| **Student Name:** Charles Wang |
| --- |

| **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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  I like the depiction of the status quo in the hook today, remember to tie it back to the motion as the perfect solution for it.  On the set-up:   * Good clarification on what progressive taxation is, but it’s starting to sound like you’re giving 50% tax to MOST people, bear in mind that only applies to the top 10 percentile of income-earners. * I appreciate the additional clarification that all regressive taxes will go away, point out that this means we’re taking away things like sales tax. * Good job mechanising where all the taxes will go.   + You can improve your strategic caveats by 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.   It’s unclear how this argument is about improving the economy, rather than improving social ills.   * The starting point should not be on the crime rate! You have to first explain the problem of capitalism which is wealth concentrated at the top when there are no redistributive taxes.   + Explain why wealth doesn’t trickle down.   + Then explain its cyclical nature as to why poverty becomes a trap for most people, then this leads to your problem of more crimes. * The impact analysis on high crime rates are almost too obvious, we need to analyse in a way that’s more contentious by linking it back to how redistributive taxes are the ONLY way or the BEST way to solve this problem.   + On impacting the fact that it hurts the ability of people to survive, we need to work on illustrating the human costs here. * On using the taxation to correct some of these problems:   + Mechanise your model proper and explain the use of funding the education systems can be used 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.   On actively improving the economy, it’s disingenuous to say that the money rots in bank accounts of the rich, because rich people also reinvest that money back into the economy.   * 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. * Good analysis on why reinvesting the money into poor people also helps. Explain why the state taking this wealth and putting it into infrastructural programs will also generate a substantial amount of jobs and growth.   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.   * Nice angle on diminishing returns for rich people, as well as the caveat of the rich people still having motivation to generate wealth in the economy.   Good job offering POIs today!  7.14 | | | | | | |