| **Student Name:** Emma Demopoulous |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 7 minutes’ long.]  Try to have a more high-impact hook that lasts longer than just a single sentence.   * Good signposting.   On Opp being the only one allowing them to have a job, this isn’t engaging with the speaker before you explaining why more jobs are preserved overall:   * They argued that labour flexibility allows businesses to keep workers on with lower pay vs retrenchment. * 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. * Since none of your 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.   + We explained that their flexi-contract makes it easy for workers to be fired, yes but Prop says that not fulfilling employment benefits also means it’s easier to just pay severance and let far more workers go, i.e. retrenchment.     - We have to weigh which business incentive is more likely to prevail.   You don’t necessarily have to bite the above trade-off on businesses dying if we can build a better counterfactual!   * 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. * Come up with economic stimulus plans to keep these businesses afloat without having to lay anyone off.   Interesting argument that poor conditions of workers means greater productivity, very logical analysis.   * The speaker before you also ran a productivity argument, can we be more engaging and compare your argument to hers?   + She argued that businesses will be better by refocusing limited investments with their best workers. Which method is a better way to improve productivity?   + While I understand that labour efforts could be higher, in the context of an economic crisis, how will that play any role in keeping the business open? Surely, the economic crisis limits our ability to keep our doors open beyond just improving worker output, such as the loss of consumer demand.   Again, all of these harms will not be exclusive if Prop is proving that they secure more jobs. This is still yet to be resolved in Opp’s favour.  At this point, Opp’s winning pathway was on workers’ rights, which Prop happily conceded. So we should’ve reinforced the framing of this burden being more important than anything else in the round.   * Analyse specifically why workers are powerless to fight against businesses if the state does not intervene with federal regulations. * 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.   Please offer more POIs today!  6.38 - So close! Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |