| **Student Name:** Shi Qi Ooi |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would nationalise all housing |
| --- |

| 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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  No one will contest that housing is a need, and that this is a critical issue - focus more on the nature of companies, or why profit means housing can never be provided at a fair cost to the public.  Set-up   * Don’t get into fiat, or the wealthy - set up the problem as clearly as possible; this debate takes places in urban centers where shortages are engineered due to multiple home ownership and private equity firms (which you do mention) * What do we mean by individuals being able to own properties? Why are regulations insufficient? We need to establish how regulatory capture leads to regulations that favor corporate interests, that companies are adept at finding and exploiting loopholes in regulation. * We are framing housing as a right, but aren’t being specific enough in our framing - housing is treated as a commodity to be traded and manipulated for profit, creating a system where access to safe and affordable housing is increasingly precarious, particularly for low- and middle-income residents.   Argument 1   * I think we need to explain why housing people and making sure they access it is more important than the right of a company or landlord to make profit; housing as a right people have to access is not going to be contested by the other side; focus on what is contentious! * Explain how people NEED housing - and then link this to the predatory loans and debt cycle you mention but run through! * You have to establish this applies in both rent and ownership - only through nationalization can the government *directly* control all rents across the entire housing market. Regulations and incentives within a private market system can influence rent levels, but they cannot *guarantee* affordability for everyone. Private landlords, even with regulations, still operate within a profit-driven framework, especially when scarcity is artificially created. * Rather than just increasing access, you need to explain why the state will do a GOOD job when this occurs.   Argument 2   * This is a collection of impacts we aren’t mechanising in sufficient detail! If we want to talk about gentrification or community development, you need to talk about HOW; for instance, targeted development projects, such as building affordable housing units, creating community spaces, or improving public transportation access.   06:13 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Gemma Yeung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would nationalise all housing |
| --- |

| 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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good on existing public housing being bad in quality. Call them out for only arguing for existence of public housing on their side, not that the government will do a good job at any of this.  Set-up   * You have to acknowledge the problem and explain what your side is going to do to deal with it; for instance, government programs providing direct subsidies to developers or renters to make housing more affordable. Government investment in the construction and maintenance of public housing can provide a crucial safety net for low-income families. There are also market based reforms - zoning reforms? Many urban areas have restrictive zoning regulations that limit housing density, such as single-family zoning or minimum lot size requirements. These regulations artificially constrain the supply of housing, driving up prices.   Rebuttal   * Lower status people…? Is this something we say? * We’re trying to say that companies have specific sectors? And hence only engage with the luxury where they can afford it - but isn’t this the point? They’re using up land to sell to those who can afford it rather than guaranteeing it is as a right? * You haven’t engaged with housing as a right, you haven’t engaged with how nationalisation increases access.   Argument 1   * What is the central claim or thesis of this argument? * Why do they have lower capital? What are the more important priorities that the state has? * This is not a positive argument on the benefits of the private market, but rebuttal against their claim! The analysis you need to unpack is that state-run housing programs are notoriously inefficient, unresponsive to local needs, and prone to corruption. History shows that centralized planning often leads to shortages, poor maintenance, and limited choices, ultimately harming the very people it intends to help. * We eventually get to the comparative, but we’re just listing out the benefits of the private market without unpacking why this works, or why this is how they will interact or engage with housing. For instance, talk about *how* stronger tenant protections, such as rent control or just-cause eviction laws, can prevent exploitation and displacement, even in a market-based system.   You can’t drop the model in 5 minutes!  We needed to run that nationalisation is a seizure of private property, and the state overstepping, alongside an explanation as to how our side deals with the housing crisis.  Gemma, there is no variation in pace, emphasis or tonal shifts. We’re just going at one rate, at a pretty quick speed and pitch. We need to pay more attention to our delivery.  06:07 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jodie Li |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would nationalise all housing |
| --- |

| 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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  Why aren’t they able to buy a house? How has the state failed them? Why can’t the invisible hand solve? Why is this a problem so beyond regulation that the only option is nationalisation?  The signposting is too extensive - be simple! Less is more!  Strategic observations: on compensation - if they can, they do it, if they cannot they don’t - the former is a democratic state, the latter is not. Don’t spend so much time on this - you don’t have to!  POI: is this meant to be a revenue generating operation - or is the whole point that we are using tax to subsidise it? You also need to trade off quality - we would rather people have a house, rather than some have a fancy penthouse, or even a simple condo. Which group of people matters more?  The wait time for public housing is multiple years! You aren’t characterising this with sufficient urgency and harm.  Argument 1   * The signposting at the top here is also slightly too extensive! I appreciate the structure, but it’s so lengthy that as a judge I cannot track all of it; jumping to characterisation after as well does the same! * On incentives - good on incentives of companies; but it’s also individuals and private landlords! Is it expensive because of middlemen? What role do they have in this debate? * We are framing housing as a right, but aren’t being specific enough in our framing - housing is treated as a commodity to be traded and manipulated for profit, creating a system where access to safe and affordable housing is increasingly precarious, particularly for low- and middle-income residents. * Rather than just increasing access, you need to explain why the state will do a GOOD job when this occurs. For instance, the state can engage in long-term planning and investment in housing infrastructure, something the private market often struggles with due to its focus on short-term returns. This allows for the development of comprehensive housing strategies that address both immediate needs and future growth * If you want to deal with the vulnerable - explain HOW the state can prioritize housing for vulnerable populations, such as the homeless, the elderly, and people with disabilities, ensuring that their specific needs are met.   We are arguing harm exists, but aren’t explaining how regulation doesn’t solve any of these problems! You need to establish why regulation is impossible - only then is this extreme step justifiable!  06:15 | | | | | | |