|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Teacher’s Name:** | **Unit Name:**  **Public Forum Debate** |
| **Lesson Title**  **Lesson 5: Cutting Evidence and Tagging** | **Indicate which:**  **Beginner Intermediate Advanced** |
| **Focus Skill:**  **Find, cut and tag evidence for use in cases and/or rebuttals** | **Time Frame:**  **100-225 minutes** |

**PART 1—ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Essential Question** | **How is the best data culled and organized for use in an argument?** |
| **Objective 1** | Students will cut evidence and distinguish between quality levels of pieces of evidence. |
| **Objective 2** | Students will write appropriate and accurate tags for multiple pieces of evidence. |
| **Objective 3** | Students will identify and include correct citations according to the Rules for Evidence. |

**Overview of Lesson** *(General summary of what will be covered)***:**

|  |
| --- |
| In this lesson, students will read, cut, and tag evidence. First, students will choose the best pieces of evidence from the samples given. Then, they will read and mark general cuts and then read for best cuts before doing a final cut. After cutting the articles they brought in, students will work to tag the evidence provided and then will tag the evidence they’ve cut. Students will also learn how to properly cite evidence in adebate round. |

**PART 2—THE LESSON**

**Detailed Step-by-Step Lesson** *(be sure to include time allocation information)***:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Session #** | **Time** | **Details of the Lesson** |
| **5.0** | **60 min.** | **Cutting Cards**  **Either as homework on in class, have the students watch the Technical Webinar, “**[**How to Cut a Card**](http://speechanddebate.adobeconnect.com/p9p7d8i7qga)**.”** As they watch, you may consider stopping the webinar and discussing (if you are watching it in class with them) and/or having students take notes. |
| **5.1** | **10-15 min.** | **Hand out and review the handout, “How to Cut Evidence.” (see below)** |
| **5.2** | **10-15 min.** | **Hand out and review the handout, “How to Cut Cards.” (see below)** |
| **5.3** | **15-20 min.** | **Then, have students choose one of the articles they found for homework. They need to read the article and put brackets around any section they believe would be a good card.** |
| **5.4** | **20-30 min.** | **When everyone has finished, review the handout, “Good Card, Bad Card.” (see below)** Then, have each student share what they believe to have the best potential as a card. Have each student read the card and explain why he/she believes it to be the best. Discuss and include focus on what the purpose of the card might be, the connection of the card to the argument, the length of the card (i.e.—does shortening the card cause it to lose value in the argument). [Note: depending on the number of students you have, you may need to limit the number of students you have share their card.] |
| **5.5** | **20-30 min.** | **Have students “cut” cards from that article.** |
| **5.6** | **5-10 min.** | **Tagging Cards**  **Hand out and review the “Tagging Cards” handout. Then, discuss the citation. [Note: you may want to go back to the “Good Card, Bad Card” handout for more info on citations.]** Point out that the required citation for debate includes full name of primary author and/or editor, publication date, source, title of article, date accessed for digital evidence, full URL (if applicable), author qualifications, page number(s). Note that the items **bolded** in the citation are what **MUST** be read in a debate; the rest must appear with the card and be in the room during the debate. [Note: for more information about citations, see the Evidence Rules for PF, LD, and Policy]. |
| **5.7** | **5 min.** | **Have students choose one of their cards and write a tag.** |
| **5.8** | **5-10 min.** | **Have students share some of their cards and tags and discuss, having students pay particular attention to strength of tag, accuracy of citation, and strength of card.** |
| **5.9** | **10-20 min.** | **Have students tag the evidence they cut from their article. Discuss.**  **Homework:** Have students cut and tag the other articles they found in lesson 4. |

**PART 3—ASSESSMENT EVIDENCE**

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Task, Product, or Other Key Evidence of Learning** *(How will students demonstrate a level of proficiency for this skill?)*  Discussion and group work will show level of proficiency as well as areas needed for improvement. Final cutting and tagging of articles found in lesson 4 will be final evidence. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Key criteria to measure Performance Task(s) or Key Evidence:**  *Examples: Rubric, Checklist, etc***.**  Check strength of cut and tag, as well as, each element of citation. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessment Strategies** *(Identify Informal/Formal Strategies)***:**  **Informal—**throughout lesson in discussion and group **work**  **Formal—**cutting and tagging and citation of articles found in lesson 4 |

