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

| **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: | 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 6 minutes’ long.]  It was a good choice to utilise a layman example of what it looks like for workers in a developing economy, it makes it easier for the judge to comprehend the situation.  On the set-up:   * Clear definition of trade liberalisation as well as protectionism with the use of policy examples. * On characterising a developing economy, aside from low growth, high unemployment, and low diversification, it would be good to pigeonhole these nations as lacking natural resources and would require foreign direct investment in order to rejuvenate its economy. * What exactly is the burden for Prop?   On the first argument:   * Good choice of an argument on immediate economic revitalisation, spend time linking this back to free trade. * Well done on the limitations of a developing economy.   + We can do without the analysis on catching up to the growth of developed economies, because this could immediately be flipped on you since free trade often increases the rich-poor gap between nations. * On addressing the need for economic growth, we need to actively mechanise as to why free trade is uniquely the only thing that does this!   + E.g. Highlight high start-up costs for infrastructural investment that the state does not have, but foreign companies will be willing to bring in capital if we embrace free trade. * On organic growth not likely happening, instead of saying that technology and development don’t happen overnight, give them credit for local development and describe why local companies are often inefficient.   + Then 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.   Was organic growth meant to be a second argument? It wasn’t presented in a distinct manner.  Good job offering POIs today!  6.06 | | | | | | |