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

| **Motion:** As a developing economy, this house will prioritise trade liberalisation over economic protectionism |
| --- |

| 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 6 minutes’ long.]  Good call-out that Opp under-mechanised their pathway for economic growth, finish this observation and explain that locals are more likely to die out on Opp without foreign help.  I like the observation that Prop can easily propose things like anti-corruption laws, but it isn’t clear why this was necessary to point out.   * Which part of the Opp case are you taking out by saying this?   Excellent rebuttal that local companies become monopolies, can you spend time mechanising HOW this is true? E.g. State subsidies will only go to a few companies, and the rest of their competitors die out.   * Spend even more time explaining why the harms of monopolies are equivalent to foreign companies.   + Because it isn’t clear why these monopolies will hurt the local governments more than foreign companies, especially since they’re only monopolies BECAUSE the government is helping them. So the power seems to lie with the state still.   You need to spend time rebutting Opp’s points on:   * Local companies being wiped out and unable to compete with foreign companies. * Large nations manipulate free trade agreements to their advantage.   On your argument:   * On expansion of the market, this is an argument that’s better placed if local companies are capable of exporting to the global market. This doesn’t apply to your context of developing nations. * Strong reinforcement on the trickle-down economic benefits to local societies.   + We can point out that foreign companies often bring in tech exchange and they help upskill the local workers in the long-term, which then helps the local workforce to transition and build their own companies.   Spend more time on the framing that economic prosperity is more important than other public well-being metrics.   * It’s not that it’s MORE important, but in the hierarchy of priorities, immediate economic survival is more important than labour rights.   + Then explain why with economic empowerment, things like political empowerment often follow anyway.   Please offer more POIs today!  6.16 | | | | | | |