| **Student Name:** Alex Zhu |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would hold social media companies liable for any criminal content hosted on their websites |
| --- |

| 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 6 minutes’ long.]  Solid start with identifying the problem statement in the hook, but take your time establishing its severity instead of swiftly moving on to the set-up.   * We also need to signpost before the set-up.   On the set-up:   * Good clarity in the definition of what composes criminal content. * Instead of limiting liability to just a hefty fine, you can add more punitive tools such as suspension of their business license.   + Interesting exception to exclude private messaging, but a lot of criminal syndicates do exclusively communicate via private messaging! This limits the effectiveness of your policy as well. * Don’t forget a burden in the set-up.   On the scale of social media, give some facts/grounding on truly how widely accessible social media is and the number of people who are on it.  Why are current measures ineffective in dealing with this problem? Why do we have to go this far?   * Explain that social media companies have an incentive to encourage more content because more users means more profit. * The companies also like radical content because it farms more engagement so advertisers pay them more money. * Thus, the incentives don’t align with the status quo.   On garnering bad press being a disincentive, does this differ with the bad press they get from farming the criminal content anyways?   * Explain that uniquely it’s the state punishment that will generate a media circus for them.   On profit disincentive, go ahead and contrast how big the fine is versus the potential profit of more users and engagement.  A lot of the harm statements are not necessarily contention!   * Instead, focus on contextualising it to social media and explain why organised syndicates have very little options for success outside of social media. It’s difficult to scam people in other places when you have no means of finding or contacting them directly.   Good job offering POIs in the debate!  5.35 - We are undertimed! Spend time summarising to hit 6. | | | | | | |