| **Student Name:** Stephanie Kwok |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Where is your hook?  Set-up   * Good work establishing you have checks and balances - point out how this also deals with the problems OG highlights; spell out explicitly how you co-opt these benefits. * 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. * On social media - this isn’t a part of the OG case, and that’s exactly the point! What’s responsible for all the bias/polarisation they point out! * 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?   Rebuttal   * Why isn’t this about ideological bias? We assert this, but move on. Why does it lead to self censorship? We assert that reporting just doesn’t happen because of the state - but if this is true, can this debate happen? It hurts your positive case too! * The point to make is that people disengage! That if they are extremist, they go online for what they want; they don’t change the appetites for individuals. * On inherent biases, explain 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.   Argument 1   * 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. * Explain what the average news consumer in this debate is; are they scrutinising on the basis of loopholes? * Why do we have such specific information about the original implementation of the Fairness Doctrine…? * Don’t fixate on the loopholes of the state messing about with the model; sound more reasonable! 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.   How do you solve the bias problem? Don’t people self-select into Fox, or CNN, or Breitbart anyways?  07:01  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |