| **Student Name:** Kevin Hu |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house opposes the “death of the author” principle |
| --- |

| 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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  What is the differentiation? Why is aesthetic value + AI generated art bad? These are lots of throwaway lines that aren’t helping you establish the framing of the round.  Set-up   * Let’s use examples to highlight what exactly this principle is; what kind of identities and characteristics are we talking about? Explain HOW their religion shapes their work, or their personality influences a character etc. We reference ‘break-up lyrics in a Taylor Swift song or something’ - but this is still too vague. * Is the burden that the death of the author is true, or whether or not this is good for art, or good for critical interpretation etc.? For instance, it is probably true that art is sometimes influenced by personal background, but other times it isn’t and could be distinct. This isn’t a debate about that - this is a debate about how this may lead to a better understanding of an art piece, as opposed to being dismissive, or leads to a better production of art etc.   Argument 1   * Does internalised misogyny or racism not exist? Lots of people of colour disagree with BLM, or think it’s too extreme, or that all lives matter - this is a sweeping generalisation!   + We’re too tied into proving that extreme traits in personalities strongly influence our pieces of art; why can’t people move away from these traits or beliefs, or even rebel against it and so forth? * Go beyond using examples to show how a personal belief can lead to a certain piece of art; even if this is true, what is the implication of this? Why is this bad or good or so forth? See the POI Marvis asks you here! * The implication might be that knowing this background is crucial guidance for understanding art; without considering intent, we risk fundamental misreadings that distort the work's purpose.   + For example, Animal Farm becomes more powerful if you understand Orwell’s specific critique of Stalinist communism rather than treating it as a generic fable about power.   + In Heart of Darkness by Conrad, without understanding his anti-imperialist intent based on his Congo experiences, a reader might interpret it as endorsing colonial racism rather than critiquing it. * We don’t have to BUY into this, and believe this is the only interpretation, but in order to understand the originalist version of it, ‘death of the author’ cannot exist. * What is the value of this standard?   + We could still privilege some art over others, or would this metric be worse, i.e. which artist is morally correct and on the right side of history versus not?   07:09  We need to ask ourselves what the specific + strategic burden of the round should be! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Marvis Leung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house opposes the “death of the author” principle |
| --- |

| 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:  Fair opening!  Set-up   * Explain that it is probably true that artistic background influences the nature of art, but hanging onto this as the most valuable interpretation is wrong; this is the most strategic burden to take. * Explain what the purpose of literature or art is here, linking it to the framing for your side - which is that when reader centered interpretation allows us to have a richer + deeper literary and artistic engagement.   Rebuttal   * Excellent first call out; link it to the burden you have in your round, as per the first comment in set-up.   Framing? World-building? What is this?   * Explain why or how this principle ends up consuming people - and what kind of art we lose out on this capacity; the point is that moral correctness cannot exist.   + We need to tie this into the culture war + politically correctness to up the impact of this framing. Talk about disengaging with Harry Potter, or Kanye West as a consequence. Then highlight why they could be meaningful + valuable regardless.   + If we cancel Jane Austen because she accepted in her society women had to get married etc. does it mean we can’t appreciate the more sophisticated commentary on gender?   Argument 1   * What is the thesis? We’re losing out on the clarity of the argument. * We need to highlight HOW consumers can interpret art on their own terms, using their own experiences, contexts, and insights; explain how it actually helps the very people who might be ‘at harm’ per the other side.   + When readers from oppressed groups find liberatory meanings in canonical texts, they gain literary ownership and validation, rather than being excluded by authorial intent that may reflect privileged perspectives. For instance, through fanfiction, or fanwork etc. * On engagement - good; explain why cancel culture etc. means that engagement doesn’t happen in their world - you’re assuming this is obvious. Then link to the point we talked about in class with reference to discourse and engagement; where do we actually engage with JK Rowling’s takes? * You can also just argue that a multiplicity of interpretations is just better.   The structure of this speech is ALL over the place!  07:05 - good POI to Kevin! | | | | | | |