| **Student Name:** Adrian Wong |
| --- |

| **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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Your opening should always try to illustrate the harm you want to prevent/try to characterise the problem - why are we having this debate, what is the problem, what do we need to solve? This is important framing, and allows you to package/boost style speaks. For instance, you could walk me through the Jan 6th Capitol Riots, and why they happened, linking to the misinformation and polarisation that led to it.  Set-up   * Good work making it parallel to BBC policies. * ‘Large scale of audience’ doesn’t provide clarity. For instance, readership rates/viewership etc. * 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? For instance, saying this isn’t a debate about extremists (Breitbart level)? The observation you make on the market staying the same is slightly confusing re what it is meant to achieve. * Give examples of what coverage looks like in the status quo, and how it changes after. * Good on purpose of news; why is this the case? This is a normative statement, not objectively true. * Don’t call this four pieces of characterisation - this is not characterisation, it is set-up.   Argument 1   * Clear thesis. * This benefit is contingent on polarisation existing in strong doses on the mainstream media; first establish this by providing examples of coverage that is insidious. * We need to strongly establish, for this argument to work, that the news/information being consumed is what causes polarisation + reinforces it. The process of engagement with the news is entirely missing, so I am not sure why people have the opinions they do, what makes them flip and so forth. * Is this comparative? 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. 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 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. * 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.   07:00 - Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ryan Qian |
| --- |

| **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:  On making media neutral; the upshot gets lost because you start with this and then go into localised channels also existing. Is this the same point, or is this a different point? Our opening needs to be clearer.  Framing/Observations:   * On bias existing - why is this true on both sides? And why is this not the problem of the debate; what is this the problem of the debate? * Is local news bad? Do we not want people to go to this? Why would they go to them? You haven’t characterised the news reader/consumer and are asserting their behaviour. * Why are there more checks? Yes, greater readership - but this isn’t sufficient analysis.   Rebuttal   * Good on confirmation bias; explain that this means that people self-select; the issue is, they can say that’s why the average news channel needs to be a comprehensive one stop shop. What do you do to resolve this? If your claim is that people disengage and go to local crazy reporting; why is local reporting crazy, why do they disengage? * There is lots of repetition with this rebuttal, and the earlier framing. On what the media requires, re coverage - what is this disproving? This is a line of positive analysis in a sea of rebuttal. You’re meant to disprove arguments, rather than just providing analysis on the issue. * On local channels - this needed to be established as the likely CF in set-up in far greater detail. I am still unsure as to what this is, or how it manifests.   Argument 1   * Confirmation bias being repeated 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 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? * On neutrality - the point to make is that 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 you have a positive path to victory?  07:15 - Let’s ask POIs consistently! Where was the transition to the 2nd argument marked? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sarah Choi |
| --- |

| **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:  Who is this debate about? The average person, the extremist who? You imply it’s about the average person - but are they then being affected by this policy? The arguments Adrian runs are about the person between average and extreme; this is adding to the confusion to the stance/case.  On the news; clarify the CF first. Do people turn to local channels which Ryan says are worse, or do they stay engaged with the channel? This needs to be clarified up top. Good work analysing what the average person is like - but this analysis isn’t then connected to the response! The real question to ask here is - what does Opp want? Why do they ensure people get truthful, high quality news? Do they have a positive path to victory?   * 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? For instance, saying this isn’t a debate about extremists (Breitbart level)? The observation you make on the market staying the same is slightly confusing re what it is meant to achieve.   POI - 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 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.  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.   Argument 1   * What’s new here? * 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.   When you speak too fast, you swallow words up. You have to slow down. The enunciation also doesn’t help! This is also worsened by the times where you can’t understand what your notes say and it throws you off. You also don’t complete your sentences! If I was to transcribe your speech, it would have so many cut-offs and chunky moments. Listen to recorded speeches to gain more awareness as to where your flow stands.  Let’s ask POIs consistently!  07:02 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Matias 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: | 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:  Don’t use jargons/terms with connotations without unpacking them. If we live in a post-truth society, what does this mean? Unpack this up top - you don’t want the judge’s first impression of this news to be that this will be, logically, all over and they’ll have to order it chronologically.  Rebuttal   * This is not a debate about all of that kind of media; if the point is that they misidentify where misinformation and polarisation come from, make this the push. You also then need to do something to resolve this problem. What positive path to victory exists? * On local channels/smaller media houses - this needed to be established as the likely CF in set-up in far greater detail. I am still unsure as to what this is, or how it manifests. * On censoring - good! The point to make is that 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 establishing the thought process of the news reader. Explain that this means that people self-select; the issue is, they can say that’s why the average news channel needs to be a comprehensive one stop shop. What do you do to resolve this? If your claim is that people disengage and go to local crazy reporting; why is local reporting crazy, why do they disengage?  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.   How do you solve the bias problem? Don’t people self-select into Fox, or CNN, or Breitbart anyways? The point on competition/market resolves point is made in a far too blase way; why do they care about the moderate/centrist viewers?  Do you have a positive path to victory? This is never given enough time in your speech, where you break it down conclusively!  Your POIs are too long. They have to be succinctly phrased.  07:11 | | | | | | |