| **Student Name:** Kelly Au |
| --- |

| **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.]  Good call-out on the one-liners from Opposition that are unproven.   * I appreciate that we were trying to flip the point of effectiveness.   On their examples being wrong, we’re not explaining why they weren’t true that many states with progressive taxation also fail in solving all the problems you highlighted.   * They’ve observed that the problem of crime rates persists in socialist states, so we have to explain why the state has a pretty high capacity to address these problems when they have money.   + We’re not actually highlighting how state powers can be checked by the structures of government, such as electoral accountability.   Excellent observation as to why cannot co-opt your safety net policies without harming their own arguments, well done!   * On the point that Opp says rich people donate to socially good initiatives, point out that they only do it to a small fraction of the wealth that the state is capable of collecting from your policy.   We’re expanding the problem statement without expounding why redistribution of taxes is the actual solution.   * We need to explain the failures of trickle down economics properly, e.g. All the wealth from Opp’s growth is monopolised by the rich, and the rich lobby for minimum wage laws to be stagnant. The inflation that comes from economic growth then leads to a cost of living crisis for the poor.   + Then explain properly why only state intervention to redistribute wealth is the only viable way to force the change. * Good job pointing out its cyclical nature as well, but HOW so? Why is poverty a trap? * I appreciate the use of funding the education systems to improve social mobility.   + Expand the mechanisation even more to other policies, like fixing the land scarcity by funding public housing.   On impacting the social ills, bear in mind that none of these analyses 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.   We are not properly engaging with the point of tax evasion. How will you collect taxes if every rich person moves to a tax haven?  On engaging with economic growth:   * Opp is pointing 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. * On our positive comparative, it isn’t entirely clear why consumer demand by the poor will be very significant to begin with.   + Instead, 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.  Please offer more POIs today!  7.00 | | | | | | |