| **Student Name:** Jodie Li |
| --- |

| **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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  What does it look like today? Good on lack of nuance, the focus being on the punch-line; do we have any illustrations of what this might look like?  Set-up   * Let’s do this without bursting in giggles please; the content characterisation must come first, with a follow up explanation as to how this ends up being circulated on social media/the goal is to go viral. * Don’t just reference profit maximising culture; characterise what the characteristics of satire are + the specific commercial interests that underlie it. * On the counterfactual - animations? I think you should 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. * 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   * Clear thesis. * ‘Messaging becomes unlikely to become unmeaningful in the very first place’.   + 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.   + Good on consolidation of media - good examples of Murdoch and Bezos. * Empathy - why does engagement with this counterfactual happen?   + Good work explaining how this dehumanisation/humanisation process occurs. Use an example to showcase how this might occur; use the SNL ad we watched together! See the POI Gemma asks on engagement.     - Why don’t these simplifications fall into the same pitfalls? If distance is the mechanism - isn’t this symmetric? * Comparative - corporate censorship is symmetric; social media is also symmetric. You’re impacting research, but I don’t buy this engagement occurs.   Argument 2   * 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.   08:15 - good work; ask POIs consistently. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Gemma Yeung |
| --- |

| **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:  Explain that this is retrospective; this is about what the rise of political satire has done, rather than what it ‘could do’ - this isn’t a general assessment of harm/good; good call out on Trump.  Do set-up first! Characterise how the nature of politics has changed, in terms of social media - the rise of the alt right, the rise of out of establishment figures like Trump; and that traditional news media just doesn’t know how to engage with them; we do this by explaining the nature of satire in terms of what types can exist in rebuttals, but doing this as housekeeping prior would be more astute.  Good on buy-in! Explain how their counterfactual on cartoons and simplification doesn’t really work. Good engagement on apathy; explain how people were alienated, were turned away - satire changed that, especially for young people; the 2008 Obama campaign directly credited shows like The Daily Show and SNL with helping mobilize younger voters who had previously been politically disengaged.  Argument 1   * Spell out what the thesis of the argument is! Characterise how politics has changed first, rather than making it exclusively about the unique nature of political satire to deal with figures like Trump.   + Political discourse has become a performative spectacle - politicians began crafting their public personas for entertainment value; corporate capture of traditional journalism had already destroyed its accountability function + political institutions lost public trust through failures like Watergate, Iran-Contra etc.   + Explain how the rise of satire served as a necessary democratic adaptation - satirical shows recognized that much of politics had become absurd theater performed by self-interested actors.   + Traditional journalism's access-dependent model meant reporters couldn't effectively challenge powerful figures without losing their jobs. Satirical shows faced no such constraints - they could call politicians liars, expose hypocrisy, and reveal incompetence without worrying about future interview access.   Argument 2   * Voter literacy; repetitive content from responses. * You can dive deeper on access; would the average person engage with policy details without the kind of coverage Last Week Tonight/John Oliver do? * There’s also analysis on how it democratises political criticism!   08:17  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sarah Han |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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:  We need to engage from the get go on why we get engagement on our side; we call them out for why they do not get the benefit they claim, but we have to plug the gap first! We list out alternates that may exist, but why won’t this fall susceptible to the echo-chamber/confirmation bias either?   * 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.   What is the structure of this speech?  Rebuttal   * 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!   + We need to engage with Gemma’s explanation as to why spread happens/censorship doesn’t happen.   + 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.   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 do we mean by ‘put above’; you have to explain how this plays out! Why do people engage with it in this way; how has it just become a show on television rather than a moment of resistance or protest? * Why don’t your cartoons etc. fall into the same pitfalls? If distance is the mechanism - isn’t this symmetric? * Explain how the comedy format structurally requires punchlines and binary narratives that cannot accommodate policy complexity, forcing reduction of issues like healthcare or climate change into simple good-versus-evil stories that eliminate necessary tradeoffs and implementation challenges.   + Someone has to be the butt of the joke! Why don’t we always punch up/why might shows end up punching down?   We need to ask POIs consistently!  07:01 - we spoke a minute under time! | | | | | | |