| **Student Name:** Hanna Zhang |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would implement the fairness doctrine 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:  Don’t just say this and move on! Break down what this means; if there is a trust deficit, do they leave? Do they stay? Their benefits are contingent on people engaging with this media; if their framing is true (self-selection) - don’t they get turned off by this balanced reporting and go online? This is our first rebuttal, but must be unpacked in the first minute comprehensively without the messy signposting; by sorting this up top, you do it in the most high impact space!  People already fear that mainstream media are being corrupted by the state. Any further trust deficit caused by the state interfering into the realms of free speech will force consumers away from mainstream media. They will instead choose to consume information in the underground and niche streams of information that are difficult to regulate, and exist in far more radical echo chambers.  On your set-up; engage with the specific responses Charles has on all of this! Why does buy-in exist on your side? Explain what the average news consumer in this debate is; are they scrutinising on the basis of loopholes? You have to point out that your burden is not to break echo-chambers; and that they don’t either; but that a fairness doctrine is innately unfair/does more harm than good.  Why is it better for each individual company/channel to be regulated, rather than enforcing standardisation across each company/channel. How do you solve the engagement problem here?  On bias - don’t focus on the image and implementation, it makes you sound uncharitable. Explain instead why biases exist anyways; they just exist covertly. Journalists and media owners will continue to have their own political opinion. The coverage they provide will still be imbued in biased narratives that are difficult to control. Viewers who don’t know any better will assume that the information they consume is neutral. At least with their political positions declared, viewers can consume information knowing it will be biased.   * + Note also, that by not taking radical positions, is that not inherently conservative? Or status quo biased?   + How would coverage of BLM, or the George Floyd protests be covered on OG?   + Refer to the shifting of the Overton Window; the range of what is/isn’t acceptable.   If your extension is all the follow-up necessary analysis that you keep referring to, it indicates you need to clean up the structure of your speech/don’t run this as your extension, but break your speech into key questions and highlight what the new contributions are. You don’t HAVE to have an extension as deputy in BP!  Good on the impossibility of engaging with all content/subjectivity existing. Explain how news requires speculation + predictions - this isn’t possible on the other side. Link to the BBC/Rees-Mogg example we talked about earlier. Connect this to the need of identity/expression and autonomy - this is an excellent point; make it about the quality of reporting also getting worse under this doctrine. Good link to voting. Go beyond the assertion of legitimate expression and explain what it is! Why is it okay for people to want to vote for Trump - he makes them feel heard etc.  Messy structure, good content!  07:03  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |