| **Student Name:** Claudia Yeung |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house regrets the increasing commercialisation of 'self care' |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 6 minutes’ long.]  Can I have the hook add some value to the debate, instead of just being a short summation?  I appreciate the attempt to explain the economic principles on why the prices will be high on the side of Proposition.   * But more demand does not actually equal high prices, because competition between multiple providers among a wide consumer base would also drive prices down. * A better explanation here would be why consumerism is so overwhelming to the point that consumers are exploited into paying higher prices, and there’s collusion among industry giants to keep market prices here.   At this rate, both speakers in the Opposition have questioned why self-care is conflated to beauty products.   * While I understand the analysis that companies have the power to define what products dominate the wellness industry, I’m not exactly hearing the incentive of companies to focus on beauty products instead of the therapy apps that Opp says the debate is about. So we still have to clarify why the debate falls more heavily in your context.   Since this isn’t a policy motion, we have no Prop fiat to assume that products and services relating to self-care will be widely available or affordable on your side.   * We can’t stop at saying that there’s no price tag on your side. You have to re-characterise the status quo’s level of awareness on self-care and explain where the supply is coming from. Who is making these products and distributing them for free? Who is talking about these things online without corporate advertising and influencers?   It’s a losing battle in arguing on the clash of accessibility if we don’t engage with Dominic’s argument!   * While poor consumers cannot access a lot of these products, more products become more available in the market on Opp's side. What can poor people access on your side in your comparative?   + To take this down, we have to deal with Opp’s analysis on stigma on issues pertaining to mental wellness. We have to explain why the corporate incentive to convert this into aesthetics will dominate instead.   + At best, I can accept this as a good mitigation, but not enough to tip the scales to proposition on the issue of accessibility. So we’re better off concluding with a trade-off analysis here.     - To still win this clash, you can question the quality of these products like online therapy, some of them like BetterHelp do actually more harm than good to the mental health of consumers.   Nice job offering POIs today!  6.20 | | | | | | |