| **Student Name:** Isabella Zhu |
| --- |

| **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 minutes’ long.]  I appreciate the attempt at a strategic observation that if you take down the incentive to donate then Opp loses everything! But we need to fully execute this immediately, rather than just assert it.  The broad response that viewers will not understand why they have to donate is fine superficially, but it does not engage with any of the analysis that Opp did give, i.e.:   * That the clicks themselves will generate more funds that go to charitable causes, * That associating donations with entertainment and happiness will influence children to embrace charity.   Good reinforcement of the poor incentives of philanthro-tainers, but 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?   On making the comparison between philantro-tainers and established charities:   * Can we weigh why the “correct” charity on a smaller scale is more impactful than “incorrect” charity on a grander scale?   + Explain clearly that it’s TAKING AWAY charitable contributions that could’ve gone to good charities in favour of the charities of the philanthro-trainers. 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. Explain that your burden here is the minimisation of harms, rather than getting more charities overall than the Opposition side!     - Otherwise, Opp is saying that they can have BOTH at the same time, and they have more money overall to benefit both types of charities. * Opp is losing on the point of expertise and incentives, but they are winning on the point of scale and accountability mechanism.   + So what you’re doing in this clash is reinforcing all the parts that you were already winning on, I agree that UNESCO will probably do a better job at helping people. But where the Opp is winning is on gaining more donations and that the viewers will heavily scrutinise these entertainers in order to improve their practices.   Excellent analysis on people being LESS likely to make donations when they see how their money is being wasted.   * But we need to engage with Opp’s analysis down the line that this very same audience will be the accountability mechanism to ensure that these practices will improve over time! This was their broad rebuttal as to why these abuses are unlikely to happen across time. * Go back and reinforce your case line on getting the same kind of scale of donation that Opp will have:   + Prop is trying to co-opt the same benefits by proposing education, however, there is no comparative analysis why education campaigns would be more effective than utilising the entertainment industry!   + Challenge whether there was a problem in their status quo to begin with.   We lost our structure as we went on, try to hold on to it throughout!  Please offer more POIs today!  5.55 - Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |