| **Student Name:** Hanna Zhang |
| --- |

| **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.]  Good job reframing this debate towards Opposition’s concerns on limiting free speech, but we’re still missing some linkages as to how a policy of fair content moderation will lean towards over-censorship.  – Good flag to say why hate speech can be persecuted under your world as well (but needs to be placed in the debate; why does this matter? How does it help your case?)   * On co-opting that the Opposition can do the same thing, be careful, we just said that censorship is bad. It’s better to clarify this later on in the set-up.   We should give the counter set-up BEFORE the rebuttals to clarify what exactly are you co-opting and how so.   * Explain what are alternative mechanisms that will become a check-and-balance to companies implementing good content moderation policies.   + The free market and competition means there’s a race to the top to make these platforms safe for users, e.g. X now has Community Notes to deal with misinformation online.   + Highlight that users can report harmful content, but it’s unclear how effective this is. * What is your winning pathway/burden?   On your first argument on cracking down on social media:   * Before asserting that discourse will be pushed towards centrism, we have to mechanise first how Proposition’s content moderation policy will filter out both ends of the spectrum! Why can’t they only remove strictly harmful content? Why is their definition of ‘harmful content’ excessive? * We are including the harms of social media cracking down on the views of minorities without first mechanising why Prop has to defend this to begin with. 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.   + Push that companies will resort to imperfect AI, because this is more cost-efficient for companies. * 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.   + We mentioned that social media is the only space where social movements thrive, but why?     - Explain why mainstream media is costly and have things like coverage bias which refuse to platform minority views.   + What are the social costs of killing off social media? How does this impact discourse and democracy?   Argument: harming discourse  – too many headings in title; you said: legitimacy of social media as well; which is a separate analysis bit  – this needs explicit illustration of what discourse are we losing (and why they matter, specifically)  – why is centrism bad, even if its pushed to that spectrum?  – marginalized groups using unpalatable language; why is it good or bad?  – I am still unclear why discourse matters too, why is it valuable?  – why is this a debate winning argument?  On your second argument on government abuse:   * This also makes it impossible for your Opp team to rely on the state to regulate these companies, if you disagree the state is a good faith actor in the debate. * This analysis of selective persecution is not necessarily unique to this mention, they can use any existing regulations for selective enforcement.   Argument: government abuse  – Why is this important if the government is affecting freedom of speech? Why does that freedom matter?  – Why would the government have the power to control corporations?  – Why will the corporations give in?  – Why does the government have the intent to control as well? Needs more characterization. Where does this apply?  Good job offering POIs.  7.32 - We are under-timed today, wait for 8 minutes. | | | | | | |