| **Student Name:** Dominic Gao |
| --- |

| **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.]  Did you just make up a word in the hook or were you trying to pronounce “inextricable”?!   * It would be good if we immediately reinforced precisely why it’s so morally repugnant at this point of the debate. * I understand your moral clash in general, 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.   The beginning of your speech could really really use more energy and a more assertive tone - especially when in a context where your opponent’s are basically beating up your case.  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.   I appreciate the characterisation on how these contestants are being abused, but can we explain why their right to consent to the conditions of these games do not exist (in light of how financially desperate they are)?   * We need to also grow beyond this single example, we need layers of mechanistic analysis on the different and 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? Such as helping those with sob stories but not those with stigmatised struggles like drug addictions?   + E.g. Are they only helping in superficial ways and then refusing to help in the long-term? Such as 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?   The argument of a rich saviour saving the poor actually isn’t too strategic for your side - if you think about it, rich people are the heads of charities and a good number of efforts to curtail poverty anyway. This applies to you too.  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?   + I like the angle that it’s TAKING AWAY charitable contributions that could’ve gone to good charities in favour of the charities of the philanthro-trainers, we can spend more time here. Explain that your burden here is the minimisation of harms, rather than getting more charities overall than the Opposition side! * 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.   Please offer more POIs in the debate!  6.18 | | | | | | |