| **Student Name:** Shi Qi Ooi |
| --- |

| **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:  Our opening has no clear issue or problem we’re targeting - you’re angry at every single thing within the sphere of the motion. Pick a specific issue, and make your opening about that - either consent, or treatment or such. I need specificity!  Set-up   * Fair establishment of status quo. I think we should frame what this phenomenon is and where it came from. I.e. rise of Youtube, clear indication of profit + virality. * On the positive comparative - I think you need to establish what trends/norms you value instead; presumably that this content never existed in the first place. * Fair on coercion/consent; on the personal forcing etc. - you need to establish what ways in which they behave first. The burdens need to be cleaner here; what is this debate about?   POI: rather than cancellation dying out, talk about how this doesn’t hurt them, why it probably benefits them; that this isn’t a sufficient correction mechanism.  Argument 1   * Fair on the incentives to gain as much profit as possible, and on the legal agreements and contracts being predatory; establish that this isn’t even about experience, but a desire to exploit to make sure you don’t lose control over profit. * Do we want to characterise these poor people as money hungry? Or as desperate instead? * Good on the success of content; talk about what exactly makes content watchable, viewable and so forth. 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. * 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? We throw this immorality element in at the end, but probably need to carve out time for a full argument on the immorality of this.   Why is every single word said with such gusto and speed; you need to have variance in the way you speak, otherwise all impact goes away!  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. I actually don’t think you’re delivering a lot to me content wise within this 6 minute period; which is because you have a lot of repetition in characterisation and language. Focus on filtering down to minimally efficient sentences. You need to have two proper arguments rather than one inflated one.  06:09 - I need you to ask POIs consistently. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Megan Zhang |
| --- |

| **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:  Good opening. You need to establish why this is true though; why and how does this money filter down to the poor.  Set-up? What does your side support?  Rebuttal   * CF: I think what you want to break down here is why people donate, or how people donate; not necessarily celebrities, but rather the average person. How do they view poor people and when do they feel it necessary to give? People try and think as little as possible of things that bring them discomfort; poverty is an example of this; it needs to be blasted in their face. I think you should draw a parallel to charities using images with graphic suffering - what is the difference? * On deserving help - point out what their preferences are; what do poor people care for more? I think you still need to prove that you actually help them. This is not an impact you can claim. * Good on expanding impact; point out how this isn’t a traditional giving versus celebrity giving debate. * Call out their lack of a comparative.   As 1st Opp, we can only spare 2-3 minutes max on rebuttals. At 4:00, we still haven’t moved onto our arguments!  POI: fair enough! Point out whether incentive exists on part of the giver; good on value judgement. Talk about revealed preferences! 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   * Talk about incentives of Youtubers; fair on how they need to cite sources to viewers, build up more analysis. You need to recharacterize the incentives and values of these Youtubers. Why aren’t they the characters Prop establishes them to be. * 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? * 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.   06:23 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jodie 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 | | | | | |
| 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:  What is this opening? If it is that this challenge does nothing for them, uses them for content and then leaves them worse than they were, call this out; the Katniss/Peeta comment isn’t doing anything at the moment!  Rebuttal   * Rather than defaulting to the Mr. Beast example, we need to explain what the incentives of these Youtubers are; generalise it and talk about how these videos are monetised, what people want to watch, what show we want to put on. You need to break down how the incentive structure of Youtubers literally requires them to showcase these poor people in the most undignified ways. * 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! * POI - fair question from Yeonseo; why is this unique to the motion? What is the unique harm being set here; fair on them being poor, but you have to go deeper. * We’re dropping fair analysis on how they want to retain profit rather than giving - 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. Explain how this takes out a chunk of the arguments. * Why is the harm we keep going back to cyberbullying? Is this what you want everyone to focus on?   Argument 1   * How is this different from the pushes we’re making in rebuttal? There is more explanation as to what incentives exist, and how they come about, but at its’ core this is about incentives to create worse lives for poor people - which is an extreme characterisation. You need to tell me why even where they have good incentives - their priorities will end up neglecting the poor at hand. * 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. * 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 need to talk about how this is actively bad for the traditional charities Opp says they want to get too; 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?   Your speech needs to be directly responsive to 1O, and be a reiteration of 1P; your speech isn’t doing rebuilding - or at least it isn’t explicitly.  05:57 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Yeonseo Kim |
| --- |

