| **Student Name:** Ryan Qian |
| --- |

| **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:  The opening identifies well the nature of companies and the core incentive they have - the ‘and such’ threw off the careful packaging that existed prior. We need to focus on cleaning up our packaging. We should focus more carefully on 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   * I don’t think you need to explain why social media has a huge influence on people - this is symmetric. Instead, focus on what the gap is - the burden is that they are responsible for this harm, and hence must be held liable in this way. * We need to analyse the problem characterisation beyond the profit incentive - what do they do to ensure people stay on the platform, for longer periods of time? How does this connect to the harm in the motion? * On incentives to regulate - you have fiat to impose this upon them. * You need to provide me with a set of mechanisms you use to measure harm, and hold liable. For instance, a ban - 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?   Argument 1   * The lack of clarity on what holding a company liable looks like leads to murky mechanisation here. You need to explain to me why this harm exists in the first place - or what this harm looks like, so as to highlight how this goes away in your world. * You need to explain how 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. * We’re spending too little time explaining how the incentive of a company changes in your world - and to what they do now! What do the incentives of Facebook look like in your world, and how does it change the way it functions?   Argument 2   * The thesis of the argument, or the outcome you’re going to prove needs to be spelled out beyond just ‘better for consumers’. * Why are we banning consumers? Do we ban them as a result of these changes? * Isn’t this just an impact of the first argument?   06:11 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Stephanie Kwan |
| --- |

| **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: | 68 | | | | | |
| 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:  Are you disputing that social media platforms are problematic and need to change their offerings? If we do this, we are disputing the need for change exists on these platforms? The better strategy is to explain how there are existing mechanisms for these companies to alter their behaviour - and do so anyways, through community notes, content moderation and such.  What is the purpose of the Tiktok example? If anything, it showcases that there isn’t agency within consumers, contrary to your opening?  What is your stance in the round? What you stand for is very confusing!  Set-up   * How will you do this? What mechanisms will you use? What do you mean by regulating algorithms and hegemonic media? * On culture - what culture? What do you mean by this? The lack of specificity in phrasing is obscuring the point you are trying to make! * On moderation - explain 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. * How will you punish them? You need to engage with the second argument from 1P to point out why holding the consumer liable is something that is, spirit of the motion wise, on your side of the debate.   Rebuttal   * Did we engage with the first argument, on the incentives of companies changing?   Argument 1 (we started this at 4:40…)   * You can’t argue that change is likely to happen, or could happen, but rather that it WILL happen. You are just jumping to what happens following the changes to the algorithm, as opposed to explaining how it happens, or what even the impact detailed out looks like? * How do you regulate the users? How do they change their opinions or behaviour?   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 getting worse?  06:02 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Audrey Lai |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  The upshot of the response you make in your opening needs to be spelled out - the company is responsible for this harm, and hence must be held liable; these problems would not exist, or would not have existed had the company not done this.  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.  Rebuttal - this is not structured. You need to understand what 2-3 big issues need to be resolved following 1O, and structure your responses on this basis.   * On consumer responsibility - explain why this is unlikely! How do these consumers react when they get banned, or get held legally liable for harm and hate speech? Do they change their opinions? You can steal the ‘algorithmic regulation’ from Opp, to explain how building a platform with echo chambers or targeted content is the reason why this harm occurs, and when the incentive of companies changes, the likelihood of building platforms in this way goes away. Tell me what the upshot of this response is. How should it influence the way I value 1O in this round? * Good examples of Youtube; what research paper are you talking about?   POI: You need to provide me with a set of mechanisms you use to measure harm, and hold liable. For instance, a ban - 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 stakes of dodging compliance? 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?  Argument 1   * Is this a principal claim about agency and autonomy, or a practical claim, or both? You need to be clear on the thesis or purpose of the argument; how is this distinct from your responses?   06:05 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sarah Seryoung Choi |
| --- |

| **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: | 68 | | | | | |
| 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:  As 2O in a very messy debate so far, your opening needs to be dedicated to cleaning up the debate. Don’t make it about why they lost, and what they did poorly; if your side’s contributions were messier, the clarity matters more. You need to tell me what the status quo looks like, what your stance is, and clarify your path forward in the round.  Rebuttal - you have to slow down and enunciate! We are getting too caught up and not instituting any gaps between words. Sometimes the first couple of words of your sentences are too confusing!   * If these companies are so powerful, why are any of the regulations you want to institute going to come to fruition? All the regulations the state wants to implement, as per Steph, how do they come about? Without a clarification as to whether you are taking on the user, or the company, the strategy for your side is so confusing? See the POI Adrian asks you! * How will you do this? What mechanisms will you use? What do you mean by regulating algorithms and content? * Do we concede to all of Audrey’s claims about the manufacturing of this harm by virtue of the company’s incentives to make money and keep consumers hooked?   Argument 1   * What is the thesis or central claim of this argument? What are you trying to prove? How is this any different from your responses? * You can’t argue that change is likely to happen, or could happen, but rather that it WILL happen. You are just jumping to what happens following the changes to the algorithm, as opposed to explaining how it happens, or what even the impact detailed out looks like?   You need to explain 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 highest impact, in the context of 1P and 2P, 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 getting worse?  06:02  You NEED to slow down and enunciate; there are parts of your speech that are near impossible to decipher, you are muddling and merging words together, and not focusing on a clear and coherent pronunciation. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Adrian Wong |
| --- |

| **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:  The opening needs to EXPLAIN how Opp went off track, rather than just saying it has. You need to dig their grave all the way, rather than pointing at it.  The clashes appear far too fragmented! This is about who is responsible, and where this harm goes away.  Don’t flag this as a big picture, but rather as clarifications or a few things to note at the top of the speech.  On power - explain that is symmetric; why their side doesn’t get anything done, and then walk me through what the step by step process of holding these companies liable looks like, to be able to buy that on your side you deal with this power. You need to provide me with a set of mechanisms you use to measure harm, and hold liable. For instance, a ban - 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 stakes of dodging compliance? 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?  On changing the platform and getting rid of the harms from misinformation, you can steal the ‘algorithmic regulation’ from Opp, to explain how building a platform with echo chambers or targeted content is the reason why this harm occurs, and when the incentive of companies changes, the likelihood of building platforms in this way goes away. Tell me what the upshot of this response is. How should it influence the way I value 2O in this round?  What is this confusing clash signposting? You should have explained how the company is responsible, Opp concedes, hence, the consumer cannot be held responsible. 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.  On gov controlled media, you need to deal with the POI you ask Sarah, on the power of the company. You also need to point out the confusion from 1O to 2O. Punish them for having lack of clarity and coherency! Ask - how does the culture change!  When the debate is super messy, you have to clean it up. You’re just muddling into the mess!  05:44 | | | | | | |