| **Student Name:** Connor Chung. |
| --- |

| **Motion:** TH opposes the rise of philantro-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** |
| 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 a child of that level. | | | | | | |

| **Teacher comments:** Speaking time:   * Nice use of an example in the hook. Great rhetoric about dignity. * Try to make sure to immediately go into why dignity is important; money is temporary but dignity is forever. Once you are captured on the internet, the internet does not forget. You will never get to outlive the image of yourself at your most vulnerable. * I like the energy and signposting today! * Remember that as a second speaker, you don’t need to do a set-up. You gotta make sure to go into your rebuilding, rebuttals, argumentation, then your conclusion. * I like the idea that there are better solutions to philatro-tainment; I get this argument, but you first need to prove that the other alternatives will work and we can actually use them. Also, try to tell me about why it is a choice between philatro-tainment or normal charity. Why does the existence of one remove the other? * I like the focus of dramatism and how this isn’t generosity; but why is this the case? Additionally, try to make sure to tell me about why genuine generosity matters; you could actually say that this type of entertainment actually hurts the image of charity as people now assume that everyone is doing charity for clout and this hurts the image of even genuine charities! * Try to tell me about the prop argument; you can talk about the fact that the help given is not very sustainable. The videos feature them one time and leave them without any further help. This does not change anything as there are structural issues at play (E.g., poverty, mental health, illness, homelessness, etc.) * Good examples are: how these influencers profit as compared to actually helping. Here is a great place to add in a moral argument actually. It's even worse when all of society is now complicit in this! * Good illustrations!   Speaking time: 07:40.81, good work! |
| --- |