| **Student Name:** Stephanie Kwok |
| --- |

| **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: | 70 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Good focal point on companies spearheading innovation. We can maximise impact by explaining why innovation is more important than accessibility in the debate.  Excellent pushback that the costs of nationalisation are quite massive. Don’t just quote statistics, mechanise for me where do these costs come from aside from compensating these companies? Because the government can decide to lower the compensation in a nationalisation model, that wouldn’t be an issue.   * On these resources can be funneled back into these industries, this could be in your counter model on subsidising some of the consumer-side costs to improve affordability.   Don’t just assert your innovation case in the rebuttal. We needed to still explain why innovation is actually needed within essential services.   * We need to spend time reinforcing why the state will not actually conduct innovation even if their incentives align, this is a capacity issue.   Good pushback on state corruption, and transparency mechanisms may still be unreliable. However, your side is still relying on the state as well to conduct many of your subsidisation policies.  Excellent responses to the POI. After stating that costs do go down over time, can you explain WHY that is the case? Point out that competition will lead to better innovation, so older technology will naturally be cheaper due to lower demand, as well as economies-of-scale to drive down prices for companies.  We need the counter set-up BEFORE the rebuttals:   * I appreciate all the grounding on what privatisation looks like, but all of them are better off in the argument. * We’re not exactly stating the state regulations to improve affordability or cut down on exploitative corporate practices.   We need to start our argument earlier than 6:30!   * Don’t immediately concede the loss of accessibility. * We’re not exactly explaining the nature of innovation and why only companies can spearhead that.   + Explain that governments are risk averse and will rather invest in tangible immediate projects.   + Explain the difference in capital capacity.   + Explain that we have more expertise.   + Etc. * What is the impact of innovation to accessibility? Point out that it can actually make some of these services more accessible.   We needed to engage with their point on accountability and explain why states are often not held accountable when they abuse the nationalisation model.   * Explain what are competing ‘voting issues’ that tend to outweigh the voters’ appreciation for public services.   + Point out that consumers make excuses for state inefficiency, but we don’t do so for companies.   Please offer more POIs in the debate.  7.13 | | | | | | |