| **Student Name:** Jennie Jung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This House would suspend labour unions in times of 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: | 67.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Our opening should be more energetic and enthusiastic! We sound like we’re in pain at the moment!  Is this a debate about the company, and whether it matters more than labour rights, or the necessary services that these workers provide, and how these services matter more than their rights? Which one do we think is more defendable?  Set-up   * We need to establish what a crisis is - what these circumstances are - and when this crisis ends. How do we know that a labour union can be active again? * What are the characteristics of a crisis?   + We need to explain what the specific traits of necessary action are - rapid and quick response to the problem, working in dangerous conditions etc. * What is the purpose of this policy? How do we achieve the benefits on our side? Do we provide any mechanisms of how, outside of unions, workers can advocate for their rights?   Argument 1   * Why does this profit, or respect, matter more than the workers and their rights? * POI - this highlights the disconnect between the motion and the case strategy your team has chosen. * Why would people perceive the union or company in this way?   The case on Proposition is that workers need to be working, even if it does harm to them, because the conditions are those of survival or no survival. For instance, mandating doctors to continue working in Covid 19, even though they lack the correct protective equipment.   * In extreme crises, the stability of the entire system is at stake. Prioritizing actions that prevent systemic collapse, even if they disproportionately impact certain groups, can be justified to avoid a complete societal breakdown that would harm everyone, including the workers in question.   We need to provide a positive pathway to how we help workers achieve rights and protections - such as advocacy and political lobbying, which works better because we preserve the goodwill and support of the public.    Generally, also - the state wants to ensure that in these situations, workers are protected such that they don’t go on strike. The state benefits from a healthy and motivated workforce. Perceived indifference to worker suffering can erode public trust and create resentment.  Let’s ask POIs consistently!  04:46 - we spoke under-time! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Kayley Cheng |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This House would suspend labour unions in times of 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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Fair opening, deliver it with more energy and gusto.  Set-up is needed!   * Explain the situations or circumstances under which a union decides to engage in strike action - will they just strike because of bad working conditions in a crisis, or be mindful and only take such action in extreme circumstances, such as a lack of PPE for doctors during a public health emergency.   + Minor grievances are less likely to lead to strike action, especially during a crisis when cooperation and stability are paramount.   + Unions typically prefer to resolve disputes through negotiation and dialogue with employers. A strike is often a last resort, taken only after good-faith negotiations have failed to produce a satisfactory outcome.   Rebuttal   * Good call out. Explain that this is a debate about the trade off between workers rights and provision of services to people; this is just not a debate about companies. Even if it was about companies, does Prop ever explain how labour unions are bad for these companies?   POI: We need to explain why it is the case that they won’t do well/companies don’t provide these kinds of services anyways. This is about government services, rather than privately provided ones. The explanation as to why they don’t do well is that mistreatment can lead to resentment, low morale, and decreased productivity, hindering the overall crisis response. Workers could just QUIT straight up! Is a strike better, or en masse quitting better? Good work acknowledging the trade off - that rights of workers probably matter more - we need to justify this properly.  We ignored the second POI - the answer is as above. In a five minute speech, we shouldn’t take 2 POIs.  Argument 1   * Why would they take advantage? Why would companies behave in this way? I buy generally that workers will be put at risk - but this isn’t contentious. You need to explain why their rights and safety matter MORE than the services they are providing. * Explain why there will be loss of life, or extreme violations when we suspend unionisation in this instance. * What did we prove at the end of this argument?   Argument 2   * Is this new?   05:30  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ari Hu |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This House would suspend labour unions in times of 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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  What is this opening? We said crisis and then got started. Our opening needs to be clear in terms of the takeaway for the judge; that a crisis is bad is not contentious or up for debate. This is a debate about how to best respond to it. Following your hook, you need to signpost what the structure of your speech will be.  Rebuttal   * Why wouldn’t it be the case that abuse or exploitation happens? When does 1O talk about child labour? * On reputation - is this a debate about the company, and whether it matters more than labour rights, or the necessary services that these workers provide, and how these services matter more than their rights? Which one do we think is more defendable?   + Even if it is about whether or not the company can provide services, why is the focus on their reputation, rather than their ability to help people…? * POI - ‘A bit more’ - you have to defend your burden! How can you guarantee that this company will be successful? Why are mistreated workers likely to do well at their job?   We don’t respond to a POI by saying ‘put your hand down’ - we say no, or no thank you, or not now, or later etc. We were borderline rude when we shouted down Torres, even though he asked his POI in protected time.  Argument 1   * On inconvenience - this is not just about convenience. We need to establish what a crisis is - what these circumstances are - and when this crisis ends. How do we know that a labour union can be active again? We need to explain what the specific traits of necessary action are - rapid and quick response to the problem, working in dangerous conditions etc. * We need to explain how the services provided are critical - we also need to explain why the provision ends. We’re assuming that a strike is always what happens and then people lose out. * Why must workers believe or prioritise others beyond themselves in this instance? We assert that this must happen, but why is this true?   The case on Proposition is that workers need to be working, even if it does harm to them, because the conditions are those of survival or no survival. For instance, mandating doctors to continue working in Covid 19, even though they lack the correct protective equipment.   * In extreme crises, the stability of the entire system is at stake. Prioritizing actions that prevent systemic collapse, even if they disproportionately impact certain groups, can be justified to avoid a complete societal breakdown that would harm everyone, including the workers in question.   