| **Student Name:** Lilianna Poon |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would place a significant tax on companies which replace workers with A.I. |
| --- |

| 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:  Good strong tone in the opening! ‘Extremely bad for the workers’ is correctly identified, but we could illustrate how they find themselves in poverty, how companies rush to adopt AI.  We need to highlight why this is the (a) the best way and (b) the only way. We need to explain why we need to force companies to adjust in this way, whilst we figure out the best way to accommodate these workers.  We’re not making consistent eye contact!  Set-up   * Good work identifying that workers cannot just become reliant on welfare - explain WHY this is very difficult. * Good work identifying we must support upskilling, but why just the new generation? Will we keep this going until those workers retire and then phase out these jobs/allow AI adoption? What does the timescale look like? Don’t commit this is going to occur indefinitely - there needs to be a reason to do this now! * We aren’t burden pushing them in terms of how if we don’t take action, companies will just lay off people - and this becomes a burden on the welfare state. They can’t spend money upskilling - because they’re too busy handing out food stamps and unemployment benefits. Budgetary allocation problem!   We have to present confidently! Use hand gestures, speaking more conversationally.  Argument 1   * We need to first establish profit as a key motivator, and then how their rationale is likely to change under your world. How does this force companies to keep employing people, while you work to upskill them so this doesn’t need to happen? What happens in Opp’s world when they have to go all guns blazing? * How would it make their lives really hard? We need to explain HOW these people will suffer, and that they have no further optionality. * A significant tax can also act as a brake on the unchecked rush towards automation, giving policymakers time to grasp the implications of widespread AI deployment. This approach allows for the development of appropriate regulations and safeguards to ensure a more responsible and beneficial integration of AI into the workforce.   Argument 2   * On finding new jobs - isn’t this technically a part of the first argument, rather than a new claim? This hurts our own case because without us providing support for these workers - do we prop them up in this unsustainable way for the long term?   05:22  We need to ask POIs consistently. How many did we ask today? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Boris Cheung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would place a significant tax on companies which replace workers with A.I. |
| --- |

| 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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Strong tone up top! Good work highlighting how this hurts efficiency, and hurts workers - we need to be slightly more specific in terms of what this looks like.  Clear signposting. Good work using hand gestures!  Set-up   * Good work pinpointing your side can provide education; explain how this is symmetric. Your side ensures there is pressure to adapt; whereas on their side they never specify a time frame/prop up blue collar work unsustainably until presumably these workers retire and the ‘new generation’ enters. Call them out for their lack of clarity on the model. * You need to explain why some workers suffering and struggling is fine on your side, rather than propping them up by punishing companies?   Rebuttal   * I think we acknowledge that companies are profit driven, but explain why this is a good thing. Talk about the benefits of economic productivity and growth.   + Explain how this inefficiency is being propped up for no reason and no explanation as to how we get out of it. Will they do this indefinitely? How do they do so?   + Taxing companies for adopting AI would discourage investment in this transformative technology. This would slow down the development and implementation of AI, hindering productivity gains and potentially putting businesses at a competitive disadvantage globally.   The time management is off! We hadn’t started our argument until 4:12!  Argument 1   * Explain why workers have no incentive to upskill unless this happens. Explain how it creates dependency! * Where are the funds and money being found from? * Analysis we need to incorporate:   + The economy naturally goes through cycles of creative destruction. While some jobs are lost, new ones are created. The market, incentivized by profit, will adapt to AI by creating new industries and roles.   + Wages and labor markets will adjust to the changes brought about by AI. As some jobs become obsolete, demand for other skills will increase, driving up wages in those areas and incentivizing workers to acquire those skills.   + Point to historical examples of technological advancements (e.g., the Industrial Revolution) where initial job displacement eventually led to overall economic growth and new job creation.   We need to ask POIs consistently!  5:18 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Cyrus Yuan |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would place a significant tax on companies which replace workers with A.I. |
| --- |

| 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:  Burden push them - if they don’t take action, companies will just lay off people - and this becomes a burden on the welfare state. They can’t spend money upskilling - because they’re too busy handing out food stamps and unemployment benefits. Budgetary allocation problem! On the blue collar can never become white collar - what is the comparative and why is this preferable? Supporting them on your side through this tax policy/economic loss, until they naturally retire? You have to defend this properly, otherwise it seems like this policy will go on indefinitely - which is a very high burden to take.  Good on companies replacing these workers rapidly - explain how as a result, we have to stop them - we need to slow down development so that innovation doesn’t outpace regulation.  Argument 1   * Is this new? You’re providing me with more analysis than your first when they make this argument, but this argument has already been made. This rebuilding/gap filling has to occur under rebuttal rather than under the guise of a ‘new argument’. * Good work identifying these people will suffer, and that they have no further optionality. * Analyse how they ended up in clerical/blue collar work in the first place due to the birth lottery - the public school system/the state likely failed them; talk about the lack of social mobility being part of the state - link this to the moral obligation the state has to intervene in this way, even though it may limit GDP/profit for a short period of time. Acknowledge the trade off here! * Excellent on the slippery slope it creates.   Randomly rebuttals enter again at 4?   * This is largely repetitive. * We can analyse further how this tax can also act as a brake on the unchecked rush towards automation, giving policymakers time to grasp the implications of widespread AI deployment. This approach allows for the development of appropriate regulations and safeguards to ensure a more responsible and beneficial integration of AI into the workforce.   Good style today!  05:21  We need to ask POIs consistently. How many did we ask today? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jennie Jung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would place a significant tax on companies which replace workers with A.I. |
| --- |

| 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:  Explain how this kind of transformative change is normal. We need to enable it, and take charge, rather than preventing it. The economy naturally goes through cycles of creative destruction. While some jobs are lost, new ones are created. The market, incentivized by profit, will adapt to AI by creating new industries and roles. Wages and labor markets will adjust to the changes brought about by AI. As some jobs become obsolete, demand for other skills will increase, driving up wages in those areas and incentivizing workers to acquire those skills. Point to historical examples of technological advancements (e.g., the Industrial Revolution) where initial job displacement eventually led to overall economic growth and new job creation.  Rebuttal   * We need to explain why it is viable to move from blue collar to white! What new opportunities? Do these help the blue collar workers Prop identifies as the ones being laid off? * We can also argue that maybe the future is one in which we don’t have to work to survive; we tax the profits of these companies - let them go full throttle, and let people re-evaluate how to gain meaning outside of economic output. * On the need of humans - why does this comfort level so significantly impact adoption rates by companies? * Why will companies behave in this pro-employee way? We have no likelihood analysis as to WHY this happens!   Why do our sentences sound like questions?  Where was our second speaker argument?   * You could argue that hindering AI adoption through taxation slows down technological progress. This is particularly detrimental to developing countries, which often rely on technological leapfrogging to catch up with developed nations. By allowing businesses to freely adopt AI, they can increase productivity, create new industries, and drive economic growth, ultimately benefiting developing countries through increased trade and investment. * You could also point out that the tax would exacerbate the digital divide between developed and developing countries. By making AI more expensive, it would become less accessible to developing nations, further widening the gap in technological capabilities and economic opportunities.   We need to ask POIs consistently. How many did we ask today?  04:59  We need to pay attention to delivery! Sounding confident, persuasive and forceful! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ishan Harishankar |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would place a significant tax on companies which replace workers with A.I. |
| --- |

| 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:  Good start on the incentive of companies! Explain why this means all the responses on Opp fall out of the debate because they just assert companies care about their workers. Point out here how if we don’t take action, companies will just lay off people - and this becomes a burden on the welfare state. Opp can’t spend money upskilling - because they’re too busy handing out food stamps and unemployment benefits. Budgetary allocation problem!  There should be two clashes! On the principle, and the practical!  Rebuttal   * Drag it out; explain how yes, this is inevitable, but we need to create systems which can adapt - which is why we want to slow down development and adoption right now. They just go full steam ahead without considering how it decimates so many people’s lives? * We can analyse further how this tax can also act as a brake on the unchecked rush towards automation, giving policymakers time to grasp the implications of widespread AI deployment. This approach allows for the development of appropriate regulations and safeguards to ensure a more responsible and beneficial integration of AI into the workforce. * We can’t shorten ‘status quo’ to SQ! * On the blue collar can never become white collar - what is the comparative and why is this preferable? Supporting them on your side through this tax policy/economic loss, until they naturally retire? You have to defend this properly, otherwise it seems like this policy will go on indefinitely - which is a very high burden to take.   Clash 1   * Vulnerability of the poor - good identification. Analyse why these poor people are so hurt and victims of the state in the first place.   + Analyse how they ended up in clerical/blue collar work in the first place due to the birth lottery - the public school system/the state likely failed them; talk about the lack of social mobility being part of the state - link this to the moral obligation the state has to intervene in this way, even though it may limit GDP/profit for a short period of time.   + Acknowledge the trade off here! * Link back to the slippery slope Cyrus talks about. * How does your side support these workers on your side? You have to provide a positive path to victory!   We need to explain how our side comes out of this policy. Does it exist indefinitely? The set-up has been unclear from first, and we need to clean it up!  Let’s ask POIs consistently.  05:21 | | | | | | |