| **Student Name:** Monique Cheuk Nam Siu |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This House Opposes Philatro-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:  Good observations on the problems with the Opposition at the beginning. Try to avoid going for long and undirected lines though - at some point I wasn’t really sure of what you were talking about in the hook.  Great sign-posting and preview of your speech and the structure within it.  Recharacterisation - To be fair to the Opposition, this debate could actually be about Gaza and non-American issues as well. There are plenty of videos that do focus on these topics. Moreover, it felt convenient for you to suggest that they do one off things that are not that sustainable (e.g. that they give them a PS5.) because this isn’t the case in most cases.  In terms of suggesting that people don’t actually benefit from the charity of these videos, you didn’t actually engage with the logic given by the first Opp. First Opp stated that people feel a unique pull to the personal brand of the entertainer and thus they are more likely to engage with this charity.  You must defend your first speaker!! Don’t forget to do your rebuilding.  **Argument: This makes people feel like they can’t give back.**   * This argument assumes that the average person doesn’t think in relative terms. Why would the average person compare themselves to Mr.Beast? Why wouldn’t they feel good giving based on their abilities? * Also, this argument actually goes against any person who is very rich and or special from engaging in charity. This argument also suggests that people don’t give to charities because there are billionaires and millionaires out there that can give so much more. It isn’t very realistic. * I still haven’t heard the comparative as to why;   + Your side does not incur the same harm.   + Your side is able to produce harms and benefits that are comparable to the Opposition.   + Why do the incentives of an influencer not align with what charities need? Some things you can focus on is accountability (i.e., financial transparency, etc) and why these entertainers can’t provide this. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ryan 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: | 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:  As the first Opposition, you want to start with a hook that encapsulates the main crux of your case!  **Rebuttal**   * Try not to issue direct challenges to your opponent’s (e.g. that nobody can name even five charities.). Because they might actually rise to the occasion. * You suggest that there is more engagement and its more personal. Why is this true? You need to talk about the context first Prop set up - that this is a one-off video focused on a specific charity and or group of people. The rebuttal doesn’t work until you deal with this. * Rebuttals missing for the angle of this is superficial and not actually what is needed for these individuals on the ground.   **Argument:** **Awareness**   * Awareness does not necessarily lead to donations. This is where you should further explain the personal connection and engagement that these entertainers can provide. * Structure is all over the place in this argument. Why jump from argumentation to rebuttal? If you’re integrating, you must flag this to the judge at the start. * You can make this argument much stronger by explaining what influencers uniquely do here. You suggest they are more accountable - why? Is it because this is their personal brand?   **Argument: Incentive to Donation**   * Why are these videos enjoyable? To be honest, this argument is one new argument on its own. You can actually suggest that this is necessary because current videos on charity are too depressing, etc. You can also talk about the attention span that people have and how these videos uniquely cater to this. * The way you are arguing is quite vague. You narrow your argument down to impacts like ‘benefits’ and etc. You must be more specific. * I’m not sure what some of the things you’re saying mean. You suggested that your case provides a ‘Self-affirming circle of infinite benefit.’ What does that mean?   Rebuttal Speech   * Great recharacterisation. * For the first rebuttal, engagement doesn’t necessarily equate to an incentive to do better. Certain influencers can get engagement without being the best person. You must engage with this context as well. * For the second rebuttal, you must why the cases talked about the Opposition are extreme to begin with. The argument about the gaps in charity should have been a full blown argument! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Stephanie Kwan |
| --- |

| **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:  Your speech could have benefitted from a lot more assertiveness at the start. The opening line was fine, but the impact of it got diminished from you repeating the opening line.  **Set-up**  Good framing of the stakeholders and why people may engage with the videos. However, when you repeatedly suggest that people only feel good by viewing these videos, it would serve you well to add some reasons to why this is the case.  **Argument: The Depiction of Those We Help**   * Don’t take a POI mid argument! * What exactly are the ‘things’ we’re talking about here? It isn’t very clear. This is important because you suggest that people are encouraged to do these ‘things’. If these ‘things’ aren’t harmful and are actually good, it works against you. * Why does slapping a few thousand dollars qualify as a small action? That’s quite a large amount of money. You must qualify this - is it one-off and unsustainable? * Saviour complex - Why does this not apply to the usual charities as well? At this point this feels like a criticism against certain people doing activism, not the philanthropists per say. * Why wouldn’t the average philanthro-tainer want to figure out the needs of those they seek to help? You must explain this through incentives and contexts at the very least. Additionally, what are their needs beyond receiving money? This must be explained to show me that money isn’t the most important thig in the debate. * Good use of hand gestures and eye contact! * You don’t actually have a comparative. What is the right way to help people? Why is that better comparatively? Why isn’t it below us as well? * This speech lacked mechanisms. How does the apathy you talk about happen? How exactly does charity work on your side? | | | | | | |