**Plans for after this lesson/competency is complete (How will you extend, enrich?):**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Key Resources Used: Websites, books, film clips, etc.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Names of Resource(s):** | **Access to Resource(s) if available:** |
| **How to Cut Cards** | **See below** |
| **How to Cut Evidence** | **See below** |
| **Good Card, Bad Card** | **See below** |
| **Tagging Evidence** | **See below** |
| **Rules for Evidence** | **NSDA** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Key Resources for Exploration: Websites, books, film clips, etc.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Names of Resource(s):** | **Access to Resource(s) if available:** |
| **Webinar--Technical—“How to Find, Tag, and Cut Evidence AND How It Secretly Helps on the ACT”** | **http://speechanddebate.adobeconnect.com/p9p7d8i7qga** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Reflections/Review for Future:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**How to Cut Cards**

Modified with permission of Tara Tate, Glenbrook South HS

***“Cutting Cards”*** is debate lingo for finding evidence and putting it into a format suitable for easy consumption for debate. The process is really the same for any debate event, so this applies to Public Forum, Lincoln-Douglas, or even Policy Debate. Here goes:

**1. Find an article on your topic with information you believe is pertinent/important/credible**. Use some common sense when considering sources and you should be fine. Here are some potentially good starting points:

***Current Event focused evidence***

* **Christian Science Monitor** - <http://www.csmonitor.com/> - One of the best sources for information on current events, updated daily.
* **LA Times** - <http://www.latimes.com/> - One of the “major papers” in the United States.
* **New York Times** – <http://www.nytimes.com> - One of the “major papers” in the United States.
* **Washington Post** - <http://www.washingtonpost.com> - One of the “major papers” in the United States.
* **Time** - <http://www.time.com/time/> - Another magazine devoted to current events.
* **U.S. News and World Report** - <http://www.usnews.com/usnews/home.htm> - Another magazine devoted to current events.
* **CNN** – <http://www.cnn.com> – A good, general news site.
* **Gallup Poll** - <http://www.galluppoll.com/> - One of the nation’s leading polling services, great for using in introductions.

***Deeper Analysis focused evidence***

* **Cato Institute** – <http://www.cato.org> – The Cato Institute is a large organization with information divided by topic area.
* **Heritage Foundation** - <http://www.heritage.org/> - The Heritage Foundation is another “think tank” organization like Cato, just on the opposite political spectrum.
* **Brookings Institute** - <http://www.brook.edu/> - Another “think tank” like Cato.
* **Congressional Quarterly** - <http://www.cq.com> – Information about Congress and what is happening in the United States.
* **Foreign Affairs** - <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/> - A website regarding foreign policies.
* **Foreign Policy** – <http://www.foreignpolicy.com> – A website regarding, you guessed it, foreign policy.
* **Financial Times** - <http://www.ft.com/home/us> - Great source for information about the business world.

***Legal Briefs and other High Level evidence***

Do you have a brother/sister/friend in college who wants to let you use their login information? Great! Explore using **Lexis-Nexis**, **JSTOR**, and/or **Project Muse**. Through your NSDA account, you may also have access to **Hein Online**—check with your coach. Great databases, once mastered. Not for the faint of heart though – but invaluable once you learn to master them.

**2. Copy your card**. Read the article and find 1-2 paragraphs that give a specific point which you feel is important. You should include all relevant info from the article that deals with the particular issue you want to discuss. If you feel there are multiple “cards” from a single article, no problem – just make them different cards. Copy and paste the content into Word or the word processing program of your choice. YES – I said copy/paste – how often have you heard someone tell you to do that?

**3. Make your MLA citation**. Above your 1-2 paragraphs, give a full MLA citation for your evidence. YES – every single piece of evidence should have this information available. You may not always need it in a round, but when it is asked for – you must have it available upon request. All evidence should be from credible sources. In a debate, you can:

* Ask for your opponent’s information
* Discredit them for source quality, outdated evidence, or biased author attack
* If they don’t have it, you can question the credibility entirely!
* Regardless, you should always have the information available.

If you don’t know how to setup a proper MLA citation, try out [www.easybib.com](http://www.easybib.com). Just realize the “Auto Citation” function screws up more than it works right. Just go through the process yourself…it will save you time in the long run. Put “**Author in Year writes**” above your MLA citation – you’ll actually say that in the debate, the MLA citation is just for clarification questions. Feel free to make it painfully small print, to save paper and make it less distracting when reading your case. I usually go with font size 8.

