| **Student Name:** Vania Wong |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would implement an aggressively redistributive income tax |
| --- |

| 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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  I like the hook today, it’s an impactful framing of what aggressive taxes will do.  On the set-up:   * Good clarification on how progressive taxation is, but it’s starting to sound like you’re giving 50% tax to MOST wealthy people, bear in mind that only applies to the top 10 percentile of income-earners. * Good job mechanising where all the taxes will go.   + You can improve your strategic caveats but also allocating resources in places that will be hurt by the loss of capitalism, such as job creation and incentivising innovation via government grants. * Frame your winning pathway and explain why wealth equality is the most important thing in the debate.   Excellent first argument on breaking the cycle of wealth inequality.   * Very good analysis as to how wealth manifests at the very top and it doesn’t trickle down. * Good job explaining its cyclical nature as well.   + Bear in mind that none of the above are contentious to the Opp, we should deal with their trade-off that job creation is the better mechanism for trickle down wealth to labourers. * On impacting the fact that it hurts the ability of people to survive, we need to work on illustrating the human costs here.   + Spend more time explaining the harms the poor suffer from which are entirely avoidable. * On using the taxation to correct some of these problems:   + I appreciate the use of funding the education systems to improve social mobility, as well as other examples like fixing the land crisis.   + We need to explain why the capitalist state is incapable of co-opting any of these policies with aggressive taxation.   In responding to the POI, we’re not actually highlighting how state powers can be checked by the structures of government, such as electoral accountability.  On the positive feedback loop, we need to predict what Opp will argue here and attempt to be comparative.   * Opp will point out that the funding of public services will be compromised because high taxes lead to economic regression.   + So we need to explain why high taxes won’t kickstart a feedback loop of a shrinking economy instead.   The better analytical focus is to explain what is the higher role of the government, and that protecting the basic needs of the vulnerable ought to be the highest priority in this debate.  Good job offering POIs today!  6.30 - We’re under-timed today! Conclude longer if necessary. | | | | | | |