| **Student Name:** Josephine She |
| --- |

| **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 profiteering at the expense of public access, I appreciate the example of healthcare. We can hammer the point home with some valuable grounding to set the context for unaffordable public goods, such as the prices of insulin example I provided in the lecture.   * Signpost the rest of your speech instead of diving right into the meat of your case.   On the set-up:   * What exactly is the model for nationalisation?   + Explain that the state will compensate private actors but eliminate their ability to provide this service.   + We can still give out contracts to private actors to help the government run these services, but the state controls everything, including price and quality. * Name me exactly what industries you will be nationalising for clarity. * Highlight your winning pathway on accessibility, then explain why accessibility is the better winning pathway over the trade-off of innovation.   Good broad descriptions of unaffordable public goods.   * Explain clearly that the premise is on corporate incentives exploiting public suffering. * We shouldn’t limit our reasoning to just pricing it high leads to more money, compare this business model to Opp’s business model on why companies make more money by expanding these goods to more consumers.   + Here, we can point out that essential goods are inelastic in nature, so they can get away by pricing it high, as the demand for essential goods and services is constant.   + Spend time characterising the profit incentive of corporations too will also lead to other harmful practices.     - E.g. Refusing to invest in the development of rural areas due to low returns of investment. * Can we spend more time impacting that these industries are the conduit for the access to basic human rights?   + Where is the illustration of human costs? How could the lack of access threaten their right to life and create a poverty trap?   + We need to expand this to the obligation of the government to nationalise public goods. What are the metrics to justify state intervention in the private market?   Very interesting argument on sole control efficiency.   * Can we mechanise clearly what is the role of state data and surveillance in terms of creating a nationwide infrastructure? We are currently asserting that it’s important. * Is state surveillance enough? What about the lack of state capacity to invest nationwide?   + We are not filling in the analytical gap on capacity. Just because the state will do it, doesn’t mean that they could! HOW will the state be efficient in any way? * The essence of this argument is about the state being able to do it better, so we need to expand state incentives even more.   + We’re not precisely highlighting what are the structures in place that forces the state to prioritise public interest.   + E.g. Propose the model of mandating transparency, spend time explaining why information is key in holding the state accountable.   + We have to highlight specific accountability mechanisms and then prove why it will be effective. Why will it be easy for backlash to be converted to anti-state political mobilisation? Are there a lot of awareness on these issues?   + Provide some grounding of when states have been held accountable.   Please offer more POIs in the debate!  6.15 - So close! Try to push for 7 minutes! | | | | | | |