**4. Make your claim**. What does your evidence prove in regards to your debate topic? State it in your own words. We’re talking a sentence maximum, but usually just an abridged shortened form of what your evidence talks about.

If your evidence is going to give statistical information on crime recidivism, your claim can be “Criminal recidivism rises/falls with rehabilitation.”

Short and sweet – connecting what your evidence will prove to your topic area. This will be the first thing you say when talking about your point, so put it above your “Author in Year writes” and MLA citation. I know it seems like I’m going out of order, but I’m going in the actual order I would use when cutting cards.

**5. Cutting the card time**. Go through the 1 – 2 paragraphs you copied/pasted from the article. Find the sentences that matter the most to your particular point you are making. Bold/Underline those words. The rest, you can shrink to size 8 font. This way, you still have the entire original context, but are only reading the info you feel is vital to your case. Your opponent can never accuse you of altering the intent of the author if you have all of the original wording right in front of them.

**6. Write your impact**. After your evidence, explain how it relates to your topic and why it matters in the round. This is your analysis on what the evidence does in the debate round for you. Explain why your argument helps you win the round. Your impact is your chance to explain how you connect the dots from what the author of a paper said to what you are actually stating during the debate.

***The final product will follow this structure:***

**CLAIM** – what you believe is true, in your own words

**WARRANT** – the proof/evidence you offer to back up your claim, composed of:

Author in Year writes,

FULL MLA CITATION

Copied/pasted 1-2 paragraphs from a particular article, bolding/underlining the important stuff and shrinking the rest.

**IMPACT** – why it matters in your own words, connecting the evidence to your particular debate topic.

***Here’s an example, from an old case:***

**Russia has interfered with peace around the world**

***Lantos in 2007 writes,***

[Tom; Representative from California; **“**Russia on the Eve of National Elections;**”** Hearing of the House Foreign Affairs Committee; 30 October 2007; Lexis]

For reasons that are perhaps not clear, the Putin government has repeatedly shown an irresponsible attitude toward global threats to peace, especially with regard to Iran. **The Russians say that they are opposed to a nuclear Iran. Indeed, Putin recently said that the two countries most threatened by an Iranian bomb would be Israel and Russia.**

**Even so, Putin insists upon fishing in these very troubled waters. He refuses to join with the civilized world in placing meaningful sanctions on Iran, and he goes so far as to sell to Iran advanced anti-aircraft missiles.**

**Putin has also hindered the United Nations efforts to preserve peace in the Balkans by resolving the final status of Kosova. His threats to veto any UN resolution that would grant long-deserved independence to Kosova make it unlikely that a unified international agreement will be found. If the United States and its European allies unilaterally recognize an independent Kosova** -- as I strongly support and seems most likely at this stage – **Putin has threatened to recognize Abkhazia, a move likely to destabilize an already fragile situation in the Caucuses.**

Russia is opposing the United States’ efforts to ensure that Iran remains non-nuclear. They refuse to allow sanctions to be placed on them, despite Iran’s repeated disregard for the United States and the United Nations. Not only that, but they also oppose an independent Kosovo – an ally of the United States. All of these efforts show that Russia is a threat to our interests.

**So, now go forth and make cards!** Cards are good for a number of reasons:

* You don’t have to have the entire article with you at all times, since you have the context always.
* You can easily see what info is from the article and what info is from you – at a glance
* You have the citation information for easy comparison
* You will make your judge happy, if evidence credibility is an issue – you look professional
* You meet NFL rules – you need full citation info and you have it – in style
* These will (eventually) form the majority of your contention level offense
* The remainder will be for your rebuttal preparation – so everything will have a purpose

Hope this helps you when cutting cards.

**How to Cut Evidence**

**Used with the permission of Dana Meiter**

Before everyone had a personal computer, debaters used to photocopy articles out of magazines or newspapers, then use scissors to cut the most important piece of information out of the paper and paste it to an index card. After the arts and crafts were finished, the debater then had to write the source information and a tag line on the card. The cards were filed in boxes that debaters carried with them from tournament to tournament. This is how debate evidence came to be called cards. Today, we still cut evidence, but we do it by cutting and pasting on the computer and printing our “cards” on normal paper. The way we carry it to debate tournaments may have changed, but the method for “cutting” and “tagging” remains the same.

**Raw Material**

In preparation for the topic, Resolved: The United States federal government should adopt a carbon tax, let’s examine a piece of an article produced by the Congressional Budget office:

Neither the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) nor the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation has published an estimate of how much revenue a carbon tax might produce. However, CBO has extensively analyzed policies, known as cap-and-trade programs, that would similarly set a price on CO2 emissions. Those analyses suggest that a carbon tax that covered the bulk of CO2 emissions or the carbon content of most fossil fuel consumed in the United States could generate a substantial amount of revenue. For example, in 2011, CBO estimated that a cap-and-trade program that would have set a price of $20 in 2012 to emit a ton of CO2 (and increased that price by 5.6 percent each year thereafter) would raise a total of nearly $1.2 trillion during its first decade.1 In addition, total U.S. emissions of CO2 would be about 8 percent lower over that period than they would be without the policy, CBO estimated.

Source: Dinan, Terry. [Senior Advisor at the Congressional Budget Office] “Effects of a Carbon Tax on the Economy and Environment.” Congressional Budget Office. 2013. Web. Accessed January 2, 2016. (p.1-2)

When preparing a “card,” the idea is to select the most valuable pieces of information and nothing more. Particularly for Public Forum Debate, it is essential that the debater present pertinent information in the most concise way possible. The article above presents two positive impacts of implementing a cap-and-trade type tax: generating a massive revenue for the federal government, and reducing CO2 emissions. The debater will break this article down into two cards in the following manner:

Neither the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) nor the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation has published an estimate of how much revenue a carbon tax might produce. However, CBO has extensively analyzed policies, known as cap-and-trade programs, that would similarly set a price on CO2 emissions. Those analyses suggest that a carbon tax that covered the bulk of CO2 emissions or the carbon content of most fossil fuel consumed in the United States could generate a substantial amount of revenue. For example, in 2011, CBO estimated that a cap-and-trade program that would have set a price of $20 in 2012 to emit a ton of CO2 (and increased that price by 5.6 percent each year thereafter) would raise a total of nearly $1.2 trillion during its first decade. In addition, total U.S. emissions of CO2 would be about 8 percent lower over that period than they would be without the policy, CBO estimated.

1. CARD ONE

For example, in 2011, CBO estimated that a cap-and-trade program that would have set a price of $20 in 2012 to emit a ton of CO2 (and increased that price by 5.6 percent each year thereafter) would raise a total of nearly $1.2 trillion during its first decade.

1. CARD TWO

In addition, total U.S. emissions of CO2 would be about 8 percent lower over that period than they would be without the policy, CBO estimated.

**Preparing the Cutting:**

Once the article is cut, a “tag” must be assigned to the information. Tags should be no more than seven words long, and read like bullet points not full sentences. Looking at the first cutting, we can come up with several ways to bullet point what that information says such as:

1. Cap-and-trade would generate $1.2 trillion in revenue

Or

1. Cap-and-trade helps government

For example, in 2011, CBO estimated that a cap-and-trade program that would have set a price of $20 in 2012 to emit a ton of CO2 (and increased that price by 5.6 percent each year thereafter) would raise a total of nearly $1.2 trillion during its first decade.

On the second card we could tag it as follows:

1. Tax reduces emissions

Or

1. Reduces Emissions

In addition, total U.S. emissions of CO2 would be about 8 percent lower over that period than they would be without the policy, CBO estimated.

****Sourcing: ALL CARDS must have complete sourcing!!!****

The complete source text for the evidence must be present. However, when speaking, the debater will not read the full source unless asked for it by an opposing team or judge. Check your district’s rules for what material must be audibly announced. In a district where author and year are required, it is suggested that you add that information at the beginning of the card so that you do not forget to read it when speaking. Your finished cards will look like this:

Cap-and-trade would generate $1.2 trillion in revenue

Dinan, 2016. For example, in 2011, CBO estimated that a cap-and-trade program that would have set a price of $20 in 2012 to emit a ton of CO2 (and increased that price by 5.6 percent each year thereafter) would raise a total of nearly $1.2 trillion during its first decade.

Dinan, Terry. [Senior Advisor at the Congressional Budget Office] “Effects of a Carbon Tax on the Economy and Environment.” Congressional Budget Office. 2013. Web. Accessed January 2, 2016. (p.1-2)

Reduces emmissions

Dinan, 2016. In addition, total U.S. emissions of CO2 would be about 8 percent lower over that period than they would be without the policy, CBO estimated.

