| **Student Name:** Kelly Zhang |
| --- |

| **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 6 minutes’ long.]  I like the clarity and signposting, but it’s coming at the expense of having impact at the top of your speech!  On shifting the focus of the debate away from the poor to everyone else, can we utilise the context of the economic crisis to prove this? Everyone is affected by a collapsing economy.   * But Opp’s point still stands that the poor are the MOST harmed by mass lay-offs.   + We should re-strategise and explain why paying people less gives businesses more options to do things like not fire people because they can go lower than the minimum wage.     - Arguing that businesses cannot go below minimum wage is a tension to the whole first speaker’s speech about helping these businesses stay afloat, and having more jobs available on nett!   Put in some caveats to encourage businesses, such as introducing subsidies or tax incentives for businesses that DO keep their workers.   * Then mitigate the human costs of firing by highlighting that basic human rights outside of labour flexibility actually still applies.   + The state can provide welfare unemployment benefits.   We need to expand on the human costs of these businesses shutting down!   * Spend time washing out the clash of job loss on both sides. You can go even further and say 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.   The argument is not fully 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.   + We analysed the inverse of lower consumer demand means continued recession, well done. Just flip this to explain why you can actively solve the crisis. * 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!  6.13 - Good timing! | | | | | | |