We need to provide a positive pathway to how we help workers achieve rights and protections - such as advocacy and political lobbying, which works better because we preserve the goodwill and support of the public.  04:56 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Emma Kwok |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This House would suspend labour unions in times of 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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Our opening needs to add strategic value to the round! Call them out for focusing on reputation, as opposed to protecting and saving workers. Explain that this is a debate about the trade off between workers rights and provision of services to people; this is just not a debate about companies. Even if it was about companies, does Prop ever explain how labour unions are bad for these companies?  Rebuttal   * Why are we responding through analogy? We’ve talked about this before! We need to respond on the basis of what the perception of the average person is, why is calling them John valuable? What is the upshot of this observation? We assert that the average person cares. Why is this true, and if it is true, why does it matter? How does it hurt the other side’s case? * On hurting workers - you need to EXPLAIN what this exploitation looks like. * We need to explain why it is the case that they won’t do well/companies don’t provide these kinds of services anyways. This is about government services, rather than privately provided ones. * POI - why don’t people care? Your side says they care, but only if it’s negative. Why is this true? Their side says they care, but only if it’s positive.   Argument 1   * Explain the situations or circumstances under which a union decides to engage in strike action - will they just strike because of bad working conditions in a crisis, or be mindful and only take such action in extreme circumstances, such as a lack of PPE for doctors during a public health emergency.   + Minor grievances are less likely to lead to strike action, especially during a crisis when cooperation and stability are paramount. Unions typically prefer to resolve disputes through negotiation and dialogue with employers. A strike is often a last resort, taken only after good-faith negotiations have failed to produce a satisfactory outcome. * Explain why companies would behave in these profit maximising, neglecting worker safety ways. * On sloppy work - the explanation as to why they don’t do well is that mistreatment can lead to resentment, low morale, and decreased productivity, hindering the overall crisis response. Workers could just QUIT straight up! Is a strike better, or en masse quitting better? Good work acknowledging the trade off - that rights of workers probably matter more - we need to justify this properly.   05:10  We must ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Chester Tam |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This House would suspend labour unions in times of 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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  What is this opening? If we want to characterise what a crisis is, focus on the harm and suffering people undergo - and what services they NEED when this happens. We do this eventually, but get to the point - we spent nearly a minute on this opening. Word efficiency!  Signposting needs to include names of clashes.  Clash 1 - ‘rights are being taken away’ - the clash title has to be a question; the title should be - what matters more - workers rights, or survival?   * Is this about the company…? Why is the point that the company survives? The point should be that the average person can survive, by having access to doctors during a health emergency, or firefighters during wildfire season. * The case on Proposition should be that workers need to be working, even if it does harm to them, because the conditions are those of survival or no survival. For instance, mandating doctors to continue working in Covid 19, even though they lack the correct protective equipment. In extreme crises, the stability of the entire system is at stake. Prioritizing actions that prevent systemic collapse, even if they disproportionately impact certain groups, can be justified to avoid a complete societal breakdown that would harm everyone, including the workers in question.   Why will they survive? We’re just saying the potential for this exists, as opposed to proving that they do. We need to provide a positive pathway to how we get workers their rights.  Clash 2   * On exploitation - you need to explain why it doesn’t happen rather than saying it won’t because there is no incentive to do so. It is very easy to flip this in terms of - they rely on the company for money, there are consequences to leaving, profit matters more etc. * We need to provide positive incentives   + The state benefits from a healthy and motivated workforce.   + Perceived indifference to worker suffering can erode public trust and create resentment. * Explain that this means that no need for existence in these extreme circumstances exists, or that there is a bare minimum quality of work life that we guarantee that they just have to accept for the time being.   Let’s ask POIs consistently!  05:23 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Torres Li |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This House would suspend labour unions in times of 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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Our opening should target their biggest contribution/push either our winning pathway, or explain why their side loses.  We need to minimise our strategic observations and focus on our clashes.  Rebuttal   * Good work flipping the profit incentive - to explain why abuse does happen. Explain the situations or circumstances under which a union decides to engage in strike action - will they just strike because of bad working conditions in a crisis, or be mindful and only take such action in extreme circumstances, such as a lack of PPE for doctors during a public health emergency.   + Minor grievances are less likely to lead to strike action, especially during a crisis when cooperation and stability are paramount.   + Unions typically prefer to resolve disputes through negotiation and dialogue with employers. A strike is often a last resort, taken only after good-faith negotiations have failed to produce a satisfactory outcome.   + Unions are more likely to strike if they believe they have the support of the public and other unions.   Clash 1   * What is new here? * Explain how the quality of their work improves when this happens; explain why the ability to respond to this crisis is contingent on workers being treated fairly!   + Mistreatment can lead to resentment, low morale, and decreased productivity, hindering the overall crisis response. Workers could just QUIT straight up! Is a strike better, or en masse quitting better?   Clash 2   * What is new here? * The explanation as to why they don’t do well is that mistreatment can lead to resentment, low morale, and decreased productivity, hindering the overall crisis response. Workers could just QUIT straight up! Is a strike better, or en masse quitting better? Good work acknowledging the trade off - that rights of workers probably matter more - we need to justify this properly.   We engage in a pretty extreme call out, but we need to focus on the justification instead!  05:02  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |