| **Student Name:** Angela Qian |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Good opening! Excellent explanation of how these are inelastic, hence ample opportunity for exploitation. The implication needs to be clear - this means the government must step in, and ensure access exists. We didn’t make any eye contact while delivering this, which hurts the impact of this! We need to try and be more assertive and forceful up top.  Set-up - thorough, rigorous characterisation. Well done!   * Good work characterising the nature of essential services - you are able to frame how these are critical. We need to link this to the duty of the state - they have a moral obligation to provide these. You can engage with the trade off here and say - quality matters less, access matters more. * On nationalisation - we need to explain why this is the only option. Regulating 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.   Argument 1   * Good work linking to earlier characterisation. We need to explain how or why private companies behave in the predatory way you claim. We assert that this just happens. * We can nuance this further by explaining that competition doesn't exist in the private sector! 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! * The implication of them being inelastic goods is also that companies don’t price effectively - cheaper x volume = more profit. If demand does not respond to price - people HAVE to buy this. * We need to explain why and how states are good actors, and will provide these essential services at fair costs/free; good about support. Make this comparative and highlight where accountability exists. If governments do a bad job, it is easier to hold them accountable - public scrutiny, democratic processes exist and checks and balances.   Argument 2 - at 4:25, which is too late.   * This is an impact of the first argument. Is this a new claim? * On proper and safe environments - this links to the claim on accountability earlier.   We can also run a principle argument on the state’s responsibility!  Let’s focus on time management next time!  05:07  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ethan Cao |
| --- |

| **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:  Don’t start your speech with imagine! You can highlight this illustration without this word. Water, electricity, or healthcare might be better examples to describe what you’re talking about - they are more directly linked to survival, compared to education.  Set-up   * Why 60%? Which ones? How do we decide? We need to establish our set-up in greater detail! * How do you ensure private companies do a good job? Why does the state have natural incentives to ensure oversight exists? * We need to explain why we can regulate private companies on our side; and explain how we preserve competition!   Rebuttal   * Is it easy to enter these industries, leading to competition? * Did we respond sufficiently to any of the claims coming from Prop?   Argument 1   * What is the nature of competition, why don’t monopolies exist? We need to unpack why companies will price reasonably due to competition, and how we prevent one company from asserting themselves and gaining dominant market share. * On efficiency and quality - first establish what the characteristics of an efficient or high quality provision are. Then, explain why states are unable to do this - and private companies are. * POI - why are they so expensive to maintain; fair on other areas needing funding, but we assert this! * Why will they reduce prices? Is it about quantity? Price x quantity leads to profit, rather than raising prices and focusing on the wealthy? Why is this true for essential services?   + For instance, that the business model follows the above? That the wealthy often opt out of these, and access private options themselves. For instance, using cars rather than trains?   Argument 2   * You cannot use the language you do. ‘Crappy’ and ‘a bit shit’ are not appropriate at all! * Explain why the state does a worse job at service provision. * 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.   05:01  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Isabella Sun |
| --- |

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  We need to start with our biggest response - we need to explain why provision is limited on their side. No one is going to argue that essential services don’t matter. We have to engage with contentious material!  Rebuttal   * Explain that Opp never explained why there is accessible provision, especially because your first speaker establishes that these are inelastic goods. Challenge their claim on competition! Does competition drive prices down on their side? This engages with the POI Ethan asks!   + When we say water is an essential service, we don’t mean drinking water - we mean line water!   + 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. * We need to explain why and how states are good actors, and will provide these essential services at fair costs/free; good about support. Make this comparative and highlight where accountability exists. If governments do a bad job, it is easier to hold them accountable - public scrutiny, democratic processes exist and checks and balances. We say votes exist as a check and balance, but need to unpack this in greater detail!   Argument 1   * On working conditions - first establish why this happens! * Is this debate about Fiji water? The examples we are using are all of non-essential services. * We need to explain why putting regulations on private companies - such as forcing them to abide by labour standards or suspending their operational licenses won’t work. We need to talk about how lobbying means that regulations favor corporate interests, that companies are adept at finding and exploiting loopholes in regulation. * Are labour standards a voting issue? Why do people care about this enough to vote on it? * Unions - these really only apply in public situations; private companies tend not to have unions in the same way. We offered one line of analysis on this! * We need to explain how or why private companies behave in the predatory way you claim. We assert that this just happens.   05:10  We still aren’t speaking with energy and enthusiasm!  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Alissa Mak |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Our opening should call out their inability to explain why the only solution to provision is nationalisation. We need to fill in the gap on set-up!   * Why 60%? Which ones? How do we decide? We need to establish our set-up in greater detail! * How do you ensure private companies do a good job? Why does the state have natural incentives to ensure oversight exists? * We need to explain why we can regulate private companies on our side; and explain how we preserve competition!   Rebuttal   * Good analogy to public defense! Explain how these are underfunded and overburdened. They lack the capital to keep these going on just tax money. * On efficiency and quality - first establish what the characteristics of an efficient or high quality provision are. Then, explain why states are unable to do this - and private companies are. * On checks and balances - is all of this a voting issue? Do people have other priorities that may take precedence? * What is the nature of competition, why don’t monopolies exist? We need to unpack why companies will price reasonably due to competition, and how we prevent one company from asserting themselves and gaining dominant market share. * Why will they reduce prices? Is it about quantity? Price x quantity leads to profit, rather than raising prices and focusing on the wealthy? Why is this true for essential services?   + For instance, does the business model follow the above? That the wealthy often opt out of these, and access private options themselves. For instance, using cars rather than trains?   Argument 1   * All of this is good to explain why the state lacks funding, has other priorities; we need to explain why nationalisation takes away from welfare - which needs attention; the correct balance is utilising and regulating the private sector - for instance ensuring adherence to labour laws, or fair pricing - with the punishment being suspension of operational licences etc.   + 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. * Good linking to the correction of the birth lottery and social mobility. I am unsure if you are able to prove that your side gets this because the question of pricing hasn’t been resolved.   04:41  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Christy Yuan |
| --- |

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good call out on access! Don’t jump to the Fiji example, focus on the logic instead. 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. Explain that Opp never explained why there is accessible provision, especially because your first speaker establishes that these are inelastic goods. Challenge their claim on competition! Does competition drive prices down on their side?  Is this debate about Fiji water? The examples we are using are all of non-essential services.  We need to really slow down and be clear when signposting, so it is clear to the judge when the opening ends, when the clash begins and so forth! The title of the clash also needs to be clearly highlighted up top.  Clash 1  We need to explain why and how states are good actors, and will provide these essential services at fair costs/free; good about support. Make this comparative and highlight where accountability exists. If governments do a bad job, it is easier to hold them accountable - public scrutiny, democratic processes exist and checks and balances. We say votes exist as a check and balance, but need to unpack this in greater detail!  Clash 2  On competition - good on all of them being private operators. Does this mean they can collude, or that there is a race to the bottom in terms of quality?  We need to explain why putting regulations on private companies - such as forcing them to abide by labour standards or suspending their operational licenses won’t work. We need to talk about how lobbying means that regulations favor corporate interests, that companies are adept at finding and exploiting loopholes in regulation.  At the end of every clash, explain how your side wins on this issue - and hence wins the debate. We aren’t doing any weighing!  We need to ask POIs consistently!  We have to speak with more enthusiasm and energy!  04:52 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Tony Huang |
| --- |

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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 does this opening achieve! Don’t say ladies and gentlemen! No random statements about bricks.  Signposting must include the title of the clash! We also didn’t really have tightly organised clashes. It was mostly speaker by speaker within.  Clash 1   * Explain WHY there will be a decrease in quality.   + 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.   + What is the nature of competition, why don’t monopolies exist? We need to unpack why companies will price reasonably due to competition, and how we prevent one company from asserting themselves and gaining dominant market share. * Race to the bottom is negative - you need to say there will be a race to the top! * On efficiency and quality - first establish what the characteristics of an efficient or high quality provision are. Then, explain why states are unable to do this - and private companies are.   Clash 2   * We need to engage with their claims on democratic checks and balances - 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. * Make the observation that their examples aren’t about essential services, and move on! * On work conditions - talk about regulations instead! Why would they be sued, who will sue them? Why does accountability exist?   We need to answer why they will reduce prices! Is it about quantity? Price x quantity leads to profit, rather than raising prices and focusing on the wealthy? Why is this true for essential services? For instance, does the business model follow the above? That the wealthy often opt out of these, and access private options themselves. For instance, using cars rather than trains?  We need to explain why the state will be a bad actor: 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.  Let’s ask POIs consistently! Let’s clean up the structure of this speech!  04:27 | | | | | | |