| **Student Name:** Theodore Wang |
| --- |

| **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.]  In debates like this one, it is actually best if you build the content for your opponent. It is true that the speaker before you has not proven the harm just yet - but they could in the next speech. It's best that you predict and pre-empt these harms before they have the chance to blindside you with them.   * After stating that at least SOME people are benefiting from the Tesla, reinforce the real problem statement is the lack of charity to begin with. This will solidify the real debate comparative that SOME people being helped is better than no people being helped.   Furthermore, to Proposition’s credit, they do prove some harm. They proved the element of exploitation. The correct and more accurate response is to suggest that the impact is minimal.  Pushing back and explaining that intentions don’t actually matter in contrast to tangible benefits is the right start, but we still have to engage with Prop’s claim that the profit motivation leads to abusive and pernicious ways in which the charity is being distributed.   * Engage with Prop’s harms that they’re helping the wrong people, or helping in ways that are not very meaningful in the long-term.   + Here, we could’ve highlighted what checks and balances exist to mitigate the harms in this industry, e.g. criticisms from channel viewers to hold these entertainers accountable.   It might be intuitive to suggest that the money and aid provided matters more than the intention. But if you reflect on your team's case, you guys haven’t actually proved that. A general rule of thumb is that if you’re suggesting that something is more valuable, you should immediately go into a few reasons for why that is the case to avoid this.  Structure-wise, is there a reason that we said we’re moving into rebuttals at 2.45 after rebutting for the last few minutes already?   * A lot of the rebuttals here on tangible charity and intentions being immaterial here became repetitive of the earlier material!   To win on the clash of scale of people helped, we should:   * Reinforce the problems in the status quo on why we’re lacking awareness and initiatives in the area of charity. Why do people lack the incentives to contribute absent of these entertainers? * Build a comparative on why watching these entertainers will actually build an audience base who becomes more willing to engage in charity.   At times, some of the observations of the debate felt a bit random - for example, you suggested that the money was going to go to rich people anyway which is quite unclear. You have to make the strategic value of these observations more pronounced.  Good job offering POIs today!   * Pay attention to the time as well, ask for the POI before the 5th minute.   6.40 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |