| **Student Name:** Dana Chung |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would suspend labour unions in times of economic crisis |
| --- |

| 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.]  Good angle in the hook, it would be even more impactful if you immediately tell me what kind of rights will be violated.   * Signpost the rest of your speech first, then counter set-up, then rebuttals and arguments.   I appreciate the reframing that workers resort to a strike only when their rights are violated.   * But this isn’t always true, they also do it to demand better privileges and work conditions;   + We need to contextualise the financial crisis, and why workers would not risk lower wages unless the circumstances are truly dire.   + This rebuttal ended up being the same as your first argument, we should avoid any overlapping, repetitive content.   We need to rebut Prop’s point on ensuring job creation in order to recover from an economic crisis.   * Explain that even the wealthy corporations will avail of this benefit, those entities won’t use it to keep their doors open, they will use it to consolidate their wealth. * Argue that stimulus programs by the state would do a better job of safeguarding jobs and engineering growth without taking away labour rights.   Where is the counter set-up?   * We need a counterfactual and a burden.   + What would Opp otherwise do in order to rejuvenate the economy in a time of crisis? Could the state propose job creation instead?     - E.g. Tax incentives given to companies who did not fire any workers.   Good job explaining why strikes are a matter of last resort due to unfavourable conditions that accompany a strike, such as the risk of being fired.   * But it isn’t very clear as to why unions would only make fair demands considering their effectiveness.   + Point out why democratic mechanisms in union will favour reasonable demands, rather unreasonable ones. * This was not the argument? We need to structure our speech clearly.   On the immorality of doing this, it isn’t clear why unions are the only avenue of protecting workers, and why we cannot rely on the state to protect them. We need to spend an equal amount of time explaining why uniquely only unions are the corrective mechanism for this.   * Explain why collective bargaining and striking is the ONLY way for labour rights to be protected. * We have to engage with Prop’s set-up on clear labour rights being encapsulated. Why wouldn’t this be enough?   + Point out that their regulations cost money for these companies, which also hurts their end objective of making it cheaper for companies to safeguard the volume of jobs. So they’re being too strategic to the point where it contradicts their own arguments. * It isn’t clear what exactly is the moral nuance of the argument, it seems purely practical.   Well done characterising harmful corporate incentives, and the lack of power of individuals.   * The harm shouldn’t just exist in theory, explain precisely the kind of corporate policies that will be enacted as soon as the state suspends unions.   + We could then intensify the impact analysis of each one using the context of a financial crisis.   + E.g. Suspending minimum wage for factory workers which make it impossible to afford basic commodities. This leads to less consumer demand, which also worsens the economic crisis.   Don’t take the POI when you are mid-sentence, finish your point first.   * Good response that asking for fair pay is also a last resort.   Please offer more POIs today!  6.25 | | | | | | |