| **Student Name:** Emi Ruijs |
| --- |

| **Motion:** In times of economic crisis, this house would introduce legislation to increase labour flexibility |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 7 minutes’ long.]  Nice initial characterisation on the instability they suffer through during a crisis, explain why employment is the backbone of economic and social stability to complete this line of reasoning.  On the counter set-up:   * Good counter-characterisation on what labour flexibility actually means, e.g. unfair dismissals, severely underpaying workers, etc. * I appreciate the effort in burden-pushing on why Prop needs to exclusively use their policy to move towards solving the economic crisis.   + If you’re claiming that this can be done without sacrificing labour rights, I’m going to hold you to this burden! * We should have a counterfactual on how to keep these businesses afloat during an economic crisis!   + Suggest tax incentives for businesses who do keep their workers.   + The government can also give moratoriums for any fees that need to be paid to the state.   Don’t say statements like “this is really bad debating,” be confident and don’t undercut your own credibility. Try to ignore Theo’s facial expressions as well.  When we’re insisting on the legitimacy of labour rights, expand the moral claim underlying this.   * We should suggest that if the state is willing to trade-off labour rights during a crisis, these measures are often long-lasting and go on even after the downturn ends. * Those businesses will lobby for its continuance, and once we conceded that labour rights are not fundamental human rights, it will be much easier to continue compromising on it. * On labour unions, we need to explain how much they have sacrificed to get to this level of advocacy and collectivism.   + Then analyse why union busting Prop is engaging in will likely be something that they cannot recover from.   Good analysis on shifting the power to rich and exploitative businesses!   * Analyse specifically why workers are powerless to fight against businesses if the state does not intervene with federal regulations.   + We mentioned how financially desperate they are, they lack options, and workplace intimidation, good job! * In the weighing, could we deal with Prop’s winning framing that when businesses die, then more jobs are lost anyways?   + Suggest economic stimulus plans to keep these businesses running, so you can mitigate the harms of the trade-off.   Structure-wise, the rebuttals and arguments bleed into one another. Work on clearer flagging.  On workers’ rights, strong analysis on how this is detrimental to the quality of life of workers.   * We need to correlate this back to the human costs being suffered by the people, as well as the obligation of the state. * Good analysis on disposable income playing a role in economic recovery as well.   + But how do I contrast this with Prop using the exact same analysis as to why businesses have to stay open in order to achieve the same recovery. * On your economic harms, all of these harms will not be exclusive if Prop is proving that MORE jobs are lost overall in your world. We need to deal with this contention first. * The broad societal collapse that follows the instability was much more intuitive to focus on, this should’ve been the main analytical focus.   Good job offering POIs today!  7.50 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |