| **Student Name:** Jasmine Gao |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that countries with ageing populations should significantly relax requirements for immigration instead of incentivising birth |
| --- |

| 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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Interesting pushback on the context of this debate, but only developed economies face the specific problem of an ageing society! Try to use some grounding and give examples of an ageing society who is struggling under the issue of overflowing migrants to prove this immediately, otherwise it runs counter to conventional wisdom.  Excellent strategic clarification that the Opposition will still have SOME immigration to curate the kind of workers we need versus Prop MUST defend a large influx of migrants.   * However, be mindful to clarify why you don’t fall prey to all of the harms of immigration that you accuse Proposition of.   Good focal point on the temporary vs permanent nature of the solution to an ageing society.   * But we need to analyse why these migrants are only here temporarily, and why we cannot manage the potential economic risks of them exiting the nation.   + Can we actively explain what happens when they do eventually leave?   + Give me multiple reasons why most workers prefer settling down in their home nations. * We are still lacking a real defence on the length of time it takes to make these children useful to the economy, how do we address this issue in the meantime?   + Otherwise, Prop still wins on a temporary gain vs no real immediate solution on Opp. They have highlighted that the pension systems could collapse if we don’t plug this temporary economic hole.   I appreciate the characterisation on why Prop’s policies would only attract low-skilled workers, however, why is this necessarily harmful when it still fixes the labour shortage? Prop has highlighted that ageing societies are highly educated and lack the kind of labour supply for low-skilled jobs, so it’s not a harm to attract these workers.   * On these workers not having the highest economic contribution to your GDP, if your society is already lacking workers, then even low-income workers are a net addition to your economy as opposed to not having enough workers to begin with. * Instead, we should’ve explained the harms to labour dynamics, i.e. the oversaturation of one type of workers lead to the kind of overcompetitiveness that will deflate the market rate of wages, and steal jobs away from locals who will have to then turn to the state for welfare.   Our strategic focal point should have been mainly on the success of pro-natalist policies. We need to actively defend the comparative of pro-natalist policies being the solution to an ageing society! Just criticising immigration does not mean that Opp has a better alternative to deal with the problem in the status quo.  Good analysis on why raising children could also stimulate the economy, but is this commensurate to the kind of income taxes that Prop says is required to fund the pension system?  Our analytical focus on natalist policies needed to be on why this would be effective to begin with, this was what is being challenged by Prop.   * We need more analysis on this being financially significant enough to deal with the costs of living. * Then actively address issues like feminist reasons why some women do not want to have children, regardless of costs of living. * Very good mechanistic analysis on why these incentives can be quite persuasive, all of this needed to have come first.   Please offer more POIs today!  7.00 - Good timing! | | | | | | |