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

| **Motion:** This house believes that governments should not bail out banks deemed ‘too big to fail’ |
| --- |

| 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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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 8 minutes’ long.]  Nice use of the 2008 global financial crisis as grounding on where the debate lies.   * Push it with more urgency by spelling out the ways in which the banks engaged in the specific habits and risky behaviours that led to this crisis/needing a bail out. * Good job signposting.   On the set-up:   * Very clear definition of bailouts.   + We are inserting some argumentative analysis here as to why bailouts have limited effectiveness on repairing lost market confidence, keep it to the argument. * Good job modelling that money can be reinvested on dealing with the harms of bailouts such as the welfare system.   + But how do we get out of the crisis? What is our positive path to victory? There’s a vague idea about initiating growth, but it’s unclear what the stimulus plan is. * We need to explain what else we’ll do to ensure these banks don’t behave in a way that gains more risk, and how they can be more sustainable. This can look like:   + Bringing back the regulatory reforms as we discussed, to make it so that banks are not relying on predatory practices, and taking high-risks at the consumers’ expense.   + We could introduce regular and rigorous stress tests that realistically assess banks' ability to withstand severe economic shocks.   + Extend regulations and oversight, including hedge funds, private equity firms etc.   On your first argument of eroding trust:   * Your claim is a practical one, but your first thesis you’re expanding is a principle one. Pick one! * Broadly, good moral push on the culpability of these companies and their exploitative ways.   + While I believe that consumers are vulnerable, I would appreciate specific grounding of practices of big banks where they profit at the expense of the public * We’re running a half principle here, what is actually the moral harm? Actively outline what is the role of the government, and why this betrayal of confidence matters in the debate. * Good impacting that the bail-outs actively reward these terrible companies and land us in a vicious cycle.   + However, this was only proven in the second argument when discussing business models. * On the social harms and disorder, we need to illustrate the human costs on a day-to-day basis to improve the persuasiveness.   On your second argument:   * Good work characterising the culture at big banks, I was persuaded that they do engage in high-risk business models.   + Spend more time linking how it is precisely the bail outs that set these banks up into risk taking behaviour further, otherwise it’s symmetrical. Let’s point to how this will remove the implicit guarantee that encourages excessive risk-taking. We need to explain why no set of regulations can succeed without this specific change; we need to link it to the influence these banks hold over the state.     - Large banks employ armies of lobbyists and contribute heavily to political campaigns, giving them significant influence over policymakers.       * We mentioned this later, spend more time on it!     - Over time, regulatory agencies can become "captured" by the industries they are supposed to regulate.     - The movement of individuals between government regulatory agencies and the financial industry (the "revolving door") further blurs the lines and can lead to regulatory capture. * Good conclusion on the excessive leverage of why the government’s hands are tied and they are pressured to bail out when the time comes.   + On the moral hazard, expand how this will affect consumers as well, not just the banks.   The impact on why the financial industry behaves in toxic, hazardous ways once we allow these forms of monopoly has so much potential, let’s stay with this line of thought and extrapolate what are the harmful practices they may perpetuate on consumers.  Good job offering POIs today!  8.13 | | | | | | |