| **Student Name:** Charles Wang |
| --- |

| **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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Good use of the George Floyd grounding and why the social movement was uniquely catalysed via citizen journalism, and not mainstream media. Can we tack on precisely why mainstream media cannot showcase these videos?  On the counter set-up:   * The characterisation of Twitter’s Community Notes should be up here in the set-up to mitigate the harms of harmful information online.   + The fact-checking mechanism is definitely a set-up, add on ALL of the content regulation policies that exist in status quo to defend your comparative. * Good low-hanging fruit burden for Opp.   Good job calling out that Prop focuses on the most extreme of users, rather than the average. But can we characterise why MOST users are quite responsible with how they use social media?   * Highlight what are the mechanisms online that make it easy for users to differentiate between credible and non-credible sources.   + E.g. Youtube requires online doctors to display their actual license and certifications.   + 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.   While I appreciate that most social media platforms do not have monetisation, the platform itself makes money from advertising when this content has high clicks and engagement!  We have to call out that none of the harms from Prop regarding bias are exclusive!   * Point out that mainstream media also have very clear biases, regardless of Prop’s checks and balances when it comes to reporting credibility. * We should then reposition social media as a safety net and a back-up to mainstream media. * And then engage with Prop’s best case scenario of users EXCLUSIVELY consuming social media news to the exclusion of mainstream news.   On the first argument:   * Well done characterising the nature of social media that makes it easy for them to overcome any media crackdown on mainstream media.   + Good mechanistic analysis as well as integration with the Arab Spring example. * We spent a little too long on the examples of news media having biased coverage for a lot of these conflicts, rather than the institutional reasons WHY the business model of mainstream media is like this, and why they will never change. * On the impacting, why is it even important to pressure your country to do things for other foreign actors?   On the second argument:   * Can you tell me WHY mainstream media cannot cover explicit content?   + I need you to explain why they have coverage bias, and not just assert it! We have to explain their business model. * We didn’t have time to impact this argument.   We are not being entirely comparative. I believe all of your mechanistic analysis on why mainstream media is flawed, but we’re not necessarily comparing it to the biases of citizen journalists.   * Nor is it clear why only social media will have better accountability mechanisms, when Prop highlighted 3 reasons why mainstream media is more accountable.   Please offer more POIs today!  8.18 | | | | | | |