| **Student Name:** Vania Wong |
| --- |

| **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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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.]  I love the example in the hook, good use of grounding to prove that accessibility means little without a minimum-level quality. Point out that access must include a meaningful level of access so that human rights can be actualised.  Excellent pushback that innovation is actually needed within essential services.   * But Prop has pointed out that the state also has incentive to achieve cost-efficiency for the same reasons, so they will conduct innovation. * So we need to spend time reinforcing why the state will not actually conduct innovation even if their incentives aligned, this is a capacity issue.   While I like the conclusion that bad services only trap the poor, while the rich can opt out, this will no longer exist under a nationalisation model because the private alternative is now banned.   * So actually rich people will also pressure the state to improve services.   On reinforcing your model of public-private partnership, we are not engaging with P2’s strategic observation that proposing this model contradicts all of your arguments.   * How do you get innovation if you are implementing antitrust laws? * 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.   We needed to engage with their point on accountability and explain why states are often not held accountable when they abuse the nationalisation model.   * Explain what are competing ‘voting issues’ that tend to outweigh the voters’ appreciation for public services.   + Point out that consumers make excuses for state inefficiency, but we don’t do so for companies.   Well done on your argument building of political risks and the incapacity of the state due to perverse political incentives.   * After proving that long-termism is something that only corporations can commit to, we’re missing the grounding to explain what difference this will make in the development of essential services. * While corporations can raise capital for development, why won’t the state allocate equivalent levels of capital from the federal budget considering the importance of these services?   Please offer more POIs in the debate.  7.06 | | | | | | |