| **Student Name:** Zechariah Chen |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 7 to 8 minutes’ long.]  Nice initial characterisation on what these labour flexibility laws look like and how unfair this could be. Here, we can also focus on the exact human costs of these unfair dismissals.  On the counter set-up:   * Good counter-characterisation on labour flexibility, e.g. reducing minimum wage, union busting, etc. * We should start with your 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. * We went too much into analysis in the set-up (e.g. why workers are part of the first cost-cutting measure), it should only be focused on what the policy action you support. * Give me your burden and winning pathway!!   On workers’ rights, strong analysis on how this is detrimental to the quality of life of workers.   * Analyse specifically why workers are powerless to fight against businesses if the state does not intervene with federal regulations. * 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!   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 epxlain 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.   Why is your argument integrated with your rebuttals?  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.  Good job offering POIs today!  8.22 | | | | | | |