| **Student Name:** Sarah Han |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would prohibit elected officials from pursuing defamation lawsuits against media organisations |
| --- |

| 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:  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 7 minutes’ long.]  Don’t burst into laughter immediately, we’re undercutting our credibility as a speaker!   * Good signposting, but label your arguments as well.   Good rebuttal that the media self-correct since there’s different media biases across the spectrum.   * We should add on all the other reasons as to why the industry self-regulates, i.e. loss of reputation, competition in the free markets, loss of investments, etc.   + Then connect it more specifically to Opp’s problem statement on publishing falsehoods.   On the rebuttal of why voters won’t be easily swayed, while it is true that some consumers can tell the difference, surely there are also consumers who do not have media literacy and they may vote based on these false allegations?   * Rather than just asserting that readers have common sense, point out the credible sources that voters are more likely to listen to, i.e. the politicians themselves and what their campaign says. Explain that electoral campaigns have greater airtime than some random tabloid. * We are fairly repetitive on this point, we should restructure our analysis into 3-4 clear reasons to avoid wasting time.   In response to the POI, we should be comparing competing business models and showing why more money is made by being ethically responsible than by lying.  On the argument:   * We need to explain why aiming for the long-game of media literacy would solve a host of other problems, which is preferable because the media could cause other problematic practices.   + Removing just ONE problem of ‘allegations against politicians,’ doesn’t remove the perverse incentives of the media to hurt other stakeholders. This is why it’s much better to aim for a large cultural shift of readers demanding ethical journalism.     - Then make observations to show why you think this is even feasible.       * E.g. Bring in the post-Cambridge Analytica context, with things like media literacy being taught in schools.   Let’s ask POIs consistently!  06:35 - We are undertimed, aim for 7 minutes! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Catherine Ho |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would prohibit elected officials from pursuing defamation lawsuits against media organisations |
| --- |

| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  Don’t burst into laughter a second into your hook, it hurts your credibility as a speaker!   * Good signposting.   On the set-up:   * Before you say the ban, explain the problem statement of politicians abusing the legal process and defamation laws. * Are we suggesting that the government themselves will ban the media from engaging in false statements? Wouldn‘t that also undermine free speech?   + What regulations are you even referring to?   + We should instead highlight that the media is self-correcting in nature and not exaggerate to a harmful degree!     - Competition in the free market, so there will be call-outs,     - Loss of credibility/reputation,     - Potential loss of investors, etc.   On the first argument:   * We need to start by structurally highlighting all the incentives of politicians to silence the media, e.g. improve electoral chances by avoiding accountability/criticism, create perfect echo chambers * I appreciate the example of Elon Musk, but don’t use the example to substitute for analysis.   + Explain why the legal risks and costs will alter the business model of media companies, and force them into self-silencing when they have to criticise politicians. * We are entirely missing the impact analysis here!   + How does this hurt political discourse?   + Does this hurt the ability of voters to make informed decisions?   + What happens when the media has no ability to hold politicians accountable for their mistakes?   Good time management when it comes to asking for a POI and transitioning to a 2nd argument.  On the second argument:   * The chilling effect analysis is part of the mechanisation of the first argument! * We need to be comparative here, explain why the media can also be held accountable for all the lies and allegations they perpetuate. * Can we have broad implications on how the media loses its ability to become the fourth estate when they are threatened by political actors?   + E.g. Investigative journalism would disappear.   7.04 - Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Joanne Lau |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would prohibit elected officials from pursuing defamation lawsuits against media organisations |
| --- |

| 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:  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 7 minutes’ long.]  Well done with the hook, illustrating your points with real-life examples would give you even more impact and mileage.   * Good job signposting, but name me all of your clashes.   Good job recharacterising that the chilling effect will work with media organisations even when the SLAPP lawsuits fail!   * But engage with Opp’s point that the politicians will also face backlash if they sued these media organisations fraudulently.   + Explain that this isn’t guaranteed, and it’s more likely that the average consumer will listen more to the media than the politicians.   You can actually cut off the POI if they’re using up more than 15 seconds of your time!  On getting the media to have better coverage:   * While they COULD engage in responsible journalism, it doesn’t mean they WILL. I believe that they will be deterred from misinformation, but I’m not sure why it will be profitable for them to engage in high-quality/ethical reporting. * We need to deal with the worst case scenario of the media engaging in unethical journalism.   + Analyse that the media self-correct for a number of structural reasons, e.g. there’s different media biases across the spectrum, loss of reputation, competition in the free markets, loss of investments, etc.     - Then connect it more specifically to Opp’s problem statement on publishing falsehoods.   On the voters being responsible/media literacy:   * While it is true that some voters are responsible and some readers can tell the difference, surely there are also readers who do not have media literacy and they may vote based on these false allegations?   + Point out the credible sources that voters are more likely to listen to, i.e. the politicians themselves and what their campaign says. Explain that electoral campaigns have greater airtime than some random tabloid. * We need to explain why aiming for the long-game of media literacy would solve a host of other problems, which is preferable because the media could cause other problematic practices.   + Removing just ONE problem of ‘allegations against politicians,’ doesn’t remove the perverse incentives of the media to hurt other stakeholders.     - Then make observations to show why you think this is even feasible. E.g. Bring in the post-Cambridge Analytica context, with things like media literacy being taught in schools.   07:25 - Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jodie Li |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would prohibit elected officials from pursuing defamation lawsuits against media organisations |
| --- |

