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

| **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.]  Good job reinforcing how frivolous lawsuits works and the chilling effect works despite defamation laws itself are perfectly fine.   * However, the point of the average person believing the court’s judgment on what is true and false, is that not a good thing? Are we not meant to trust the investigations of law enforcement agencies?   It’s true that politicians can be held more accountable, when we highlight their flaws, but we’re making an assumption that these media organisations are making fair and legitimate accusations.   * Try to 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, spend more time proving why it’s more likely that the average consumer will listen more to the media than the politicians themselves. * There’s a lot of logical links missing here to voters suddenly losing trust in the entire political system. Why can’t this not lead to what Opp says on the average voter demanding the media to provide higher quality coverage that helps political discourse?   + We are arguing our political harms in a vacuum, instead of engaging with Opp’s clashing point on the role the media plays to devolve political discourse into character assassination, lies and scandals, etc. A lot of your own analysis feeds into their harms.   Good job recharacterising that the media can be held accountable if they are the ones behaving irresponsibly within discourse. But you’re only asserting things in the mechanistic analysis here, rather than actually proving the effectiveness of these mechanisms.   * 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 why this is sufficient in correcting Opp’s problem statement on publishing falsehoods.   Nice characterisation that the users engage in more credible sources.   * Can we 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. * This clash is not made to be important in the round. 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.   07:12 - Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **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.]  Good focal point on the powerful and wealthy controlling the flow of information in the media, try to immediately relate it back to the policy on banning defamation lawsuits.   * Good signposting.   On the set-up:   * We didn’t need to characterise that defamation lawsuits are useless to begin with here, this may lead to a tension. Why are we banning things that are broadly ineffective in its purpose, no companies will need to self-silence when these lawsuits never work. * While I appreciate that we’re mentioning things like the public figure doctrine, you have to be able to explain it as if I’m a person who has never heard of this before. * What do you mean that bad things in the media are already censored? 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.   Is there a reason why your set-up is always super thick? A lot of the above characterisation would be better placed in the argument instead. Going into argument 1 at 03:30 is quite late!  On the first argument:   * Good descriptions of politicians weaponising defamatory lawsuits to their example.   + But 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 that will never have any counter-narratives, etc. * Good reasoning for the chilling effect, but clearly explains why the legal risks and costs will alter the business model of media companies, OVER the profits they will gain from engaging in discourse. Then you can force them into self-silencing when they have to criticise politicians. * While it’s a good impact on media organisations on criticising politicians, we are not nuanced in our analysis here. Why do you believe the media will even be responsible in the process of reporting here, and how do we know that voters have adequate media literacy to navigate this?   On the second argument:   * The argument is analysed in very generic ways, and a lot of this overlaps with the first argument! E.g. Rather than repeat that the media cannot hold politicians accountable, explain things like the business model that justifies the existence of investigative journalism would disappear. Then ground this with how much it has contributed to political accountability, such as Watergate.   7.14 - Good job asking POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **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, but illustrating your points with real-life examples would prove the point much more than the counter-rhetoric.  It’s true that politicians can be held more accountable, when we highlight their flaws, but we’re making an assumption that these media organisations are making fair and legitimate accusations.   * Try to 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.   Good job recharacterising that the media can be held accountable if they are the ones behaving irresponsibly within discourse. But you’re only asserting things in the mechanistic analysis here, don’t just bait me with this, give the full analysis right away.   * 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 why this is sufficient in correcting Opp’s problem statement on publishing falsehoods.   + We analysed this later on, good job.   Interesting rebuttal that users make assumptions on the basis of whether a lawsuit happens.   * However, if they believe the court’s judgment on what is true and false, is that not a good thing? Are we not meant to trust the investigations of law enforcement agencies?   On getting the media to have more ethical 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. Explain changing market trends. * We need to deal with the worst case scenario of the media engaging in unethical journalism.   On the voters being responsible/media literacy:   * 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. * HOW will this be done in the status quo when some voters are irresponsible with their information diet? 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.   07:15 - Good job asking POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **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 rhetoric in the hook, but illustrating your points with real-life examples would give you even more impact and mileage. E.g. Hillary Clinton lost the presidential election because the media released the information on her emails the day before the election.   * Good job signposting. Don’t admit that you don’t know what your framing even is!!   Good counter-characterisation that the courts will only eliminate false information that are actively harmful.   * However, we need to specifically engage with Prop explaining the chilling effect that occurs even when the lawsuits fail. They argued that suing alone is enough to create a chilling effect.   Give the counter set-up BEFORE the rebuttals:   * The rebuttal of business models have developed systems around being sued, such as insurance and a strong legal team belongs here! * We should also explain how defamation laws will work and the likelihood of legal abuse can be minimised.   + E.g. Frivolous lawsuits get thrown out by courts very quickly during the summary trial, so it doesn’t get abused very much. For the trial to go on, the lawsuit needs merit.   In response to the POI, we should explain that if lawsuits tend to fail, then this undermines the chilling effect argument made by Prop to begin with!  On the first argument:   * Good mechanistic analysis on media incentives to propagate these lies. We can add more grounding to explain the severity of these harms. * We are under-explaining the harm here, expand to explain 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 harm is not just contained to politics, it extends to real victimisation of politicians as individuals! They deserve rights too despite their occupation.   + Focus on the most vulnerable stakeholder such as female and minority politicians. 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, good logical premises on political impacts.   * 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. * Spend more time on the point of 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. * We’re skipping some logical links to the media suddenly behaving responsibly because of this!   7:17 - Please ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **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.]  After stating that Prop’s solutions aren’t mutually exclusive, explain that the existence of defamation lawsuits will actually help with pushing the media towards more ethical journalistic standards that Proposition wants!  Spend more time pushing back on why the average consumer listens to the media more than they listen to the political campaigns! We are illustrating their behaviours without really explaining WHY they behave that way.   * Point out that every reader is a captive vote, most are swing voters so they find the media to be more neutral than biased political campaigns.   After explaining that the media is likely to behave in perverse ways, then flip this claim and point out why politicians are likely to NOT abuse defamation lawsuits.   * Point out that politicians are unlikely to engage in frivolous lawsuits as it makes them look bad, and the average voter can identify that they are abusing the law.   Don’t take the POI when you’re mid-sentence!   * Explain that if lawsuits tend to fail as Ryan pointed out, then this undermines the chilling effect argument made by Prop to begin with! * Avoid taking the 2nd POI so soon too.   + We are still not engaging with Prop’s analysis that politicians do it even knowing that the lawsuits won’t work, because suing alone is enough to create a chilling effect.     - Bring back Sarah’s characterisation that this doesn’t actually work to silence media organisations. Business models have developed systems around being sued, such as insurance and a strong legal team belongs here!     - We should also explain how defamation laws will work and the likelihood of legal abuse can be minimised.       * E.g. Frivolous lawsuits get thrown out by courts very quickly during the summary trial, so it doesn’t get abused very much. For the trial to go on, the lawsuit needs merit.   We need to rebut Prop’s check-and-balance of the media industry self-regulating against false information. Explain things like the average user is in an echo chamber and they don’t counter-check for competing narratives.   * When you explained low media literacy, it could’ve reinforced this point.   On your argument:   * Investigative journalism is a point that is more likely Proposition’s point because they reduce the likelihood of being sued for breaking laws to expose powerful people! * We are under-explaining the political harms. The harm is not just contained to politics, it extends to real victimisation of politicians as individuals. They deserve rights too despite their occupation. Focus on the most vulnerable stakeholder such as female politicians. Expand the harms of these people being victims of a public witch-hunt.   07:09 - Please offer POIs consistently! | | | | | | |