| **Student Name:** Charles Wang |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would break up monopolies |
| --- |

| 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.]  I like the hook about the game of Monopoly transferring to real life, very witty!  On the set-up:   * Good definition on what constitutes a monopoly, i.e. 25%. But for the purposes of having a judge with layman knowledge, we should explain that it’s premised on their power to affect other players in the industry. * Well done on the mechanism of breaking up via the divestiture strategy and a piecemeal strategy., but where is the explanation as to what does each of these things mean? Give me the example of what that looks like. * Do NOT concede that you don’t have any framing.We still need a burden/winning pathway!   + Point out they can still make profit, the only difference you’re introducing is that they will make rightful profiteering vs excessive profiteering on Opp.   On the first argument:   * Good start highlighting harmful monopolistic practices such as aggressive pricing, but we need to precede this with the lack of competition means that consumers will have no real option to go to when these harmful practices kick in.   + Analyse the measures they use to eliminate competition in the free market, e.g. hostile takeovers, and the competition is the precise means in which we can hold corporations accountable. Angle the impact towards how the free market is destroyed but it is precisely the free market that is a correcting mechanism against ALL bad corporate practices, so this is the biggest harm of all in the debate.   + We eventually mech’ed it later on! Good mechanistic analysis on the high barriers of entry and why other companies cannot compete properly against companies. Good grounding on hostile takeovers and slow progression.     - On greater diversity in the market, it isn’t clear why more choices almost always result in better products. So spend time analysing why fair competition in the free market is the only thing that will force companies to develop better products. * We’re doing a good job on the mechanistic analysis and not enough time on the impact analysis!   + We only had a couple of lines on how the consumers suffer, when this needs to be at the heart of the argument.     - E.g. Consumers are denied innovation that are created by small companies so we are deprived of higher quality products.     - E.g. Quality of services become far worse when they are monopolies since they are not threatened.     - E.g. Post-hostile takeover, they sit on all of the innovations they acquire, their only goal is to kill the competitor.   Good response to the POI, but end it sooner because you’re running out of time here.  Where is the 2nd argument?  Good job offering POIs in the debate.  6.22 | | | | | | |