| **Student Name:** Emma Demopoulos |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would make social media companies liable for any harmful content made available on their platforms |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | **N/A** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Competition Score: | 70 | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 8 minutes’ long.]  We should signpost right after the hook!  On the set-up:   * Good modelling on severe financial penalties and negative media coverage. * Aside from the examples, we need to set a clear metric on what constitutes ‘harmful content’ on social media. * We cannot just assert that we won’t overly censor. How would we be able to tread the fine line of avoiding penalties without over-censoring?   + Are there any clear methods where social media companies can claim they have done their due diligence, so that they don’t have to resort to over-censoring? * Clarify your burden/winning pathway!   On the first argument of social harm:   * Explain the uniqueness of social media being the primary medium to disseminate information in modern society, before you argue that the content itself is harmful. * Why doesn’t the average user have the ability to consume this information without being influenced?   + It isn’t clear why the liability passes to the social media companies and the users who post the harmful information. Why is this the obligation of the platform? * We have to characterise the profit incentives of corporations to explain why they have devised the algorithm in such a way that specifically enables the harmful information to spread.   + The profit that social media gains from advertising is based on the number of views and engagement, thus they will develop echo chambers and encourage fake news to go viral in order to get more clicks.   + Point out that they don’t crack down because more engagement with controversial content will also bring in more money. So they let extremism fester online.   I appreciate the characterisation of bad media coverage to explain why corporations are more to comply with your policy.  It isn’t clear how severe these penalties are in relation to how much profit they can earn from allowing people to post whatever they want. The liability needs to be high enough so that social media companies do not choose to just absorb these penalties as operational costs.  Don’t give up when answering the POI!  On the social harms, it’s not enough to just say it exists. It should be nuanced to the unique capacity of social media as the main culprit of this level of harm.  On the usage of private data, we can explain that it’s the state of Proposition who would be more willing to crack down on corporate abuse.   * You don’t have to be opposed to more regulations.   We should have two distinct arguments as the first speaker!  Good job offering POIs in the debate.   * Excellent POI to the 2nd Opp.   7.55 - So close! Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |