| **Student Name:** Anastasia Kavvathas |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house regrets the media’s focus on the private lives of celebrities |
| --- |

| 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 5 to 6 minutes’ long.]  Start with a high-impact hook, rather than repeating the motion!   * We should do the set-up first, then rebuttals and arguments.   On the celebrities not being afraid, we are asserting that they aren’t afraid without really explaining why!   * Point out that there are laws to protect them from stalking or harassment. * Then instead of referencing benefits, explain that most celebrities enjoy the fame or enjoy the fact that they have fans, so they like the public interaction.   When we’re describing that fans have a warped view of these artists and don’t enjoy it when these artists disappoint them, this seems like a harm rather than a benefit!   * What if fans pressure them to do things like not enter into a relationship? We should actively explain that these fans will only be protective in favour of these celebrities.   + In fact, some of these strong fandoms even protect the artists from the exploitation of their managing companies or the scrutiny of the public.   You don’t have to accept the POI as soon as it’s offered! Wait for a transition point in your speech to accept it.   * We should also avoid taking two POIs back-to-back. * When we mentioned that no one will follow them, then we followed it up by saying that we cannot expect that no one will follow them. These two points are in tension with each other.   The rebuttals bled into the arguments without any explicit structure or transition points. Work on reorganising your speech.  Where is the counter set-up?   * Here, we don’t have to accept the status quo the way it has been described by the Proposition!   + Point out trends of improvement such as the state regulating against things like stalking and harassing celebrities.   Good claim on why knowing about the lives of celebrities would benefit them.   * Do celebrities have an obligation to share their private lives just to benefit their fans? We can explain that sharing their lives would also be quite healing and cathartic for the artists themselves. * The big question here is how do we prevent the media from stopping here and not furthering the exploitation of celebrities beyond what they want to share? We can try to be a bit more comparative to the Proposition’s argument here.   + Can’t they share if they wanted to, but the media shouldn’t report anything if the celebrities do not want it?   We need a greater impact analysis here! Why can’t the celebrities earn just as much support and income without making their personal lives public?   * Explain the link to show why sharing their personal lives is what leads to the level of public fame and support that the Opposition wanted.   Why should we consider the harms to journalists over the harms to celebrities? We cannot advocate for inhumane things and just decide the comparative based on the number of lives. We need to consider the human costs.   * Why can’t those journalists report on something that is more ethical instead?   Please offer more POIs today!  7.08 - Watch for time!! | | | | | | |