Policy Debate

Constructive Speeches (5 minutes)						
		1A	1N	2A	2N	
Evidence & Logic	/20					
Language	/10					
Delivery	/10					
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/40</b>					
Cross Examination (3 minutes)						
		2N	1A	1N	2A	
Relevance	/10					
Strategy	/5					
Delivery	/5					
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/20</b>					
Response to Cross Examination						
		1A	1N	2A	2N	
Relevance	/10					
Strategy	/5					
Delivery	/5					
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/20</b>					
5-Minute Prep Time						
Rebuttal (5 minutes)						
		3N	3A			
Evidence & Logic	/20					
Language	/10					
Delivery	/10					
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/40</b>					

Individual Debater Total							
		1A	2A	3A	1N	2N	3N
Constructive Speech	/40						
Cross Exam	/20						
Response	/20						
Rebuttal	/40						
<b>Total</b>							

**Affirmative:**

**Negative:**

<b>Constructive Speeches (5 minutes) Notes and Comments</b>			
<b>1A</b>	<b>1N</b>	<b>2A</b>	<b>2N</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Defines terms in resolution <input type="checkbox"/> States need for change <input type="checkbox"/> Introduces a plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Refutes 1A definitions and need for change <input type="checkbox"/> Shows why status quo is acceptable OR <input type="checkbox"/> Offers alternatives	<input type="checkbox"/> Clashes with 1N contentions <input type="checkbox"/> Explains workable plan in detail <input type="checkbox"/> Plan has solvency	<input type="checkbox"/> Shows how plan won't work <input type="checkbox"/> Maintains status quo OR <input type="checkbox"/> Offers alternatives
<b>Cross Examination (3 minutes) Notes and Comments</b>			
<b>2N</b>	<b>1A</b>	<b>1N</b>	<b>2A</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Controls time <input type="checkbox"/> Asks relevant questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Controls time <input type="checkbox"/> Asks relevant questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Controls time <input type="checkbox"/> Asks relevant questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Controls time <input type="checkbox"/> Asks relevant questions
<b>Response to Cross Examination Notes and Comments</b>			
<b>1A</b>	<b>1N</b>	<b>2A</b>	<b>2N</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Cooperates in answering questions <input type="checkbox"/> Responds to questions tactfully and quick-wittedly	<input type="checkbox"/> Cooperates in answering questions <input type="checkbox"/> Responds to questions tactfully and quick-wittedly	<input type="checkbox"/> Cooperates in answering questions <input type="checkbox"/> Responds to questions tactfully and quick-wittedly	<input type="checkbox"/> Cooperates in answering questions <input type="checkbox"/> Responds to questions tactfully and quick-wittedly
<b>Rebuttal (5 minutes) Notes and Comments</b>			
<b>3N</b>		<b>3A</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Sums up position <input type="checkbox"/> Defends against any attacks from affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Explains why their team should win <input type="checkbox"/> No new arguments	<input type="checkbox"/> Sums up position <input type="checkbox"/> Defends against any attacks from negative <input type="checkbox"/> Explains why their team should win <input type="checkbox"/> No new arguments		

	<b>Affirmative</b>	<b>Negative</b>
<b>Debate Team Total</b>	/200	/200

**Judge's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Non-policy Debate**

Case Presentation									
		A1	N1	A2	N2				
Logic & Evidence	/ 20								
Language	/ 10								
Delivery	/ 5								
Team Work	/ 5								
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/ 40</b>								
Q & A—Questions									
		N1	N2	A2	A1	N2	N1	A1	A2
Relevance	/ 10								
Strategy	/ 10								
Delivery	/ 5								
Team Work	/ 5								
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/ 30</b>								
Q & A—Answers									
		A1	N1	A2	N2				
Relevance	/ 10								
Strategy	/ 10								
Delivery	/ 5								
Team Work	/ 5								
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/ 30</b>								
Summary & Final Pitch									
		N2	A2	N1	A1				
Logic & Reasoning	/ 20								
Recap & Organization	/ 10								
Delivery	/ 5								
Team Work	/ 5								
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/ 40</b>								

Team Total					
		A1	A2	N1	N2
Case Presentation	/ 40				
Q & A—Questions	/ 60				
Q & A—Answers	/ 30				
Summary & Final Pitch	/ 40				
<b>Total</b>	<b>/ 170</b>				

Affirmative Total: \_\_\_\_\_ Negative Total: \_\_\_\_\_



<b>Case Presentation</b>							
<b>A1</b>		<b>N1</b>		<b>A2</b>		<b>N2</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Define terms in resolution <input type="checkbox"/> Present appropriate number of arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Support arguments with logic and evidence		<input type="checkbox"/> Challenge terms in resolution <input type="checkbox"/> Refute arguments from A1 <input type="checkbox"/> Present appropriate number of arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Support arguments with logic and evidence		<input type="checkbox"/> Refute arguments from N1 & rebuild arguments from A1 <input type="checkbox"/> Present other arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Support arguments with logic and evidence		<input type="checkbox"/> Refute arguments from A2/A1 & rebuild arguments from N1 <input type="checkbox"/> Present other arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Support arguments with logic and evidence	
<b>Q &amp; A—Questions</b>							
<b>N1</b>	<b>N2</b>	<b>A2</b>	<b>A1</b>	<b>N2</b>	<b>N1</b>	<b>A1</b>	<b>A2</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Ask questions to clarify <input type="checkbox"/> Use questions to expose flaws in opponent's case <input type="checkbox"/> Capitalize on questions asked by the previous teams <input type="checkbox"/> Control time		<input type="checkbox"/> Ask questions to clarify <input type="checkbox"/> Use questions to expose flaws in opponent's case <input type="checkbox"/> Capitalize on questions asked by the previous teams <input type="checkbox"/> Control time		<input type="checkbox"/> Ask questions to clarify <input type="checkbox"/> Use questions to expose flaws in opponent's case <input type="checkbox"/> Capitalize on questions asked by the previous team <input type="checkbox"/> Control time		<input type="checkbox"/> Ask questions to clarify <input type="checkbox"/> Use questions to expose flaws in opponent's case <input type="checkbox"/> Capitalize on questions asked by the previous teams <input type="checkbox"/> Control time	
<b>Q &amp; A—Answers</b>							
<b>A1</b>		<b>N1</b>		<b>A2</b>		<b>N2</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Provide pertinent answers <input type="checkbox"/> Respond with tact and quick-wit		<input type="checkbox"/> Provide pertinent answers <input type="checkbox"/> Respond with tact and quick-wit		<input type="checkbox"/> Provide pertinent answers <input type="checkbox"/> Respond with tact and quick-wit		<input type="checkbox"/> Provide pertinent answers <input type="checkbox"/> Respond with tact and quick-wit	
<b>Summary &amp; Final Pitch</b>							
<b>N2</b>		<b>A2</b>		<b>N1</b>		<b>A1</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Organize & recap arguments from both sides <input type="checkbox"/> State reasons why the negative case sustains		<input type="checkbox"/> Organize & recap arguments from both sides <input type="checkbox"/> State reasons why the affirmative case sustains		<input type="checkbox"/> Finish summarizing arguments from both sides (reword N2's summary if necessary) <input type="checkbox"/> State reasons why the negative case sustains		<input type="checkbox"/> Finish summarizing arguments from both sides (reword A2's summary if necessary) <input type="checkbox"/> State reasons why the affirmative case sustains	

附件四：「全國高中英語辯論比賽區域賽與全國賽」流程表

**Tournament Timetable**

時間 Time	活動 Event	地點 Venue
8:30~8:50 am	參賽隊伍及評審報到 Reporting	自習教室
8:50~9:00 am	開幕式 Opening Ceremony	自習教室
9:00~9:30 am	辯士賽前說明 Explanation of Rules	自習教室
9:00~9:30 am	評審會議 Judges' Meeting	智慧教室
9:30~11:00 am	第一輪賽事、評審會議、評審講評與宣佈賽事結果 (政策性及非政策) Round One, Judges' Conference, Comments and Announcement of Results	賽事地點：班級教室
11:10~12:40am	第二輪賽事、評審會議、評審講評與宣佈賽事結果 (政策性及非政策) Round Two, Judges' Conference, Comments and Announcement of Results	賽事地點：班級教室
12:40~1:40 pm	午餐休息 Lunch Break	自習教室
1:30~1:35 pm	第三輪賽事配對公布與正反方抽籤 Announcement of Matchups and Drawing the Sides for Round Three	自習教室
1:50~3:20 pm	第三輪賽事、評審會議、評審講評與宣佈賽事結果 Round Three, Judges' Conference, Comments and Announcement of Results	賽事地點：班級教室
3:20~3:40 pm	賽事成績統計 Points Tabulation	自習教室
3:20~3:40 pm	評審會議 Judges' Meeting	自習教室
3:40~4:10 pm	綜合講座 Debate Seminar	演藝廳
4:10~4:40 pm	頒獎與閉幕式 Award Presentation and Closing Ceremony	演藝廳

