| **Student Name:** Kelly Zhang |
| --- |

| **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.]  In the hook, we’re taking a far higher burden than necessary on philanthro-tainment providing even better charity. It would be more strategic if we focused solely on the scale of generating more charitable donations instead, which is our winning pathway.   * Good signposting.   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.   + Your BEST rebuttal is to push back and explain why there doesn’t need to be a trade-off between philanthro-tainers and good charities. It could be the case that philanthro-tainment increases the pool of charity to begin with, so there’s more money to go around for BOTH the channels and the charitable organisations.   Excellent rebuttal explaining that these philanthro-tainers are very well developed and experienced, but rather than making this as a factual rebuttal that is decided by characterisation; explain the STRUCTURAL reasons why philanthro-tainment will continue to improve even if they are imperfect.   * E.g. Channel viewers will heavily scrutinise them and hold them accountable if they engage in abusive tactics. * Otherwise, the characterisation on how developed these channels are is quite well done, but bear in mind that there’s A LOT of examples on Prop as well to show that these philanthro-tainers are also quite flawed. We don’t want to be sucked into making this a factual clash.   We’re explaining a lot of minimisation of costs, but we’re not framing why this is particularly important in the scale of things, nor is it unique. Charities can also adopt these cost-cutting measures.  Pushing back and explaining that intentions don’t actually matter in contrast to tangible benefits is the right start, but we still have to engage with Prop’s claim that the profit motivation leads to abusive and pernicious ways in which the charity is being distributed.   * Engage with Prop’s harms that they’re helping the wrong people, or helping in ways that are not very meaningful in the long-term.   + Here, we could’ve highlighted what checks and balances exist to mitigate the harms in this industry, e.g. criticisms from channel viewers to hold these entertainers accountable.   We rebutted for too long and entered into our arguments too late!  On teaching children more:   * Can we explain the problems in the status quo on why we’re lacking awareness and initiatives in this area? Why do people lack the incentives to contribute absent of these entertainers? * Why is it important to shape CHILDREN in particular? * On the impact statement, can we analyse why the scale of how many people are benefitted must win this debate?   + We could’ve explained that the goal of charity is not some vague moral exercise in improving altruism, it is to improve the quality of life of the most vulnerable. This explanation will do some work in explaining to the judge that tangible outcomes must outweigh the moral principles argued by the Proposition. * Build a comparative on why watching these entertainers will actually build an audience base who becomes more willing to engage in charity.   + This led very well into your second argument which should’ve been your first! Focus on the uniqueness on building the audience base for charity.   Please offer more POIs today!   * Don’t take the POI mid-sentence!   6.41 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |