| **Student Name:** Jacky Jiang |
| --- |

| **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:  The opening does a good job of highlighting the unique nature of social media companies, and the unique harm the spread of this information poses. The issue is that 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 the opening.  Set-up   * Rather than refusal to cooperate, have positive phrasing and provide us with a set of mechanisms you use to measure harm, and hold liable. For instance, a ban - which you do mention - is the most extreme mechanism; what goes in the middle and soft-line? Having a tool in a toolbox approach is most strategic. * What are the parameters for harm? How do we measure it? * The burden is that they are responsible for this harm, and hence must be held liable in this way.   Argument 1   * The thesis or claim of the argument should be said up front; that these companies profit off of harmful content and this is principally unjustified. Following from this, you need to establish how profit occurs - add nuance of intention, explaining how it is done intentionally, and where it isn’t - harm is so significant accountability matters more. Draw a parallel to the mens rea and actus rea element of measuring a crime. * Why is this not the same as any other platform? The uniqueness of these companies and platforms have to be highlighted - so the platform architecture, such as algorithms and content narrowing, is what you must focus on. * Good on vulnerability and harm.   Clear response to the POI! Explain how companies construct an echo-chamber for you, where there are no checks and balances, such that they foster misinformation, to have higher engagement rates.  Argument 2   * Ease of doing this - hence we should do it? I think phrasing wise, it may be easier to present this as a how do we solve it argument, where the alternate you compare it to is consumer responsibility and disengagement, or how this incentivises companies to change their offerings and behaviour - so investing in content moderation, or community notes, or other verification mechanisms. * 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? * We just jumped to the impact of reducing harmful content, spending little time proving how their actions change.   06:36  Let’s use the highlighter + style strategy next time! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Gemma Yeung |
| --- |

| **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:  The stronger response is that profit and money ensure that they moderate content, or harm doesn’t exist, because otherwise the company comes under flack from the state or consumers; so people or consumers will disengage if this doesn’t happen. Then explain how external to profit, image matters.  The transition from opening to the rest of the speech is too messily done. You have to signpost! Tell me what the structure of your speech will be. We cannot set this as a goal 1.5 hours ago, and then ignore it entirely.  Where is set-up? What do we support? What strategies to prevent harm will we engage in, or are already being done in status quo?  On companies risking engagement and consumer dissatisfaction wrt regulations - this is the claim you made in your opening, then deal with something, and then go back to this. You’re prolonging dealing with this rather than just in the opening in one go. You also take a POI at this moment, which adds to the chaos of this speech. You can deal with this in set-up by supporting community notes, or fact checking verification - you have to call out their burden; which is to explain how the platform is responsible for harm and must be held liable, which they haven’t done.  Your argument signposting came at 4:26…  Argument 1 - at 04:30   * Good on opinions don’t change - where do they go and express these opinions instead? 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. How do you engage with these people and change their behaviour or opinions? * What is the outcome of them going to other platforms outside of misinformation gets worse?   06:13 - our time management and discipline in this speech was very off!  We need to offer more POIs! I shouldn’t have to remind you to do this! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jodie 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:  How is this mitigatory? They just say we deal with this through external strategies. They don’t really explain this in enough detail.  Rebuttal  On alternatives and enforceability - fair, but they could explain how social media companies can lobby governments and dodge this, especially given their oligopolistic structure and power against the state.  Good on this being reactionary, but doesn’t the same occur on your side? You are also punishing them in retrospect - harm has to be done for this punishment to occur. Both sides use punishment as a deterrent to future bad behaviour.  Fair on lack of consumer responsibility and awareness. I think the point you want to make on echo-chambers is that companies engineer misinformation and radicalism that leads to this behaviour; 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. The burden on your side is that companies are liable for this harm, rather than consumers. The point should be that in the CF, people are able to exist on social media outside of their echo-chambers, and hence change occurs.  Argument 1   * I couldn’t track the thesis or questions, you were going too fast. Make the upshot of the claim as clear and easy to comprehend as possible. * I’m confused - do these benefits go away on Opp? The objective platform and speed benefits presumably remain? * On believing misinformation - how do you get rid of this? * You need to plug the gap and explain why companies change their behaviour and incentives to the extent 1P claims but doesn’t mechanise. Why are existing mechs of moderation and truth insufficient? * 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?   What is happening with our time management? We have to be more mindful! You are not going to be tracked beyond an extra 15 seconds.  06:55 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Shi Qi Ooi |
| --- |

| **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:  Good opening - explain why there is awareness, or why existing checks and balances exist. Is this debate exclusively about misinformation though? Look at the examples in the motion!  Rebuttal - what you are responding to is too caught up in individual speakers, rather than a more broad identification of what matters or doesn’t.   * Explain how both sides are reactionary - both sides take action following harm. They cannot lob this accusation at you without taking a hard look at themselves. * On migrating to other platforms - explain why this will lead to worse harms; in that the mixing you could have on your side of opinions goes away. The question is - why do they stay on the more mainstream platform after you hold a case against them. Aren’t you also shutting them down, and alienating them, technically speaking? How do you engage with these people and change their behaviour or opinions? * The vulnerable cannot speak up - explain why it isn’t true, then explain why it is worse on their side. Why are we just engaging in washing it out, rather than challenging it on the basis of truth? * Why are consumers aware and responsible enough such that they will disengage if companies don’t improve? You need to deal with this challenge Jodie issues in her speech, your organic change and mechs are contingent on this.   Argument 1   * Why will it occur in this way? The entire argument assumes that this will be done generally and badly. The example of the word is fine, but does it showcase why this will occur in the way you claim? * On liability - how does this occur, and how does this change happen? You’re jumping to accountability without any explanation of how it occurs, what impact it has, why it is good or what it does? Sure, you claim liability - what does it do???   06:26  We need to offer more POIs! I shouldn’t have to remind you to do this! | | | | | | |