| **Student Name:** Kevin Hu |
| --- |

| **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.]  While I appreciate the reinforcement of helping the poor workers, the Proposition has already addressed this in multiple ways that need to be engaged with:   * I.e. that an economic crisis affects EVERYONE’S jobs. * We need to deal with Prop’s winning framing that ultimately more jobs are secured if these businesses are allowed to shut down.   Our entire speech is living within a very specific tunnel vision without being very comparative of all the things that Prop has argued thus far. Prop is saying that on BOTH sides, workers are hurt nonetheless.   * Your first speaker did not offer Opp’s counterfactual on how to keep these businesses afloat during an economic crisis! So give me a comparative so that exclusively you’re the only one who can actually protect workers.   + 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 can’t move away too fast after stating bailing out businesses, spend time mechanising this model and tell me why it’s MORE viable than Prop’s pathway of labour flexibility.   After explaining that the poorest are hurt, we can expand this argument on a macro-scale to the entirety of the working-class if we argue about shifting the power to rich and powerful 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. * In the weighing, could we deal with Prop’s winning framing that when businesses die, then more jobs are lost anyways?   + Point out that the deterioration of the framework of labour rights could also be permanent even after the crisis recovers, this would be your winning pathway because the clash on securing jobs is washed out at this point.   Good use of rhetoric and characterisation on labour exploitation. Very well done!   * However, none of this is exclusive on human costs since Prop argues less jobs will lead to the same effects. * 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?   Please offer more POIs today!  5.22 - We are under-timed! Wait until 6! | | | | | | |