| **Student Name:** Marvis Leung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house 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:  I like the opening - but I think it can have more oomph; you should spell out how satire and satirical coverage has hijacked our political discourse, degrading the quality of engagement with the news.  Set-up   * I think we should start by characterising what the characteristics of satire are + the specific commercial interests that underlie it. * On the counterfactual - explain that you can have a range of options; investigative journalism, public broadcasting, depictions in popular culture; and then illustrate what coverage looks like here versus through satire. * If we know that Opp will run engagement, we need to safeguard and highlight why people engage with the CF we support. * Note that this is a retrospective motion; what has this rise done, rather than what it could do; did its rise and dominance in coverage mean we didn’t end up taking Trump + other alt right members of the administration seriously - which then translates into real political issues.   Argument 1   * What is the thesis of this argument? * 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. * POI: censorship exists; this debate doesn’t happen in those conditions. * The impact needs to be clear - when citizens get their political information primarily through comedic framing, they lose appreciation for the genuine complexity of governing. The 2016 election cycle exemplified this - serious discussions about trade policy, immigration reform, and healthcare were overshadowed by viral clips of politicians being mocked. * How does it change political coverage? Do we have policy discussions - or instead focus on the silliest things said; race to the bottom.   Argument 2   * What is the thesis of this argument? What is new and distinct about this argument; these are just other potential harms/ways in which satire could occur - without explaining why it will and **has** occurred in this way! * You can also explain that everyone is a target; which ends up creating false equivalencies and encourages voter apathy; if everyone is bad - why do you vote? * Analysis on fact-checking/legitimacy on sources is missing. * Why is the counterfactual better? The positive analysis as to how your side prevents these problems is missing!   07:49 | | | | | | |