| **Student Name:** Emma Demopoulos |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  Good focal point in the hook, hammer the point home with some valuable grounding to set the context for unaffordable public goods.  On the set-up:   * The parts in your case about placing a premium on essential goods shouldn’t be in the set-up, keep that in the argument. * The nationalisation model is pretty thin! Name me exactly what industries you will be nationalising. * Use the hybrid model we discussed in class via public-private partnerships. * I need a winning pathway/burden for the case!   Strong start on why essential products often lead to oligopolies.   * Good use of layered reasoning related to market behaviour, lack of competition, and no consumer power to change it. * However, all of this merely justifies that the state engages in antitrust regulations. It isn’t clear why we can’t just break up the oligopolies, rather than assume command.   A lot of our harms pertaining to labour exploitation and cyclical harm is not nuanced to the motion! Why does any of this have to do with essential services in particular, and why is nationalisation the only solution?  Good characterisation on why goods end up being unaffordable due to it being an inelastic good.   * Don’t forget to prove the perverse incentives of companies first.   On the state being able to do it better:   * I appreciate the analysis on the state having better incentives, but we’re not precisely highlighting what are the structures in place that forces the state to prioritise public interest. * We are not filling in the analytical gap on capacity. Just because the state will do it, doesn’t mean that they could! HOW will the state be efficient in any way?   On accountability being better on the state:   * A lot of the material on companies not being held accountable did not add value from what was previously said. * We are ending too early on holding the state accountable! The state COULD be held accountable, but will they?   + We have to prove the effectiveness of these accountability mechanisms. Why will it be easy for backlash to be converted to anti-state political mobilisation? Are there a lot of awareness on these issues?   + Provide some grounding of when states have been held accountable.   We need to work on the speech structure a little bit more, the points don’t necessarily flow or logically build on each other. Many points sounded repetitive.  Good job offering POIs in the debate.  7.06 | | | | | | |