| **Student Name:** Vania Wong |
| --- |

| **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: | 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 8 minutes’ long.]  Good clarification that we correct some of the accusations that Opp provides, but be more specific on which parts you can correct.  On the counter set-up:   * Well done on your checks and balances! * On the post-Cambridge Analytica society, explain precisely what this context means and what attitudes are now prevalent in this context. * Good job setting up measures to lead to balanced reporting and exposure of biases. * Be mindful that our set-up shouldn’t be 2 minutes’ long, some of these things could be included as a rebuttal instead. * Point out that your burden isn’t to break these echo chambers, but that a fairness doctrine is innately unfair, or leads to more harm than good.   On this pushing more users underground, we have to be engaging to Prop’s claim that on scale, the average user will not be radical enough to leave mainstream media.   * So try to balance out what the average reasonable person might do.   Well done recharacterising the harm of platforming dangerous and prejudicial views!   * Be mindful that this overlaps with your argument.   We don’t have any direct rebuttals to harmful practices of media organisations, so actively weaponise the counter set-up your provided.  Good claim on violating moral minimums:   * After mechanising that this may lead to platforming dehumanising rhetoric, we need to expand what the human costs may be to minorities having their very identities delegitimised. * The impact is better focused on permission mechanisms, then explain why the average person feels like these arguments are valid despite being gravely immoral.   + Point out that viewers get desensitised to these forms of grievous moral hurt. * The impact highlighted in response to the POI is well done on driving minorities away from discourse! * Good use of laws existing to hold media organisations accountable.   On better discussions:   * We need to be more comparative and explain why this doesn’t happen anyways in the status quo. * The harm would be elevated if we explained that discourse is now skewed towards a post-truth society, so it becomes harder to come to a compromise. * We are skimping analysis on the impact!   Good job offering POIs today!  8.14 - Good timing. | | | | | | |