| **Student Name:** Charles 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: | 71 | | | | | |
| 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 minutes’ long.]  Good start making the debate a comparison between philanthro-tainers and real charities, spend some time here explaining why this is the real trade-off. Why can't the Opposition have BOTH of them contributing to charity?  On the set-up:   * We’re providing a lot of contentious characterisation in the set-up that belongs better in the argument instead, but it is a good contribution nonetheless. * Excellent counterfactual that Proposition supports real charities that do meaningful work vs entertaining forms of charity.   + But we’re still not saying the most crucial thing, which is why these charities are COMPETING with philanthro-tainers. Point out that desire and capital to donate is finite, and this is why money that could’ve gone to a good cause is being wasted instead.   On whether the charity is going to a good cause:   * While there’s no guarantee that in every instance the correct people are being helped nor are they helped in a meaningful way, surely the Opposition's comparative is they will get MORE money to begin with. So they will say more people are still helped on a scale, try to be cognisant on which part of the argument will be contentious.   + Otherwise, it is pretty intuitive that these charities will distribute the money in a more meaningful way.   We ended up being slightly repetitive on the harm statement. Try to progress into other forms of characterisation on how these contestants are being mistreated! 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 addiction? * 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 to the point where the house gets confiscated? * 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?   Can we weigh why the “correct” charity on a smaller scale is more impactful than “incorrect” charity on a grander scale?   * Focus on 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 harm, 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.   Try to have more than one argument as the first speaker!  Good job offering POIs today!  6.00 - Good timing. | | | | | | |