| **Student Name:** Vania Wong |
| --- |

| **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: | 71 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Clear hook, but aim for high impact please!   * Good job signposting.   Well done calling out that Proposition did not define their metric of harmful content.   * After positing that it could also include mental distress to users, actively spend time burden pushing why the Proposition should defend these very low metrics of harm based on their own argument. * We shouldn’t end too early by just asking these questions, make a clear conclusion on why the lack of clarity is fatal for their case.   On whether liability should be imposed, I appreciate that we do have negative media coverage on Opp, this should be in the set-up.   * But simply discovering the abuse is not explaining why the backlash is strong enough to influence the companies to make the changes they need to make social media safer.   A lot of our rebuttals on spreading important information on social media is actually positive material that belongs in the arguments! Be mindful of repetition.  The counter set-up should come BEFORE the rebuttals:   * The claim that companies will just remove whatever content they don’t like as ‘harmful’ is a rebuttal, not the set-up. * Explain what are alternative mechanisms that will become a check-and-balance to companies implementing good content moderation policies.   + E.g. The free market and competition means there’s a race to the top to make these platforms safe for users. * Good job pointing out that users can report harmful content, but it’s unclear how effective this is.   On harmful content going underground, isn’t this infinitely better because the scale of exposure to the public is significantly reduced?  On your first argument:   * We need to spend more time on the mechanistic analysis as to why the companies will overly-censor even though their business model is reliant on it being highly accessible to users. * Good job highlighting the harms of over-censorship.   + On diversity, we need to explain why mainstream media engages in practices like coverage bias which silences the views of minorities.   + Characterise social media as the only space where social movements thrive.   + What is then the social costs of killing off social media? How does this impact discourse and democracy?   It isn’t clear why companies won’t just comply instead of resist the regulations.   * What is the incentive for them resorting to things like regulatory loopholes?   + Explain why companies will likely make more profit doing this, insert of complying. * Is this meant to be the 2nd argument? We need to make the structure more distinct.   Please offer more POIs in the debate.  7.55 - So close! Wait for the double bell. | | | | | | |