

**Students should complete the following questions:**

1. After reading the coverage as it was written, and assuming all content is accurate, compile three possible negative outcomes and three possible positive outcomes of publishing the content.

Positive outcomes	Negative outcomes
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.

2. A literal reading of the First Amendment would allow you to publish this story, but editors must also answer the ethical question “Should we publish?” Obviously, the editors determined the story’s potential to serve a public good far outweighed any potential negative consequences. Considering the potential negatives you listed above weighed against the potential positives, why do you think the editors chose to publish the story? Would you have made the same decision? Explain.

3. Prior to this issue, the *Cardinal Columns* was not required to submit for prior review, and they fought against it, but, ultimately, they lost. How would you fight for your full First Amendment rights if your principal instituted prior review?

Remember, a fight like this is your fight. Your adviser can help and guide, but it is not his or her First Amendment rights being violated, and your adviser, ultimately, still has to acquiesce to the principal’s or the district’s orders or risk losing his or her job.