| **Student Name:** Emi Ruijs |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that tax evasion is a legitimate form of protest |
| --- |

| 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: | 71 | | | | | |
| 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:  Tell me what the context is right from the get-go, as opposed to the more long winded call out. Point out very simply - people evade tax for a reason; where they are getting sufficient and high quality public services, it goes against their own self-interest to evade taxes. Following from this, give me EXAMPLES of where this is happening; for instance, is this a failing and corrupt state where officials pocket the honest man’s income tax? Is it a state where some groups - genders, or races - have greater freedoms or protections?  We have to speak slower! It is difficult to write feedback for all that you are saying if my typing speed cannot keep up with you.  Clash 1 - self aware that this is basically the debate, and hence not a clash. This is because there is a messy exchange happening, where neither side is establishing what the components of legitimacy are. We needed to fill the gap in set-up + engagement from 1O here, analysing how we measure or define what a legitimate protest is! In this case, it should be moral legitimacy - such as the claim that there can be no taxation without representation, justifying where the state should have power - and practical effectiveness - comparing this to other forms of protest/analogising this to be an extension of civil obedience and establishing how these changes occur.  The start of this clash is slightly repetitive, but we eventually do explain why this is happening during the circumstances in which the state is failing. You should stop here and explain what the upshot is; that their argument at 1st Opp falls out of the debate; they think this debate is happening in a Scandinavian state, but people there wouldn’t evade tax in the first place!  On democracy - good on engagement. Challenge their lack of a comparative and go through other forms of protest that ARE legitimate, and push them to explain what the distinction is. For instance, boycotts or strikes - they inconvenience other people too! We’re missing engagement with the people who suffer that they talk about - you can explain here that they would not benefit in the first place because the state cannot distribute revenue properly.  On this working, we need to explain why or how the state cares sufficiently on losing out revenue - and why it is reaching critical mass, or has sufficient buy-in. We can explain that tax evasion doesn't need universal participation to be effective. A critical threshold exists where it creates sufficient pressure for reform, and demonstrates widespread dissatisfaction. Explain how it functions as a signalling effect, or hits the corrupt officials who pocket this money exactly where it hurts.  You are very funny, but I think in the context of a serious debate speech this is probably not the best thing. Be more formal and serious! You’re being **too** conversational here.  06:47 | | | | | | |