

# The Final Round<sup>1</sup>

Everett Rutan

Xavier High School

[ejrutan3@ctdebate.org](mailto:ejrutan3@ctdebate.org)

or

[ejrutan3@acm.org](mailto:ejrutan3@acm.org)

## Connecticut Debate Association

### Glastonbury High School

February 2, 2013

**Resolved: College financial aid should be based on merit and/or expected future earnings.**

## A Note about the Notes

I've reproduced my flow chart for the final round at Glastonbury augmented by what I remember from the debate. The notes are limited by how quickly I could write and how well I heard what was said. I'm sure the debaters will read them and exclaim, "That's not what I said!" I apologize for any errors, but I hope debaters will appreciate this insight: what a judge hears may not be what they said or wish they had said.

There are two versions of the notes. The one below is chronological, reproducing each speech in the order in which the arguments were made. It shows how the debate was actually presented. The second is formatted to look more like my written flow chart, with each contention "flowed" across the page as the teams argued back and forth. It's close to the way I actually take notes during the debate.

## The Final Round

The final round at Glastonbury was between the Daniel Hand team of Arthur Wilkins and Henry Cohen on the Affirmative and the Simsbury team of Kevin Gyurco and Matthew Smits on the Negative. The debate was won by the Negative team from Simsbury.

### 1) First Affirmative Constructive

- a) Introduction
- b) Statement of the Resolution
- c) A1<sup>2</sup>: More money should be spent on K-12 education
  - i) Improved K-12 education helps more prepare for college and level the playing field
  - ii) Improved K-12 is the fundamental educational reform
  - iii) By college it's too late
- d) A2: College should be earned, not simply expected
  - i) Now, students assume they will get aid
  - ii) Aid drives up prices due to excess demand

---

<sup>1</sup> Copyright 2013 Everett Rutan. This document may be freely copied for non-profit, educational purposes.

<sup>2</sup> "A1" indicates the Affirmative first contention, "N2" the Negative second contention and so forth.

- iii) The number of graduates is disproportional to the jobs that need their qualifications
  - iv) The result: too much debt, no job, Occupy Wall Street
  - v) Schools dumb down the curriculum to capture the aid subsidy
  - e) A3: College is a money trap
    - i) Kids take on debt, and can't get a job
      - (1) Majors like communications or sports management
    - ii) Use expected future earnings (EFE) to prove they can repay
      - (1) Just like a loan, student has to show career prospects
      - (2) Majors like economics, computer science
  - f) A1, A2, A3
- 2) Cross-Ex of First Affirmative**
- a) You didn't give any definitions, correct? Yes
  - b) If school should be earned, that means some won't get to go? Yes. Too many go to college now
  - c) But the rich can afford college without aid? Yes. But others will be more likely to go to college under the affirmative plan.
  - d) Aff would take funds from needs based support (NBS) to reform education and pay for merit based system (MBS)? Federal funds for universities would go to reform; private money to fund MBS.
  - e) Don't you need good professional skills to get a good job? Some, like lawyers, don't get jobs
  - f) Science and engineering majors do better? Yes, as in A3
  - g) The NBS funds that will go to K-12 reform are Federal funds? Yes
  - h) Aren't Pell grants given mostly on merit? Fed provides a lot of funds
  - i) Aren't you taking money from the universities? We aren't taking money from anyone
  - j) What if there aren't enough NBS funds from the Fed? There are plenty, even if not the Pell grants.
- 3) First Negative Constructive**
- a) Intro
  - b) Resolution
  - c) Definitions
    - i) "Expected future earnings" (EFE): aid based on career earnings
    - ii) "Merit based support" (MBS) is aid based on performance on tests
  - d) N1: Only needs based support (NBS) will help the lower and middle class get an education
    - i) This is the Negative Counterplan
      - (1) The problem today is loans
      - (2) Neg would change to a system of grants only
    - ii) Aff talks about a debt trap
      - (1) Most loans go to the lower classes
      - (2) We need to educate them to compete globally
  - e) N2: Merit based aid is biased to the upper classes
    - i) This is due to the K-12 schooling
    - ii) Poor have poor schools, test poorly, so get less MBS

