| **Student Name:** Jodie Li |
| --- |

| **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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  Why are you acknowledging that it leads to a drop? Good on how this is all about facilitating a quicker bounce back.  Set-up   * Fair on what this means companies can do; but we don’t need to verbatim repeat what is in the motion - only give me the expansion/new points. * Crisis - why do we need to know they are declared by economists? How does this change the debate? * On why it happens - this should go in your argument. You’re just offering analysis in no direction in your set-up, as opposed to using this in a meaningful manner in an argument. * Is this a model or an overview of what exactly the mechanism for change is on Prop? * Burden - ‘this debate is about the economy’ - is this a specific burden? * Put in some caveats, such as introducing subsidies or tax incentives for businesses that DO keep their workers.   Argument 1 (started at 2:53…)   * Clear claim. * Companies have more money in long-run   + Fair on how it leads to cost cutting; you spend an incredibly long time explaining this already very clear analysis. The same applies to demand outstripping supply and this flipping during a crisis. We are too verbose/over explain what is simple and under explain that which needs explanation.   + Why is severance coming up at 4 minutes? This **should** be in set-up, where you are able to explain what they no longer have to worry about.   + How do we suddenly get to liquidation? * Bounce back   + Why will all this happen? Why are these the behaviours they engage in? * In the argument, we need to explain first why businesses do not have any financial cushion to withstand the recession. Contextualise it to the conditions of the economic crisis that are outside of their control, including things like the destruction of consumer demand. * Can we explain why these businesses often do not get revived post-crisis when the economy recovers if we allow them to die?   Why is this crucial to surviving the economic crisis? This is a high burden without explaining how you achieve the outcome the motion is hinting towards. We ought to spend more time explaining HOW exactly the continuation of the business is the precise KEY towards solving the crisis. Explain why consumer demand will provide tax returns to the government and the growth that will neutralise the economic downturn.  We were only able to run one argument in a six minute speech, because we spent three minutes on set-up.  06:15 - good POI to Joanne, but did you prove this in your speech? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Joanne Lau |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Good opening, remove the ‘judge’ cry up top.  Counter set-up:   * What path forward does your side see in terms of dealing with the economic crisis? * The loans and recovery packages are unsubstantiated entirely - why is this likely, how will this work, why does this lead to any change or recovery?   Rebuttal   * The rebuttal needs to be more strategic; identify the key claims being made - and then deal with them systematically, rather than offering responses where you can. * On welfare; point out how this puts the burden on the government; why does it make matters worse? * We have to deal with how laying off people does not actually lead to cost cutting and recovery; companies depend on disposable income for demand - how do people have disposable income if they get fired? What if people get overworked and leave - and cannot find new jobs in a recession? * Why will your second speaker explain why your side is better?   Argument 1   * Fair on the worker - try to pinpoint moral culpability. Should the state be responsible, or the companies that misjudged this? Make it sound like companies fully understand demand and projected demand but overhire and then engage with layoffs anyways; but keep the executives and pay them even more. Point out how their priorities are incorrect. * On abuse - fair on the state having a duty to protect individuals; but how do you protect them from abuse in the form of an economic crisis as Jodie asks you in the POI?   How does Opp solve this crisis? What do you do to move towards stabilising the economy? This analysis is missing and means that your side doesn’t have a positive comparative.  06:01 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Hisham Khan |
| --- |

| **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: | 68 | | | | | |
| 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 can’t be something important - and then us saying but ah I will explain this later; why is it later? Deal with this claim up top, otherwise what is the purpose and impact of your opening?  Signposting is missing.  Rebuttal   * The rebuttal needs to be more strategic; identify the key claims being made - and then deal with them systematically, rather than offering responses where you can. * We barely engaged with the moral claim on Opp - which is the biggest argument on their side. This is criminal   Argument 1   * Labour force is better off - this is a thesis, not a premise, but a good attempt at structure. The structure dropped off after the first minute of this argument.   + How or why is it solved faster or better? We recycle all the analysis on 1st Prop, but don’t add new analysis. You aren’t filling in the gaps in the 1P speech.   + Where does the rate of change come from; this is just asserted and never explained. * We need to explain first why businesses do not have any financial cushion to withstand the recession. Contextualise it to the conditions of the economic crisis that are outside of their control, including things like the destruction of consumer demand. * Can we explain why these businesses often do not get revived post-crisis when the economy recovers if we allow them to die? * Why is this crucial to surviving the economic crisis? This is a high burden without explaining how you achieve the outcome the motion is hinting towards. We ought to spend more time explaining HOW exactly the continuation of the business is the precise KEY towards solving the crisis. Explain why consumer demand will provide tax returns to the government and the growth that will neutralise the economic downturn. * Good reference to Joe Biden - what does this illustrate; link this back to your outcome. * We keep repeating they’ll have to borrow trillions - why is this true? Analyse the amount of money needed to recover first.   **You need to slow down + vary your pace. Everything coming at x words per minute with no let-up means your speech blends together + is hard to listen to/track.**  06:04  We have to ASK POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Shi Qi Ooi |
| --- |

| **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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good opening; but you have to prove that this is a marginal benefit. Why does citing this burden help; did 2P engage with your burden at all? Claiming you proved it and hence you win seems flippant.  Rebuttal   * The rebuttal needs to be more strategic; identify the key claims being made - and then deal with them systematically, rather than offering responses where you can. * Call this out in greater detail; frame this as a concession. Point out what the human cost is here - and who it hurts the most. What kinds of workers get laid off, who ends up surviving or thriving? How does this hurt the most vulnerable actor? * On change - point out how it just cannot be as fast as Prop claim; and how the incentives of companies mean that they skirt or shirk any blame or responsibility as this being out of their control; consider 2008 or even 2020 - in what ways did these companies contribute to the economic crisis? * Explain how or why abuse of this policy means the change Prop talks about doesn’t actually occur - companies depend on disposable income for demand - how do people have disposable income if they get fired? What if people get overworked and leave - and cannot find new jobs in a recession? * Is this about blue collar jobs?   POI: afford necessities - this is a wonky answer; you guys need to explain how companies need to bite these costs; they still have revenue, they just spend it on big salaries for executives. The MDC loan angle is unrealistic, and requires an incredibly high burden of proof.  On brain drain and migration - this is a jump we come to from nowhere; I know this is weighing - but you need to explain to me step by step how they never explain how change occurs - and hence, because the crisis is prolonged, what options are left for the middle class - and what happens.  Why are we dropping in the Finland example from nowhere?  Try to pinpoint moral culpability. Should the state be responsible, or the companies that misjudged this? Make it sound like companies fully understand demand and projected demand but overhire and then engage with layoffs anyways; but keep the executives and pay them even more. Point out how their priorities are incorrect. Bring it back.  Did you have a second speaker argument?  **You need to slow down + vary your pace. Everything coming at x words per minute with no let-up means your speech blends together + is hard to listen to/track.**  06:17 | | | | | | |