

「112 年全國高級中等學校英語文思辨簡報比賽」實施計畫與比賽辦法

一. 目的

- (一) 透過英語思辨簡報比賽，深化學生英語文表達及邏輯思辨能力，培養雙語溝通與思辨長才。
- (二) 辦理全國英語文賽事活動，鼓勵各地師生跨區校際交流與鼓勵活化專業群科及學程之雙語思辨教育。

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) 承辦單位：臺中市立沙鹿工業高級中等學校。

三. 參加對象

- (一) 公私立技術型、普通型及綜合型高級中等學校專業群科/專門學程學生始具參賽資格（即普通型及綜合型高級中等學校非專業群科/專門學程學生不具參賽資格）。
- (二) 每校以一隊為限，分應英組及非應英組，每隊包含三人，並至多可備取兩位選手，即每校可報名三至五人，含三位參賽選手及至多兩位備取選手。
- (三) 參賽隊伍上限為十六隊，如報名隊數未達上限，處理方式依序如下：
 1. 承辦學校可多報名一隊。
 2. 若承辦學校不報第二隊，開放其他學校報名第二隊。
 3. 若仍不滿十六隊，則以當時已完成報名之隊伍數進行比賽。
- (四) 每校參賽指導教師至少一位。指導教師請務必準時並全程參加賽前評審會議。

四. 簡報型式

簡報以英文進行，分為「指定題」與「即席題」兩部分。

(一) 指定題

主辦單位於賽前兩個月公布指定題目，指定題為一具爭議性題目，該爭議可與某一政策或日常生活相關。主辦單位將提供與題目有關之中文或英文書面參考資料，參賽隊伍亦可自行蒐集至多兩則文獻加以補強，並針對各資料進行統整與判讀，其後將其判讀結果轉化為(1)支持己方所選立場之論點及(2)針對對方可能提出之理由與佐證之回應，並以英文簡報形式呈現，[指定題簡報範例](#)請見

<https://shorturl.at/czINT>，請依循指定題書面參考資料及模版上之說明建構簡報內容。

簡報結束後，參賽隊伍將接受評審提問，為其立場辯護。指定題之參考提問請見指定題書面資料，評審提問將以參考提問為主，於必要時亦會就發表人回應內容，加入即席提問。指定題書面資料請見[附件一](#)。

(二) 即席題

比賽當天，完成指定題英語簡報之隊伍即刻進入即席題英語簡報。參賽隊伍將針對一則與日常生活中有關的英文資料進行判讀或評析，主辦單位會提供判讀或評析資訊中所含英文單字之單字表及簡報模版，幫助參賽者理解訊息內容並產出簡報。即席簡報題目可為以下兩種型式中的一種：

1. 資料判讀：參賽隊伍須針對某一訊息（如某類產品廣告、報導或其他文本），進

行批判性分析，且回答主辦單位之提問，並將問題之答案以英文簡報方式呈現。
[資料判讀示例題及含答案之簡報模版](https://shorturl.at/vxRT4)請見 <https://shorturl.at/vxRT4>，請參考模版上之說明建構簡報內容。

2. 證據評析：針對某一爭議，參賽隊伍須就主辦單位所提供之數則證據，決定立場，選出可支持該立場最具說服力之證據，並以英語簡報方式解釋選擇理由為何及為何淘汰其他證據。[證據評析示例題及含答案之簡報模版](https://shorturl.at/aptA5)請見 <https://shorturl.at/aptA5>，請參考模版上之說明建構簡報內容。

112 年簡報比賽即席題之題型為資料判讀，應英組與非應英組皆為同一主題與題型，但在題目所含訊息量上會稍作區隔，即應英組即席題所含訊息量稍多，非應英組即席題所含訊息量較少。另外，應英組要回答的題目亦比非應英組多出一、兩題。針對即席題發表內容與型式，參賽者可自行選擇是否要使用主辦單位所提供之模版，只要能確實回應即席題題目所問之問題，參賽者可使用模版架構論點，亦可自行設計簡報內容。

五. 比賽規則

(一) 比賽時間：上午 8:30 開始報到、8:50 賽前說明、9:15 開始比賽，遲到之隊伍視為棄權。

(二) 比賽方式：

1. 指定題部分之思辨英語簡報：

- (1) 簡報時間五分三十秒至六分鐘，超過六分鐘，每十秒響短鈴一次並扣總分一分，超過三十秒，響長鈴一次，長鈴響時須立即停止。發表時，三位隊員輪流上台，每人上台一次，三位隊員發表時間須盡量平均分配。簡報結束後，評審針對簡報內容與隊員進行至多四分鐘問與答，過程中有可能指定某位隊員回答，若無指定時，任一隊員可回答問題。回答問題時如有必要，隊員亦可彼此支援、補強答案。隊員可攜帶與簡報內容有關之書面資料上台，唯該資料只能於簡報後的問與答時使用，指定題簡報進行中，發表人不得使用備忘稿。
- (2) 各校隊伍上台順序由主辦單位事先抽籤決定並於賽事前三日中午 12:00 寄信告知。各隊出場順序以英文代碼呈現，如「A」為第一支上台隊伍、「B」為第二支上台隊伍，以此類推。隊員出場順序則以報名表上所填隊員順序為準，以 A 隊為例，第一位出場隊員將配戴標示「A1」之名牌、第二出場隊員將配戴標示「A2」之名牌，以此類推。

2. 即席題部分之思辨英語簡報：

- (1) 發表前各隊有一小時準備時間，可使用主辦單位提供或 PPT 內建之模板製作內容，參賽隊伍須獨立作業，並禁止使用電子產品。簡報時間三分鐘到三分三十秒，若時間不及三分鐘，每少十秒扣一分；超過三分三十秒，每十秒響短鈴一次並扣總分一分，超過三十秒，響長鈴一次，長鈴響時須立即停止。發表時，三位隊員輪流上台，每人上台一次，三位隊員發表時間須盡量平均分配。發表後無問答時間。如有需要，隊員可將即席簡報重點抄寫至空