- iii) It isn't a question of ability or desire
- iv) Aff wants to spend NBS money on K-12
  - (1) These funds aren't from the Federal Gov't
  - (2) So there is no money to spend
  - (3) So MBS will favor the rich
- f) A2: The poor need aid to go to college
  - i) Under the Aff plan, they wouldn't go to college
  - ii) This would reinforce the cycle of poverty
  - iii) Money continues to go to the rich
- 4) Cross-Ex of First Negative**
  - a) How can you call the Aff funds imaginary when the Neg counterplan spends money? We named a specific source
  - b) The counterplan provides for a lot of grants? We just convert loans to grants—the same money is used differently.
  - c) Aren't loans paid back? If you have \$400,000 of student loans you can't pay them back
  - d) Why do people pay back other loans? They can't pay their student loans now.
  - e) If they have a higher income couldn't they pay back loans? Not \$400,000 work.
  - f) Is everyone who goes to college a success? No
  - g) Are people who don't go to college successful? Yes
  - h) Do you agree that merit is measured by SATs? For college admissions, yes.
  - i) In N3 you claim income can't be predicted? Yes
- 5) Second Affirmative Constructive**
  - a) Intro
  - b) A1: Neg agrees K-12 needs to be improved
    - i) Aff re-allocates funds to that purpose
    - ii) Fed. Gov't provides NBS that can shifted to K-12
    - iii) Neg wants to command private entities to convert their loans to grants
  - c) A2: Scholarship should be treasured, education isn't about money
    - i) Colleges used to be a place to expand knowledge
    - ii) Now it's expected, and keg stands and social life
    - iii) This is a fault of the culture
    - iv) Grade inflation makes college less valuable, e.g., lawyers
  - d) A3: too many with BAs are underemployed
    - i) Students should focus on merit, not just test scores.
  - e) N3: Projected earnings can be determined statistically, by major
  - f) N1: Neg is using an imaginary source of money
    - i) Why would colleges convert loans to grants? How could you force them.
  - g) We need to re-assess the value of education
- 6) Cross-Ex of Second Affirmative**
  - a) Do you agree jobs change in importance over time? Yes
  - b) And that the economy today is different than it was 40 years ago? Yes, as are culture and social standards
  - c) So therefore the lucrative jobs change? Yes
  - d) How would you predict incomes out 40 years? Most want to repay the loan sooner than that

- e) Would the loans be re-adjusted while students in college? No
- f) What? You may not be able to predict long-term economic change, but things are stable in the short run
- g) You can predict good jobs today but not in 40 years? Maybe
- h) What is the difference between a grant and a loan? Grants aren't repaid
- i) So grants don't put you into debt? Yes, but why would colleges give them.
- j) How do you know there is enough Federal NBS to reform K-12? Every little bit would help
- k) How can you allocate the money from one purpose to another? Affirmative has fiat power in debate.

**7) Second Negative Constructive**

- a) N3: It's impossible to extrapolate expected future earnings (EFE)
  - i) Aff says you could compute averages based on field of study
  - ii) But value changes over time, e.g., engineering, web design
  - iii) So A3 money trap remains if EFE calculation wrong
  - iv) Many graduates don't get jobs, 50% have low wages
  - v) What happens to loans if students change majors? Loan is already made
  - vi) Overall, NBS is better
- b) N1: Providing NBS through grants provides affordable education to the poor
  - i) No bias towards high income students
- c) N2: MBS has a bias towards high income students
  - i) Colleges look at standardized test scores so "merit" = SAT
- d) A1: Most NBS is not from the Gov't, so Aff has no money to shift to K-12
- e) A2: Aff attitude is harmful
  - i) It will discriminate against low and middle income students
- f) A3: Money trap

**8) Cross-Ex of Second Negative**

- a) Do you agree that there are more automation and technology jobs? Yes
- b) Who develops the economy? Many occupations do
- c) Doesn't math play a role? Many fields do, not all relevant all the time
- d) How would Neg control private institutions? Aff has the same problem redirecting funds.
- e) How? If the Aff doesn't have to explain how it reallocates funds, neither does the Neg.
- f) Isn't your concept anti-capitalist? Didn't espouse capitalism, we just noted we have a capitalist economy. The debate is about whether this should be done
- g) How is MBS skewed? Poor have to work, take care of people at home
- h) Aff plan is based on "should", so we've accomplished that? Neg has presented a counterplan, and has shown it is better than the Aff plan
- i) Why would we have to project salaries out 40 years if loans are repaid in 5? (Time)

**9) First Negative Rebuttal**

- a) Intro
- b) The main difference between us is the Neg provides more equality and more economic success
- c) A3: We agree college today is a money trap

- i) Neg is not espousing the status quo
- ii) So the status quo is not relevant to the debate
- d) A2: Aff means that college attendance is not a ticket, but an opportunity
  - i) No college education cuts off options, puts a ceiling on earnings
  - ii) Under the Aff plan those most affected will be the poor
    - (1) Some may succeed without help, but only a few
    - (2) Poor already disadvantaged
    - (3) Aff treats people like statistics
  - iii) An educated workforce benefits the economy
- e) On the money issue
  - i) There is no source of funds for the Aff plan
  - ii) If the Aff can create money by fiat, so can the Neg for its counterplan
- f) Neg counterplan is better
  - i) It's more equitable
  - ii) It results in more educational success which is better for the country

#### **10) First Affirmative Rebuttal**

- a) Intro
- b) Both sides agree the economy of education is broken
  - i) Students come out overqualified and with too much debt
  - ii) Aff plan pushes high school grads to more productive careers
  - iii) Aff limits college to those who pursue higher paying jobs
  - iv) Neg mention technology like robots, stem cells
    - (1) Aff bases loans on those careers
  - v) Neg would provide loans and grants to lawyers and other un-needed professions
  - vi) Neg perpetuates over-educated debtors
- c) Aff improves high school
  - i) Neg plan has no funding
  - ii) Aff plan has funding to improve schools, raise student potential
    - (1) Best students get MBS and go on to productive college degrees
    - (2) Compared to today where people with college degrees poor coffee
- d) Aff can get money from the Federal Gov't.
  - i) Neg has no idea if colleges will convert loans to grants

#### **11) Second Negative Rebuttal**

- a) Intro
- b) Resolution
- c) Expected Future Earnings
  - i) We mentioned robots as technology that replaces workers, e.g. surgeons
  - ii) Aff has no way to adjust funding if majors or EFE changes
    - (1) Loan is made first, can't take it back
  - iii) Loans lead to a money trap if job market is poor
    - (1) College grads aren't overqualified
    - (2) There are no jobs, or only unskilled jobs
    - (3) EFE may be wrong and students disappointed
- d) Aff vs Neg
  - i) How will the plan/counterplan be paid for?

- (1) Funding scheme is flawed in both cases
- ii) It is the prerogative of the of the Neg to present a counterplan
- iii) Aff still has the burden of proof, so Aff is more affected by funding issue
- e) Using college funds for K-12 education
  - i) The idea that college should be “earned” is not realistic
  - ii) US doesn’t have a system of trade schools like Germany or Japan
  - iii) University is the key to economic success
    - (1) Need a plan that makes it available to all

**12) Second Affirmative Rebuttal**

- a) Intro
- b) Neg Counterplan
  - i) Fiat power can’t provide unlimited money
  - ii) “give everyone a college education” is a bad idea, and morally wrong
  - iii) Aff takes money currently being spent for college and applies to K-12
- c) There are technical schools in the US
  - i) Community colleges
  - ii) Trade schools
- d) Loans can be adjusted
  - i) People take out loans all the time
  - ii) It’s a banker’s problem to figure it out, not a debater’s
- e) Colleges are devalued today
  - i) This devalues all knowledge
  - ii) Better to give education to those who really want it
  - iii) Want is self-evident in merit, hard work, effort
  - iv) Students with a passion for knowledge will go to college; others will go elsewhere