| **Student Name:** Ryan Qian |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good strategy on identifying vulnerable people who lack the ability to prosper; we need to focus on packaging to highlight their plight + make sure it is actually linked to the motion. We want to make sure we’re being specific to the motion, rather than the concept of redistribution specifically.  Set-up   * We can summarise our run-on sentence into saying we support a system of progressive taxation; UBI conditionally is not UBI - it is unemployment benefits. * On investment into public goods - explain what this looks like/why we are unable to do this in status quo. * Good work incorporating crack downs on tax loopholes. * Stop saying ‘or whatever’! * Why is it income? Your burden is to prove that these benefits only accrue an aggressive tax on income, as opposed to anything else.   Argument 1   * Good work establishing firstly, why taxation is legitimate as a concept - we have to be more specific to INCOME tax. * Why is the best way to crack down on the rich by taxing their income. On minorities - don’t you tax them under a progressive system of tax anyways? * Is the ‘richness’ of the rich contingent on monthly income streams? Or is it on the basis of wealth? Capital gains, property, and so forth?   + Income tax can potentially reach a broader segment of the population than asset taxes. While asset taxes primarily target those with significant wealth, income tax can apply to anyone earning above a certain threshold. This broader base can generate more revenue and contribute to a greater sense of shared responsibility.   + Extremely high asset taxes might be a stronger driver of capital flight than moderately high income taxes. Individuals are often more sensitive to taxes on their accumulated wealth than on their current earnings. * Good work structuring this argument clearly, and transitioning at each stage. * Good work unpacking the impacts! We need to weigh these impacts comparatively - what will Opp run? Will they concede these impacts are valuable, but just choose a different kind of tax? Or will they say helping the poor doesn’t matter?   Argument 2   * Why is this the best way to correct the accident of birth? How will Opp contest this argument? * You aren’t proving the burden of the argument - that this solution is contingent on income tax specifically.   06:06  We need to take POIs! We need to ask consistently? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Adrian 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: | 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:  Did they run this? They have tax brackets - the middle class pay this anyways. They didn’t really try to squirrel this to my understanding; you can still run this response - that income is not the correct focus; income comes from labour, wealth comes from abuse. Our opening is trying to call them out very extremely - you’ll always benefit from being more realistic and charitable.  We didn’t do set-up in enough detail. You need to spell out which kinds of wealth tax you would have, and why this targets the rich specifically, compared to their side.  Good work analysing that the middle class are being unfairly penalised. Explain why income is unfair here; we just assert that the middle class are being hurt, and that the rich deserve to pay up. Our response here isn't very clear.  Argument 1   * We need to talk about who earns income, and who doesn’t. We need to explain who works hard, earns money, and so forth. Do this realistically, rather than saying the average middle class person went to public school; explain how it is more likely that they are earning some form of social mobility themselves. Good on responsibility and whether they owe the poor their income. * Explain how the moral correctness of taxation is contingent on who is being taxed, and in what way - income is labour/extension of it. You need to explain how the wealth tax you support is morally correct, and explain HOW it achieves the same redistribution Prop claims. You don’t explain the positive comparative at all. * Good work explaining what the upshot of the argument is, in relation to their case. * What is the impact of this argument? You didn’t unpack this at all!   Argument 2 - at 5:36?   * What were you able to prove here?   The strategy on Opp must be explaining why redistribution is valuable, but that income tax targets people who actually do work hard, rather than the extremely wealthy who have accumulated capital. High taxes lead to capital flight, and actively hurt economic growth; you can run an argument on how taxation is theft, and must provide counter set-up explaining how your side is better able to achieve redistribution through taxes on wealth!  Good work asking POIs consistently. Let’s take them as well!  06:15 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Audrey Lai |
| --- |

| **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: | 70 | | | | | |
| 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:  Is this opening comparative? Does it engage with the biggest call out on OO - which is that you’re targeting the wrong mech - income, rather than wealth?  On the middle class - good work identifying you need to engage with this, but it’s more meta than just this - it’s on income versus wealth; they don’t really provide a detailed picture of what wealth looks like - which you should call them out on.   * Fair on progressive tax not hurting them, but you’re really exaggerating with the 99/1 breakdown. * Why is it income? Your burden is to prove that these benefits only accrue an aggressive tax on income, as opposed to anything else. * We need to weigh these impacts comparatively - what has Opp run? Have they conceded these impacts are valuable, but just chosen a different kind of tax? Or have they said helping the poor doesn’t matter? * The upshot of your responses needs to be clearer. What is the purpose of the response you are making, and how does it target the premise of their case?   Extension   * I think the impacts are well-explained and unpacked - the uniqueness and solvency of the mechanism is still unclear. Why income tax? * Is the ‘richness’ of the rich contingent on monthly income streams? Or is it on the basis of wealth? Capital gains, property, and so forth?   + Income tax can potentially reach a broader segment of the population than asset taxes. While asset taxes primarily target those with significant wealth, income tax can apply to anyone earning above a certain threshold. This broader base can generate more revenue and contribute to a greater sense of shared responsibility.   + Extremely high asset taxes might be a stronger driver of capital flight than moderately high income taxes. Individuals are often more sensitive to taxes on their accumulated wealth than on their current earnings.   + We need to target income because it prevents the middle class from accumulating excess capital and perpetuating the system of capitalism further - this is how wealth concentration and capital accumulation occurs. * You aren’t proving the burden of the argument - that this solution is contingent on income tax specifically. POI - Adrian questions you on this too!   06:14  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Stephanie Kwan |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Fair call out on lack of mechanisation; your LO doesn’t set-up wealth tax at all - you need to fill this gap to explain what exactly you do, what you use it for, and why this is more effective than OG. What is the root of the problem? We need to break this concept down.  