| **Student Name:** Zechariah Chen |
| --- |

| **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 examples in the hook, good use of grounding!  When we’re questioning what the Opposition is trying to achieve, try to actively engage with their actual model on private-public partnership. Make the strategic observation that they are crossing the aisle!   * Why did Opp argue against things like bureaucracy when they still relied on the state as their counter-model! * We also need to engage with Opp’s counter of anti-trust regulations to deal with all of your harms of oligopolies.   On engaging with the lack of competition, say it clearly that the state still stands to make a profit rather than a loss by running essential services efficiently.   * When you are reinforcing that the state has the correct incentives, 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?   When pushing back against innovation, explain that those arguments mean next to nothing in the field of essential services. We don’t need high quality technology, we need access to water and energy.   * Innovation also improves cost-efficiency, and less burden to taxpayers in the long-run.   Good reinforcement on the corporate incentives and why it overcomes Opp’s characterisation of corporate incentives.   * This is under-executed, flip it and highlight what are the structures in place that forces the state to prioritise public interest.   In response to the POI, excellent response! We’re so close to the final conclusion, which is that Opp contradicts all of their own arguments with their own counter model. E.g. How do they create innovation if they impose anti-trust regulations?  Why are we going into rebuttals at the 6th minute?   * Sure, if the state works well, we don’t need accountability, but it’s intuitive that the state could mess up. How do we deal with your worst case scenario? * The state COULD be held accountable, but will they? Be more engaging to Opp’s reasoning.   + 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.   Please offer more POIs in the debate.  7.06 | | | | | | |