| **Student Name:** Kayley Cheng |
| --- |

| **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.]  Nice hook and signposting!  On rebutting the damage to the reputation:   * Good initial response that media outlets ought to fact-check the truthfulness of what they report, however, this does not hold true for tabloid media.   + They can simply throw the terms “alleged” and they get away with reporting gossip. * Nice check and balance that the celebrity can also provide clarity and make posts on their end.   + Would this be enough to contain any rumours?   + 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.   Bear in mind that this rebuttal does not take down Prop’s point if the criticism is not based off of rumours, what if the celebrity did enter into a relationship that their fans don’t approve of? Do they just have to be cancelled or change their private life to please the public?  We need a stronger counter set-up! 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.   Nice claim that the media can be used to expose negative actions of these celebrities.   * However, focusing on criminal allegations is not quite “private lives,” it would be a matter of public interest. * Rather than just focusing on elites, could we explain why holding them accountable is important so that they set good examples/role models for their fans?   + Explain that their own fans are blinded against the cult of personality, so it has to be the media itself doing this.   We should have a rebuttal against Prop’s point that the talents of these celebrities will be further encouraged in absence of this media.   * We could explain that celebrities already do have an incentive to showcase their talents, but often their personal lives can boost their visibility and have more fans appreciate their talents.   We also need to rebut Chester’s argument about forcing celebrities to give up parts of their personal lives that are important.  Please offer more POIs today!  5.44 - So close to 6 minutes! | | | | | | |