| **Student Name:** Sarah Seryoung Choi |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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:  How does it damage political culture - give me a specific example! Our opening is slower, easier to comprehend - good!  Set-up   * Is it just criticism? Characterise what the characteristics of satire are + the specific commercial interests that underlie it. * Good work focusing on what the rise looks like!   + But remember - 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.   + Who consumes this - progressive, left wing - good! Link this to our criteria to regret this; what is our metric of evaluation? Did satire mean that we didn’t take Trump seriously? That we took him as a joke but then he ended up being elected? * More harm than benefits isn’t good enough! This is so general - we have to be specific! * Where is the counterfactual?   Argument 1   * Is the CF not also feeding you opinions? How does news consumption work in your world? Your response to my POI doesn’t actually clarify this! It seems symmetric. * Explain to me why satire is structurally bad, or structurally too simplistic. 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. * It doesn’t lead to confirmation bias; it DID lead to it. * Don’t say there’s room for engagement with Trump/Musk; do you want to have to defend this? * On resentment - what is unique about satire? How does satire treat these issues/figure, as opposed to traditional news media? * On echo-chambers; set this up first. 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.   Argument 2 - at 6:19!   * Policies go away; explain why this is the nature of coverage of satire; explain why this is bad for politics/leads to a race to the bottom. Otherwise, the mechanisms are too similar to the first argument - this is just another impact explanation?   07:16 - I don’t buy that these problems will go away on your side. You’ve also forgotten that this is a retrospective debate. | | | | | | |