| **Student Name:** Peyton Qian |
| --- |

| **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:  Clear opening - you need to capitalise on the moral higher ground here; outrage in your voice about how immoral this is.  Set-up   * Clear explanation of what this, clear comparative. * I think we should frame what this phenomenon is and where it came from. I.e. rise of Youtube, clear indication of profit + virality.   Argument 1   * Excellent first line on dignity and what is being done; I think what you need to establish first is why youtubers behave in this way, what incentives this have, what this looks like. You’re jumping to this being immoral without explaining to me why it will and always will be done in this way; why will they be exploited, why will they be depicted in ‘bad ways’? * Why or how is this coercive?   POI: establish what the incentives of these youtubers are, and explain how even where there is impact, why you want to trade it off. Framing earlier, of what this looks like, would have prevented this.  Argument 2   * Why do people think this way? Is it because they see a Youtube video and just change their mind? * Ask instead - does this money even reach the poor? What certainty do we have that the poor benefit in any way? * I think we need to highlight how grotesque this is - how are they depicted on screen, is the money just a hand-out, or do they have to do something for it and such?   Characterisation and framing missing! There also needs to be more work done on how or where charity exists on your side, why it is better, both in terms of quality and quantity, but really accountability; that it doesn’t come at the cost of your dignity. Link this to the vicarious sense of giving linked with watching this content and complacency.  What trends or patterns does this set in other content creation etc.? How does this push other content creators to showcase the poor in worse and worse ways - show me how this becomes a long term self-sustaining trope.  06:11  Good POIs - where was this analysis re YouTuber’s incentives in the speech itself? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Nathalie Ng |
| --- |

| **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: | 68 | | | | | |
| 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:  Just give me a clear benefit; the many harms/benefits doesn’t give me a sense of what matters or is valuable in this debate. A high impact opening will instead either target the premise of their case, or posit the strongest reason as to why we support this.  Rebuttal   * You need to challenge whether these videos or content exists in this way; are the grounds for this to be immoral legitimate. * On benefit - you need to explain why or how they get benefits in the first place. * We assert this utilitarian benefit is sufficient. Why is this true? Why is this more important than the harm Prop highlights. Maybe talk about revealed preferences - what do poor people care about? * POI - why do people feel human emotion; you need to explain HOW they feel, rather than intuition pumping that they just do. There is analysis to be made as to how this humanises poor people and their struggle, and forces them to confront this egregious harm - but this isn't the analysis you’re making.   Argument 1   * Why is this argument exclusively founded on MrBeast; this is an Example. You need to extrapolate the logic from the example and run it. Why do YouTubers have incentives to do this well? * How does this change occur? You need to walk me through how people change in this way - or become more likely to give in your world. * What’s the comparative - what does their side achieve or get?   Argument 2   * Is this the only way to teach children kindness? * Is this the best way to teach children kindness?   05:29 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Annabel Cheung |
| --- |

| **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:  Spectacle of poverty is excellent - but you need to break down how the incentive structure of Youtubers literally requires them to showcase these poor people in the most undignified ways.  What are we rebutting? We’re dropping good analysis on profit investing and channel growth rather than giving - but you need to target this to their premise/push - you need to explain what the implication of this response is. For instance, saying - what this means is that none of these Youtubers are benevolent; they do not get better outcomes for the poor etc.  Rebuttal   * What are we rebutting…? * Good on why people opt-in to these videos. Excellent on lack of consent.   + Consider revealed preferences - even where coercion exists, technically, all choice is coerced. What other options do they have? * Good on short-termist flashy solutions; break down why it always has to be short-termist; do these Youtubers benefit in a world where these people’s lives change permanently for the better? Or where they can continue to create this kind of content? * Why is the comparative any better? You need to tell me why this has led to outcomes being worse for existing charities, and for the poor in-turn.   + We say welfare, traditional charities etc - explain to me how they suffer due to this phenomenon existing - because people feel like all is okay - you do this later, which is good.   + We need to explain how welfare or charities actually work! How do they have more accountability, transparency, checks and balances? * Good response to the POI! * Talk about how people may feel included in the solution - that they’re already giving to others vicariously and are less likely to turn out and give!   What trends or patterns does this set in other content creation etc.? How does this push other content creators to showcase the poor in worse and worse ways - show me how this becomes a long term self-sustaining trope.  There also needs to be more work done on how or where charity exists on your side, why it is better, both in terms of quality and quantity, but really accountability; that it doesn’t come at the cost of your dignity. Link this to the vicarious sense of giving linked with watching this content and complacency.  Was there an argument? If so, mark the transition clearer and internally signpost the thesis and outcome clearer!  06:39 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ivy Xu |
| --- |