白檢索卡上（空白檢索卡由賽事承辦學校提供）並攜帶上台，作為簡報進行中之備忘稿。

- (2) 即席題隊員上台順序由參賽隊員自行決定，並於發表前告知評審隊員上台順序，隊員進行即席題發表時仍應配戴與指定題相同之名牌，亦即即席題發表順序與隊員在指定題發表時即已配戴之名牌順序無關（假設隊員 A2 在即席題為第一位上台，仍配戴原 A2 之名牌），請勿自行調換名牌，造成主辦單位計分錯誤。

六. 賽事評審

賽事評審皆由主辦單位聘請，指定題與即席題各由三位具英語思辨教學專業背景之專家學者擔任評審。

七. 評分方式

本賽事雖以英語進行，但至為強調參賽者簡報內容是否充分展現其思辨能力，包含論點架構、字詞定義、假設分析、邏輯推理、證據判讀及偵測訊息疏漏等能力。指定題部分之英語簡報佔總成績 60%；即席題部分之英語簡報佔總成績 40%，兩項成績總和為賽事總分。

- (一) 指定題部分評分重點在於簡報論點及問與答中答案之清晰度與說服力，以下為指定題評分項目與比重（在此先以 100% 呈現，之後再將原始分數乘以 60%）：

簡報論點*	應答內容	組織方式	語言使用	表達技巧 (含團隊合作)
40%	20%	10%	20%	10%

*指定題簡報論點內容請依循指定題書面參考資料上之說明及簡報模版上之指示進行建構。

- (二) 即席題部分評分重點在於資料理解判讀和簡報內容解說是否清晰合理，以下為即席題評分項目與比重（在此先以 100% 呈現，之後再將原始分數乘以 40%）：

資料理解與判讀	簡報製作*與解說	語言與表達
40%	40%	20%

*即席題簡報論點內容請依循即席題及即席題簡報模版上之指示進行建構。

本賽事相關評分細項與級分見附件二。

八. 授獎項目

依照參賽隊伍數量，將分別從應英組及非應英組各取賽事總分最高前一至兩名為優勝隊伍，各組排名緊接其後之一至兩名者獲選評審團獎。針對表現優異之個人，主辦單位亦將視參賽隊伍數量，分別從應英組及非應英組各取一至三名獲頒「最佳簡報發表人獎」。

九. 指定題題目

Should secondary school students be strongly discouraged from using Generative AI Tools (for example, ChatGPT) for doing their homework?

十. 報名時間及方式

報名期限 112 年即日起至 112 年 10 月 18 日 (三) 中午 12 點止，請於線上填妥報名資料 (<https://shorturl.at/grS13>)，任何報名訊息異動，請自行在 112 年 11 月 1 日 (一) 中午 12 點報名系統關閉前完成。

十一. 比賽時間及地點

112 年 11 月 11 日 (六) —沙鹿高工 (433 台中市沙鹿區台灣大道七段 823 號)。

十二. 報名表及證明相關注意事項

報名表單上之正、備取選手皆可獲得參賽證明；比賽當天實際上場之選手可獲得團體獎項獎狀。獲獎隊伍未上場之備取選手在符合以下所有條件時，可由指導老師於賽後三天內主動向主辦單位提出授予團體獎獎狀申請：

- (一) 完成四分之三以上之訓練總時數。
- (二) 實際上場參與校內練習發表。
- (三) 協助指定題資料收集及簡報內容撰寫。
- (四) 除有正當理由以致無法出席，於比賽當天準時報到並全程參與。

十三. 賽事承辦學校聯絡人

與報名以外其他賽事相關問題，請洽：

沙鹿高工試務組張又仁組長

(聯絡資料：cedward@gs.slvs.tc.edu.tw，04-26621795#211)

十四. 攜帶物品

- (一) 參賽學生請務必攜帶身份證或學生證以查驗身分。
- (二) 參賽隊伍請事先將指定題簡報檔案存入自備之 USB 並將該 USB 攜帶至比賽會場，屆時直接讀取 USB 檔案進行簡報。自備之 USB 上僅能存有指定題發表之檔案。
- (三) 即席題準備時間可攜帶紙本字典，但禁止使用任何電子儀器查閱資料或閱讀其他紙本資料。參賽隊伍需將即席題簡報檔案存入與指定題相同之 USB，屆時直接讀取 USB 檔案進行簡報。

十五. 棄權處理與參賽規範

- (一) 選手個人棄權處理：
每一隊皆須有三位隊員，若該隊伍未能滿足本賽事一隊三人之規定，仍可進行比賽，但將只具角逐個人獎項之資格，而無法競爭團體獎項。
- (二) 隊伍棄權處理：
參賽隊伍若無充分理由，報名後棄賽之隊伍，主辦單位將衡量情事之嚴重性決定往後一至三年是否錄取該校參賽，並予以行文至棄賽學校。
- (三) 參賽隊伍或個人若有失參賽者風範之情事，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。

十六. 比賽場地注意事項

- (一) 比賽會場內沒有麥克風，主辦單位僅提供電腦播放簡報及簡報筆進行操作。
- (二) 即席題準備教室備有一台筆電 (但無網路連線) 供選手建構即席題簡報內容。

- (三) 即席題準備教室之筆電有下載英漢電子辭典軟體，可供選手查詢英文單字字義與發音。
- (四) 即席題準備會場會提供碼表供選手計時，選手不可自行用手機計時，也不可用手機查閱資料。
- (五) 教室內不得飲食，請勿攜帶食物入內。
- (六) 可進入比賽教室之觀賽人員為隊伍指導老師、帶隊老師與備取選手。
- (七) 比賽開始後，除承辦單位的工作人員外，禁止任何人員出入。
- (八) 為避免影響選手表現，比賽開始後請勿走動或交談，並請確實關閉手機。
- (九) 比賽進行中請勿鼓掌喧鬧。
- (十) 比賽期間，嚴禁指導教師與場上或尚未上場選手有任何交談、傳遞書面訊息或展示電子產品上所呈現資訊之行為。
- (十一) 比賽期間，由承辦學校負責錄影，同時亦開放參賽隊伍自行錄影；欲照相者，切勿使用閃光燈，以免干擾比賽之進行。
- (十二) 競賽場地（教室）待安排確認後，再行通知各參賽學校。
- (十三) 不開放參賽師生或賽事工作人員以外之人士觀賽。

十七. 主辦單位免責聲明

- (一) 參賽師生如需更動調整報名資料（僅能更改指導教師、參賽學生中英文姓名），請自行在報名系統關閉前完成。
- (二) 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。
- (三) 主辦單位亦視系統關閉前之報名資料為填表者（含指導教師及參賽正備取選手）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，將由指導教師及參賽學生自行負責，主辦單位將不予更正及補發。
- (四) 若因個人因素遺失證明或獎狀，則不予補發。

十八. 服儀規定及身分確認

為避免任何可能先設印象，所有比賽隊伍皆以主辦單位事先選定之英文代碼（而非校名）呈現。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。

十九. 備賽資源

本賽事所聚焦之思辨技巧可參閱臺灣高級中等學校思辨與英語論辯推廣計畫官網「相關資源」中的「技高雙語思辨教育教學資源」(<https://reurl.cc/WGOxDO>)。

2023 Study Guide

National High School Critical-Thinking-Based English Presentation Contest

“Should secondary school students be strongly discouraged from using Generative AI Tools (for example, ChatGPT) for doing their homework?”

Since the release of ChatGPT on November 30, 2022, people have looked for ways to integrate this artificial intelligence chatbot developed by OpenAI into many aspects of our lives. Almost immediately, whether students should use generative AI tools when doing their coursework becomes a controversial issue. While some view it as a tool to enhance students’ learning performance and better prepare them to work alongside AI systems as adults, others see it as a potential threat to learning and even the integrity of students, opening the door to more cheating and plagiarism.

What are some other arguments defending or opposing the use of AI by students? Do the benefits outweigh its costs? This contest allows students to explore this trending issue more broadly and deeply.

By definition, generative artificial intelligence is a type of AI technology that uses large language models and machine learning to create new content. Generative AI tools, such as OpenAI’s ChatGPT, Midjourney, or Google’s Bard, can produce various types of text, imagery, audio, and code. The term “strongly discourage” means that schools implement certain practices that restrict the use of AI tools, which may include but are not limited to policing and enforcement. Secondary schools refer to junior high schools and senior high schools in Taiwan.

As presenters, you should focus on proving and defending your reasons for or against the use of Generative AI Tools to complete homework. Strive to defend your viewpoint by presenting your arguments with strong reasons and sound evidence. You should also respond to one compelling reason on the opposing side in your presentation and explain why or how that concern can be put to rest. When making your case, you should arrange your content by following the organizational structure (see the template for the prepared presentation) suggested by the organizers of the contest and abiding by the principles governing a good slide presentation.

You are not required to create a concrete plan for how to ban or restrict the use of AI tools in secondary schools in Taiwan. However, you are advised to ponder on and address it if needed as a response to questioning from the judges that may take the opposing side’s viewpoint.

Following is a list of references that are meant to serve as a starting point for your research into the issue. It is by no means comprehensive or flawless. Many of the links also contain information or arguments that may not be directly relevant to the arguments you wish to make and thus warrant closer examination. You, as presenters, can also clip information from two additional references for the presentation but remember to cite the source when needed.

Helpful Links

This article explores why to think twice before using ChatGPT for help with homework.

<https://www.snexplores.org/article/chatgpt-homework-school-help-learning-ai-bot-mistakes>

This article discusses the growing concern over students using AI to cheat on homework. It is basic and easy to read. Written from the perspective of a student but written by AI.

<https://lhstoday.org/39127/news/growing-concern-over-students-using-ai-to-cheat-on-homework/>

This article looks into how tools like ChatGPT could threaten critical thinking skills.

<https://www.techbusinessnews.com.au/blog/chatgpt-may-lead-to-the-downfall-of-eduction-and-critical-thinking/>

Op-Ed: Don't ban chatbots in classrooms — use them to change how we teach. Differentiates between 'knowing' and 'thinking' and supports the use of AI in the classroom.

<https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2023-01-19/chatgpt-ai-education-testing-teaching-changes>

OpenAI scuttles AI-written text detector over 'low rate of accuracy.' Reports on the failure of tools designed to detect the use of AI in a submitted text. Nothing here is covered in other articles.

<https://techcrunch.com/2023/07/25/openai-scuttles-ai-written-text-detector-over-low-rate-of-accuracy/>

General overview. Interview of Orange County Dept of Ed administrator. Suggestions for implementation of AI in the classroom. General audience and not overly technical or difficult for students.

<https://newsroom.ocde.us/qa-exploring-the-pros-and-cons-of-chatgpt-and-other-a-i-generators-in-education/>

General overview with some pros and cons and quotes from teachers. It is very accessible to students and targets K-12 teachers as the audience.

<https://www.nea.org/advocating-for-change/new-from-nea/chatgpt-enters-classroom-teachers-weigh-pros-and-cons>

Basic overview. Not too long, more for a general audience, rather than an academic one. It should be accessible to vocational HS students. Bullet points.

<https://www.ie.edu/insights/articles/unpacking-chatgpt-the-pros-and-cons-of-ais-hottest-language-model/>

Questions for the Q&A Session After the Presentation

Below are some questions that might be asked during the Q&A session after your presentation, but other questions could also be asked to clarify your point.

Questions for those who are FOR using generative AI tools for homework:

- How can you be sure that students learn to think for themselves if they use AI for all their homework?
- When would be an appropriate time for students to learn to use AI resources to keep up with developing technologies?
- Please explain more on why/how _____ supports why secondary school students should NOT be banned from using AI Tools for doing their homework.

Questions for those who are AGAINST using generative AI tools for homework:

- If students don't learn to use AI now, won't they fall behind all the people who do learn how to use AI?
- What do you think might be lost from overusing AI tools in a person's education/life?
- Please elaborate further on why/how _____ supports why secondary school students should be banned from using AI Tools for doing their homework.

Questions for both sides:

- What is your most significant reason for/against supporting students using AI technology on schoolwork?
- Why did you choose that particular reason, out of many reasons, on the opposing side to respond to?

National High School Critical-Thinking-Based English Presentation Contest Rubrics for Evaluation

Prepared Session

Team Scores

Scoring Criteria	Points	Criteria Breakdown
簡報論點 (40%) Arguments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 36%~40% ● Good: 32%~35% ● Average: 28%~31% ● Inadequate: 24%~27% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Identify issue at hand <input type="checkbox"/> Draw a logical conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Employ strong reasons <input type="checkbox"/> Support reasons/the conclusion with concrete, dated and trustworthy evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Offer clear definition for keywords
應答內容 (20%) Responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 18%~20% ● Good: 16%~17% ● Average: 14%~15% ● Inadequate: 12%~13% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Respond to the point <input type="checkbox"/> Provide clear and logical answers <input type="checkbox"/> Handle tactfully and quick-wittedly questions to which the answers are not known
組織方式 (10%) Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 9%~10% ● Good: 8% ● Average: 7% ● Inadequate: 6% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Have a structure that includes the introduction, body and conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Employ appropriate transitions <input type="checkbox"/> Use a clear numbering system
語言使用 (20%) Language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 18%~20% ● Good: 16%~17% ● Average: 14%~15% ● Inadequate: 12%~13% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Have correct pronunciation <input type="checkbox"/> Have correct grammar <input type="checkbox"/> Employ terminology pertaining to argumentation and critical-thinking
表達技巧 (含團隊合作) (10%) Delivery (including Teamwork)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 9%~10% ● Good: 8% ● Average: 7% ● Inadequate: 6% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Enounce words clearly <input type="checkbox"/> Adopt an appropriate volume <input type="checkbox"/> Employ appropriate vocal emphasis <input type="checkbox"/> Use natural gestures <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain good eye-contact <input type="checkbox"/> Distribute the presentation evenly among the presenters <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrate good teamwork
TOTAL		

Individual Scores

Scoring Criteria			
Language (30%)	Delivery (30%)	Poise (15%)	Q&A (25%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 27%~30% ● Good: 24%~26% ● Average: 21%~23% ● Inadequate: 18%~20% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 27%~30% ● Good: 24%~26% ● Average: 21%~23% ● Inadequate: 18%~20% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 14%~15% ● Good: 12%~13% ● Average: 10%~11% ● Inadequate: 9% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 23%~25% ● Good: 20%~22% ● Average: 18%~19% ● Inadequate: 15%~17%

National High School Critical-Thinking-Based English Presentation Contest

Rubrics for Evaluation

Impromptu Session

資料判讀 Judgment of Information

Team Scores

Scoring Domain	Points	Criteria Breakdown
資料理解與評判 (40%) Comprehension and Judgment of Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 36%~40% ● Good: 32%~35% ● Average: 28%~31% ● Inadequate: 24%~27% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Understand the information correctly <input type="checkbox"/> Complete the assigned tasks evolving around the information with answers that demonstrate targeted critical thinking skills
簡報製作與解說 (40%) Presentation Slides & Elaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 36%~40% ● Good: 32%~35% ● Average: 28%~31% ● Inadequate: 24%~27% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Create clear slides that follow the template <input type="checkbox"/> Employ appropriate pace and vocal emphasis <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrate good teamwork
語言與表達 (20%) Language and Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 18%~20% ● Good: 16%~17% ● Average: 14%~15% ● Inadequate: 12%~13% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Have a good command of pronunciation and grammar <input type="checkbox"/> Deliver with an appropriate volume <input type="checkbox"/> Present with confidence and poise
TOTAL		

Individual Scores

Scoring Criteria			
Content (30%)	Language (25%)	Delivery (30%)	Poise (15%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 27%~30% ● Good: 24%~26% ● Average: 21%~23% ● Inadequate: 18%~20% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 23%~25% ● Good: 20%~22% ● Average: 18%~19% ● Inadequate: 15%~17% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 27%~30% ● Good: 24%~26% ● Average: 21%~23% ● Inadequate: 18%~20% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 14%~15% ● Good: 12%~13% ● Average: 10%~11% ● Inadequate: 9%