**2020 年全國高中英語辯論比賽**  
**「英語辯論最佳指導教師獎」**  
**2020 High School English Debate Tournaments**  
**「English Debate Coach of the Year Award」**

為肯定各參賽隊伍指導教師的辛勞付出，並鼓勵指導教師們加入「臺灣高中思辨與英語論辯推廣計畫」（以下簡稱本計畫）的行列，共同為擴展臺灣高中英語辯論比賽的參賽版圖而努力，2020 年本計畫將首度於賽事中加入「英語辯論最佳指導教師」選拔，凡參加北中南英語辯論比賽區域賽隊伍的指導教師皆具角逐資格。

To commend the hard work of high school English debate coaches and to encourage them to join forces with “High School Critical Thinking & English Debate Promotion Project” (hereon as “The Promotion Project”), the “English Debate Coach of the Year” Award is first introduced in 2020. Coaches who participate in 2020 High School English Debate Regional Tournaments sponsored by the Ministry of Education are all eligible to compete for the award.

「英語辯論最佳指導教師獎」評選項目及其比重如下：

- 所指導隊伍於 2020 年區域賽中獲得團體獎 (up to 15%)
- 所指導隊伍於 2020 年區域賽中獲得個人獎 (up to 15%)
- 全程參加區域賽賽前會議 (5%)
- 2019 年協助本推廣計畫團隊舉辦英語辯論指導教師研習 (即新竹、屏東、桃園與新北等場次) (20%)
- 引薦從未參加本推廣計畫所辦賽事之學校成為 2020 年區域賽之參賽隊伍 (up to 30%)
- 其他 (如於 2019 學年度曾擔任校內外講者介紹英語辯論、成立英辯社團、擔任英辯社指導教師、開設英辯課程、安排賽前友誼賽、與他校結盟為英辯伙伴學校等等) (up to 15%)

Following are the evaluation criteria and their respective percentages:

- Team coached winning a team award in the 2020 regional competition (up to 15%)
- Team coached winning an individual award in the 2020 regional competition (up to 15%)
- Attending the pre-tournament meeting (full participation) (5%)
- Assisting in hosting English debate coach workshops held at Hsin-chu, Ping-tung, Tao-yuan, or New Taipei City as part of the Promotion Project in the 2019 school year (20%)
- Recruiting new schools to compete in the 2020 regional tournaments (up to 30%)
- Others (including, but not limited to, being an invited speaker on English debate, establishing and/or supervising English debate club, offering English debate courses, arranging interscholastic debate matches/practice, forming coalitions or partnerships with other schools, etc. in the 2019 school year) (up to 15%)

凡有意願參選之指導教師 (或有願意推舉指導教師競選的辯士同學)，請填寫下頁表格，並於所參加之區域賽結束後七天內將表格與相關證明寄至吳浩宇助理 ([mike870811@gmail.com](mailto:mike870811@gmail.com))。主辦單位將根據申請人在各評選項目上所列之紀錄與證明，給予評分，並依照參選人數多寡，選出一至三名為本年度「英語辯論最佳指導教師」獲獎人。

Coaches who would like to apply (or debaters who would like to nominate your coaches), please fill out the application form on the last page, and send it to Mike Wu at [mike870811@gmail.com](mailto:mike870811@gmail.com) **within 7 days in**

**wake of the regional tournament.** The tournament organizer, i.e., the Department of English, National Taiwan Normal University, will then review the applications, verify the proofs, and select one to three coaches (depending on the number of applicants) to be the recipients of the 2020 “English Debate Coach of the Year” Award.

「2020 年高中英語辯論比賽—全國賽」舉辦之兩週前，主辦單位臺師大英語系將於其系網頁公布獲獎名單，並以公文正式通知獲獎人服務學校。獲獎教師將受邀出席於 2020 年 6 月 6 日在中科實中所舉辦的全國賽，並於閉幕式時受獎。

The results will be posted two weeks prior to the 2020 National Tournament on the website of the Department of English, National Taiwan Normal University. An official missive will also be sent to the awardee’s school. The awardee will be invited to attend and receive the award at the closing ceremony of the National Tournament held by the Experimental High School at Central Taiwan Science Park on June 6<sup>th</sup>, 2020 .

