| **Student Name:** Emma Demopoulos |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would implement fairness doctrines on broadcast news media with significant audience reach |
| --- |

| 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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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 8 minutes’ long.]  We were defensive right away with the slavery example, it would be better to just focus on your exclusive winning pathway.  On the set-up:   * We should start with explaining what exactly is the fairness doctrine requirement first. * Good enforcement mechanism on federal broadcasting agencies. * The defense on the underground information streams is good by focusing on scale. * Convert the breaking of echo chambers and maximising diverse exposure as the main winning pathway! Why exactly is this the most important thing in the debate?   Why are we pre-butting a model that they haven’t given? We should repackage the low media literacy as part of our expansive problem statement, including our statements on misinformation and echo chambers. We are currently asserting the problems, rather than proving the extent of this.  On the media obligation:   * We’re not explaining where the obligation even comes from, re: media houses are a culturally normative force which have the capacity to shape the decision making calculus of individuals. * Good mechanistic analysis on why media biases often exist.   + This is where we have to insert the comparative as to why the free market of information cannot correct itself.     - E.g. Media orgs cannot check and balance each other due to the trust deficit, so you don’t listen to the call-outs by competing media houses. * After explaining the problematic media practices such as sensationalism, we need to correlate all of this to how it harms public interest.   + Only after we expand the harm, then we can justify why the overwhelming influence that the media holds necessitates the intervention of the state.   On getting change via diversity:   * We’re lacking grounding on how these echo chambers actually construct problematic dominant opinions in society! * The change is missing many mechanistic steps. Simply being exposed to contrary opinions doesn’t address all the reasons people have to not support certain causes.   + We need to expand this to the characterisation of what you think the discourse would look like under a fairness doctrine.     - E.g. During discourse, all narratives that politicians air are pushed onto a neutral platform, which forces them to defend their stances instead of using fear-mongering and inflammatory language. This means a politician whose campaign is founded on anti-immigration and justifies it though xenophobia has to bring up factual information in order to counter their opposition. The comparative is that opposition confines bigotry to an echo chamber, leaving it unchallenged and to fester.     - E.g. You propose a neutral mediator that will equally support the minority representation. * The burden could be lowered if we focused only on representation, rather than actual change.   Slow down, Emma! A lot of things are falling through the cracks if I cannot track you.  Good job offering POIs today!  8.10 - Good timing. | | | | | | |