| **Student Name:** Isabella Chau |
| --- |

| **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.]  Nice start clarifying that you agree with the problem statement, just not the model.   * Rather than highlight that criminals will still be criminals, we should’ve inserted the countermodel on companies taking their own initiatives to limit their ability to do this.   + Because even if criminals can commit crimes outside of social media, it is specifically the social networking sites that give them the SCALE in which they can conduct their crimes successfully.   On shifting criminal liability to individuals, it is still the case that the state will criminalise their actions!   * So it isn’t clear why Proposition cannot co-opt all of these measures, and enjoy the bonus of also punishing social media companies.   + To make this exclusive, explain properly that the companies will have an incentive to hide the fact that this content exists and not cooperate with law enforcement agencies to also prevent prosecution themselves.   We are combining rebuttals, arguments and counter set-up throughout our speech!   * We need proper signposting and separating these contents. The speech itself became very repetitive by the end of it, and not mutually exclusive.   We should have analysed why the companies already have an incentive to crack down on criminal content, without the additional penalty.   * Explain that they also want users to experience user safety, so they will do the right measures without their policy.   + Then co-opt all of Prop’s benefits.   The correct argument is explaining that liability will actively destroy social media because the companies will crack down on user privacy and the sharing of information.  Please offer more POIs today!  6.05 | | | | | | |