| **Student Name:** Charles Wang |
| --- |

| **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:  Good - explain the implication of this observation; that this is a debate about those who without satire, would literally disengage entirely from politics. What do they do for them? They have a huge huge gap in the counterfactual, and you aren't exploiting this!  Good on the gateway! Explain how they don’t engage with what Steph says on accountability and checks on accuracy etc. Explain why checks from other shows/strong editorial standards/social media accountability all exist; good on the trade off - but this should come after, and explain how this is the hook; it gets people into being engaged; they eventually graduate past the oversimplification into more serious material; if they don’t - then better than nothing.   * Push them on never explaining how these problems go away; we very calmly present the pitfalls of traditional media + ragebait.   POI - good response! 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.   * + Push them on the comparative! 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? * Good on other polarising forces existing as well; explain how this washes out their harm here. This is symmetric.   Argument 1   * This is actually an excellent argument, identifying a unique benefit satire can have, especially in authoritarian states; you ground this in extreme environments, when the most benefit is in just weak democracies, where there is limited censorship. * Push them on how there is no counterfactual; you flag this on the basis of underground sites; explain how this pushes awareness - you miss out on the impact by saying ‘really good thing’.   There are other angles here as well! You can explain how 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. Then, go on to 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.  Let’s ask POIs consistently!  06:17 | | | | | | |