**「英語辯論最佳指導教師獎」參選表格 / 「English Debate Coach of the Year」Application Form**

指導教師姓名 / Name of the Coach	
參賽學校名稱 / School Name	
參加賽事 / Participated Tournament <input type="checkbox"/> 北區 / Northern Regional <input type="checkbox"/> 中區 / Central Regional <input type="checkbox"/> 南區 / Southern Regional	
1. 指導隊伍於區域賽中獲得團體獎 / Team Award Won (up to 15%) <input type="checkbox"/> 是 / Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 否 / No 獎項說明 / Award Detail :	此欄位由主辦單位填寫
2. 指導隊伍於區域賽中獲得個人獎 / Individual Award(s) Won (up to 15%) <input type="checkbox"/> 是 / Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 否 / No 獎項說明 / Award(s) Detail :	
3. 是否出席區域賽賽前會議 / Attending Pre-tournament Meeting (5%) <input type="checkbox"/> 是 / Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 否 / No	
4. 2019 學年度曾協助本高中英語辯論推廣計畫舉辦「英語辯論指導教師研習」(即新竹、屏東、桃園、新北場次) / Hosting Debate Coach Workshop Affiliated with the NTNU High School Debate Promotion Project in 2019 School Year (i.e., Hsin-chu, Pint-tung, Tao-yuan, New Taipei City Debate Coach Workshop) (20%) <input type="checkbox"/> 是 / Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 否 / No	
5. 引薦從未參賽學校成為 2020 年區域賽參賽隊伍 / Recruiting New Schools to Compete in 2020 Regionals (up to 30%) <input type="checkbox"/> 是 / Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 否 / No 說明與證明文件 / Names of the School(s) you Recruited to Compete in 2020 Regional & Proof :	
6. 其他 / Others (up to 15%) <input type="checkbox"/> 是 / Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 否 / No 說明與證明文件 / Details & Proof :	
指導教師簽名	總分

註：證明文件請以附件方式連同本表格一併寄至 [mike870811@gmail.com](mailto:mike870811@gmail.com).

Please attach your written proofs to this form and email them to [mike870811@gmail.com](mailto:mike870811@gmail.com).

## 2020 POLICY DEBATE PROPOSITIONS

### NONPOLICY DEBATE (非政策性辯論)

#### **Resolved: Homework should be banned in secondary schools in Taiwan.**

Homework, an age-old practice, has stirred a new debate in recent years. Is homework a necessary evil that facilitates learning? Does it, by nature, encumber students more so than it helps them? What about its impact on those other than students? Here, “homework” is defined as an assignment given to a student to be completed outside the regular class period. “Ban” means “officially prohibited” and thus what is stipulated in the ban will have the binding power over teachers. “Secondary schools” refers to both junior and senior high schools.

As this is a non-policy debate, debaters do not need to come up with a concrete plan for how to ban homework or make the ban binding to secondary school teachers. Instead, they should focus on contending the reasons and proof for or against banning homework in secondary schools in Taiwan.

Following is a list of references to serve as a jumpstart, which means it is in no way comprehensive. Many of them also contain information or arguments that may not be directly relevant (but may still be related in some way to the proposition) or are not without flaws and thus warrant closer examination. So do exercise caution when reading and/or using them.

#### **Materials that take no particular side:**

Homework policy review: A case study of a public school in the Western Cape Province  
<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/0401/bbe0846471e4e248cef1c2c36881e4ed1cd2.pdf>

Pros and Cons of Homework (commonly seen arguments for/against HW)  
<https://vittana.org/20-pros-and-cons-of-homework>

What Research Says about the Value of Homework: At A Glance  
[http://www.ljc.ea.argyll-bute.sch.uk/uploads/files/1485174370what\\_researchers\\_say.pdf](http://www.ljc.ea.argyll-bute.sch.uk/uploads/files/1485174370what_researchers_say.pdf)

Does Homework Improve Academic Achievement? A Synthesis of Research, 1987–2003  
<http://upload-community.kipa.co.il/819201525856.pdf>

The Cult of Homework  
<https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2019/03/homework-research-how-much/585889/>

Time Students from Different Countries Spend on Homework  
<https://qz.com/311360/students-in-these-countries-spend-the-most-time-doing-homework/>

Why Homework Doesn't Seem to Boost Learning--And How It Could  
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/nataliewexler/2019/01/03/why-homework-doesnt-seem-to-boost-learning-and-how-it-could/#53925fa868ab>

