| **Student Name:** Andrew Man |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Good link to retrospective; explain why people engage with it in this way. Explain the situation and scenario in which people consume it, if this is late night television; post-work, exhausted, looking to be entertained.  Rebuttal   * Why does satire lead to a replacement of good news; what is the comparative your side supports, and how does it lead to engagement? * They explain why checks and balances against inaccuracy and fact-checking exists; you need to explain why even if it is accurate, they buy into simplicity - and that is bad, because they can’t access the nuance or subtlety.   + For instance, coverage on Obamacare focused on the failure of its website + Republican opposition rather than explaining insurance market dynamics, adverse selection problems, or the fundamental tension between universal coverage and cost control.   + Viewers left with strong opinions about healthcare politics but little understanding of why American healthcare costs so much or how different reform approaches might work.   A clash? What is the structure of this speech?   * Why aren’t they engaged? Why is this true? What is the comparative? I am repeating myself here/this analysis is also repetitive. * 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.   Argument   * Entertainment; why are they behaving in this way/this is also repetitive from above. * Explain how this desensitisation means that dehumanisation occurs - we have psychological distance; explain how humour takes away the stakes of the situation. * How do we deal with this in our world though? * Clear on the harm, well impacted on preservation! However - don’t other mechanisms exist, or has the rise of satire eroded/replaced these other mechanisms?   06:16  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |