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

| **Motion:** This house opposes philanthro-tainment |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 6 to 6.30 minutes’ long.]  The hook didn’t really work in this speech. The reason was because the debate shifted away from exploitation. The LO claims that influencers can do charity genuinely out of the good of their hearts and that the intention does not matter compared to the impact these influencers bring. You must take that into account.   * The moral criticism is clear but at this point of the debate, the main clash is who provides more charity. So we need to do some work to explain why the exploitation factor still matters more than the scale of people helped in the debate.   We’re doing a good job mitigating a lot of Opp’s positive impacts, such as there’s no guarantee that in every instance the correct people are being helped nor are they helped in a meaningful way.   * But we’re still lacking in the comparative! Surely, SOME poor people helped is better than little to no people helped right?   + Re-explain the counterfactual and how Proposition is capable of encouraging more charity in absence of these entertainers who provide charity.   The first few rebuttals felt convenient. This is because the case didn’t evolve beyond bad influencers. What about influencers who are able to represent the people they help with integrity? What is the case at that point?  If these content creators never actually provided any prizes or rewards to the people, then are they actually philanthro-trainers? Try to provide some kind of grounding of renowned philanthro-trainers who get away with pulling such tricks without any recourse.   * The harms would be more magnified if we explained why it’s impossible to hold these entertainers accountable as they are hiding under the guise of being “charitable” when they do abuse the people they help. Do they have a cult of personality? * We need stronger mechanistic analysis on the pernicious ways in which these entertainers hurt the people they claim to help:   + E.g. Are they not supporting the people truly in need, but instead helping people based on what is the most commercially palatable?   + E.g. Are they only helping in superficial ways and then refusing to help in the long-term? Like buying them a house and not helping them pay the taxes on it?   + E.g. Does the content captured represent these people in their worst moments? How can this impact them mentally, as the content captured stays on the internet forever?   How can Proposition claim that the people with the “correct” motivations will actively be providing charity to the scale that the Opposition is?   * Can we weigh why the “correct” charity on a smaller scale is more impactful than “incorrect” charity on a grander scale? * We can mitigate and challenge if Opp’s problem statement is true on the status quo lacking people with altruistic intentions giving back to society.   Good job offering POIs today! We can offer more in the first half of the debate.  6.32 - Solid timing! | | | | | | |