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

| **Motion**: This house believes that governments should not bail out companies deemed ‘too big to fail’. |
| --- |

| 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:  Moral outrage in the opening is evident and good. The justification as to why we should be is hidden under lots of words - cut through it and present it simply! Spell out the ways in which the banks engaged in the specific habits and risky behaviours that led to this crisis/needing a bail out.  Set-up   * On too big to fail - good work breaking this down; the push is that they engage in risky behaviour, they use their standing to be able to throw their weight around. * Fair on the alternate package of policies; we need to expand on this in terms of being able to run a positive path to victory. * I think we need to spell out that we’re going to regulate them such that they don’t remain too big to fail - we want to break up big banks/companies.   + Good work mentioning Dodd-Frank, we can also bring back Glass-Steagall as we discussed, to make it so that banks hold more of their own money at risk, reducing their reliance on debt and making them more resilient to losses.   + We could introduce regular and rigorous stress tests that realistically assess banks' ability to withstand severe economic shocks. * Don’t just name drop a bail-in!   Argument 1   * Explain how they became too big to fail - and how any bail out convinces them that this dominance continues; we need to explain why no set of regulations can succeed without this specific change; we need to link it to the influence these banks hold over the state.   + Large banks employ armies of lobbyists and contribute heavily to political campaigns, giving them significant influence over policymakers.   + Over time, regulatory agencies can become "captured" by the industries they are supposed to regulate.   + The movement of individuals between government regulatory agencies and the financial industry (the "revolving door") further blurs the lines and can lead to regulatory capture. * On overdependency - once you’ve established this, move on! Explain the risky behaviour they indulge in and how it leads to harm. This argument has some repetition within it.   + We need to explain how this hurts the economy by preventing creative destruction from happening, and hurting smaller, more prudent banks. * What’s the positive comparative? How does your side prevent this + solve a crisis? * Why is it unsustainable? Unpack this!   Argument 2   * We aren’t following the structure of a principle argument. What inalienable right or freedom has been violated, and how must the state restore it? Why is a bail out the unjust way in which to do this? * Suddenly we’re in a liquidity crisis? The chronology of this argument is a bit messy! * How do you solve these problems? Do you think prove this? * The impact cannot be the thesis - it has to be an implication of the thesis being true.   How do we get out of the crisis? What is our positive path to victory?  07:20 | | | | | | |