| **Student Name:** Andrew Man |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Don’t acknowledge that they’re good! As 1P, we shouldn’t be so fixated on what Opp says - what you say shouldn’t be phrased in response to what they might say, but rather be strategic (taking into consideration what they say) and positively phrased.  Set-up   * 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 incorporating the model we discussed in class. * Good work considering what consumers want - but this content should be put into the argument, as opposed to set-up. * Is the burden just to prove that monopolies are bad, or is it 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 marking the course of the argument at the top. * When we talk about network - I think we just mean power; network effects are a very specific characteristic that monopolies possess. * We’re asserting the ways in which monopolies behave - we need to establish why monopolies engage in bad practices - why are they likely to abuse their power to engage in predatory pricing, as opposed to pricing below cost? We aren’t starting this argument with first principles. * What prevents companies from competing? What happens when companies break up such that competition now exists? * On better products and competition - why didn’t this exist before? Why can’t monopolies be creative? You have to EXPLAIN this! * What is the value of innovation? Why does it matter so much?   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.   06:01 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sarah Seryoung Choi |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Our opening sentence hasn’t been thought out enough - and if you were to transcribe it - it wouldn’t be grammatically correct. Try to phrase with more simplicity - this will help with clarity. Give me a simple opening - slow, easy to understand, clear upshot.  Set-up   * We need to be a little bit more specific and targeted when it comes to our model. Try to go over the different instances where you identify the specific problem with the monopoly and take action accordingly; for instance, if it’s patenting - we’ll make them go open source, if it is about high capital requirements, we’ll provide grants and subsidies. * Why is your side able to regulate? Why is there buy-in to regulation? Your benefits are contingent on being able to do this!   + You can also say 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   * I think the first thing you need to question is whether choice is compromised or not - both on the basis of price, and in terms of the quality of products. You can argue what incentives monopolies have to maintain their status; they need to make money - make more money - keep their market position etc. * The Apple example isn’t helping you! Apple is technically a monopoly in its demographic, without real competitors.   Argument 1   * Good work analysing how monopolies engage in innovation. You can give me more analysis as to why this happens!   + Even without direct competition, monopolies still have a profit motive. Innovation can lead to cost reductions, new revenue streams, and expanded market opportunities, all of which increase profits. The threat of future competition exists. Innovation can allow monopolies to expand into adjacent markets, further increasing their dominance and profitability. * Why are we giving Opp fodder by saying ah but price exploitation could exist? Phrase this more strategically! * 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.   Let’s ask POIs consistently! We’re speaking too fast - we have to go slower!  06:07 | | | | | | |