| **Student Name:** Sarah Han |
| --- |

| **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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  HOW does it control people’s opinions? 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   * Why is it biased? In what ways? * Good work establishing what significant reach looks like. Why is this just a debate about these, as opposed to other sources? Pinpoint why this deals with 80% of the harm. * It is important to establish what this ISN’T a debate about as well - can you claim to solve extremism/conspiracy theories? Or do they engage with extreme niche sources anyways? * Give examples of what coverage looks like in the status quo, and how it changes after.   Argument 1   * Start by establishing the incentives to engage in confirmation bias, both in how consumers select the news they consume + the way in which companies want to give consumers what they want. Use the Fox CEO’s comments on fact-checking which we talked about in class. There are structural disincentives to do this.   + 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. * 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. * We need to explain why this is the correct solution, as opposed to just regulating individual channels - because the average consumer is passive and we need to fix these sources as one stop shops.   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.  We have to hit 6 minutes!  05:03 - Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Cyrus Yuan |
| --- |

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  On these biased views - why don’t they go away on Prop; why do you solve them? Is this an issue you can win on? Good on how they have the power to just disengage; but why do they do this/how do you resolve it.  Framing   * I think we want to push this as quickly and succinctly as possible; the example is too fixated on feasibility i.e. how do you find the time to interview everyone, rather than explaining how no pro/con coverage can exist such as the vaccines example (which is fine), or even on race issues etc. Can there be proper coverage on complicated issues? * Subjectivity - also fair, but we’re taking too long to establish this. We should have established this comprehensively and conclusively - fair on how it becomes a moral issue; abortion or drug use would have been a better example to use here.   Set-up   * 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   * 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 Prop?   + Refer to the shifting of the Overton Window; the range of what is/isn’t acceptable.   Argument 1 - at 4:50! Too late for 1st Opp.   * How do you solve the bias problem? Don’t people self-select into Fox, or CNN, or Breitbart anyways? * 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.   Do people engage with broadcast media in the status quo? Is that the problem? Or is it social media?  06:12  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Joanne Lau |
| --- |

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Explain why it’s only on your side that this blocking out cannot occur, because every news source that is meaningful is going to be regulated; they don’t do that. They let people exist in echo-chambers, even if there isn’t fake news (their fact checking solves this), they still have biased coverage.  Rebuttal   * Challenge feasibility on the range of people being interviewed, but you cannot force people to engage with the media holistically - your policy literally targets this. * On asking what they do - spend more time on this! You barely engaged with their argument on echo-chambers and polarisation. What does the average consumer behaviour mean for their fact checking model? * We didn’t engage at all with their framing on subjectivity and balanced reporting being impossible to do with complex issues.   Argument 1 - is there anything meaningfully different between this and what your first speaker talked about?   * Start by establishing the incentives to engage in confirmation bias, both in how consumers select the news they consume + the way in which companies want to give consumers what they want. Use the Fox CEO’s comments on fact-checking which we talked about in class. There are structural disincentives to do this.   + 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. * POI: This is an opportunity for you to explain exclusivity with regards to the motion, which you aren’t doing! Why is the fairness doctrine on media with such reach the ONLY solution?   + 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. * **We need to explain why this is the correct solution, as opposed to just regulating individual channels - because the average consumer is passive and we need to fix these sources as one stop shops.** We eventually say this, but don’t point out this means there isn’t a positive path to victory on Opp.   Let’s ask POIs consistently!  05:47 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jodie Li |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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:  The biggest call out on their side is their lack of engagement with the concept of subjectivity/the ability to cover issues genuinely in a balanced fashion. The opening at the moment is a vague illustration of harm - what is it doing?  The more general explanation of how complicated/complex issues are difficult to cover simply and presenting ‘both’ sides needs to be spelled out with a clearer implication; what is the purpose of the news, to what extent, and with what depth do people need to be informed?  On these biased views - why don’t they go away on Prop; why do you solve them? Is this an issue you can win on? Good on how they have the power to just disengage; but why do they do this/how do you resolve it. 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 feasibility - this isn’t necessarily debating in good faith; spend less time on this/establish how there are other incentives that mean regulations are engaged with ‘strategically’. Point to how this already happens in the status quo. Look up the Gary Lineker BBC scandal.  Argument 1   * Clear thesis. Good! * 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 is the status quo biased?   + How would coverage of BLM, or the George Floyd protests be covered on Prop?   + Refer to the shifting of the Overton Window; the range of what is/isn’t acceptable. * Explain what the impact of standardisation is. 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? Your positive path to victory is missing!  Do people engage with broadcast media in the status quo? Is that the problem? Or is it social media?  Let’s ask POIs consistently!  06:13 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Gemma Yeung |
| --- |

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  They don’t have a positive path to victory. This is the biggest winning/losing issue for you/them. Yes, this is a simplification - but compared to what? Explain why it’s only on your side that this blocking out cannot occur, because every news source that is meaningful is going to be regulated; they don’t do that. They let people exist in echo-chambers, even if there isn’t fake news (their fact checking solves this), they still have biased coverage.  You didn’t slow down re clashes + signposting. Transitions need to be slowed down, otherwise the speech blends together.  Challenge feasibility on the range of people being interviewed, but you cannot force people to engage with the media holistically - your policy literally targets this. We need to explain why this is the correct solution, as opposed to just regulating individual channels - because the average consumer is passive and we need to fix these sources as one stop shops. We eventually say this, but don’t point out this means there isn’t a positive path to victory on Opp.  On the TV remote down; point out if this is true; this debate is a wash; do they achieve anything? If this is true, surely this is WORSE in their world? What is their positive path to victory?  Start by establishing the incentives to engage in confirmation bias, both in how consumers select the news they consume + the way in which companies want to give consumers what they want. Use the Fox CEO’s comments on fact-checking which we talked about in class. There are structural disincentives to do this. 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.  We didn’t engage at all with their framing on subjectivity and balanced reporting being impossible to do with complex issues.  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.  There is no such thing as a clash-less third speech. You have to have clashes. Otherwise, there is no structure at all!  06:07 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Catherine Ho |
| --- |

| **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:  The biggest call out on their side is their lack of engagement with the concept of subjectivity/the ability to cover issues genuinely in a balanced fashion. The opening at the moment is a vague illustration of harm - what is it doing? The biggest issue we need to resolve is the lack of a positive pathway to victory! On these biased views - why don’t they go away on Prop; why do you solve them? Is this an issue you can win on?  Clash 1: True Balanced Media   * 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 is the status quo biased?   + How would coverage of BLM, or the George Floyd protests be covered on Prop?   + Refer to the shifting of the Overton Window; the range of what is/isn’t acceptable. * How do you solve the bias problem? Don’t people self-select into Fox, or CNN, or Breitbart anyways? Your positive path to victory is missing! * Do people engage with broadcast media in the status quo? Is that the problem? Or is it social media? * No swearing! * Explain what the impact of standardisation is. 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.   Clash 2: Depth - you started this at 05:44….   * The more general explanation of how complicated/complex issues are difficult to cover simply and presenting ‘both’ sides needs to be spelled out with a clearer implication; what is the purpose of the news, to what extent, and with what depth do people need to be informed? * 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?   Let’s ask POIs consistently! How many POIs did we ask today?  06:14 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Hanson Ko |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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:  The biggest call out on their side is their lack of engagement with the concept of subjectivity/the ability to cover issues genuinely in a balanced fashion. The opening at the moment is a vague illustration of harm - what is it doing? The biggest issue we need to resolve is the lack of a positive pathway to victory! On these biased views - why don’t they go away on Prop; why do you solve them? Is this an issue you can win on?  What is the structure of this speech?  The more general explanation of how complicated/complex issues are difficult to cover simply and presenting ‘both’ sides needs to be spelled out with a clearer implication; what is the purpose of the news, to what extent, and with what depth do people need to be informed?  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 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 is the status quo biased? * How would coverage of BLM, or the George Floyd protests be covered on Prop? * Refer to the shifting of the Overton Window; the range of what is/isn’t acceptable.   How do you solve the bias problem? Don’t people self-select into Fox, or CNN, or Breitbart anyways? Your positive path to victory is missing!  Do people engage with broadcast media in the status quo? Is that the problem? Or is it social media?  Explain what the impact of standardisation is. 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.  Good work asking POIs consistently.  06:10  There is no such thing as a clash-less third speech. You have to have clashes. Otherwise, there is no structure at all! | | | | | | |