| **Student Name:** Ella Chan |
| --- |

| **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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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: This is a 4 minutes’ reply speech.]  Good clarity on co-opting Opposition’s mechs on keeping businesses afloat! Go even further and explain why your model is infinitely better anyways on keeping businesses open.   * Explain precisely how labour flexibility gives EVERY business the agency to figure specifically HOW to keep their doors open, e.g. not fire people because they can go lower than the minimum wage.   + Then re-emphasise the final comparison which is that SOME disposable income is better than no disposable income.   I appreciate the reinforcement of your winning framing, but we’re still not mitigating the human costs on Opp.   * On people being able to continue on with lower incomes, explain what measures can the state do to keep costs of living low. * You’re also STILL allowing them to terminate the employment of people. Then they will have zero disposable income also in your world. Focus on unemployment benefits given by the state. * Explain why companies have no business incentive to straight up put their workers in hazardous environments, this will lead to lawsuits and low productivity.   We need to expand on the human costs of these businesses shutting down!   * Good job in general washing out the clash of job loss on both sides and proving that more jobs are lost on a scale.   + Here, we can analyse why unemployment on a wider scale can kill lives. * Explain properly why the loss of supply chains and business operatives also make it difficult for consumers to access goods and services.   + Then we can weigh why public interest ought to be higher than the interest of a small number of workers.   We ought to spend more time explaining HOW exactly the continuation of the business is the precise KEY towards solving the crisis.   * Explain that businesses staying open and people having jobs means more tax returns to the state! Then tell me why this is crucial to the state’s ability to enact policies that end the crisis. * Explain also why consumer demand will provide the growth that will neutralise the economic downturn. * In comparison, can we explain why these businesses often do not get revived post-crisis when the economy recovers if we allow them to die?   Please offer more POIs today!  4.08 - Good timing! | | | | | | |