| **Student Name:** Zechariah Chen |
| --- |

| **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.]  Was there ever really a stigma against charity? We can do some work here on what a world “opposing philanthro-tainment” will look like, do they have support some kind of shaming entertainers like Mr Beast?  It’s a stretch to suggest that channels will be taken down. It’s also likely to be a stretch to suggest that people who vlog charity works will be involved in this debate - it seems to revolve around a unique type of influencer with a large following.  Provide a clearer counter set-up first before your rebuttals:   * Explain the metric or burden when it comes to supporting philanthro-tainment. * Highlight what checks and balances exist to mitigate the harms in this industry, e.g. criticisms from channel viewers to hold these entertainers accountable. * We can burden push the Proposition and ask them to provide a positive comparative to improve charitable contributions.   The first rebuttal should not have been settled as a wash - the point wasn’t so much that they wanted profit. The point from the proposition was that this is morally wrong as we are exploiting suffering for money. A way to respond to this is to suggest that it might be exploitative, but the aid provided is more important.  In a motion that is regarding things that have happened, your arguments would be a lot stronger if you could point to actual examples. For example, when you suggest that Mr.Beast could work with a charity, that is speculative. Do you have any specific examples of where a YouTuber, etc has done so?  There was a lot more that can be said for the angle mentioned on how these people uniquely help charities. What is the unique angle here? Is it because they have fandoms, etc? How does that uniquely impact YouTubers?  While I appreciate the call-out on the lack of distinction between philanthro-tainment and other forms of charity, we need to actually explain why they are the same.   * We can hold Mercy accountable, but how do we hold Mr Beast accountable? Explain that we can improve on any abuses since these entertainers have to maintain their popularity among the public.   Solid analysis on improving the incentives for people to provide more charity.   * Can we explain the problems in the status quo on why we’re lacking awareness and initiatives in this area? * On the impact statement, can we analyse why the scale of how many people are benefitted must win this debate? I appreciate that you’ve identified the metrics, we just need a final strategic explanation on why these metrics are debate-winning! * The angel here on why these entertainers are faster vs a charity is a double edged sword. Yes, there are standards to adhere to - but these standards assure the safety of the funds and recipients. In general, you don’t want to introduce this type of analysis since it can be used against you.   Don’t take the POI when you’re mid-sentence!  Good job offering POIs today!  6.26 - Good timing! | | | | | | |