| **Student Name:** Gwyneth Chan |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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.]  We would have benefitted from making a strategic observation as a hook before diving right into the clashes!   * Your best observation would be 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.   + So the clear conclusion here would be: That Proposition created a FALSE comparative that philanthro-tainment has to be better than established charities, this is not Opp’s burden at all.   Excellent reinforcement that children are definitely the target audience for these entertainers.   * But be cognisant of Prop’s clash with this which is to suggest that education can co-opt the same kind of benefits. So spend time establishing why a child’s buy-in into education campaigns are far lower than a viral, entertaining platform. * On disposable income, good job highlighting that clicks are free and can build a stronger donation pool than the Prop will have.   + To win the clash on influencing others, can we explain first 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.       * THIS will go a long way in taking down their moral clash!   + Build a comparative on why watching these entertainers will actually build an audience base who becomes more willing to engage in charity.   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 ended up getting pulled into the false comparative of proving why the philantro-tainers are better than established charities, when this is meant to be Opp’s losing clash. 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. * You can also flip their claim because there are MANY established charities are EQUALLY as flawed as philantro-tainers.   Good job offering POIs today!  6.15 - Good timing! | | | | | | |