| **Student Name:** Hanna Zhang |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house regrets the rise of political satire |
| --- |

| 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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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:  Excellent opening. Explain how satire created this distance between voters and parties; that it had to be a binary, that it had to be an us versus them.   * The format structurally required punchlines and binary narratives that could not accommodate policy complexity, forcing a reduction of issues like healthcare or climate change into simple good-versus-evil stories that eliminated necessary tradeoffs and implementation challenges.   Clash 1   * Information - don’t call it a subclash, call it a layer, or a tier!   + Explain why it is character assassination, rather than being issue based; we explain that satire is bad, and can be bad - but not why there are structural reasons for this; punchlines to make people laugh because that’s what keeps people on; sensationalisation and so forth - spell out the incentives of studios! Studios prioritize audience retention over accuracy because their revenue depends on viewership. The comedy format structurally demands oversimplification. Sensationalization becomes inevitable under ratings pressure. Competition drives increasingly extreme content.   + On whether people understand these as jokes; you need to engage with what Charles says in terms of this being their only hook in/hence valuable; but with a missing CF from Prop - this harm I do not bite.   + What is the CF? This is unclear; SQ says ‘protest art’ - but is this a replacement for news, which is what satire is technically replacing?   + Good call out on gateway assertion; but this is uncomparative! Is traditional media not also personal attack based? Opp identify Fox/right wing channels as the alternative. * Engagement - you didn’t flag when you went into engagement.   Clash 2   * Explain why it is always a binary of good versus bad, Democrat versus Republicans. * Echo-chambers; good. Conservative viewers stopped watching SNL and The Daily Show; liberal viewers used these programs to reinforce existing beliefs. You can say that they felt pressure to do ‘both sides’ - but this then made it worse, because Clinton/Trump are not the same. * Were these viewers ever watching these issues in the first place? Good on engaging with the washing Charles attempts; explain why the CF meant that this wouldn’t have happened. * We have a timeline issue; Breitbart etc. didn’t emerge because satire became prominent; they grew organically separately; you can pinpoint that it degraded politics and made it more entertainment forward - and hence lead to Trump etc. being popular.   06:10  Let’s ask POIs more consistently! | | | | | | |