| **Student Name:** Stephanie Kwok |
| --- |

| **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 need a hook before rebuttals please!  While I appreciate that experience and expertise is not that crucial, Proposition’s point still stands that there is a higher quality system of charitable donations if we exclusively utilise established charities.   * The second part of your rebuttal that there’s greater incentive for people to donate in Opp is MUCH stronger, focus on this!   + I want a clear conclusion here: That Proposition created a FALSE comparative that philanthro-tainment has to be better than established charities, this is not Opp’s burden. If Opp proves that you raise more money, then there’s more money to go around for BOTH the YouTube channels and the charitable organisations.   Good counter-characterisation that these philanthro-tainers are very well established, 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.   * When you explain that viewers will hold them accountable if they engage in abusive tactics, this is perfect for proving structural analysis, spend more time here! * 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. (As shown by Charles’ POI against you!)   + Rather than saying Mr. Beast is an anomaly, explain that the reason we could hold him accountable now is because he is a public figure!     - When you mentioned Jeffrey Epstein, this would’ve been the perfect way to flip that established charities are EQUALLY as flawed as philantro-tainers.   There was a lot more that can be said for the angle mentioned on how these people uniquely help charities. What is the unique angle here? Is it because they have fandoms, etc? How does that uniquely impact YouTubers?  Solid analysis on raising more funds from views which can be redirected to charity vs having to donate money from our disposable income to established charities.   * 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? * 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.   Please offer more POIs today!  6.26 | | | | | | |