On income tax. I’m confused - why are we explaining that income tax disrupts the process of capital accumulation? That mechanises their argument for them. If your point is that income tax hurts labour/tax is theft - can we run wealth tax at the same time? What’s the point of accumulating capital and working hard if the final outcome - property, or stocks, or gold, or whatever - gets taken away? This hurts your own case? The distinction between income and wealth tax, as to why the former hurts competition and economic growth, but not the latter needs to be clearer.  Don’t take two POIs? On dependency and support from the state - isn’t the point of your wealth tax to achieve this as well?  Why doesn’t your side hurt the middle class? You need to break this down into greater detail!  You could explain why a high income tax means political will gets exhausted on this one mechanism - which doesn’t achieve redistribution as well, because it only targets people who earn, rather than the really wealthy - who have assets instead. Hence, we are unable to engage in further redistribution, or focus on uplifting the poor in other ways.  The strategy on Opp must be explaining why redistribution is valuable, but that income tax targets people who actually do work hard, rather than the extremely wealthy who have accumulated capital. High taxes lead to capital flight, and actively hurt economic growth; you can run an argument on how taxation is theft, and must provide counter set-up explaining how your side is better able to achieve redistribution through taxes on wealth!  I think you did a fair job explaining why taxation is unfair - but it hurts your case!  05:01 - why aren’t we speaking to time? We have to hit 6 minutes!  We need to ask POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sarah Seryoung Choi |
| --- |

| **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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  The opening for any Member speech needs to position their extension into the debate. The rhetorical flourish style of opening isn’t achieving anything at the moment.  Don’t rebut OO without positioning your extension; these responses occur in isolation without an understanding of what the comparative will be.  On hard work - you need to call out the DLO for the contradiction. They explained that income tax disrupts the process of capital accumulation? This is mechanising the OG claim for them. If DLO’s point is that income tax hurts labour/tax is theft - can they run wealth tax at the same time? What’s the point of accumulating capital and working hard if the final outcome - property, or stocks, or gold, or whatever - gets taken away?   * As to why your side gets hard work; I think the claim on passion needs to be delivered with more CALM and CONTROL. We cannot speak as fast as we do, without pauses or emphasis, or minimising the punchy delivery (we cannot deliver every sentence and word this way). In order for you to claim this, you need to explain why your side gets people to this work for the passion stage in the first place; and HOW. You’re technically just impacting what OG said - this is derivative.   We need to engage with the biggest call out on OO (LO) - which is that you’re targeting the wrong mech - income, rather than wealth?  The point of a member speech is to present an extension which naturally responds to OO, and where you illustrate how the analysis you present takes it above OG. The biggest gap is the uniqueness of income tax. Your burden is to prove that these benefits only accrue an aggressive tax on income, as opposed to anything else.   * + Income tax can potentially reach a broader segment of the population than asset taxes. While asset taxes primarily target those with significant wealth, income tax can apply to anyone earning above a certain threshold. This broader base can generate more revenue and contribute to a greater sense of shared responsibility.   + Extremely high asset taxes might be a stronger driver of capital flight than moderately high income taxes. Individuals are often more sensitive to taxes on their accumulated wealth than on their current earnings.   + We need to target income because it prevents the middle class from accumulating excess capital and perpetuating the system of capitalism further - this is how wealth concentration and capital accumulation occurs.   How do you get sameness? We explain what the impact of sameness is, but don’t explain how this specific mechanism is what leads to it. Why would the rich also use public services in your world?  We’re missing weighing! We need to ask POIs!  06:06 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jodie Li |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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:  If it is obvious that MG is derivative, should this be the strategic focus of your opening. The same applies to the ‘I will weigh above everyone’ - of course you will, that’s the point of a member speech.  You can’t actually run a counter-model. This is against the rules. You need to instead explain how the gap in the speech is a positive counter-factual. OO identifies well that a wealth tax makes more sense than income tax, but that’s all they do. You’re going to unpack what a wealth tax is, what it would look like, and how your side will achieve the same benefits as Gov Bench; who has lots of benefits, but never explains exclusivity to an income tax.  Do you need to engage with CG in such a comprehensive way? What’s the winning pathway?  You could explain why a high income tax means political will gets exhausted on this one mechanism - which doesn’t achieve redistribution as well, because it only targets people who earn, rather than the really wealthy - who have assets instead. Hence, we are unable to engage in further redistribution, or focus on uplifting the poor in other ways.  The point of a member speech is to present an extension which naturally responds to the other side, and where you illustrate how the analysis you present takes it above your opening. Start by positioning your extension!  Good work explaining how wealth is immoral. Explain how as a result, this is a more morally justified way of correcting the accident of birth. Explain how taxation on income targets the wrong group - the middle class, who actually laboured to get what they want/engaged in social mobility themselves.  Income tax targets people who actually do work hard, rather than the extremely wealthy who have accumulated capital. High taxes lead to capital flight, and actively hurt economic growth; you can run an argument on how taxation is theft, and must provide counter set-up explaining how your side is better able to achieve redistribution through taxes on wealth!  Explain how the moral correctness of taxation is contingent on who is being taxed, and in what way - income is labour/extension of it. You need to explain how the wealth tax you support is morally correct, and explain HOW it achieves the same redistribution Prop claims. You don’t explain the positive comparative at all.  The impact of the extension is missing!  We need to ask POIs!  06:14 | | | | | | |