Dinan, Terry. [Senior Advisor at the Congressional Budget Office] “Effects of a Carbon Tax on the Economy and Environment.” Congressional Budget Office. 2013. Web. Accessed January 2, 2016. (p.1-2)

\*\*\* Important Note \*\*\* In some districts you may be able to omit speaking certain words from the evidence as long as you do not alter the intent of the card. In the first card above, you might want to omit the “for example” because it is extraneous. The actual card MUST include the full text but you may gray out the material you do not intend to speak aloud as this helps the eye travel to the next spoken word. For example, (The debater reads aloud everything in black while skipping grayed words):

Cap-and-trade would generate $1.2 trillion in revenue

Dinan, 2016. For example, in 2011, CBO estimated that a cap-and-trade program that would have set a price of $20 in 2012 to emit a ton of CO2 (and increased that price by 5.6 percent each year thereafter) would raise a total of nearly $1.2 trillion during its first decade.

Dinan, Terry. [Senior Advisor at the Congressional Budget Office] “Effects of a Carbon Tax on the Economy and Environment.” Congressional Budget Office. 2013. Web. Accessed January 2, 2016. (p.1-2)

**Organizing Cards:**

****As you create cards, organize them by category (not just Pro and Con or Aff and Neg) so that you have several cards for each category. Cards should be listed in order of the best evidence (most impact) to worst. In the example of the topic using the evidence above, the Pro side might have the following categories into which they compile evidence:****

****Global Warming is Real  
Carbon Tax will save the Environment  
Carbon Tax provides other benefits****

Good Card, Bad Card

**Used with permission from Dana Meiter**

**Raw Material**

In preparation for the topic, *Resolved: The United States federal government should adopt a carbon tax,* let’s examine a piece of an article produced by the Congressional Budget office:

Neither the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) nor the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation has published an estimate of how much revenue a carbon tax might produce. However, CBO has extensively analyzed policies, known as cap-and-trade programs, that would similarly set a price on CO2 emissions. Those analyses suggest that a carbon tax that covered the bulk of CO2 emissions or the carbon content of most fossil fuel consumed in the United States could generate a substantial amount of revenue. For example, in 2011, CBO estimated that a cap-and-trade program that would have set a price of $20 in 2012 to emit a ton of CO2 (and increased that price by 5.6 percent each year thereafter) would raise a total of nearly $1.2 trillion during its first decade. In addition, total U.S. emissions of CO2 would be about 8 percent lower over that period than they would be without the policy, CBO estimated.

Source: Dinan, Terry. [Senior Advisor at the Congressional Budget Office] “Effects of a Carbon Tax on the Economy and Environment.” Congressional Budget Office. 2013. Web. Accessed January 2, 2016. (p.1-2)

Cutting: Aim for a short card with only the most important information.

**BAD CUT: (starts on sentence three of raw material above)**

Those analyses suggest that a carbon tax that covered the bulk of CO2 emissions or the carbon content of most fossil fuel consumed in the United States could generate a substantial amount of revenue. : Dinan, Terry. [Senior Advisor at the Congressional Budget Office] “Effects of a Carbon Tax on the Economy and Environment.” Congressional Budget Office. 2013. Web. Accessed January 2, 2016. (p.1-2)

*Why is this a poorly cut card?*

1. The text says “suggests” a tax “could” generate revenue. An opponent will immediately point out the speculative nature of the statement.
2. NO concrete information is highlighted.

**BETTER CUT: (beginning in sentence four of the raw material) This material includes actual numeric estimates made by the CBO.**

For example, in 2011, CBO estimated that a cap-and-trade program that would have set a price of $20 in 2012 to emit a ton of CO2 (and increased that price by 5.6 percent each year thereafter) would raise a total of nearly $1.2 trillion during its first decade. In addition, total U.S. emissions of CO2 would be about 8 percent lower over that period than they would be without the policy, CBO estimated. : Dinan, Terry. [Senior Advisor at the Congressional Budget Office] “Effects of a Carbon Tax on the Economy and Environment.” Congressional Budget Office. 2013. Web. Accessed January 2, 2016. (p.1-2)

**Tagging the card:**

Note that the source material indicates the estimates of revenue and emissions decrease were based on analysis of cap-and-trade programs, not straight tax programs. Even though the source material then goes on to say that a postulate what carbon tax might produce in terms of revenue and positive impact to the environment. However, the material clearly indicates that the postulate was made based on models from cap-and-trade. A debater can use either carbon tax or cap-and-trade in their tags, but if using “carbon tax” the debater must be prepared to answer a well-informed opponent who probably has this same research and knows that the estimates were based on a cap-and-trade system.

