| **Student Name:** Lauren Lui |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would ban social media for users under the age of 16 |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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:  We’re reading out our opening; when you are told, you are able to make eye contact! We need to keep this up! We slipped pretty quickly back into reading after the first reminder.  Set-up   * Our stance isn’t just the motion repeated, but rather why we think this is the way it should be. * Clear model, clear on regulations - but how do we ensure this? For instance ID verification? * Good work thinking about the pre-emption; don’t say Opposition thinks or might say; but rather explain - we need a ban because regulations have failed.   Argument 1   * What is the thesis or central claim of this argument? What outcome are you trying to prove? * We assert that kids will get exposed to racism, or other harmful things. We need to explain what social media looks like, why it’s harmful, what kind of harm exists, why regulations or content moderation will not prevent this from happening. Our characterisation of what social media is like, and indeed even what children like is missing. * The harms to focus on must be more urgent than this; we should talk about how children under 16 are particularly vulnerable to online predators and privacy violations. They may not have the maturity or awareness to navigate the complexities of online safety and protect themselves from potential harms, even where their parents might teach them. * On parents, we need to explain why at 16, the harms specified go away. What’s the difference between a 15 and 16 year old?   02:09 - we have to try and hit 3. We cannot just stop speaking once we’re done with our prepared material!  Lauren, it's really important to speak up if you're ever feeling confused about a concept or instruction. Instead of sitting in silence if you're stuck, please ask questions! I want to make sure you're getting the most out of the exercises we do, instead of sitting for the five minutes of thinking time, with myself assuming that you’re good and understand what’s going on for it to turn out that you couldn’t think of anything during that time period! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jay Lam |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would ban social media for users under the age of 16 |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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: As Jay has a painful sore throat today, he was allowed to speak for as long as he could within the upper limit of 4 minutes, rather than being instructed to reach [that upper limit].  Our opening should explain what the problem with Prop is - presumably it is that these harms are preventable with regulations. We talk about how we think parents need to be involved, and then go into rebuttal - but we’re meant to then do signposting and set-up!  Rebuttal/set-up?   * Good on difficulty in enforcing age - explain this means we must just make the platform safer; because even if we ban them, they will end up there.   + Give examples of how this happens with Instagram in the status quo. * We need to explain that we’re going to invest in content moderation, safety checks etc. * Good on the role of parents, and how they can teach and supervise their kids.   Did we transition into an argument?  We just said we want to preserve the freedom of choice of kids, without explaining why this is a good choice, what the need for kids under 16 to engage with social media even is! What is the positive value of social media such that we want kids to be able to access it?  02:25! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Yu Bo Peng |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would ban social media for users under the age of 16 |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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:  What harmful content? Let’s be more specific!  Clear signposting, argument title is too long without being clear on what the specific outcome you’re proving is.  Set-up   * Good work including examples of what these apps are. * How do they have zero way of accessing it? The model would be clearer if you said we’d do ID checks using existing software, where we both ask for the child and parental ID. * What kind of regulations, and why are they failing? Good work thinking of this, but we’re lacking the detail here. * Good work spelling out a burden,   Argument 1   * Excellent characterisation of how kids get access to phones earlier - and hence the average user is younger than younger; explain why this age doesn’t understand what is right and wrong. We asserted this repeatedly without explaining it specifically.   + The prefrontal cortex, the part of the brain responsible for reasoning, decision-making, and impulse control, is not fully developed in individuals under 16.   + Kids struggle with abstract concepts like online privacy and the permanence of digital information. They don’t understand the long-term consequences of their online actions, such as reputational damage or future employment prospects. * Good link to peer pressure. * We didn’t characterise what the problem with social media is specifically - we assumed this was evident.   04:13 - good work!  We have to focus on our tone and presentation. Are we using pauses, tonal variation, emphasis? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Moses Cheuk |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would ban social media for users under the age of 16 |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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:  Is the best benefit here convenience? Or is it that all socialisation + life now happens on this digital platform; we can’t remove kids from it when this is where they’ll live their life post 16. We have to teach them now, so they don’t make bad decisions in the future.  Set-up   * Clear stance on freedom of choice; but why is this a good choice? * Good on parental control + involvement. Good on the role of parents, and how they can teach and supervise their kids. What if they are unable to? We assume all parents are free and ready to do this? * We should pinpoint that most age bans on social media age simply haven’t worked - explain this means we must just make the platform safer; because even if we ban them, they will end up there.   Rebuttal   * Good work problematising the 16/17 gap; but this is just mitigatory! * On easy influence - don’t just use your model as a quick solution to everything.   Argument 1 - the model was used as the only mech here   * Good on the immediate shift when they hit 16; where does the easy influence from others come in here? * What is the impact, why does it matter?   Argument 2 - the same model mech substitution happens   * We just said we want to preserve the freedom of choice of kids, without explaining why this is a good choice, what the need for kids under 16 to engage with social media even is! * What is the positive value of social media such that we want kids to be able to access it?   I want proper mechanisation, not just us pointing to the model and saying hence, everything I say happens just does!  04:41 - we went 41 seconds over! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Candice Chen |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would ban social media for users under the age of 16 |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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:  We start our opening reading; it’s well written explaining the harms of social media, but it’s not delivered it’s read out. Slow down, integrate pauses, stops, emphasis to increase the impact of this!  Signposting missing!  Set-up   * Good work including examples of what these apps are. * Good work establishing what happens to existing users/future users. * The model would be clearer if you said we’d do ID checks using existing software, where we both ask for the child and parental ID. * Don’t say that ‘the Opposition might say’, but rather say: we think there are a number of apps where children can engage in socialisation without the harms these apps do; for instance, Whatsapp and so on. * We’re basically running an argument here in terms of cancel culture and how the short-termism of children hurting themselves. Keep this for the argument!   We didn’t mark our transition from set-up into the argument!  We need to explain why younger kids make poorer decisions! Explain why this age doesn’t understand what is right and wrong. We asserted this without explaining it specifically.   * + The prefrontal cortex, the part of the brain responsible for reasoning, decision-making, and impulse control, is not fully developed in individuals under 16.   + Kids struggle with abstract concepts like online privacy and the permanence of digital information. They don’t understand the long-term consequences of their online actions, such as reputational damage or future employment prospects.   We didn’t characterise what the problem with social media is specifically - we assumed this was evident.  02:15 - we need to keep going to try and hit 3! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Verena Wong |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would ban social media for users under the age of 16 |
| --- |

| 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 |
| 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:  Clear opening, clear tone - make more eye contact here!  We don’t call signposting signposting; just transition and say - what will I do in this speech; and then explain what it is.  Set-up   * Good work characterising what social media is like; say here - we acknowledge that social media has problems; here’s what we do instead. Otherwise the phrasing isn’t competitive. * How do we decide what’s inappropriate, and verify who is 16; good work covering the parents in terms of how they're involved. What if they are unable to? We assume all parents are free and ready to do this? * We should pinpoint that most age bans on social media age simply haven’t worked - explain this means we must just make the platform safer; because even if we ban them, they will end up there.   Rebuttal   * We largely just use our model to respond here; we need to go beyond! I want proper mechanisation, not just us pointing to the model and saying hence, everything I say happens just does!   Argument 1   * Clear thesis. * What is the positive value of social media such that we want kids to be able to access it? Why is this a good choice, why is it valuable? You need to explain why this is a legitimate choice, and then say we cannot take it away; we take away lots of choices from kids presently, why is this unique and different?   I want proper mechanisation, not just us pointing to the model and saying hence, everything I say happens just does!  We have to make more eye contact, use intentional pauses, moments where we speed up, emphasis and tonal variation.  03:58 | | | | | | |