| **Student Name: Emma Demopoulos** |
| --- |

| **Motion:** THBT the state should not fund any works of art or performances that the average citizen would not recognise as having artistic merit. |
| --- |

| 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: | 72.5 | | | | | |
| 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:**  Very interesting hook. This can open a completely new layer of interpretation in this debate.  Rebuttal   * Good diagnosis that the prop brought examples of very specific form of art (abstract).   + I suggest you link this with how their definition (or characterization) of art is absolutely limited.   + Provide alternative examples to show that your side has a broader perspective.   + Feel free to cherry pick examples to some degree, since this argument can easily go to your favor with just a little more characterization and exemplification. * Average citizen   + This is an issue in the debate. What is an average citizen, and what do they want?     - What is your side’s stance on this? This needs rebuilding because the prop has a uniquely different idea about the average public. * Individual choice   + This is a super important point, i.e. you fund art that is useful, and later people decide what they want to see. This point can be an independent substantive, and its important to stress on this more.   + In so far, there’s a lack of stress on this point. * You must rebuild the case from your side   + How average citizens generally represent majority and there’s less diversity on the prop   + Link the above concern with a few examples of how wide range of art is prioritized under your side, and even in the worst case scenario where sojme art is prioritized over other in terms of viewership, the fact that there is more diveristy means there’s more representation of wide range of groups. * You’re spending a good amount of time evaluating the kind of art that will be displayed more. However, you need to engage with examples. * Competition for funding: I wish this point was brought early on in the debate, however, it does add well to your side. Can you connect it with how it opens up avenues for specific form of art to get a very large platform, or even make it to ‘mainstream’, something that doesn’t happen under prop * At this point, its important to argue that the prop creates an echo chamber (or stays in it for long) where there’s a fixed perspective of likes and dislikes, and the funding is quite rigid.   + Utilize this point to argue that they don’t get sustainability (something that the prop tried to argue)   Speaking Time: 7 min approx | | | | | | |