| **Student Name:** Jasmine Gao |
| --- |

| **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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Nice rhetoric focusing on the moral repugnance of these philantro-tainers today.   * However, the moral criticism is clear but at this point of the debate, the main clash is who provides more charity. So we need to do some work to explain why the exploitation factor still matters more than the scale of people helped in the debate.   I appreciate the attempt at making strategic observations:   * While children have very little disposable income, the speaker before you made very clear that the income streams they’re tapping into are based on just views, and that virality builds a lot more on the donation pool than Prop has which relies on explicit donations. * I appreciate that 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! * Why will you get the same kind of buy-in and attention that the Opposition will have today?   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.   In response to the POI, the part where children don’t watch these channels is counter-intuitive, but what is persuasive is the kind of charities that they will find to be appealing, we should’ve explored the different kinds of abuses being perpetuated here.   * I like the examples of putting contestants on islands and mistreating them, spend more time expanding on the categorical analysis first, and then attaching the illustrations as characterisation. 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?   Good job offering POIs today!  6.12 | | | | | | |