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

| **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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Nice job flipping the call-out to them!   * But be mindful that they’ve called out Opp’s lack of mechanism towards economic growth, and this still sounds like a glaring failure on our end. So fill in this gap immediately.   + Reinforcing your mech on quotas and subsidies doesn’t answer their accusation that your government doesn’t even have adequate resources to invest into initial economic development in your world. How do you build things like infrastructure?     - You can suggest mechs like development aid.   Good job reinforcing the lack of accountability mechanisms.   * We need to spend time proving why these economic hegemons can strongarm developing nations into unfavourable terms, we are taking advantage of the intuitiveness of this claim. * Can we ground this better and spend time explaining what exactly these common unfavourable terms are that make it impossible for developing nations to come back from?   On the local development being preferable:   * We are not completely mechanising why these local governments have no real choice but to listen to these foreign forces.   + We need to explain why the state had to prioritise economic survival over local interests, due to the importance of the working class as a voter bloc and the economic growth being the foremost concern of the developing world. * There’s under-impacting of what the real harm is here.   + Explain the human costs of deregulation.   + Then we can compare this to prop’s main harm on basic survival being threatened here.   I can agree with the conclusion on the long-term development, but it’s not clear exactly how you’re going to fare in terms of engineering short-term growth!   * What’s the grounding of subsidies leading to globally-competitive local brands? Use South Korea as your example of how this is possible.   Good response to the POI, we need this in the rebuttals earlier.  Good job offering POIs today!  6.08 - Well done today, if we can go even SLOWER, I would’ve given you one point higher. | | | | | | |