2023 National High School Critical-Thinking-Based English Presentation Contest

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 and bilingual critical-thinking education across disciplines and programs.
- 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: Taichung Municipal Sha-Lu Industrial High School
- III. Participating Teams
 - A. Only students from (1) vocational high schools and (2) vocational tracks/groups/programs in general high schools or comprehensive high schools are eligible to participate in the contest. **In essence, the contest excludes student participation from non-vocational tracks/groups/programs in general high schools or comprehensive high schools.**
 - B. Each school can send only one team to compete. Each team consists of 3 official presenters and up to 2 backup presenters. Teams consisting of students from applied English groups/programs will compete separately from teams consisting of students from other groups/programs.
 - C. The maximum number of school teams in the contest is 16. When the cap is not met, the following measures (in that order) will be taken:
 1. The hosting school may send in one more team to participate.
 2. When (1) fails, other schools registering in the contest can send in a second team. If more than one school wants to do so, the contest organizer will resort to lot drawing to decide which school can send in a second team.
 3. When both (1) and (2) fail, the contest will proceed with the number of teams that have completed the registration.
 - D. Each participating team is required to designate at least one teacher as the coach. All coaches are required to attend a pre-contest meeting (dates to be announced later).
- IV. Format of Presentation

The presentation should be conducted in English, and it contains two parts – a presentation on the “prepared topic” and a presentation on the “impromptu topic.”

 - A. Prepared Presentation:

The contest organizer will announce the topic for the prepared presentation 2 months before the contest takes place. The topic involves a controversy that could be policy- or everyday-life-related. The contest organizer will provide a study guide, containing both Chinese and English references, for the prepared topic. Participating teams are encouraged to (1) present their contentions and (2) respond to their opponents' contentions in their presentations by making use of the references in the study guide and 2 additional references if needed. See <https://shorturl.at/vxRT4> for an example of a topic for the prepared presentation. When constructing the slides for the prepared presentation,

please utilize the references in the study guide and follow the instructions on the presentation template given by the organizer. Following each team's presentation, judges will bring up questions concerning their contentions, during which participating teams will need to defend their respective positions. The questions posed by the judges will primarily be based on the study guide provided for the prepared topic. However, if necessary, the judges may also introduce impromptu inquiries based on the responses given by the presenters. See the Appendix I for the study guide.

B. Impromptu Presentation:

On the day of the contest, all participating teams will proceed with an impromptu presentation after completing the prepared presentation. All participating teams will interpret or analyze a written text (in English) related to matters of everyday life. The contest organizer will provide a word bank and presentation template to assist the teams in comprehending the text and constructing presentation slides. The topic of the impromptu presentation could take the form of one of the following two types:

1. **Judgment of Information:** Participating teams will conduct a critical analysis of the written text (e.g., a product advertisement, a news report, or text of other genres), answer questions from the contest organizer, and present their answers in their presentation slides in English. See <https://shorturl.at/vxRT4> for a sample topic of Judgment of Information and a presentation template with answers. When constructing the slides, please follow the instructions on the presentation template.
2. **Evaluation of Evidence:** Participating teams will (1) decide the stance taken by each piece of evidence provided by the contest organizer, (2) select the most convincing pieces of evidence in support of a particular stance, and (3) explain in English via their presentation slides why those pieces of evidence were selected and why other pieces of evidence were not selected. See <https://shorturl.at/aptA5> for a sample topic of Evaluation of Evidence and a presentation template with answers. When constructing the slides, please follow the instructions on the presentation template.

The topic for the impromptu presentation of the 2023 contest will take the form of Judgment of Information. Both applied-English and non-applied-English groups will be given the same topic and the same genre of text and will be asked to respond to the same questions. However, there will be a slight difference in the amount of information included in the text for the two groups, i.e., more information in the text for the applied-English group and less information in the text for the non-applied-English group. There are also slightly more questions to be answered by the applied-English group than by the non-applied-English group. Regarding the content and format of the impromptu presentation, participants have the freedom to decide to utilize the presentation template provided by the organizer or to come up with their own structure so long as they are able to answer the questions posed in the topic for the impromptu presentation.

V. Rules & Regulations

- A. **Time:** Sign-in at 8:30 AM, briefing on rules at 8:50 AM, and first presentation starting at 9:15 AM. Late-coming teams are automatically disqualified.
- B. **Format:**

1. Presentation on the prepared topic:

- (1) The length of the presentation should fall between five minutes thirty seconds and six minutes. Timekeepers will ring a long bell ring when six minutes are up, subsequent short rings for every 10 seconds over time, and a prolonged bell ring when it is 30 seconds over time. Upon hearing the prolonged bell ring, presenters should stop and get off the stage immediately. A point will be deducted for every 10 seconds over time. The three presenters from each team will take turns presenting on stage. Each presenter can only take the stage once. Speaking time should be distributed as evenly as possible among the three presenters. After the presentation, there will be a Q&A session between judges and presenters on the presented content for up to 4 minutes. The question may be directed to a specific presenter or to the whole team. Whenever necessary, presenters should supplement one another's answers when responding to the judges. Participating teams can bring on stage written notes related to the presentation, but those notes can only be used in the Q&A session. During the presentation, presenters are prohibited from using the notes.
- (2) The order of participating teams will be decided by the organizer through lot drawing and announced via email at 12 PM three days before the contest. Team orders will be shown by English alphabet (i.e., "A" as the first team to present, "B" as the second team to present, and so on). The order of speaking within each team follows the order on the online registration form filled out by each participating team. Taking Team A as an example, the first presenter on stage will wear the name tag that marks "A1", the second presenter will wear the name tag that marks "A2", and so on.