**Possible tags for this card are:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Well-constructed tags**  Good tags should include directive language and summarize what is in the card with language that provide links to greater impacts. Example: a tax that generates over a trillion will benefit the government in a multitude of ways any of which the Pro could exploit as advantageous impacts. | ***Cap-and-trade produces substantial revenue***  (this tag correctly sites the type of carbon taxing system mentioned in the source material and points to the positive impact) |
| ***Cap-and-trade generates over a trillion dollars***  (this tag correctly sites the type of carbon taxing system and points to the SPECIFIC numeric positive impact) |
| ***Cap-and-trade reduces emissions and generates over $1 trillion emissions*** (this tag correctly sites the type of carbon taxing system and points to the SPECIFIC numeric positive impact AND this card points the main reason we might want to implement a carbon tax, in other words what the resolution is seeking to solve – reduce carbon emissions) |
| **Mediocre tag** | ***Carbon tax increases government revenue***  Not specific enough |
| **Poor tags** | ***Carbon tax is good***  (problems with this tag are twofold: 1. The evidence sited does not point to any moral valuation, 2. This tag is much too general. It does not indicate the real impacts of the card and why it is important to the case) |
| ***Carbon tax makes money***  (this is not a good tag because the source material says that the estimates for the revenue were made from a cap-and-trade model which is DIFFERENT than a carbon tax model. In fact, the opposing team in this debate may well be arguing that a carbon tax is not the answer but cap-and-trade is, in which case this tag (and card) feeds the opposing case. |
| ***Cap-and-trade could significantly help offset the national deficit***  (this statement is not supported at all by the evidence in the card because the card does not reference the deficit or offsetting it at all. The tag should NOT be analysis. It is a bullet describing the content of the card.) |
| ***A carbon tax will help the government by earning a lot of money and it will also help the environment by reducing emissions which will reduce global warming***  (too long, not a tag!) |

**Tagging Evidence**

**Used with permission from Dana Meiter.**

Note that the source material indicates the estimates of revenue and emissions decrease were based on analysis of cap-and-trade programs, not straight tax programs. Even though the source material then goes on to say that a postulate what carbon tax might produce in terms of revenue and positive impact to the environment. However, the material clearly indicates that the postulate was made based on models from cap-and-trade. A debater can use either carbon tax or cap-and-trade in their tags, but if using “carbon tax” the debater must be prepared to answer a well-informed opponent who probably has this same research and knows that the estimates were based on a cap-and-trade system.

**Possible tags for this card are:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Well-constructed tags**  Good tags should include directive language and summarize what is in the card with language that provide links to greater impacts. Example: a tax that generates over a trillion will benefit the government in a multitude of ways any of which the Pro could exploit as advantageous impacts. | ***Cap-and-trade produces substantial revenue***  (this tag correctly sites the type of carbon taxing system mentioned in the source material and points to the positive impact) |
| ***Cap-and-trade generates over a trillion dollars***  (this tag correctly sites the type of carbon taxing system and points to the SPECIFIC numeric positive impact) |
| ***Cap-and-trade reduces emissions and generates over $1 trillion emissions*** (this tag correctly sites the type of carbon taxing system and points to the SPECIFIC numeric positive impact AND this card points the main reason we might want to implement a carbon tax, in other words what the resolution is seeking to solve – reduce carbon emissions) |
| **Mediocre tag** | ***Carbon tax increases government revenue***  Not specific enough |
| **Poor tags** | ***Carbon tax is good***  (problems with this tag are twofold: 1. The evidence sited does not point to any moral valuation, 2. This tag is much too general. It does not indicate the real impacts of the card and why it is important to the case) |
| ***Carbon tax makes money***  (this is not a good tag because the source material says that the estimates for the revenue were made from a cap-and-trade model which is DIFFERENT than a carbon tax model. In fact, the opposing team in this debate may well be arguing that a carbon tax is not the answer but cap-and-trade is, in which case this tag (and card) feeds the opposing case. |
| ***Cap-and-trade could significantly help offset the national deficit***  (this statement is not supported at all by the evidence in the card because the card does not reference the deficit or offsetting it at all. The tag should NOT be analysis. It is a bullet describing the content of the card.) |
| ***A carbon tax will help the government by earning a lot of money and it will also help the environment by reducing emissions which will reduce global warming***  (too long, not a tag!) |