| **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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  Is our opening strategic? I think we need to start by trading off some of the adverse incentives that exist; acknowledge it and move on to why you’re okay with it because of what poor people themselves want - argue what their revealed preferences are.  Why is there consent? Explain to me why we can never have perfect consent for things - because everyone exists under a degree of coercion; their revealed preference is to not die, or to at minimum, be in the video rather than be hungry; who are we to judge this choice?  Explain how they convert in terms of their beliefs - how did they think prior to watching, and how did their priorities change? How does this humanise the poor, make it a problem they see practically or are confronted with.  You need to explain HOW they feel, rather than intuition pumping that they just do. There is analysis to be made as to how this humanises poor people and their struggle, and forces them to confront this egregious harm - but this isn't the analysis you’re making.  Good analysis on the incentives of Youtubers to not be cancelled. Stop and EXPLAIN to me why this is sufficient; how does this hold these influencers accountable?  POI: fair response; I think you may want to talk about how NGOs or traditional charity just isn’t efficient. Point out why people care for the poor, or want to give to them - which team is better at achieving this?  We assert this utilitarian benefit is sufficient. Why is this true? Why is this more important than the harm Prop highlights. Maybe talk about revealed preferences - what do poor people care about?  What is the structure of this speech? Remember that as 2nd Opp, you need to be very clear about what your paths to victory at this point in the debate are. What key issues from 2P do you need to respond to? You need to respond to the principle, you need to respond to short termism, you need to push on their lack of a comparative!  I’m concerned with how much spec you have on this issue…? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Hanson Ko |
| --- |

| **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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  I think the delivery of this opening is good, but is taking too much time to highlight - I think we need to apply this excellent delivery to highlighting the grotesque nature of this video instead - how exactly these people sign off on being in this video, how they are treated/depicted and so forth; connect this back to what your 2P says!  Good on how kindness is symmetric.  Good work bringing back coercion.  Good work establishing that this will be a profit based model - break this down for me! How do a large amount of views usually generate ad or sponsorship revenue, and in the case of charity content creators, a portion of this money is funnelled back into making more charity content, and the cycle continues!  On one winner, everyone else loses - point out what structural incentive there is to make the videos this way.  Good on the comparative! Checks and balances is excellent analysis. You have to tell me why the cancel culture analysis from Ivy isn’t sufficient.  Break down why it always has to be short-termist as Annabel says this; do these Youtubers benefit in a world where these people’s lives change permanently for the better? Or where they can continue to create this kind of content?  What trends or patterns does this set in other content creation etc.? How does this push other content creators to showcase the poor in worse and worse ways - show me how this becomes a long term self-sustaining trope.  Clash - effectiveness - at 5:15? If you’re uncertain as to how to make the entire speech through clashes, please ask me; otherwise you’re getting the speaker structure of third wrong!  Good attempt to trade off who matters more and what matters more!  06:16  There also needs to be more work done on how or where charity exists on your side, why it is better, both in terms of quality and quantity, but really accountability; that it doesn’t come at the cost of your dignity. Link this to the vicarious sense of giving linked with watching this content and complacency. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Catherine Ho |
| --- |

| **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: | 68 | | | | | |
| 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:  Interesting opening - you need to immediately explain to me why there are barriers to entry, and how this phenomenon makes it such that this changes; this is a big statement to make and you cannot let it stand without sufficient justification.  Clash 1  Why is there consent? Explain to me why we can never have perfect consent for things - because everyone exists under a degree of coercion; their revealed preference is to not die, or to at minimum, be in the video rather than be hungry; who are we to judge this choice?  Good on charities and using pictures of starving children; push this further - what is the difference here truly? Maybe it is that they are non for profit, where content creators are not.  Clash 2  Explain how they convert in terms of their beliefs - how did they think prior to watching, and how did their priorities change? How does this humanise the poor, make it a problem they see practically or are confronted with. You need to explain HOW they feel, rather than intuition pumping that they just do. There is analysis to be made as to how this humanises poor people and their struggle, and forces them to confront this egregious harm - but this isn't the analysis you’re making.  We need to establish why or how people don’t give - and how these videos target their minds. I think you need to consider the material from Opp on how people watch these and just become complacent; why don’t they become complacent?  05:37  You have to ask POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Matias Li |
| --- |

| **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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Our opening needs to be cognisant of where our side is winning and losing at this point; do we win on the incentives of Youtubers and whether they will do this well? Do we win on donations or practical outcomes? You want to start on where you think you’re losing, and where there is room for you to flip the judge.  What is the structure of this speech?  Good on practical outcomes - this is your winning issue. I think you need to tell me, however, how people change their minds!  Explain how they convert in terms of their beliefs - how did they think prior to watching, and how did their priorities change? How does this humanise the poor, make it a problem they see practically or are confronted with.  We need to establish why or how people don’t give - and how these videos target their minds. I think you need to consider the material from Opp on how people watch these and just become complacent; why don’t they become complacent?  You need to explain HOW they feel, rather than intuition pumping that they just do. There is analysis to be made as to how this humanises poor people and their struggle, and forces them to confront this egregious harm - but this isn't the analysis you’re making.  On incentives to do well - explain why this true! Why are views and cancel culture sufficient checks and balances? It’s easy to say that cancel culture is actually good for views, that these influencers are able to bounce back from this.  Good call out on lack of comparative.  We need to reiterate what has already been said that is valuable:   * Why is there consent? Explain to me why we can never have perfect consent for things - because everyone exists under a degree of coercion; their revealed preference is to not die, or to at minimum, be in the video rather than be hungry; who are we to judge this choice? * Good on charities and using pictures of starving children; push this further - what is the difference here truly? Maybe it is that they are non for profit, where content creators are not.   Don’t say ‘not only that’ as much as you do!  Good work asking POIs, but we need to make sure we phrase them more tightly and clearly. Short and simple - no longer than 15 seconds, which your POIs are consistently longer than! | | | | | | |