| **Student Name:** Edna Chow |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that all essential services should be nationalised. |
| --- |

| 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:  I think the issue with our opening at present is that we’re pausing too much/have too many filler umms. We need to try and be more intentional and forceful up top. Very clearly establish the problem characterisation, rather than listing out a number of issues. Try to be as clear and direct as possible.  Set-up   * I don’t need literal definitions! Rather, you need to establish what the nature of essential services is. Frame up top why these are so critical, and why the state has to provide them as a consequence. * We need to explain why putting regulations on private companies - such as forcing them to provide a service at a certain cost is insufficient - we need to talk about how lobbying means that regulations favor corporate interests, that companies are adept at finding and exploiting loopholes in regulation. * Good work explaining this is a hybrid model - but we’re not really nationalising it if we say there is a preservation of profit. You have to defend a model in which even where it is hybrid, no profit is made. * How can we just say no corruption exists? This is far too convenient!   Argument 1   * Good work identifying what the moral obligation of the state must be. * If they provide it for free, can they make profit as your model claims? We need to explain why and how states are good actors, and will provide these essential services at fair costs/free - we kind of just assert states will do well. * We need to explain why private companies will provide services and goods at a high cost - explain what their incentives are, and why this is uniquely bad;   + We should have pushed that essential services are natural monopolies, which means that competition and the free market cannot lead to prices being pushed down, or companies behaving properly due to fear of losing out!   + Essential services often require extensive and expensive infrastructure, such as pipelines, power grids, railway networks, or communication lines. Building and maintaining this infrastructure involves substantial upfront investment, making it difficult and inefficient for multiple companies to duplicate these networks. Natural monopolies also benefit from economies of scale, meaning that their average cost of production decreases as output increases. * Did we prove that provision occurs to a wider net of people by the end of this argument? * Why wouldn’t companies price effectively - cheaper x volume means more profit! You need to establish that these are inelastic goods, which means demand does not respond to price - people HAVE to buy this.   05:03  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jacky Xu |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that all essential services should be nationalised. p |
| --- |

| 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 opening - what is this reason? You can’t make your opening about this really important reason and then not explain it all.  Don’t say we win in developing countries. Say instead - I want to question whether Prop can just fiat corruption doesn’t happen - and then respond to it. Why does your side have enforcement power? How do we get companies to buy in and listen to us?  Set-up needs to come before rebuttal. We need to explain why we can regulate private companies on our side; and explain how we preserve competition!  Rebuttal   * Explain how this moral obligation is better fulfilled on your side because provision is better on your side; they have an obligation to ensure it is provided to us, rather than specifically providing it to us themselves. * Good on lack of accountability. How do you solve profit maximisation though? We ignored this!   POI - respond properly! If their service is free, do they make any profit? Fair on government corruption as well.  Argument 1   * We jumped to innovation. What is higher priority is explaining how private companies are able to provide essential services well! * Explain what matters more for the state to spend on! Government-run services can be plagued by inefficiency, bureaucracy, and lack of innovation. The absence of competition can remove incentives for improvement and cost reduction, leading to higher prices and lower quality services for consumers. * Explain why all governments are likely to mishandle these services, making it a wash amongst those running for election, or that people have a range of voting priorities that make it that this cannot occur. * Explain why on the flip, companies are forced to price down, through the power of regulation. I think the point to make is that these companies rely on volume - which is what we say in the end anyways, so good job. * On innovation - explain what companies have access to compared to governments to pull this off - for instance, private companies have greater access to capital markets, making it easier for them to finance research and development and implement new technologies.   05:04  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Bernard Chong |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that all essential services should be nationalised. |
| --- |

| 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:  We need to call them out for never engaging with the profit incentive that companies have, which they ignore entirely. Is it realistic to claim you will achieve public healthcare provision in Afghanistan..?  Rebuttal   * On the hybrid profit model - if they provide it for free, can they make profit as your model claims? We need to explain why and how states are good actors, and will provide these essential services at fair costs/free - we kind of just assert states will do well. * On inelastic good - explain why your side is the only one that fulfils the moral obligation of the government. The implication is that if demand does not respond to price - people HAVE to buy this. * Did we respond at all to the content from 1O?   + We need to respond to corruption!   We need to explain why private companies will provide services and goods at a high cost - explain what their incentives are, and why this is uniquely bad; we should have pushed that essential services are natural monopolies, which means that competition and the free market cannot lead to prices being pushed down, or companies behaving properly due to fear of losing out!  Why wouldn’t companies price effectively - cheaper x volume means more profit! You need to establish that these are inelastic goods, which means demand does not respond to price - people HAVE to buy this.  Argument 1   * What is the thesis of this argument? * This argument is an impact of the value of essential services - this is not contentious. Both sides agree that essential services are important. You need to explain why your side provides these services BETTER. * We need to explain why putting regulations on private companies - such as forcing them to provide a service at a certain cost is insufficient - we need to talk about how lobbying means that regulations favor corporate interests, that companies are adept at finding and exploiting loopholes in regulation. * How are they earning profit? From what?   05:03  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Renee Yang |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that all essential services should be nationalised. |
| --- |

| 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:  Fair call out on the model - the simple question is; if this is a free service, where are they making money? How is profit making possible?  Good observations on why they try and have it both ways - explain why this is exclusive to your side. On corruption - say I want to question whether Prop can just fiat corruption doesn’t happen - and then respond to it.   * Elected officials are short-termist, maintaining and upgrading nationalized services requires significant ongoing investment. Powerful interest groups, including unions, industry lobbies, and even specific communities, can also exert pressure on governments to make decisions that benefit them. Government bureaucracies are also slow-moving and resistant to change, hindering innovation and efficient management of nationalized services.   POI: you need to explain how your side can regulate private companies on our side; and explain how we preserve competition! This deals with their claim that private companies would just charge lots of money.  Explain how this moral obligation is better fulfilled on your side because provision is better on your side; they have an obligation to ensure it is provided to us, rather than specifically providing it to us themselves.  Please don’t randomly extend; it needs to be opening, observations/call outs, rebuttal, second speaker argument. This is not BP - it is WSDC.  On demand and pricing - fair observation, BUT Edna explains that these are natural monopolies, or inelastic goods - if this is true, how do we achieve competitive pricing?  Argument 1   * Why wouldn’t they become monopolies if they were privately owned? * Good example of cronyism and corruption.   + Explain why all governments are likely to mishandle these services, making it a wash amongst those running for election, or that people have a range of voting priorities that make it that this cannot occur. * Explain what matters more for the state to spend on! Government-run services can be plagued by inefficiency, bureaucracy, and lack of innovation. The absence of competition can remove incentives for improvement and cost reduction, leading to higher prices and lower quality services for consumers.   05:19  There’s a lot of repetition and jumping from one point to the next, and then completing it later in this speech.  We need to ask POIs consistently. | | | | | | |