作業的意義(Doc) (Google 關鍵字「壹、作業的意義」)  
本文含作業意義、功能、種類、設計原則等說明

中小學生學習問題的預防與輔導：以家庭作業為例  
張民杰(2014)。教育研究月刊，第 239 期，5-18。

本論文說明家庭作業對學生學習扮演的角色、探討家庭作業的意義和書寫沿革、分析家庭作業的正向功能與負面影響、教師應該如何指派、批改學生的家庭作業及輔導學生寫家庭作業。

爭論百年沒有定論 家庭作業對孩子是好是壞？(節錄自《學習超載世代：史丹佛研究團隊教你用對策略，培育健康成功的孩子》)

<https://udn.com/news/story/6898/3473731>

法國國小費廢除家庭作業之後

<https://kknews.cc/education/9nnkn8.html>

## **Materials that argue against homework:**

Why I Think All Schools Should Abolish Homework

<https://time.com/4740297/homework-should-be-banned-from-schools/>

Homework Is Different from Learning (the Philippines)

<https://www.rappler.com/views/imho/239185-homework-can-be-pointless>

Excessive Homework May Be Exhausting Students in Japan

<https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2019/08/17/national/media-national/excessive-homework-may-exhausting-students-japan-summer-vacation/#.XX0naS2B3ow>

瑞典中小學為何無回家作業

<https://opinion.cw.com.tw/blog/profile/320/article/3989>

家庭作業的迷思 《[The Homework Myth: Why Our Kids Get Too Much of a Bad Thing](#)》

## **Materials that argue for homework:**

The Homework Conundrum – What the research says

<https://www.westonschools.org/blog/2018/02/07/homework-conundrum-research-says/>

(At the end there are links to some additional research regarding homework)

Homework or No Homework? Maybe We're Asking the Wrong Question (Part 1)

<https://www.gettingsmart.com/2018/02/homework-or-no-homework-maybe-were-asking-the-wrong-question/>

Homework or No Homework? Maybe We're Asking the Wrong Question (Part 2)

<https://www.gettingsmart.com/2018/03/homework-or-no-homework-part-2/>

Research Spotlight on Homework

<http://www.nea.org/tools/16938.htm>

“No homework” Policy Is No Good (the Philippines)

<https://www.manilatimes.net/2019/08/31/opinion/editorial/no-homework-policy-is-no-good/608789/>

Should Homework Be Abolished? (Canada)

<https://www.universityaffairs.ca/news/news-article/should-homework-be-abolished/>

A Teacher's Defense of Homework

<https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2013/09/a-teachers-defense-of-homework/279967/>



## POLICY DEBATE (政策性辯論)

### **Resolved: Gender-neutral restrooms should be established in schools at all levels in Taiwan.**

The debate over whether transgender individuals should be allowed to use the public restrooms that correspond to their currently expressed gender rather than their biological sex has been of recent interest in the US and many other countries as well. Proponents of the gender-neutral restrooms stress the need to protect transgender people's equal right of access to public restrooms that are safe and comfortable. Opponents identify the need to public safety by mandating that individuals use the facility that corresponds to their biological sex. What are some other arguments for or against the controversy? This policy debate duly provides debaters a chance to explore the issue further. A gender-neutral restroom, simply put, is a restroom that can be used by a person of any gender or gender identity. Gender-neutral restrooms are also known as unisex, gender-inclusive, mixed-sex or all-gender toilets, bathrooms or restrooms. Although the controversy may well extend to locker rooms, changing rooms, and public restrooms, in this particular debate, restrooms refer only to those installed on campus, excluding locker rooms, changing rooms, and public restrooms. "Schools at all levels" refers to educational stages from pre-school to tertiary (or higher) education.

As this is a policy debate, both the affirmative and the negative have to address a comprehensive policy conceived for this proposition. Here is a word of caution: This debate tournament, aligning with "traditional" policy debate, prioritizes use of logic and evidence, and arguments from the pragmatic perspective, instead of something philosophical or derived from advanced debate theories or strategies. Thus, no kritiks are allowed in structuring the affirmative or the negative case, and the negative counterplan, if the negative decides to run one, has to be non-topical (meaning the counterplan cannot affirm the proposition) and non-conditional (meaning the negative cannot ditch their counterplan during the debate).

Following is a list of references to serve as a jumpstart, which means it is in no way comprehensive. Many of them also contain information or arguments that are not without flaws and thus warrant closer examination. So do exercise caution when reading and/or using them.

#### **Materials that take no particular side:**

Planning A Unisex Bathroom: The Pros, Cons & Practicalities  
<https://www.washwareessentials.co.uk/content/unisex-bathroom>

Should Schools Have Gender-Neutral Bathrooms for Transgender Students?  
<https://www.debate.org/opinions/should-schools-have-gender-neutral-bathrooms-for-transgender-students>

The Gender-Neutral Restroom Debate: Right or Privilege?

[https://www.mydoorsign.com/blog/gender-neutral-restroom-debate/?gclid=EAIAIQobChMI0pG19t\\_P5AIVVq6WCh1iZABLEAMYASAAEgLfPPD\\_BwE](https://www.mydoorsign.com/blog/gender-neutral-restroom-debate/?gclid=EAIAIQobChMI0pG19t_P5AIVVq6WCh1iZABLEAMYASAAEgLfPPD_BwE)

What's The Backlash Against Gender-Neutral Bathrooms All About?

<http://theconversation.com/whats-the-backlash-against-gender-neutral-bathrooms-all-about-57028>

The Transgender Bathroom Debate at the Intersection of Politics, Law, Ethics, and Science

<http://jaapl.org/content/46/2/232>

中性廁所

<https://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/中性廁所>

一場難以政治正確的「跨性別如廁之爭」

<https://theinitium.com/article/20160705-international-LGBTBathroom/>

## **Materials that argue against such restrooms:**

GLSEN 2017 National School Climate Survey (NSCS) - **Full Report**

<https://www.glsen.org/sites/default/files/GLSEN-2017-National-School-Climate-Survey-NSCS-Full-Report.pdf>

GLSEN 2017 National School Climate Survey (NSCS) - **Executive Summary**

<https://www.glsen.org/sites/default/files/GLSEN%202017%20National%20School%20Climate%20Survey%20%28NSCS%29%20-%20Executive%20Summary%20%28English%29.pdf>

Con: Gender neutral restrooms tough to implement

<http://theroundupnews.com/2016/05/22/con-gender-neutral-restrooms-tough-implement/>

A Bathroom of One's Own?

<https://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/18/opinion/a-bathroom-of-ones-own.html>

Here's Something: Women suffer when bathrooms are unisex

<https://www.pressherald.com/2017/11/13/heres-something-women-suffer-when-bathrooms-are-unisex/>

Unisex Toilets in Schools Should Be Avoided at All Costs

<https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/comment/unisex-toilets-in-schools-should-be-avoided-at-all-costs-9206081.html>

投書：性別友善廁所未必友善

[https://www.upmedia.mg/news\\_info.php?SerialNo=51755](https://www.upmedia.mg/news_info.php?SerialNo=51755)

雷倩／性別友善廁所真對性別友善嗎？

<https://forum.ettoday.net/news/613506>

## **Materials that argue for such restrooms:**

“Kicked out”: LGBTQ youths’ bathroom experiences and preferences

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5346479/>

What Does Research Suggest About Transgender Restroom Policies?

<https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2016/06/08/what-does-research-suggest-about-transgender-restroom.html>

Gender Identity Disparities in Bathroom Safety and Wellbeing among High School Students

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10964-017-0652-1>

Creating Gender-Inclusive Restrooms on Campus

<https://eab.com/insights/expert-insight/facilities/creating-gender-inclusive-restrooms-on-campus/>

To Those Who Oppose Gender-Neutral Toilets: They're Better for Everybody

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/dec/01/gender-neutral-toilets-better-everybody-rage-latrines-trans-disabled>

5 Reasons All Bathrooms Should Be Gender Neutral

<https://www.bustle.com/articles/163101-5-reasons-all-bathrooms-should-be-gender-neutral>

Gender-Neutral Bathrooms: Some Ways to Meet Everyone's Needs

<https://nccj.org/blog/gender-neutral-bathrooms-some-ways-meet-everyones-needs>

Public Bathrooms Are Gender Identity Battlefields. What If We Just Do It Right?

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/oct/03/public-bathrooms-are-gender-identity-battlefields-what-if-we-just-do-it-right>

School Officials Agree: Policies Protecting Transgender Student Do Not Compromise the Privacy or Safety of Other Students

<https://transequality.org/what-experts-say>

3 Myths That Shape the Transgender Bathroom Debate

<https://edition.cnn.com/2017/03/07/health/transgender-bathroom-law-facts-myths/index.html>

「性別友善廁所」為何？從政大通過設置辦法談起

<https://www.thenewslens.com/article/60861>

觀點投書：性別友善廁所 X 強暴迷思—回應雷倩

<https://www.storm.mg/lifestyle/76236>