| **Student Name:** Vania Wong |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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 to 6.30 minutes’ long.]  After observing that the Proposition conceded that these videos are capable of influencing society, we need to shift the debate first as to why influencing more charity is what decides this debate!   * 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. * To be fair to the speaker before you, the impact they talked about is how this form of philanthropy is actually harmful. Might not be the best approach to start your speech on that note given that.   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.   On expanding the audience and encouraging people to make charitable donations, we can make a strategic observation that Proposition provided no positive comparative to fix the problem of the lack of charity.   * So it’s a negative case that doesn’t take away from the fact that Opp still has more nett positive benefits.   The speech felt undirected up until the 2 - 3 minute mark. What was the point of the observations you made? It is true that there is some benefit proven in terms of charity being accrued - but how does this impact the debate overall? As a whip, you must put some time into explaining the way that your team has outweighed or out-proven crucial aspects of the proposition speech.  On achieving a nett positive benefit, we could’ve explained that the goal of charity is not some vague moral exercise in improving altruism, it is to improve the quality of life of the most vulnerable. This explanation will do some work in explaining to the judge that tangible outcomes must outweigh the moral principles argued by the Proposition.  Great work on the clout angle - but you could have gone so much further! For example, what is the way we assess the impact of clout in terms of consistent donations, volume of donations, etc? This is a crucial piece of analysis that should have been expanded on.  Don’t enter a new comparative after the 6th minute, watch for time!  Please offer more POIs in the debate!  6.40 | | | | | | |