2. Presentation on the impromptu topic:

- (1) Each team will have one hour to prepare before giving their impromptu presentation, either working from the template given by the contest organizer or any of the built-in templates on the computer. The presenters should work on their own and are prohibited from using electronic devices during their preparation. Their presentation on the impromptu topic should last from three minutes to three minutes and thirty seconds. If the time is less than three minutes, every ten seconds will result in a deduction of one point. Timekeepers will ring a long bell ring when three minutes and thirty seconds are up, subsequent short rings for every 10 seconds over time, and a prolonged bell ring after 30 seconds over time. Upon hearing the prolonged bell ring, presenters should stop and get off the stage immediately. A point will be deducted for every 10 seconds over time. The three presenters from each team will take turns presenting on stage. Each presenter can only take the stage once. Speaking time should be distributed as evenly as possible among the three presenters. There is no Q&A session after the presentation on the impromptu topic. When needed, presenters can jot down key points from their presentation slides on blank index cards provided by the hosting school and bring them onto the stage as presentation notes.
- (2) The order of speaking is decided by each team. Each team needs to inform the judges of

their speaker order prior to their presentation. All presenters need to wear the same name tags worn previously in the presentation on the prepared topic regardless of their speaking order in the presentation on the impromptu topic. In other words, the number on the name tags has nothing to do with the speaking order in the impromptu presentation; it is simply for the identification and scoring of each presenter. (Assuming presenter A2 from the prepared presentation now speaks first in the impromptu presentation, that speaker should still wear the name tag that says “A2” instead of “A1.”) Switching name tags halfway through the contest will result in scoring errors (i.e., scores mismatched with presenters) and thus is strictly prohibited.

VI. Judges

Judges in the contest are all invited by the contest organizer. For both prepared and impromptu topics, the judging panel consists of three experts or scholars with professional backgrounds and knowledge in critical thinking and English presentation.

VII. Scoring System

This contest focuses on critical-thinking skills demonstrated by contestants in their presentations, including constructing arguments, discerning the meaning of words, detecting assumptions, pinpointing logical fallacies, evaluating evidence, and identifying missing information. The total score in this contest is the sum of the scores for the prepared topic (60%) and impromptu topic (40%).

A. The evaluation of the presentation on the prepared topic focuses on the clarity and persuasiveness of the arguments contained in the presentation and answers provided during the Q&A session. The following table shows the scoring criteria and their respective percentages for the prepared presentation. The raw score, on a scale of 100 points, will be multiplied by 0.6 to arrive at the final score for the presentation on the prepared topic.

Arguments*	Responses	Organization	Language	Delivery (Including Teamwork)
40%	20%	10%	20%	10%

*Please construct arguments for the prepared topic based on the instructions in both the study guide and the presentation template.

B. The evaluation of the presentation on the impromptu topic focuses on the presenters' comprehension, analysis, and evaluation/judgment of the given evidence/information and the delivery of their analysis and evaluation/judgment. The following table shows the scoring criteria and their respective percentages for the impromptu presentation. The raw score, on a scale of 100 points, will be multiplied by 0.4 to arrive at the final score for the presentation on the impromptu topic.

Comprehension and Evaluation/Judgment of Evidence/Information	Presentation Slides* & Delivery	Language and Delivery
40%	40%	20%

* Please construct arguments for the impromptu topic based on the instructions on both the given materials and the presentation template.

See the Appendix II for detailed scoring rubrics and criteria.

VIII. Awards

The top one to two teams ranked by their total scores from the applied-English and non-applied-English groups respectively, pending the number of participating teams, will be the Winning Teams; the one to two teams ranked after that from each group will be given Judges' Choice Award. The top one to three presenters ranked by their individual total score from each group, pending the number of participating teams, will receive the honor of "Best Presenter."

IX. Prepared Topic

To be announced.

X. Registration

Registration has to be completed on the website (<https://shorturl.at/grS13>) by 12:00 PM, October 18. Any revision to the registration has to be completed on the above website before the registration system is closed (12:00 PM, November 1).

XI. Date and Venue

November 11, 2023, Taichung Municipal Sha-Lu Industrial High School

XII. Notes on Registration Form and Certificate Issuance

Certificates of participation will be issued to all members on the registration form (i.e., official and backup debaters). Team award certificates (i.e., certificates of excellence) will be issued to the debaters who have presented on the day of the contest. However, coaches may request, within 3 days after the tournament, the issue of a team award certificate for backup presenter(s) who did not present on the day of the contest but have fulfilled all of the following criteria:

- A. Completed at least three-fourths of the total training hours.
- B. Participated in practice presentations.
- C. Contributed to the research of topic and drafting of presentation contents.
- D. Signed in to the contest punctually and attended the contest for the whole duration unless there are valid reasons for absence.

XIII. Contact

For any further questions (excluding registration-related matters), please contact Mr. Edward Chang of Taichung Municipal Sha-Lu Industrial High School at 04-26621795#211, cedward@gs.slvs.tc.edu.tw.

XIV. Required items

- A. Contestants must bring their Student or National ID cards for an identity check.
- B. Participating teams must bring a USB drive containing their prepared presentation slides. All teams will access their slides directly through their USB drives, which should only contain the slides for the prepared presentation.
- C. Printed copies of dictionaries are allowed during the preparation for the impromptu presentation, but references and electronic devices are prohibited. Participating teams will need to save their slides for the impromptu presentation to the same USB drive and access the file through it.

XV. Prohibitions & Penalties

- A. Individual drop-out:

There should be 3 presenters on each team. If, for some reason, a team has fewer than 3 presenters showing up at the contest, it may still proceed with the available presenters, but the team will not qualify to compete for team awards.

B. Team drop-out:

A team (school) that drops out of the contest with no legitimate reason will incur the penalty of being banned by the organizer from participating in the contest for one to three years. The organizer will also send an official missive to inform the school being banned of the penalty that is incurred.

C. All teams/contestants must not behave disrespectfully toward others, or the adjudication committee may take away their title, which will then be filled by the runner-up team/contestant.

XVI. Onsite Code of Conduct

A. There are microphones in the rooms where the presentations take place. Only computers and a laser pointer will be provided.

B. A laptop with no internet connection will be provided in the preparation rooms for the presenters to construct their impromptu presentations.

C. The laptops in the preparation rooms (one in each room) for the impromptu presentation are downloaded with an English-Chinese electronic dictionary for presenters to look up definitions and pronunciation of English words.

D. Stopwatch will be provided for timing. Presenters are prohibited from using their cellphones during the contest.

E. Eating and drinking are prohibited in the rooms where the presentations take place.

F. Only team coaches, teacher chaperones, and backup presenters can enter the contest venue as the audience.

G. Doors will be shut right after the contest begins. Any entry is forbidden except for staff members of the contest.

H. In order not to disturb the presenter, the audience is not allowed to chat and walk around during the presentation. One's cellphone should be turned off or switched to vibration mode.

I. Clapping is not allowed during the presentation.

J. The audience is not allowed to talk to the presenters in the front, nor are they allowed to pass over any information or materials in any form.

K. All presentations and Q&A sessions will be recorded by the hosting school. Participating teams can also record or photograph their own presentations, but should keep the flash off at all times.

L. Participating teams will be notified of the classrooms for their presentations once the information is available.

M. Access to observe the presentations is restricted to teachers and students from participating schools and contest staffers only. Individuals who are not part of the contest are prohibited from attending as the audience.

XVII. Important Clauses

A. Revisions/Corrections to the registration form can only be made about contestants' names (i.e., concerning the words or spelling of their names), the composition of teams, and orders of

speaking, and have to be completed before the online registration system is closed.

- B. Other than some uncontrollable factors, no changes can be made to the registration once the online registration system is closed.
- C. All the participation proofs and award certificates issued after the contest will be based on the information on the registration form at the time when the online system is closed, which will be taken as finalized by all participating schools, regardless of which individuals from the participating schools are responsible for filling out the form. For errors appearing on the proofs or award certificates that concern the participant's names, when proven not a result of a mistake made by the organizer, no proofs or certificates will be reissued.
- D. Proofs or certificates, when lost due to personal negligence, will not be reissued.

XVIII. Dress Code and Identity Check

All participating teams will be referred to with a team code assigned by the organizer. Contestants should be dressed in formal attire that is not their school uniforms and shall bring with them their student or national ID cards when signing in.

XIX. Relevant Resources

For relevant resources on critical-thinking skills, please refer to <https://reurl.cc/WGOxDO>.

Appendix I: Study Guide for the Prepared Topic

2023 Study Guide

National High School Critical-Thinking-Based English Presentation Contest

“Should secondary school students be strongly discouraged from using Generative AI Tools (for example, ChatGPT) for doing their homework?”

Since the release of ChatGPT on November 30, 2022, people have looked for ways to integrate this artificial intelligence chatbot developed by OpenAI into many aspects of our lives. Almost immediately, whether students should use generative AI tools when doing their coursework becomes a controversial issue. While some view it as a tool to enhance students’ learning performance and better prepare them to work alongside AI systems as adults, others see it as a potential threat to learning and even the integrity of students, opening the door to more cheating and plagiarism.

What are some other arguments defending or opposing the use of AI by students? Do the benefits outweigh its costs? This contest allows students to explore this trending issue more broadly and deeply.

By definition, generative artificial intelligence is a type of AI technology that uses large language models and machine learning to create new content. Generative AI tools, such as OpenAI’s ChatGPT, Midjourney, or Google’s Bard, can produce various types of text, imagery, audio, and code. The term “strongly discourage” means that schools implement certain practices that restrict the use of AI tools, which may include but are not limited to policing and enforcement. Secondary schools refer to junior high schools and senior high schools in Taiwan.

As presenters, you should focus on proving and defending your reasons for or against the use of Generative AI Tools to complete homework. Strive to defend your viewpoint by presenting your arguments with strong reasons and sound evidence. You should also respond to one compelling reason on the opposing side in your presentation and explain why or how that concern can be put to rest. When making your case, you should arrange your content by following the organizational structure (see the template for the prepared presentation) suggested by the organizers of the contest and abiding by the principles governing a good slide presentation.

You are not required to create a concrete plan for how to ban or restrict the use of AI tools in secondary schools in Taiwan. However, you are advised to ponder on and address it if needed as a response to questioning from the judges that may take the opposing side’s viewpoint.

Following is a list of references that are meant to serve as a starting point for your research into the issue. It is by no means comprehensive or flawless. Many of the links also contain information or arguments that may not be directly relevant to the arguments you wish to make and thus warrant closer examination. You, as presenters, can also clip information from two additional references for the presentation but remember to cite the source when needed.

Helpful Links

This article explores why to think twice before using ChatGPT for help with homework.

<https://www.snexplores.org/article/chatgpt-homework-school-help-learning-ai-bot-mistakes>

This article discusses the growing concern over students using AI to cheat on homework. It is basic and easy to read. Written from the perspective of a student but written by AI.

<https://lhstoday.org/39127/news/growing-concern-over-students-using-ai-to-cheat-on-homework/>

This article looks into how tools like ChatGPT could threaten critical thinking skills.

<https://www.techbusinessnews.com.au/blog/chatgpt-may-lead-to-the-downfall-of-eduction-and-critical-thinking/>

Op-Ed: Don't ban chatbots in classrooms — use them to change how we teach. Differentiates between 'knowing' and 'thinking' and supports the use of AI in the classroom.

<https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2023-01-19/chatgpt-ai-education-testing-teaching-changes>

OpenAI scuttles AI-written text detector over 'low rate of accuracy.' Reports on the failure of tools designed to detect the use of AI in a submitted text. Nothing here is covered in other articles.

<https://techcrunch.com/2023/07/25/openai-scuttles-ai-written-text-detector-over-low-rate-of-accuracy/>

General overview. Interview of Orange County Dept of Ed administrator. Suggestions for implementation of AI in the classroom. General audience and not overly technical or difficult for students.

<https://newsroom.ocde.us/qa-exploring-the-pros-and-cons-of-chatgpt-and-other-a-i-generators-in-education/>

General overview with some pros and cons and quotes from teachers. It is very accessible to students and targets K-12 teachers as the audience.

<https://www.nea.org/advocating-for-change/new-from-nea/chatgpt-enters-classroom-teachers-weigh-pros-and-cons>

Basic overview. Not too long, more for a general audience, rather than an academic one. It should be accessible to vocational HS students. Bullet points.

<https://www.ie.edu/insights/articles/unpacking-chatgpt-the-pros-and-cons-of-ais-hottest-language-model/>

Questions for the Q&A Session After the Presentation

Below are some questions that might be asked during the Q&A session after your presentation, but other questions could also be asked to clarify your point.

Questions for those who are FOR using generative AI tools for homework:

- How can you be sure that students learn to think for themselves if they use AI for all their homework?
- When would be an appropriate time for students to learn to use AI resources to keep up with developing technologies?
- Please explain more on why/how _____ supports why secondary school students should NOT be banned from using AI Tools for doing their homework.

Questions for those who are AGAINST using generative AI tools for homework:

- If students don't learn to use AI now, won't they fall behind all the people who do learn how to use AI?
- What do you think might be lost from overusing AI tools in a person's education/life?
- Please elaborate further on why/how _____ supports why secondary school students should be banned from using AI Tools for doing their homework.

Questions for both sides:

- What is your most significant reason for/against supporting students using AI technology on schoolwork?
- Why did you choose that particular reason, out of many reasons, on the opposing side to respond to?

Appendix II: Scoring Rubrics and Criteria

National High School Critical-Thinking-Based English Presentation Contest Rubrics for Evaluation

Prepared Session

Team Scores

Scoring Criteria	Points	Criteria Breakdown
Arguments (40%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 36%~40% ● Good: 32%~35% ● Average: 28%~31% ● Inadequate: 24%~27% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Identify issue at hand <input type="checkbox"/> Draw a logical conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Employ strong reasons <input type="checkbox"/> Support reasons/the conclusion with concrete, dated and trustworthy evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Offer clear definition for keywords
Responses (20%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 18%~20% ● Good: 16%~17% ● Average: 14%~15% ● Inadequate: 12%~13% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Respond to the point <input type="checkbox"/> Provide clear and logical answers <input type="checkbox"/> Handle tactfully and quick-wittedly questions to which the answers are not known
Organization (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 9%~10% ● Good: 8% ● Average: 7% ● Inadequate: 6% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Have a structure that includes the introduction, body and conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Employ appropriate transitions <input type="checkbox"/> Use a clear numbering system
Language (20%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 18%~20% ● Good: 16%~17% ● Average: 14%~15% ● Inadequate: 12%~13% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Have correct pronunciation <input type="checkbox"/> Have correct grammar <input type="checkbox"/> Employ terminology pertaining to argumentation and critical-thinking
Delivery (including Teamwork) (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 9%~10% ● Good: 8% ● Average: 7% ● Inadequate: 6% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Enounce words clearly <input type="checkbox"/> Adopt an appropriate volume <input type="checkbox"/> Employ appropriate vocal emphasis <input type="checkbox"/> Use natural gestures <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain good eye-contact <input type="checkbox"/> Distribute the presentation evenly among the presenters <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrate good teamwork
TOTAL		

Individual Scores

Scoring Criteria			
Language (30%)	Delivery (30%)	Poise (15%)	Q&A (25%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 27%~30% ● Good: 24%~26% ● Average: 21%~23% ● Inadequate: 18%~20% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 27%~30% ● Good: 24%~26% ● Average: 21%~23% ● Inadequate: 18%~20% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 14%~15% ● Good: 12%~13% ● Average: 10%~11% ● Inadequate: 9% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 23%~25% ● Good: 20%~22% ● Average: 18%~19% ● Inadequate: 15%~17%

National High School Critical-Thinking-Based English Presentation Contest

Rubrics for Evaluation

Impromptu Session

Judgment of Information

Team Scores

Scoring Domain	Points	Criteria Breakdown
Comprehension and Judgment of Information (40%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 36%~40% ● Good: 32%~35% ● Average: 28%~31% ● Inadequate: 24%~27% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Understand the information correctly <input type="checkbox"/> Complete the assigned tasks evolving around the information with answers that demonstrate targeted critical thinking skills
Presentation Slides & Elaboration (40%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 36%~40% ● Good: 32%~35% ● Average: 28%~31% ● Inadequate: 24%~27% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Create clear slides that follow the template <input type="checkbox"/> Employ appropriate pace and vocal emphasis <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrate good teamwork
Language and Delivery (20%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 18%~20% ● Good: 16%~17% ● Average: 14%~15% ● Inadequate: 12%~13% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Have a good command of pronunciation and grammar <input type="checkbox"/> Deliver with an appropriate volume <input type="checkbox"/> Present with confidence and poise
TOTAL		

Individual Scores

Scoring Criteria			
Content (30%)	Language (25%)	Delivery (30%)	Poise (15%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 27%~30% ● Good: 24%~26% ● Average: 21%~23% ● Inadequate: 18%~20% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 23%~25% ● Good: 20%~22% ● Average: 18%~19% ● Inadequate: 15%~17% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 27%~30% ● Good: 24%~26% ● Average: 21%~23% ● Inadequate: 18%~20% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Excellent: 14%~15% ● Good: 12%~13% ● Average: 10%~11% ● Inadequate: 9%