| **Student Name:** Stephanie Kwok |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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.]  I like the rhetoric in the hook, but we need to link it back to the motion a little bit more. What role does social media even play in the midst of this harmful content, and how does it link to the policy of imposing liability on companies?   * We don’t have to quote specific legislations, we just have to hammer down the reason why corporations are given so much immunity amidst their role of perpetuating so much harm in the digital age. * On the hook, I am unclear what this is indicating on your prioritization or path to victory in the debate. * Signpost the rest of your speech after the hook please!   On the set-up:   * Good clarification that individual liability still remains in Prop’s world. * I appreciate the use of examples of what constitutes harmful content, but we need a very clear metric on what is the level of harm that needs to be reached before it will be removed from social media.   + Violation of established law etcetera are good clarification; but no need to spend so long on analyzing it (eg hate speech was spoken for roughly a minute or long), just flagging individuals are still held accountable is enough * On the punishment, good job threatening the potential suspension of business.   + However, bear in mind that greater deterrence means you have to concede that companies will lean towards over-censorship. * Effectiveness of report checking will increase, how? What measures will be taken?   + I am unclear what the strike system looks like   POI ANS: Sometimes illegal, sometimes legal is a smart answer. But it can just end there, or can at best in a line or two to explain the example. Remember what helps you win the debate.   * I appreciate the example of Pizzagate, but you need to be worried about the amount of time you’re spending here. The analysis on corporations receiving a lot of immunity belongs in the constructive argument.   Watch your time management, we should be entering the arguments by 02:30, as opposed to 5:15.  On your first argument:   * Good start with deterrence, but a better start should be the problem statement as to why companies were even turning a blind eye to harmful content. * “less harmful content”, how are you ensuring this exactly? Why will the profit-driven or more eye-ball catching algorithm have this sudden shift perfectly? * 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.   + For example, the profit that social media gains from advertising is based on the number of views and engagement, thus they will develop echo chambers to keep people engaged online and encourage fake news to go viral in order to get more clicks. This explains why the algorithm is deliberately faulty.   + Point out that they don’t crack down on this harmful information because more engagement with controversial content will also bring in more money. So they let extremism fester online. * On social media being integral to the lives of younger generations, 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, instead of the sole liability of the users who post the harmful information. Explain that it’s easy for individual users to hide their digital footprint and personal identities, so we have to force companies to have better content moderation policies in order to have any success in eliminating harmful online content.   We are stopping too early by just outlining the potential harms, we need to characterise the severity of harm and layer it across different aspects of society.  I am unclear of clear comparatives at the end of the speech. What does this social media platform now look like? How do conversations change? Help me imagine it through illustrations.  Please offer more POIs today!  8.11 - Good timing. | | | | | | |