| **Student Name:** Kelly Au |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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! I like the focal point, emphasise even more on the harm statement.   * Good signposting.   I appreciate the counter characterisation that monopolies deserve their market dominance, good mechanistic analysis as to how this could be true. But this isn’t ALWAYS true. So some kind of examples or grounding here would be better suited to prove that reality sides in your favour.   * While we claim that it’s natural, that’s precisely how the antitrust laws prevent this from occurring. * On the injustice of it all, this would be better off in argumentation because it’s so contentious.   + Why is it that paying taxes gives them a free pass to engage in harmful corporate behaviour?   Good pushback that competition still exists, but don’t stop too early with just name dropping companies.   * Give the kind of grounding where these competitors were actually capable of keeping each other in check in response to harmful corporate practices.   Provide the counter set-up BEFORE the rebuttals.   * Are you okay with the full free market with minimal safeguards? * What is your burden/winning pathway?   How is it that we’re entering rebuttals at 03:30 in a 06:00 speech? The counter-characterisation at the top should have been in the rebuttals or arguments.   * Good flipping that lower prices are good, and this is done via cost-efficiency. * 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.   On your first argument:   * Good characterisation that companies gain their monopoly via the development of brand loyalty. * There’s no real impacting to this level of violation of the right to property?   + E.g. Companies and businesses will be disincentivised from investing in business expansions, thus hurting more job opportunities.   On your second argument:   * Good start on why innovation is more likely to happen. * But 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.   Please offer more POIs in the debate.  6.08 | | | | | | |