| 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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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: Today’s speeches are 7 minutes’ long.]  Well done with the hook, illustrating your points with real-life examples would give you even more impact and mileage.   * Good job signposting.   On the counter set-up:   * I appreciate the counter-characterisation with sensationalism and spreading false information (are falsehoods that different from sensationalism though?), but we are not explaining the underpinning business model on how this helps them make money more than any other competing business strategies. * Spend time outlining all the ways that defamation lawsuits tend to fail, rather than just say Mai has explained it!   + And engage with Prop’s analysis that they do it even knowing that the lawsuits won’t work, because suing alone is enough to create a chilling effect.   The rebuttals completely bled into the set-up!   * We need a separate engagement on the media’s chilling effect. While they can raise awareness on the issue, it’s not responding to how it’s incredibly bad for business.   On the first argument:   * Good mechanistic analysis on media incentives to propagate these lies. * Well done explaining how the media then becomes weaponised into political tactics that divert discourse and hurt people unfairly.   + Expand this to people sending in false information and making up rumours just days before the electoral voting happens. * The impact on scapegoating is too small!   + Expand the harms of these people being victims of a public witch-hunt, and how this hurts other minorities from becoming political representatives.   On the second argument:   * A lot of the mechanistic analysis overlaps with the first argument!   + We should be comparing competing business models and showing why more money is made by lying, than being ethically responsible instead. * Connect all of your descriptors to low media literacy in the status quo, then explain to me why it’s impossible for this specific problem to improve for as long as tabloid journalism exists. * You cannot go into a new impact analysis at 7:20!   + The loss of investigative journalism is more likely an argument for Prop than Opp!   Good job asking POIs consistently!  7:36 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would prohibit elected officials from pursuing defamation lawsuits against media organisations |
| --- |

| 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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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: Today’s speeches are 7 minutes’ long.]  We need better, high-impact hooks.   * Good job signposting.   Good recharacterisation that politicians are unlikely to engage in frivolous lawsuits as it makes them look bad.   * Good job outlining the ways that defamation lawsuits tend to fail.   + But engage with Prop’s analysis that they do it even knowing that the lawsuits won’t work, because suing alone is enough to create a chilling effect. * This still doesn’t deal with Prop’s mechanistic analysis that it’s still incredibly bad for business so media organisations immediately keel over. So politicians do it quickly and this gets rid of the problem.   Excellent rebuttal of echo chamber and confirmation bias to take down Prop’s check-and-balance of the media industry self-regulating against false information.   * However, we spent too long on this repeating same mechanistic analysis. Instead, evolve on to a criticism of the low media literacy of the average user, and why they don’t utilise responsible consumerism tactics.   Both of the above rebuttals are mechanistic, spend time reinforcing and weighing the impacts in your favour!   * Explain how the media then becomes weaponised into political tactics that divert discourse.   + Expand this to people sending in false information and making up rumours just days before the electoral voting happens.   + Expand the harms of these people being victims of a public witch-hunt, and how this hurts other minorities from becoming political representatives.   On your argument:   * Good mechanistic analysis on how the media has developed defense mechanisms in order to engage in problematic and invasive practices that hurt these political actors.   + But we need to spend time illustrating these exact practices. What exactly do they do that is considered so harmful?     - E.g. Bring back the Princess Diana example we discussed. * Without these, it’s hard to imagine the immediate jump to things like depression and suicide? * We can’t claim a principle right to privacy when it comes to politicians especially when their public life is something voters are entitled to know about.   Please offer POIs consistently!  06:50 - We are under-timed, try to reach 7 minutes. | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would prohibit elected officials from pursuing defamation lawsuits against media organisations |
| --- |

| 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:  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 7 minutes’ long.]  Good call-out in the hook and good signposting.  On the first clash:   * Rather than reinforcing the problems of sensationalism, low media literacy, easy defense mechanisms to not be sued for defamation, we can start by being engaging by saying why these incentives OVERRIDE Prop’s incentives on why the media is easily self-regulating.   + E.g. When prop explained that media with different biases will correct each other, point out that because of echo chambers and confirmation biases, this doesn’t actually work.   + We should be comparing competing business models and showing why more money is made by lying, than being ethically responsible instead. * Good recharacterisation that politicians are unlikely to engage in frivolous lawsuits as it makes them look bad. * Good job outlining the ways that defamation lawsuits tend to fail.   + But engage with Prop’s analysis that they do it even knowing that the lawsuits won’t work, because suing alone is enough to create a chilling effect. * This still doesn’t deal with Prop’s mechanistic analysis that it’s still incredibly bad for business so media organisations immediately keel over. So politicians do it quickly and this gets rid of the problem.   + If we do not take this down, then all of Prop’s harm of losing political discourse and accountability becomes true.   + I want more impact analysis pushing on why the media will shift towards personal politics rather than a healthy political discourse.   On the second clash:   * On voters being influenced within their echo chambers, would this not be true regardless? Spend time explaining the role that the media plays in insulating this echo chamber. * Good job describing that the average user will not check for multiple sources.   + But can you explain why this problem of improving media literacy can never be fixed? Proposition has a model towards improving this.   By the end of the speech, we are repeating a number of these mechanistic analysis on the incentives of politicians. We are better off expanding the impact analysis instead, because both of your previous speakers did not expound on the final comparison.   * E.g. Explain how the media then becomes weaponised into political tactics that divert discourse.   Good job asking POIs, let’s ask POIs consistently!  07:15 | | | | | | |