| **Student Name:** Daryl Ng |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would make social media companies liable for any harmful content made available on their platforms (e.g. drug dealing, Jan 6 riots, misinformation, etc.) |
| --- |

| 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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  Prevalence is insufficient for the burden you have; the burden is why these companies specifically should be liable, as opposed to any other actor. The role that they play is what must be prominent in your speech.  Set-up - our framing didn’t add strategic value, and just prolonged our set-up, making it far too long.   * How will we hold them liable? What mechanisms exist in the model that allow us to crack down on this? Why is it social media specifically? * Analysing the prevalence, once more, is not strategic - the cause of misinformation, and the role of companies in perpetuating this through the platform architecture, such as algorithms and content narrowing, is what you must focus on. * Definitions? Why are we literally defining the key words in the motion? Set a metric or standard for harm, rather than using examples to establish the parameters - use this to illustrate the parameters instead. * We eventually talk about some mechanisms, such as tax and other penalties. Explain why there will be buy-in to this - but in the ARGUMENT, not here. * POI - if the harm is urgent, you cannot slow down the model roll-out. It eats up too many benefits.   We have to have more efficient and strategic set-up!  Argument 1 (at 4:30!)   * We need to analyse the incentives of companies, and how these liabilities change these incentives such that their behaviour also changes. What did they invest in before, and what do they invest in now? For instance, content moderation and safety measures, leading to a more effective removal of harmful content and quicker responses to user reports. * We just jumped to the impact of reducing harmful content, spending little time proving how their actions change. * Why is this content harmful, and who is most hurt by it? For instance, children, minorities, and other vulnerable groups are often disproportionately targeted by harmful content online. * Do we prove the outcome, and do we sufficiently impact it?   06:03 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Matias Li |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would make social media companies liable for any harmful content made available on their platforms (e.g. drug dealing, Jan 6 riots, misinformation, etc.) |
| --- |

| 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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  The analogy isn’t helping you! You assume there is buy-in into the situation/context you are drawing a parallel to. What we need to instead do is highlight why this doesn’t work, or leads to further harm? The highest impact, in the context of 1P, is that companies aren’t responsible, people are - when we punish companies, you don’t correct the harmful behaviour that translates into this speech, just incentives them to go elsewhere. The stance on Opp must be engagement.  Set-up   * Moderation, harsher punishment and law enforcement online - how does this happen? Explain why incentives to do this exist.   Rebuttal   * We problematise the concept of harm, which is fair - but then simultaneously claim we would be able to accurately deal with the same type of harm on our side? * Why does free speech matter? You’re using your argument to respond here, but without having made the argument, why this is more important or valuable isn’t being analysed/clear!   POI - good use of examples of how this happens - why wasn’t this in set-up?  Argument 1   * Until you prove you deal with harm, the principle of free speech cannot be absolute. Why do these political opinions hold importance over the harms Prop talks about? * Is all speech valuable, or are we assuming this within the framework of the argument? Why do corporations need to uphold or respect these spaces? These are private actors providing a service - why must we hold them to this standard or account. * You also make this argument whilst supporting some restrictions - what then, is the line you draw? * What is the impact of this argument?   Argument 2   * User responsibility - so then we do punish or have standards for good versus bad speech? * What is the impact of this argument?   06:13 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Hanson Ko |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would make social media companies liable for any harmful content made available on their platforms (e.g. drug dealing, Jan 6 riots, misinformation, etc.) |
| --- |

| 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:  Make the upshot of the opening as clear and easy to comprehend as possible. If you’re going to engage with the principle, take it out up top. Ask - is all speech valuable? Why do corporations need to uphold or respect these spaces? These are private actors providing a service - why must we hold them to this standard or account? Opp also supports some restrictions on speech - so what is the line we draw?  What is the structure of rebuttal and rebuilding? Extension unclear!  Rebuttal   * Good work bringing back the model, and how it is common sense as to how to measure misinformation and harmful content. The conclusion of this should be that they never engage with our model outside of claiming no harm exists. You need to plug the gap here and explain why companies change their behaviour and incentives to the extent 1P claims but doesn’t mechanise. You should also point out, until Opp proves how they deal with harm, the principle of free speech cannot be absolute. Why do these political opinions hold importance over the harms you talk about? * Why are existing mechs of moderation and truth insufficient? We assert they don’t work - but WHY is this true?   Rebuilding   * Prevalence of information is insufficient for the burden you have; the burden is why these companies specifically should be liable, as opposed to any other actor. The role that they play is what must be prominent in your speech. * Why must these companies hold the blame? You have to explain HOW through their actions and policies, these companies are to blame - for instance, the role of the platform architecture, such as algorithms and content narrowing. * Good POI response on being able to do this well because of profit and corporate incentive. Point out how this also takes down their first argument and singular path to victory.   Missing analysis needed in your speech: we need to analyse the incentives of companies, and how these liabilities change these incentives such that their behaviour also changes. What did they invest in before, and what do they invest in now? For instance, content moderation and safety measures, leading to a more effective removal of harmful content and quicker responses to user reports. We just jumped to the impact of reducing harmful content, spending little time proving how their actions change. Why is this content harmful, and who is most hurt by it? For instance, children, minorities, and other vulnerable groups are often disproportionately targeted by harmful content online.  06:13 | | | | | | |