

The 19th "Dutch Lions & Chinese Dragons" Online Exchange Program between GCUT and NHL-Stenden

"DEBATE, DISCOVER, DELIGHT" (draft)

第19届“中国龙·荷兰狮”线上跨文化学术交流活动日程表（拟）

Monday June 7th 6月7日（星期一）	Tuesday June 8th 6月8日（星期二）	Wednesday June 9th 6月9日（星期三）	Thursday June 10th 6月10日（星期四）	Friday June 11th 6月11日（星期五）
<p>Online Opening Ceremony 线上开幕式 15:00-15:20</p> <p>Introduction of the Program and the Schedule+drawing lots 活动介绍+抽签 15:20-16:00</p>	<p>Introduction of the Debate Contest 活动简介 15:00-15:10</p> <p>1st Round Debate Contest 1 首轮辩论赛（一） (每场 45mins 辩论赛+15mins 复盘) 15:10-16:10</p>	<p>Introduction of the Debate Contest 活动简介 15:00-15:05</p> <p>Semi-final Debate Contest 1 辩论赛半决赛（一） 15:05-16:05</p>	<p>Intercultural Workshop 2: Chinese Culture 跨文化交流课（二） 中国文化 15:00-16:30</p>	<p>Introduction of the Debate Contest 活动简介 15:00-15:05</p> <p>Final Debate Contest 辩论赛决赛 15:05-16:05</p>
<p>Ice Breaking 破冰活动 16:00-16:25</p>	<p>1st Round Debate Contest 2 首轮辩论赛（二） 16:20-17:20</p>	<p>Semi-final Debate Contest 2 辩论赛半决赛（二） 16:10-17:10</p>	<p>Introduction of GCUT and NS and their international programs 两校国际项目及专业特色介绍及分享 16:31-17:00</p>	<p>Closing Ceremony 闭幕式 16:10-17:00</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feeling sharing 感想报告 16:10-16:35 - Awarding and sharing 颁奖仪式/获奖感言 16:36-17:00
<p>Intercultural Workshop 1: Dutch Culture 跨文化交流工作坊（一） 荷兰文化 16:30-18:00</p>	<p>1st Round Debate Contest 3 首轮辩论赛（三） 17:25-18:25</p> <p>1st Round Debate Contest 4 & The announcement of winners of the 1st round and topics of semi-final Debate 首轮辩论赛（四）和第一轮晋级结果公布 18:30-19:30</p>	<p>Preparation of the Final Contest: 决赛准备: Announcement of the two winner teams and topic of final contest 宣布晋级的两个组和决赛的辩论题目 17:20-17:30</p>	<p>Online Show time 线上才艺表演 17:01-18:00</p>	
<p>Group Discussion 小组讨论 20:00-21:30 CN / 14:00-15:30 NL</p>				

Rules of Debate:

辩论赛规则:

- ◆ There are 3 rounds in total in the contest: the first round, the semi-final and the final. The contest is set as a single-elimination, which the loser of each match-up will be immediately eliminated from the contest. Winners will advance into the next round, until the final match-up.

本次辩论赛共设 3 轮，分别为首轮、半决赛、决赛，赛制为单败淘汰制，负者淘汰出局，胜者晋级下一轮。

- ◆ There are 8 teams with a total of 32 contestants, each consisting of 2 students from GCUT and 2 students from NHL-Stenden. Each team has 1-2 substitutes, the exact personnel arrangement will be decided by team members internally.

本次辩论赛共设 8 个参赛队伍，每队 4 人，每个队伍中包含中荷双方学生各 2 人，共 32 名参赛选手。每队增加 1-2 名候补选手，具体出场人员由组员内部自行决定。

- ◆ Four teachers will be participating in the contest, ideally 2 from GCUT and 2 from NHL-Stenden. Each teacher is responsible for coaching 2 teams and hosting 2 debate match-ups.

本次辩论赛共有 4 名教师参与，中荷双方教师各 2 人，每位教师负责指导两个参赛队伍。教师的职责包括指导参赛队伍、主持辩论赛等。

- ◆ The judges of each match-up are composed of teachers, contestants who are not the participators of the current match-up, and audience. The score given by the teachers, contestants, and audience accounts for 40%, 30% and 30% of the final scores respectively.

本次辩论赛评委由教师、非本场参赛选手、观众组成，其中分数占比为教师评委 40%，非本场参赛选手投票 30%，观众投票 30%。

- ◆ The specific process of the debate is attached in Appendix 1.

本次辩论赛的具体流程如附录一所示。

- ◆ The debate grading rubric is attached in Appendix 2.

本次辩论赛的评分表如附录二所示。

Appendix 1: The Process of the Debate Contest

附录 1 辩论赛流程:

The contest is divided into 4 phases: statement, rebuttal and cross-examination, free debating, and summary. Net debating time is 43 minutes.

赛制设置分陈词阶段、驳论和询问阶段、自由辩论阶段、总结陈词共计 4 个环节。净比赛时间 43 分钟。

Phase 1: Statements (12 minutes in total)

1. 陈词阶段 (共 12 分钟)

- 1) 1st affirmative gives a constructive statement (3 mins);
由正方一辩开篇立论, 时间为 3 分钟;
- 2) 4th negative questions 1staffirmative (1.5 mins), 1staffirmative responds (1.5 mins);
由反方四辩对正方一辩进行询问, 正方一辩回答, 时间各为 1 分半钟;
- 3) 1st negative gives a constructive statement (3mins);
由反方一辩开篇立论, 时间为 3 分钟;
- 4) 4thaffirmative questions 1st negative (1.5 mins), 1st negative responds (1.5 mins).
由正方四辩对反方一辩进行询问, 反方一辩回答, 时间各为 1 分半钟。

Phase 2: Rebuttal& Cross-examination (16 minutes in total)

2、驳论和提问阶段 (共 16 分钟)

- 1) 2nd affirmative rebut 1st negative (2mins)
正方二辩针对反方一辩的观点进行驳论, 时间为 2 分钟;
- 2) 2nd negative rebut 1st affirmative (2mins)

反方二辩针对正方一辩的观点进行驳论，时间为 2 分钟；

- 3) 3rd affirmative cross-examines arbitrary negative debater (except for the 3rd negative), each speech should not exceed 1.5 min (6 mins);

正方三辩提问反方任意辩手（除反方三辩），双方单次发言时间不超过 1.5 分钟，时间为 6 分钟；

- 4) 3rd negative cross-examines arbitrary affirmative debater (except for the 3rd affirmative), each speech should not exceed 1.5 min (6 mins).

反方三辩提问正反任意辩手（除正方三辩），双方单次发言时间不超过 1.5 分钟，时间为 6 分钟。

Phase 3: Free debating (9 minutes in total)

3、自由辩论阶段（共 9 分钟）

The affirmative team speaks first, then take turns to speak. Each speech should not exceed 1.5 mins. Once a party finishes the speech, the other party could choose to respond or give up for the current turn, 9 mins in total.

由正方开始发言，随后轮流发言。单次发言时间不超过 1.5 分钟。一方发言结束，另一方可选择继续发言，也可以放弃本轮发言，共计 9 分钟。

Phase 4: Summary (6minutes in total)

4、总结陈词阶段（共 6 分钟）

- 1) 4th negative gives a summary speech (3 mins);

由反方四辩进行总结陈词发言，时间为 3 分钟；

- 2) 4th affirmative gives a summary speech (3 mins).

由正方四辩进行总结陈词发言，时间为 3 分钟。

Appendix 2: Debate grading rubric

Levels of Performance for AFFIRMATIVE Team (正方打分表)

Criteria	4	3	2	1	Grade:
<p>1. Organization & Clarity:</p> <p>Main arguments and responses are outlined in a clear and orderly way.</p>	Completely clear and orderly presentation	Mostly clear and orderly in all parts	Clear in some parts but not overall	Unclear and disorganized throughout	
<p>2. Use of Argument:</p> <p>Reasons are given to support the resolution</p>	Very strong and persuasive arguments given throughout	Many good arguments given, with only minor problems	Some decent arguments, but some significant problems	Few or no real arguments given, or all arguments given had significant problems	
<p>3. Use of cross-examination and rebuttal:</p> <p>Identification of weakness in Negative team’s arguments and ability to defend itself against attack.</p>	Excellent cross-exam and defense against Negative team’s objections	Good cross-exam and rebuttals, with only minor slip-ups	Decent cross-exam and/or rebuttals, but with some significant problems	Poor cross-exam or rebuttals, failure to point out problems in Negative team’s position or failure to defend itself against attack.	
<p>4. Presentation Style:</p> <p>Tone of voice, clarity of expression, precision of arguments all contribute to keeping audience’s attention and persuading them of the team’s case.</p>	All style features were used convincingly	Most style features were used convincingly	Few style features were used convincingly	Very few style features were used, none of them convincingly	
					TOTAL SCORE: _____

Levels of Performance for NEGATIVE Team (反方打分表)

Criteria	4	3	2	1	Grade:
<p>1. Organization & Clarity:</p> <p>Main arguments and responses are outlined in a clear and orderly way.</p>	Completely clear and orderly presentation	Mostly clear and orderly in all parts	Clear in some parts but not overall	Unclear and disorganized throughout	
<p>2. Use of Argument:</p> <p>Reasons are given against the resolution</p>	Very strong and persuasive arguments given throughout	Many good arguments given, with only minor problems	Some decent arguments, but some significant problems	Few or no real arguments given, or all arguments given had significant problems	
<p>3. Use of cross-examination and rebuttal:</p> <p>Identification of weakness in Affirmative team's arguments and ability to defend itself against attack.</p>	Excellent cross-exam and defense against Affirmative team's objections	Good cross-exam and rebuttal, with only minor slip-ups	Decent cross-exam and/or rebuttal, but with some significant problems	Poor cross-exam or rebuttal, failure to point out problems in Affirmative team's position or failure to defend itself against attack.	
<p>4. Presentation Style:</p> <p>Tone of voice, clarity of expression, precision of arguments all contribute to keeping audience's attention and persuading them of the team's case.</p>	All style features were used convincingly	Most style features were used convincingly	Few style features were used convincingly	Very few style features were used, none of them convincingly	
					TOTAL SCORE: <hr/>