| **Student Name:** Kelly Au |
| --- |

| **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 6 minutes’ long.]  Nice initial re-characterisation on what the world would look like, aim for even greater descriptions of the human costs for a stronger impact!  Provide the counter set-up BEFORE the rebuttals:   * Good counter-characterisation on what labour flexibility actually means, e.g. unfair dismissals, severely underpaying workers, etc. * Nice job reinforcing laws such as minimum wage, timely payment of wages, etc. * 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.   We need to engage with Proposition’s point that jobs will be lost on either side if these businesses shut down. So when we are reinforcing the harm to workers, we have to be a bit more comparative.   * Can we weigh whose side actively loses more jobs on a scale?   + Suggest economic stimulus plans to keep these businesses running, so you can mitigate the harms of the trade-off and still have jobs continuing to be provided. * The response to the POI would’ve been the perfect place to respond to Prop’s winning framing!   When we’re expanding 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 the continuance of exploiting workers, and once we conceded that labour rights are not fundamental human rights, it will be much easier to continue compromising on it in the long-run. * We can also expand that this leads to businesses engaging in union busting and using this as an opportunity to destroy labour unions who advocate utilising these labour laws as a basis.   + Then analyse why union busting Prop is engaging in will likely be something that they cannot recover from.   Spend time analysing how this shifts 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, e.g. how financially desperate they are, they lack options, and workplace intimidation, etc.   The claim on workers not wanting to go to work in such conditions is in tension with the argument on how desperate they are in need of a job during a crisis. Surely in a crisis, the point is that they’re willing to do whatever it takes to hold on to their jobs. Which is more true?  On the economy, it’s bizarre for us to run this without engaging in Prop’s problem statement that these businesses cannot keep their doors open anyways! How do you prevent them from going bankrupt?  On workers’ rights, strong analysis on how this is detrimental to the quality of life of workers.   * Analyse why 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.   Please offer more POIs today!  6.27 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |