| **Student Name:** Hanna Zhang |
| --- |

| **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.]  Don’t TELL me that you’re winging it and just go straight to the call-out.   * Fully execute the observation by explaining how the lack of responses actively damages her case, or proves that the trade-off swings in your favour.   Excellent pushback that there’s no incentive to innovate in essential goods and services.   * Here, we can point out that essential goods are inelastic in nature, so they can get away by pricing it high and not competing with others, as the demand for essential goods and services is constant. * Explain that even if there are several companies in the industry, they usually sub-divide control of the market, so no one company has to innovate to take over market share in certain areas. * Without these reasons, Opp can still come back and explain that innovation can actually IMPROVE the ability to access certain things, e.g. innovating telecommunications lead to faster, better internet. * You can actually flip this and explain that innovation also improves cost-efficiency, and less burden to taxpayers in the long-run, so governments could also innovate if they wanted to.   Good job reinforcing the trade-off of accessibility over innovation/quality, but we need to spend more time proving how so.   * Expand the analysis that these industries are the conduit for the access to basic human rights.   + Where is the illustration of human costs? How could the lack of access threaten their right to life.   + Then conclude this with the obligation of the government to nationalise public goods. What are the metrics to justify state intervention in the private market?   On the dangerous and exploitative ways the companies operate, don’t stop too early by just explaining that they have no interest in protecting the public.   * We need to explain that corporations can refuse compliance or lobby to deregulate.   + We eventually stated this later on, well done! * This will help you land the conclusion that ONLY sole state control leads to effective compliance to regulations.   + Explain that it’s easier to take over control in one go, instead of risking the back and forth power struggle against corporations.   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?   * I appreciate the analysis on the state having better incentives, but we’re not precisely highlighting what are the structures in place that forces the state to prioritise public interest. * We need to engage with O1’s analysis on the state lacking capacity, and therefore, will hurt accessibility.   + We’re finally stating at the end that the state can engage in tactics like attracting investments, but it’s not clear why the state will have BETTER capacity in contrast to companies.   On accountability being better on the state, the state COULD be held accountable, but will they?   * 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.   You cannot add a new argument at 07:30!! Call it quits, there’s nothing you can prove to me in 15 seconds.  Good job offering POIs.  7.58 - We are wayyy over-time!!! | | | | | | |