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

| **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.]  Don’t announce that you’re improvising the hook! The call-out would make more sense if Prop didn’t also have an argument about helping consumers, so it would be more contentious if you immediately weighed who helps consumers better?  Good job flipping the analysis and explain why monopolies do help consumers at times.   * But it’s not engaging with the predatory pricing tactics that Prop claims monopolies engage in. While SOME monopolies engage in the kind of behaviour that benefits consumers, they also engage in destructive and harmful behaviour.   + So we’re currently washing out this point! We have to prove why there’s a structural business incentive to ALWAYS do what’s right for consumers, e.g. analyse the ‘loss leader’ strategy to maintain market dominance, which is always pro-consumer in nature.   Good rebuttal that monopolies play a large role in fueling the economy, and they can survive tough times, but this analysis doesn’t actually take down Prop’s specific analysis on ‘too big to fail’ companies forces the state’s hand.   * Explain why in totality, we’d rather bail out big companies SOMETIMES during a one-off crisis, but during regular economic cycles, these companies are more resilient and survive tough times.   Excellent response on why innovation will happen better on Opp.   * But bear in mind that Prop didn’t actually challenge Opp’s point on innovation. Their only claim is that companies do still have money and incentives to innovate. So we are assuming that these monopolies suddenly become small fledgling companies, Prop has already pointed out that they will still make a lot of profit, just not EXCESSIVE profit. * We need some kind of grounding as to what the human costs are when it comes to the loss of innovation. It isn’t clear what the scaling of harm is here.   We dropped the entire principle clash on monopolies deserving their market dominance!  On your argument:   * Good characterisation on why this worsens operational costs, and increases the costs to consumers.   + What is not clear is why doesn’t the competition in the free market kick in and allow prices to be optimised to a point that is affordable?     - At best, I can agree that prices might go up, but these prices will be at price equilibrium between demand and supply which is good.   There’s a baseline assumption on what roles these companies play when it comes to social development. We need to make clear first that the state would fail to do all of these same things, such as building infrastructure and incentivising innovation, that we uniquely require monopolies to step in and perform all of the same functions.  Good job offering POIs in the debate.  SLOW DOWN!  6.05 | | | | | | |