| **Student Name:** Daryl Ng |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that 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: | 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:  Good work starting by establishing what the role of the state must be; but this lacks urgency + we haven’t spent enough time curating our problem identification. We must link this to the taxpayer, we must link this to the duty of the state to ensure that people are happy/get enjoyment/feel represented - we want to deal with the push from Opp that art is inherently subjective; and say that this isn’t a debate about this.  Set-up - have clear steps/parts to this - it is currently structureless.   * Good work saying the private sphere still exists. * This is a debate about what kind of art the state should fund; we want to push a counterfactual of what the state would fund in place of this, and why that is worse - so for instance, why people will like rap, or art by working class people (think Rivera working class/industrial murals) versus traditional, high brow art. Specify why their money must be used to uplift them. * On diversity - the same comment applies; explain what metrics the state uses at presently - and why they have to change. * Explain what kind of art your side will end up funding + will not; illustrations and examples are missing!   + We must frame this to be not controversial + a straightforward decision in that there's a general consensus about what constitutes quality and value in art. Works that are poorly executed, lack creativity, or fail to resonate with a broader audience shouldn't receive public funding.   We have to have more energy and variation in our voice. It’s difficult to register when you’re transitioning, when something matters, when something is urgent.  Argument 1   * Good work starting by establishing the duty of the state.   + State funding comes from taxpayers. The government has a responsibility to ensure these funds are used in ways the public supports.   + Would these images (distressing menstrual art performance pieces) be funded in the counterfactual? * We need to analyse what the purpose of art should be/what this funding means in terms of the art that is produced, the museums and galleries that prop up, exhibitions that get support. * Explain how art becomes more accessible - in the CF, following traditional guidelines they might end up funding avant-garde works that only a small, specialized audience appreciates, creating a sense of elitism and excluding the average person from engaging with publicly funded art. * What is the impact of this argument?   07:00 | | | | | | |