| **Student Name:** Isabella Chau |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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 call-out on Proposition not having the competition that Opp has.   * But how do we resolve the deadlock created when Prop argued that often monopolies dominate in essential industries or oligopolies engage in market collusion? So he’s saying there’s market failure here for the free market.   + If I accept Prop’s characterisation here, these monopolies will never be held accountable when they engage in predatory pricing.   Before arguing that the state won’t be held accountable because of no competition, we need to first prove the underlying assumption that the state is innately inefficient or corrupt. Explain clearly that this engages with Prop’s point that political competition replaces economic competition.   * THEN we explain why poor accountability matters. It’s the last resort in case of failure.   + But good job laying down the logical links on why the state can distract political issues or public services may not be voting issues.   + Try not to stop too early by just highlighting this COULD happen, tell me WHY it happens. We cannot just assert that corruption happens, why is corruption so prevalent in state structures?   We are not doing anything to solve the issue of accessibility here, we need to reinforce our counter-model so we don’t lose this clash.   * We’re not exactly stating the state regulations to improve affordability or cut down on exploitative corporate practices.   + We can explain that the state can also propose antitrust laws to constrain monopolies.   Good reinforcement on the state’s lack of capacity!   * Can we explain why the provision of essential services are extremely resource-intensive, and illustrate what these services could look like under state care?   + The state will build the hospitals but they are under-staffed, no medical equipment, no ability to provide specialists, etc.     - Then conclude clearly that on both sides, access to services could be limited, but under privatisation, consumers can opt out of a failing state model.       * Point out that this is extremely important in the event that the state is corrupt, it’s a last resort in the worst case scenario. Explain that transparency mechanisms may still be unreliable.   On the capacity to innovate:   * I agree that companies have more capacity, but we’re not exactly explaining the high-risk nature of innovation and why only companies are willing to take on these risks for the sake of returns.   + Explain that governments are risk averse and will rather invest in tangible immediate projects.   + Explain the severity of the difference in capital capacity. Explain that we have more expertise because of wages and infrastructural differences. * We need to still explain why innovation is actually needed within essential services.   + What is the impact of innovation to accessibility? Point out that it can actually make some of these services more accessible. E.g. Innovative electricity grids allow us to build in mountainous areas. * We need to spend time reinforcing why the state will not actually conduct innovation even if their incentives align, this is a capacity issue.   We need to explain that costs do go down over time. 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.   * Otherwise, we will lose on the issue of accessibility wholesale.   Please offer more POIs in the debate.  6.57 - So close! Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |