| **Student Name:** Kelly Au |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Our hook is summative, instead of impactful! Next time, try to make a call-out to start you off so we can maximise your impact from the very top.  Good reinforcement that ultimately philanthro-tainers don’t have the right incentives because they started off as an entertainer.   * But how can Proposition claim that the people with the “correct” motivations will actively be providing charity to the scale that the Opposition is? * 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!   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?   We moved on to the argument too fast, we need to engage with Opp’s arguments on the uniqueness of these channels in terms of building an audience and gaining virality in the realm of gaining more charity.   * 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.   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 the second argument, we could’ve focused a lot more on the moral repugnance of the whole situation. Especially since we’re focusing on the lack of consent, rather than the specific abuses that they are suffering from.   * The moral criticism is clear but at this point of the debate, the main clash that the Opposition is concerned with 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.   Please offer more POIs today!  6.14 - Good timing! | | | | | | |