| **Student Name:** Dominic Gao |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house regrets the rise of citizen journalism |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | **N/A** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Competition Score: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 8 minutes’ long. ]  Rather than rely on just a theoretical example, we can use the real example of the Boston bombings like we discussed in class, so the severity of harm becomes even more compelling.   * Good job signposting.   On the set-up:   * On the definition, rather than just repeat the info slide on what citizen journalism is, we should provide examples and illustrations. Good job highlighting the lack of professional qualifications.   + Remove all of the argumentative stuff on making up fake news and it spreads faster, this doesn’t belong in the set-up.   + Strategically, we should add that people who consume news on social media do so EXCLUSIVELY, so Opp’s check and balances of when users consume BOTH social media and mainstream media often do not work. * We can use the strategy of Proposition having both on our side, but we don’t support the RISE of citizen journalism. So it won’t be the most dominant source of news on Prop. * We need to build your counterfactual!   + What are mechanisms in place in the status quo to improve the quality of mainstream media?     - Good job highlighting that they care about their reputation, add on to this!       * Explain the scale of investments, so they have to be careful, or that other media organisations can call them out due to competition.   We don’t have a clear division between the set-up and arguments, it all bleeds together because the set-up was so argumentative.   * We should also enter the argument by 03:00, instead of 04:30!   On the first argument:   * We end up being repetitive on the lack of qualifications of journalists, and the accountability mechanisms of mainstream media, because it was argued in the set-up! * We need to point out that even though bias and bad reporting isn’t exclusive, social media has nothing to answer for the lack of credibility and training of online journalists.   + Spend more time on the mechanistic analysis of why mainstream media is innately more credible! E.g. investments, reputation, call-outs, etc.   + Can we add some grounding to showcase the difference in how social media vs mainstream media reports things? E.g. Boston bombing where social media spread false information on the identity of the bomber and led to vigilante justice vs mainstream media did not report the alleged whistleblowing. * Add more characterisation on why fake news goes more viral, rather than just say it spreads fast. Spend time explaining the algorithms on social media.   + We need to acknowledge that this kind of bias, radicalism and echo chamber is actually not exclusive; then move on to the nuanced difference.     - I.e. In mainstream media, these biases are KNOWN. So we know to consume the information with a grain of salt. Versus there is no documented evidence of the biases of online journalists.     - Otherwise, everything here is not exclusive. * What is the importance of saying any of these points on misinformation?   + We need to relate the role this discourse plays in politics and social movements.   + Spend time criticising users and why they don’t engage in responsible consumer behaviour and low media literacy.   The argument on investigative journalism not being exclusive was randomly thrown in there at the end.   * While we’re doing well at mitigating, it isn’t clear how we are tipping the scales in the larger comparison.   The whole speech needs to be more comparative to your counterfactual! A lot of these harms are not entirely exclusive, so we have to refocus it to the parts that are.  Please offer more POIs today!  8.00 - Good timing. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Audrey Lai |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house regrets the rise of citizen journalism |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Competition Score: | 72 | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 7 minutes’ long. ]  I like the rhetoric in the hook!  Well done calling out that none of the harms from Prop are exclusive.   * While there is no institutional bias, it doesn’t mean that each user does not have their OWN biases. * If you defend that social media platforms have strict content regulation, this will also undercut your benefits of accessibility and participation! * I appreciate the above mitigations, but it also doesn’t tip the scale as to why mainstream media is necessarily worse than social media.   + Good use of the example of Trump dominating Fox News.   Our defense of social media also ends very early by just saying things like people COULD double check/call out, but not explaining why the majority WILL double check the facts and call out bad information.  Good job reinforcing accessibility:   * But why was accessibility even a huge stumbling block when it comes to the consumption of news? * Good reasoning that certain journalists and news are gatekept away from mainstream media. Explain why this level of participation is necessary to fulfill the goals of news media.   + Expand the impacting on why social movements exclusively thrive on social media.   Well done repositioning social media as a back-up to mainstream media.   * But engage with Prop’s best case scenario of users EXCLUSIVELY consuming social media news to the exclusion of mainstream news.   + How do you prove that these social media users have some amount of media literacy and initiative?     - Recharacterise the world to a post-Cambridge Analytica world where there’s a high degree of political consciousness and high scrutiny on social media platforms.   The argument on persecuted groups needing citizen journalism is a great claim!   * Be clear and explain that the decentralised nature is the difference between state censorship on either side, even though censorship is not exclusive. * Good characterisation on the low barriers of entry that allows minorities to thrive.   + Spend time on the big picture comparisons on how this reverses the structural disenfranchisement of these minorities because of the great power/influence of the media.   You can offer more POIs today!  7.22 | | | | | | |