| **Student Name:** Dominic Gao |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would nationalise all essential services (such as communication, energy, transportation, etc) |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 7 minutes’ long.]  If the Opposition wanted public-private partnership, why can’t this exist under a nationalisation model? Are you not ceding control to the state entirely? We should’ve proposed regulations instead.  I appreciate the recharacterisation as to why state control is particularly problematic. We need to spend more time on each point; there’s a lot of potential on why state monopoly over an entire industry will destroy it due to lack of competition.   * If you’re commenting on bureaucracy, that will also exist when you are utilising a public-private partnership. Only a completely free market is free of any bureaucracy. * I need to know way more about anti-trust regulations, what are they?   + Point out that this takes out the entire first argument from P1 about harms of an oligopoly.   + You later argued innovation, anti-trust laws are in tension with innovation!   Good pushback on why corporate incentives may also work in such a way to lower prices due to cost-efficiency.   * But we are not engaging with any of P1’s analysis on an inelastic good, and why competition rarely exists in essential industries. We cannot just counter-assert that there’s always competition.   + I like the final comparative that there’s even less competition if the state controls it. But Prop is proving that they have an incentive to keep things affordable. So we have to engage and explain why state incentives are also questionable.   We needed to engage with P1’s second argument and explain why states are often not held accountable when they abuse the nationalisation model.   * We finally said it later on within the argument instead, it belongs here. Explain what are competing ‘voting issues’ that tend to outweigh their appreciation for public services.   + Point out that consumers make excuses for state inefficiency, but we don’t do so for companies.   On your argument:   * We are constantly repeating the premise of lacking competition, but we are not explaining the role that competition plays in improving efficiency, innovation and affordability! * Explain the structural reasons as to why the state cannot possibly be efficient when delivering public goods. * What are the human costs to consumers without this? There’s no actual impact statement to this argument.   We are randomly inserting an argument on innovation in the last 15 seconds.   * Why do we even need innovation for essential services? What problems are we solving here?   The arguments today are pretty generic and under-developed. Work on having grounding to illustrate the mechanisms and the outcome.  Please offer more POIs in the debate.  7.22 | | | | | | |