| **Student Name:** Ryan |
| --- |

| **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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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: P1  Good hook – you focused on monopolies harms, and constant profit driven culture being harmful.  Setup   * You are right to say companies have bad habits; Nestle example of child labor is good (try to use more illustration and give analysis instead of just giving an example) * You can say for example companies often have a disregard for moral aspects because those at the top of companies do not need to ensure these aspects; often times its normalized within these industries as a common practice, often because companies do not get caught as they can either get away from lawsuits so government don't intervene, and so on. * You said the opp's burden is to defend a world of open markets. So they cannot claim unlimited funds; but they can claim maximizing profit. Here, I am unclear what this setup is doing.   Argument 1: Accountability   * Companies often have child labor because they do not have accountability. Ok, good point – but what is the comparative here? * – Is it better because governments can implement comprehensive plans for development and maintenance of services without the constraints of short-term profit? If so, please add those analyses. * POI ans: don't just say the UK has better human rights accountability. Why is it true? Is it because private companies are primarily driven by profit. This can lead to cost-cutting measures that negatively impact labor rights, working conditions, and employee welfare?   Argument 2: Accessibility   * I am unclear why there is more accessibility is ensured in your case * Why don't corporations want accessibility? Don't they want to sell more? * You may add because governments are required to ensure essential services for people to ensure (1) they get re-elected, (2) and because they don't want to be necessarily under protests.   Style: Using the phrase “whatever, or whatever” does not sound the nicest, please limit that. Also, please limit pauses when speaking, as it interrupts speaking flow and its clarity.  Speech time: 7:01 |
| --- |

| **Student Name:** Adrian O1 |
| --- |

| **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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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: O1  Good hook, I could see a clear direction of you pointing out why consumer scrutiny is useful in private companies!  Rebuttal to accountability   * It's good that you said you can have it too because your consumers can also give feedback and so on. * – You can add the “scale” of effect here. You can say you have it more because people have higher expectations of these products; and because they can also push for competitors to come up in the market.   Rebuttal to accessibility   * You could add why greater market product is something government can ensure * Without competition, there may be less incentive for innovation and efficiency. Bureaucratic processes can lead to delays and a lack of responsiveness to consumer needs, resulting in poor service quality. * In a competitive market, consumers benefit from a variety of service options. Nationalisation may result in homogenized services that do not cater to diverse needs and preferences, leading to dissatisfaction.   POI ans: Don’t just say it is a good question. “Can I not answer it” is not the best answer either. You could just say “yes but that R&D is unlikely because the need of it is lower, as long as the basics are met” and that would be enough.  Argument 1: innovation   * Corporations have it more because they compete and need the edge for market reach is a good point * There needed to be more analysis; especially you could say why corporations have that trend? Pfizer - vaccine; Apple/Microsoft - tech; Boeing - safety in aviation; and so on —-- you have abundance to use.   Style: Tone variation needs to increase, more eye-contact would help too! Also, generally, a decrease of pauses could help.  Speech time: 7:07 |
| --- |

| **Student Name:** Stephanie P2 |
| --- |

| **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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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: P2  Hook: clear direction, I like it.  Rebuttal to short-term solution   * I am unclear why politicians would not want to prioritize short-term benefits * Your analysis is “they have greater incentive” if people ask for it; but where is capacity? You need to account for both! Just say why the government can focus on serving urgent issues to citizens whereas companies must focus on long term profit forecasts.   POI: Won't people pass bills anyway?  ANS: if they pass, then that's good for us. Good answer. Please don't be confused with it. Say that means quick decisions are likely and that is useful, in most cases.  Rebuttal to innovation   * It is good that you talked about how that can lead to higher expenses as R&D needs funding * But here, more analysis would be useful; especially if we want to show comparatives. Are you not for R&D? Can the government subsidize more? You can say the government can do it better because they prioritize services better even if it means some innovation takes longer.   HK urban density   * Good analysis how that effects peoples lives * I am unclear how nationalizing is helping MTR be cheaper? Is it because government is subsidizing based on tax money? If so, say it! * If you don't say that^, the comparative remains unclear.   Government has labor union accountability   * Ok, but don't corporations have it too? ‘ * You could analyze here that governments ensure higher quality or decent wage because they are not only focused on money making.   Style: Tone variation needs to increase, more eye-contact would help too!  Speech time: 5:54; please plan speech from early – we need to reach 7 mins and a proper script (or early plan) goes a long way! |
| --- |

| **Student Name:** Sarah O2 |
| --- |

| **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’s choice of words was persuasive and strategic. | 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: O2  Hook – where? Don't just repeat what opp said here.  Integrated rebuttal   * “Economies work in supply demand”, you stated. * Expense: we have balance because we want more customers to buy our products. Here, the government also wants the same no? So everyone can ensure basic bits. So where is the tipping point? Also, where does it connect to essential services? This is a generic analysis otherwise. You could say, electricity and so on are unlikely to be made too expensive, otherwise people can't use them.   POI ANS: if it's unclear, you can ask it actually; especially if its under 15 sec; here the question was asked in less than 6-7 seconds so you could ask for a repeat!   * If not, just move on! Don't stay hung on!   POI ANS (2): Quality of product/ samsung   * Answer - don't respond to example, but answer more on the structural analysis here   Clash 1   * Better innovation = high standard of living * I am still unclear why you have higher innovation. Is it because of competition on market grip? * I think you could analyze why state has less innovation; its not only no competition, but its also that they wont take risky moves because they dont necessarily need to do it. * Also, add weighing. Why is this debate winning? Is it because more people benefit from it? * Is this otherwise debate winning because you are able to have a drastic improvement in terms of innovation? Eg pfizer?   Style: Tone variation needs to increase, more eye-contact would help too! Try to speak more confidently!  Speech time: 6:50! |
| --- |