| **Student Name:** Jacky Xu |
| --- |

| **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:  Good opening highlighting what the status quo is - but keep building on this problem characterisation; talk about how the rise of social media has ushered in an era of misinformation, polarization, and declining trust in institutions.  Set-up   * We need to establish what this decline looks like, and what has replaced traditional media instead. We jump to social media, without unpacking this in enough detail. What is the nature of this decline? Is the threat to traditional media existential? * 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. * What does the counterfactual look like? What do we wish to have happened instead? Remember that this is a retrospective motion, on what has ALREADY happened.   Argument 1   * Good work establishing what the incentives of social media influencers are, and how the lack of checks and balances contributes to extremist reporting. Is there no example we can refer to here to illustrate this point? * 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 consumer. * What is the impact of this argument? We need to consider how this lead to the bad decisions you imply will exist. For instance, how people vote, who they vote for. * We could have set out the structure of this argument in greater detail - for instance, the first thing I’m going to do is establish what the structural differences in reporting are between traditional and social media… * 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. * How does traditional media solve echochambers?   We needed more than one argument!  07:00  We have to pay attention to our flow, fluency and enunciation. The delivery comes out slightly fragmented.  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Renee Yang |
| --- |

| **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:  Is this an extreme characterisation? This isn’t a policy debate Renee, on models and replacement, this is a regrets debate; Prop supports a world in which this decline never happened, you support a world where this decline did. This opening misinterprets the  Don’t call everything extreme or weird - it makes you seem uncharitable/unwilling to engage in good faith. If we want to say there are checks and balances because call out culture or cancel culture exists, say that instead!  Set-up   * On why this decline happens - don’t give me a historical account, give me causes that indicate that people were frustrated with the limited coverage of traditional media. * You’re not framing by establishing who the major stakeholders are - you’re just telling me who the major stakeholders are. 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 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.   Argument 1   * 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? * 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!   The winning strategy for Opp on this motion is not to focus on echo-chambers, because it is unlikely this is winnable. Instead, 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.  In a 7 minute speech, you need to have 2 arguments. There is a lot of repetition on echo-chambers without a clear resolution either!  07:06  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |