| **Student Name:** Joanne Lau |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would breakup monopolies |
| --- |

| 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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  I would prefer you highlight what is uniquely harmful about monopolies - is it exploitation, is it the suppression of competition, which is it?  Set-up - took us 3 minutes, we need to be more mindful of our word economy.   * We need to first define what a monopoly is through examples - it shouldn’t just be an overview of their characteristics; with each characteristic, ground it using an example. * Good work explaining the different ways in which the breakdown occurs - good link to the examples in class! * Is the burden just to prove that monopolies are bad, or is that regulation is impossible necessitating an extreme form of government intervention.   + Monopolies often engage in rent-seeking behavior, using their political influence to protect their market dominance and extract unearned profits. This distorts the political process.   Argument 1   * Good work having layers to explaining why monopolies engage in bad practices; good use of the Diapers.com example!   + Explain WHY this happens to small start-ups - why are they put down; what are the incentives of a monopoly? We aren’t starting this argument with first principles.   + What is the value of a small start-up? * Pricing - why are monopolies providing such essential goods in the first place? Break down the nature of goods in this case - such as privatised natural resources - becoming monopolies! * POI - clear answer. Explain why the incentive of additional profit is not worth it - this is not a consumer demographic worth acquiring. * On labour abuse - clear explanation. Explain what kind of areas this happens in and why this is uniquely bad. * The inability of regulations to work needed to be established in set-up! We need to explain why regulations don’t work - and this needs us to talk about how abuse occurs at a scale that cannot be regulated.   + For instance, tech giants operate with incredibly complex algorithms, data-driven pricing models, and opaque internal structures. Regulators often lack the technical expertise and resources to understand these intricacies, making effective oversight extremely challenging.   + The tech landscape evolves at a breakneck pace. By the time regulators catch up with one abusive practice, these companies have already developed new, more sophisticated methods of exploiting consumers. Regulation becomes a constant game of catch-up, always one step behind. * The structure of this argument is really messy, and isn’t following proceeding logic.   Let’s ask POIs consistently!  06:01 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would breakup monopolies |
| --- |

| 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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Give me a simple opening - slow, easy to understand, clear upshot. Don’t aim to respond but expand at the same time.  Set-up   * Good work having a bucket of options! Good incorporation of downward and upward pressure.   + Good work going over the different instances where you identify the specific problem with the monopoly and take action accordingly; excellent range of examples. * Winning pathway - healthy, innovation - good. * Why is your side able to regulate? Why is there buy-in to regulation? Your benefits are contingent on being able to do this!   Rebuttal   * Responses aren’t as magical as just pointing to your counter-model, you have to explain why your counter-model is BETTER at solving the problem. * POI: good response - incorporate this into your set-up! You can also argue that regulatory agencies will be required to disclose all sources of funding, including private donations or grants, to identify potential conflicts of interest. There can be transparent and well-defined regulatory guidelines and processes that make it more difficult for special interests to exert undue influence. Use the fiat Opp has in the round!   Argument 1   * Good work explaining why monopolies exist; but it needs to be more nuanced, taking into account the hostile practices these companies engaged in. You need to explain why your model works here. * Good comparative analysis, incorporating what you learned in class today! * We just assume that monopolies behave in a certain way, and assert this behaviour to be the case - but this needs to be established in the round! * Good job using all the analysis on why innovation still exists on your side; explain why in most instances when monopolies decide to innovate or not, the calculation they are making - and why it is the case the decision always falls on the innovation side. * Good on the cost of R&D being passed down to the consumer - give us an example of this! * This relies on a very narrow and positive characterisation of monopolies, rather than being realistic about their profit incentive and connecting good behaviour to this incentive + incorporating the model into it to show why it is likely to work.   Let’s ask POIs consistently!  06:16  Style wise - this is too fast for a parent judge! Slow down, simplify your wording, try to stay away from jargon. | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would breakup monopolies |
| --- |

| 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:  Please no funny openings. You can’t do this at JSDC!  Rebuttal   * Explain why even where there is buy-in to regulations, they can’t keep up. One response is corporate capture - as you point out. The other is to explain that despite this, regulation doesn’t work. This also deals with the POI Jodie asks you.   + For instance, tech giants operate with incredibly complex algorithms, data-driven pricing models, and opaque internal structures. Regulators often lack the technical expertise and resources to understand these intricacies, making effective oversight extremely challenging.   + The tech landscape evolves at a breakneck pace. By the time regulators catch up with one abusive practice, these companies have already developed new, more sophisticated methods of exploiting consumers. Regulation becomes a constant game of catch-up, always one step behind. * On innovation - push them on their very jolly characterisation of monopolies where they disregard all profit incentive + hostile means of accumulating market share.   + Explain why the incentive of additional profit is not worth it - this is not a consumer demographic worth acquiring.   + Explain why the innovation could exist, but the desire to make the product accessible is likely missing.   Argument 1   * Intimidation - call them out on their characterisation here; did they become a monopoly only through hard work? * Please no world problem examples. * Good work explaining how the space for competition opens up - you need to ground this claim through examples!   + The breakup of AT&T in 1982 resulted in the creation of several regional Bell operating companies, fostering competition in the telecommunications industry and leading to lower long-distance rates.   + The breakup of Microsoft's attempted bundling of Internet Explorer with Windows helped prevent it from monopolizing the web browser market, allowing competitors like Netscape and eventually Firefox and Chrome to thrive.   You need to slow down - this is too fast for a parent judge.  06:15  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would breakup monopolies |
| --- |

| 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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  What are these incentives? Why are they stronger towards regulation, rather than Prop? You can argue that regulatory agencies will be required to disclose all sources of funding, including private donations or grants, to identify potential conflicts of interest. There can be transparent and well-defined regulatory guidelines and processes that make it more difficult for special interests to exert undue influence. Use the fiat Opp has in the round!  Rebuttal   * Why are we numbering them? * Explain why they aren’t? If it is dependent on these two claims, why aren’t we taking them down - rather than just noting this and moving on? The point isn’t that monopolies cannot innovate - it is why they are likely to share the fruits of innovation with the average consumer. * You also need to explain why in most instances when monopolies decide to innovate or not, the calculation they are making - and why it is the case the decision always falls on the innovation side. See the POI Gemma asks! * It can also be about the quality of innovation - why is the quality of innovation better on your side? Why doesn’t competition lead to better innovation? * Brand loyalty - is this true? This relies on a very narrow and positive characterisation of monopolies, rather than being realistic about their profit incentive and connecting good behaviour to this incentive + incorporating the model into it to show why it is likely to work. * Responses aren’t as magical as just pointing to your counter-model, you have to explain why your counter-model is BETTER at solving the problem.   Argument 1   * Dominance through merit - why is credibility or brand loyalty valuable? The primary stakeholder for this argument seems to be the welfare of the company, as opposed to the consumer. To the extent this is counter-intuitive in terms of weighing - explain either why companies matter, or explain how the consumer benefits. * We’re parroting the benefits, rather than explaining what the value of these are! Why is market expansion good, why is efficient resource allocation good? * We just assume that monopolies behave in a certain way, and assert this behaviour to be the case - but this needs to be established in the round! * Good on the cost of R&D being passed down to the consumer - give us an example of this! * Good on first mover advantage! Connect this to merit!   We just started rapping at the end! You cannot speak in this way at JSDC. You have to speak in a slow and more controlled tone.  Let’s ask POIs consistently!  06:13 | | | | | | |