| **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:  I think what you need to target is the incentives of Youtubers - and trade these off; even where incentives are perverse, does the money reach the poor - and how/why does this matter more in the round. Trade it off! This is the strongest path to victory you have.  Rebuttal   * Explain why cancel culture is sufficient; Shi Qi responded to this already - your engagement has to go beyond her answer. * Please rebut, don’t offer criticism - that’s my job! * You’re not being charitable; Jodie explains how these people are misrepresented and suffer due to comments/cyberbullying; directly explain why it doesn’t. You haven’t recharacterized Youtubers/the culture enough - you’re just counter asserting at the moment. * How does the money trickle down; Jodie says they keep this money - you say they don’t. Who is right?   POI: 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? Point out what their revealed preferences are; what do poor people care for more?  Argument   * On the incentive to do this to get children viewers; fair - but what change does this make? * Additionally, if the video is as grotesque as Prop describes and you accept, because some money makes it way to poor people - what are these kids learning?   I think what you want to break down here is why people donate, or how people donate; not necessarily celebrities, but rather the average person. How do they view poor people and when do they feel it necessary to give? People try and think as little as possible of things that bring them discomfort; poverty is an example of this; it needs to be blasted in their face. I think you should draw a parallel to charities using images with graphic suffering - what is the difference?  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?  06:11 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Hisham Khan |
| --- |

| **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: | 67.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Rather than this being what you cannot stand by, point out that this is what you said at 1st, at 2nd - and all Opp had to say was but at least poor people get a little bit of money; the stance clarification doesn't add anything - call them out instead.  Signposting needs to include the names of the clashes.  Do both sides disagree that poor people are the most important stakeholder..? You need to explain to me why poor people value their dignity more, or why they cannot consent.  Why do people pay to charity? This is an assertion that you’re not justifying.  This is an incredibly long ‘observation’ - skip to clashes!  POI: I don’t get this response  Clash 1   * What will you prove here? You need to follow a specific clash structure; thesis, what they said, why it isn’t true, not important, comparative then weighing. You’re just dropping rebuttal without any insight into what these are responses to! * Why do we care about their mental health; if Opp is saying that they get food on their table - why is your push more important. * On money and incentives - UNPACK THIS. Rather than defaulting to the Mr. Beast example, we need to explain what the incentives of these Youtubers are; generalise it and talk about how these videos are monetised, what people want to watch, what show we want to put on. You need to break down how the incentive structure of Youtubers literally requires them to showcase these poor people in the most undignified ways. * 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! * We’re dropping fair analysis on how they want to retain profit rather than giving - 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. Explain how this takes out a chunk of the arguments.   Where is the second clash? You need to be giving me clear insight into what the two issues of this debate are, and why you win on these. You aren’t doing this.  What is the structure of this speech?  STOP SAYING RIGHT.  06:02 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Gemma Yeung |
| --- |

| **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:  Good opening. I think what you want to do is break down what the burden was for both sides - and why they never justified why this was so incredibly bad, and that this moral harm mattered more than the help that we could get them; this will do FAR more than the observation right now.  In signposting, the only thing I want is; two clashes, the first on whether this is moral and whether we care about this, and the second on where charity is better; you spent a whole thirty seconds on just summarising the various things you would say rather than just saying them.  Go straight into either strategic observations/clarifications - or go straight into clashes. You’re effectively doing that, but under the guise of ‘arguments’??  Ask if cyberbullying even exists in the first place; what incentives exist, what incentives override them - bring back Yeonseo’s point on cancel culture and checks and balances.  Clash 1   * What will you prove within this clash? What will you prove here? You need to follow a specific clash structure; thesis, what they said, why it isn’t true, not important, comparative then weighing. You’re dropping rebuttal without any insight into what these are responses to, or what you’re trying to prove; clashes need to be structured with some strategic outcome yo’re gunning towards. * Why do we care about authenticity - talk about this! I think what you want to break down here is why people donate, or how people donate; not necessarily celebrities, but rather the average person. How do they view poor people and when do they feel it necessary to give? People try and think as little as possible of things that bring them discomfort; poverty is an example of this; it needs to be blasted in their face. **I think you should draw a parallel to charities using images with graphic suffering - what is the difference?**   On more charity - 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.  06:08 | | | | | | |