| **Student Name:** Alvina Ng |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house regrets the decline of traditional media in political reporting |
| --- |

| 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:  I would prefer you start your speech illustrating what these ‘eye-catching headlines’ are in a way that showcases the clear harm of the status quo. The analogy/example at present isn’t the most strategic entry into the debate.  Set-up   * We need to establish what this decline looks like, and what has replaced traditional media instead. What is the nature of this decline? Is the threat to traditional media existential? * We need to develop a counterfactual - what does our world look like? We need to analyse how traditional media would have developed without the rise of social media; for instance, that traditional outlets remain primary sources, that their presence is still digital, what checks and balances exist? * Remember that this is a retrospective motion, on what has ALREADY happened.   Argument 1   * What is the thesis of this argument? * Good work identifying algorithms drive social media, but we need to pinpoint why this incentive exists, why it cannot be regulated/has not been regulated. * POI - the question Torres asks isn't based on bias, but that selective engagement will still exist. You need to explain how the nature of reporting means the extremism goes out; we say this, but not explicitly enough + without spelling the implication - which is that polarisation simply doesn’t exist in the most extreme sense on your side. * We need to establish how or why traditional media is better; what is the process of publishing and writing a news story, what steps of fact-checking and verification exist? Describe the difference in editorial process! We are just analysing what the end product on both sides looks like, rather than explaining how we get here. * We need to explain why, due to people engaging in limited time, engaging with limited attention is not going to be critical - so the quality of what they read/watch must be better. We cannot depend on a critical consumer - it has to be targeted to passive consumers. * What is the impact of this argument? We need to consider how this leads to the bad decisions you imply will exist. For instance, how people vote, who they vote for. Link to the Trump example you use here.   Argument 2   * Why can’t fact-checking solve this problem? Does the profit incentive not exist with traditional media outlets? What incentives do they have? We needed to explain how the speed and virality of social media prioritize engagement over accuracy. You can talk about the example of the 2020 US election being ‘stolen’, and people acting on their beliefs to storm the Capitol.   05:09  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Emma Kwok |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house regrets the decline of traditional media in political reporting |
| --- |

| 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:  We need to start by characterising social media positively; you need to establish the checks and balances that exist in the status quo/have been put into place because people are aware of the harms that exist.  Why are we saying which speaker we are? Is this important?  Counter-set-up? We need to frame the debate! Framing would be to say that this is a debate about where the decline happened because people lost faith in the media companies reporting with profit incentive based on their owner, rather on what the people need to hear.  Rebuttal   * Slow down, and consider what the purpose of the response you are making is. What does this point on diversity respond to? We’re just explaining diversity exists on social media, without considering if it engages with the content coming from Prop. This is not a rebuttal. * We have to explain why traditional outlets are still susceptible to profit incentive, sensationalisation and the same harm, but with a veneer of credibility, which is even more dangerous.   Argument 1   * The winning strategy for Opp on this motion is to focus on how traditional media acted as gatekeepers, controlling the flow of information. For instance, citizen journalists using social media to document protests and share information, bypassing traditional media outlets. You can also argue how social media makes news more accessible - the average person is more engaged on your side. * We barely analysed this argument! Explain to me why people don’t engage with traditional media, and as a result are less informed - social media makes the news more accessible which leads to a more informed populace on the net.   Argument 2   * Why do these ordinary ideas matter? * I don’t think we win on echo-chambers unless we establish very clearly how social media has had checks and balances introduced after extreme harms - or that there is a corrective trend. You’re calling out traditional media without establishing how diversity of views kick in; for instance, comment sections, cross-coverage, disagreements etc. * Why do you follow someone who is different in political belief to you?   Let’s ask POIs consistently!  05:06 - please conclude properly rather than just saying done. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Tiffany Chan |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house regrets the decline of traditional media in political reporting |
| --- |

| 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: | 71 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good on this ignorance - but what are these wrong spots? Spend some time characterising the way in which social media has worked, and how harmful it has been. Explain that they fixate on the ordinary person and diversity - but does this actually happen? How many people follow them, how many people actually engage with different people?  Rebuttal   * On speed and penetration - explain that digitisation means this happens on your side anyways. * We need to develop a counterfactual - what does our world look like? We need to analyse how traditional media would have developed without the rise of social media; for instance, that traditional outlets remain primary sources, that their presence is still digital, what checks and balances exist? * We need to establish how or why traditional media is better; what is the process of publishing and writing a news story, what steps of fact-checking and verification exist? Describe the difference in editorial process! We are just analysing what the end product on both sides looks like, rather than explaining how we get here. * Remember that this is a retrospective motion, on what has ALREADY happened.   Argument 1   * Good work identifying algorithms drive social media, but we need to pinpoint why this incentive exists, why it cannot be regulated/has not been regulated. Why can’t fact-checking solve this problem? Does the profit incentive not exist with traditional media outlets? What incentives do they have? We needed to explain how the speed and virality of social media prioritize engagement over accuracy. You can talk about the example of the 2020 US election being ‘stolen’, and people acting on their beliefs to storm the Capitol. * We need to explain why, due to people engaging in limited time, engaging with limited attention is not going to be critical - so the quality of what they read/watch must be better. We cannot depend on a critical consumer - it has to be targeted to passive consumers. * You need to explain how the nature of reporting means the extremism goes out; we say this, but not explicitly enough + without spelling the implication - which is that polarisation simply doesn’t exist in the most extreme sense on your side. * What is the impact of this argument? We need to consider how this leads to the bad decisions you imply will exist. For instance, how people vote, who they vote for. Link to the Trump example you use here. * We need to structure the argument into clear steps, rather than meandering throughout.   Let’s ask POIs consistently!  05:20 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Chester Tam |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house regrets the decline of traditional media in political reporting |
| --- |

| 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:  Good opening - the implication needs to be that traditional outlets, without being checked with social media/co-existence, will perpetuate the beliefs of their owners, and indeed do in status quo anyways. Social media checks them by allowing a diversity of views to proliferate. Think of the kind of reporting the big institutions do on Palestine/Hamas, versus what citizen journalists may present?  We need to frame the debate! Framing would be to say that this is a debate about where the decline happened because people lost faith in the media companies reporting with profit incentive based on their owner, rather on what the people need to hear.  Rebuttal   * Why do they behave in such a way that they censor? Think of profit, think of their liberal/elite education etc. * Torres points out well that you aren’t analysing the likelihood of such accurate views proliferating on social media. * The winning strategy for Opp on this motion is to focus on how traditional media acted as gatekeepers, controlling the flow of information. For instance, citizen journalists using social media to document protests and share information, bypassing traditional media outlets. You can also argue how social media makes news more accessible - the average person is more engaged on your side.   Good on the veneer of credibility that exists. I don’t think we win on echo-chambers unless we establish very clearly how social media has had checks and balances introduced after extreme harms - or that there is a corrective trend. You’re calling out traditional media without establishing how diversity of views kick in; for instance, comment sections, cross-coverage, disagreements etc.  Argument 1   * What you say on quality information is true, and the capacity for this exists - but does likelihood? Why do you follow someone who is different in political belief to you? * Why don’t algorithms lead to segregation of content? You have to spell this out up-front. You do a good job of explaining traditional media ALSO has echo-chambers, but this just brings this issue to a stalemate, rather than having you win on it. * Explain to me instead why people don’t engage with traditional media, and as a result are less informed - social media makes the news more accessible which leads to a more informed populace on the net. * What is the impact? What do people do with the beliefs they do/do not have on your side? You have to spell out what decisions are and are not made!   05:17  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |