| **Student Name:** Kevin Hu |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Let’s characterise what this bias looks like by packaging what its harms look like; walk me through the Jan 6th Capitol Riots, and why they happened, linking to the misinformation and polarisation that led to it. This allows you to illustrate the problem characterisation, rather than just saying it exists.  Set-up   * You need to explain what significant reach looks like, and why this is just a debate about these, as opposed to other sources. * Good work establishing an independent body to sort this out - explain the upshot here; what is the value of this? * Give examples of what coverage looks like in the status quo, and how it changes after. * Keep the characterisation to the argument; the characterisation of people only engaging with their own belief systems/being passive consumers is important because it lets you explain why both sides/all sides need to be covered. The specificity in problem characterisation/solution is missing.   Argument 1 - spell out the thesis up top, and then build to proving it. Make sure structure remains within the argument. We get slightly repetitive during due to a lack of tight structure.   * Start by characterising the consumer/what they care about; make this argument about the average person and why general exposure matters. Keep the argument on polarisation + extremism for later; it’s also likely that they engage with more niche news sources that don’t qualify per the motion and hence that harm continues to exist. * Highlight how this harm builds! When biased media reporting continues, it creates an echo chamber that continues to validate its biased narrative, and often at the expense of intellectual honesty or journalistic integrity. Voters become more hostile and intolerant as a result. Breaking echo chambers will create more informed voters. * Explain WHY bias exists - is it on the basis of ownership?   + The owner of the media organisation will have the ability to craft the journalistic environment of the agency in a politically compliant way. Media moguls, e.g. Rupert Murdoch who is a Republican, controls FOX News and hires journalists who are also conservatives. The media will no longer be socially representative, the rich will control the political agenda, while sweeping other concerns under the rug.   + Link to the Bezos example we discussed in class! This came later, in a pretty limited fashion - break it down earlier! * On incentive to stay fair - we need to consider that Opp is likely going to have a counter-prop! They won’t allow for these harms to exist. They will establish media literacy, or fact checking etc. The harms on X and Musk exist, but do they exist on their side? You need to explain why this is the ONLY way to deal with this in order to say this is the harm that exists on their side.   Our ideas are good, but need to be packaged properly. Spend time thinking about phrasing and delivery!  08:15 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Marvis Leung |
| --- |

| **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: | NA | | | | | |
| 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:  What do the call outs do? You’re just saying this is what they do, and this isn’t enough - but then aren’t analysing what the burden of the motion is in a way that is substantially different; are fair/information radically different?  Don’t deny the problem doesn’t exist, explain why it won’t be done well; for instance - that independent bodies can’t sort this out; it has to be the state - and then explain what the harms are.  Set-up   * You can’t run the fairness doctrine + analysis and adjectives. You have to justify this framing; why can’t Prop use these adjectives? Why would it be a betrayal of the fairness doctrine? Why must it occur in this limited fashion? Explain why it runs into this problem/why balanced coverage isn't a problem. We’re describing the problem, without explaining why it must exist. This happens with the POI Kevin asks; you’re rebutting a version of a case they didn’t present. If you burden push, you have to justify it. * Explain what your side does - is it media literacy programs, is it fact-checking, is it promoting market competition, is it transparency requirements?   We could have run the following!   * Biases will continue to exist covertly because 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. * 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 exists in far more radical echo chambers. * By forcing every media organisation to engage in diverse platforming of all ideas, we will be removing safe spaces for many oppressed communities. Many people will be forced to debate and justify their own existence and human rights. Radical ideas will also be normalised once they are allowed to propagate their ideals under the guise of “neutral and fair” information on all mainstream media.   Do people engage with broadcast media in the status quo? Is that the problem? Or is it social media?  04:10 | | | | | | |