| **Student Name:** Ryan Qian |
| --- |

| **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:  Good opening; this would have a higher impact if you were able to illustrate this instead; give me an example of how there is fundamental linkage; that is to say George Orwell/other examples we discuss in class.  Set-up   * I appreciate the strategic decision to introduce moral relativism, but the actual explanation is too contrived and isn’t making this point clear; spell out how morality changes, how what was seen as normal/even liberal in Victorian England is now incredibly morally harmful/bad; for instance, takes on colonialism. * This is a principle in terms of how we should interpret and engage with literature; the burden of the debate must be connected to this. 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. * We have to characterise the ways in which death of the author works/doesn’t - is it the only and exclusive means of viewing a piece of art, or is it just one critical perspective among many others? * What is the metric in this debate? On what basis do we oppose this?   Argument 1   * You have to spell out the outcome up top; saying ‘historical context matters’ is insufficient as insight into the argument for the judge. * On these changes + radical moments in art, why could we never come to this realisation or discovery without the author principle being deployed? The exclusivity analysis is asserted, rather than being justified; you have to start by establishing how interpretation occurs - what we prioritise, what gets obscured? * Establish, beyond this example, that art loses essential layers of meaning when we ignore authorial context. This erasure is particularly harmful because it was often these very contexts that made publishing possible or necessary for marginalized voices in the first place.   Argument 2   * Same comment as above on missing thesis/insight into roadmap applies. * Why does personal belief only manifest positively - for instance, why can’t people move away from these traits or beliefs, or even rebel against it and so forth? Be more flexible/strategic with how you set-up the author principle to work in your world. * Explain why accessibility exists on your side in terms of a clear pathway into the art, as opposed to needing a specific artistic background/feeling overwhelmed.   07:15  Consistent POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Audrey Lai |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  The opening isn’t clear - when you imply that they belittle or impose certain perspectives with the white man comment/belittling phrasing, the actual call-out is getting lost. Be clear, clean and explicit here.  Set-up   * On the death of the author - don’t be so literal! 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. * It is best for you to characterise this debate as occurring within the context of the culture war - which means that art gets ‘cancelled’; don’t just say it exists - frame this far more intensely. * Who are these more questionable people? * 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   * Good on purpose of art; explain that art is a dialogue, as opposed to a one way street. Explain how, using examples, how this dialogue occurs. 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.   + For instance, 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. * What is the harm of art being stuck in the past? How does art evolve on your side? Give me examples - otherwise it is too abstract; don’t name drop authors and books - spend time unpacking the example! For instance, if we chose to not read pre-eminent political philosophers or just philosophers because they lived in a time where slavery or colonialism were justified. * The black man/white woman is a gross reduction of the identity influences interpretation analysis we discussed in class.   Argument 1   * What is the thesis or central claim of this argument? * If you’re talking about merit - commit and make to the argument, rather than just suggesting relevance beyond bigotry exists. Explain how killing the author means that there are more valuable interpretations/gets engaged with - they have to defend how cancel culture often captures a piece of art if evaluated from the author’s point of view. * You have to explain why or how this principle ends up consuming people - and what kind of art we lose out on in 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.   07:23 - consistent POIs please! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sarah Seryoung Choi |
| --- |

| **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: | 70 | | | | | |
| 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:  This opening can be delivered in a fraction of the number of words you are using; if you are calling them out for narrowing, rather than widening the world-view of an individual - explain this, rather than just moving on.  Minimise the signposting!  Framing   * Explain why people are able to engage critically. Here, you are swallowing words again - slow down!   + This is the correct thing to bring back - but you are just reasserting something he asserted, rather than explaining it. Spell out how morality changes, how what was seen as normal/even liberal in Victorian England is now incredibly morally harmful/bad; for instance, takes on colonialism. * This is a principle in terms of how we should interpret and engage with literature; the burden of the debate must be connected to this. 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.   Rebuttal   * Are we saying lived experiences are a bad thing? Or is it that this bias leads to worse interpretations? How do we measure interpretations - and their positive/negative impact? * Good on Orwell - this is an educational impact; explain why this is valuable. * The exclusivity analysis is asserted, rather than being justified; you have to start by establishing how interpretation occurs - what we prioritise, what gets obscured? * Why would their beliefs be challenged on your side? We aren’t actually explaining this!   POI: illustrate this - this is too generalised/abstract a claim; what values are different? What diversity are you talking about?  Argument 1   * Good work highlighting what relativism is and how it works; why would we dismiss it - why is this how actors behave? * You need to explain how the death of the author ALLOWS us to move past cancel culture because we can position the text contextually, rather than just speeding past the mechanism.   + In Heart of Darkness by Joseph 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.   07:07 - we’re slower and clearer towards the end, good! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Adrian Wong |
| --- |

| **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: | 71.5 (-0.5 for 30 sec arg) | | | | | |
| 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:  Clear opening.  It is best for you to characterise this debate as occurring within the context of the culture war - which means that art gets ‘cancelled’; Audrey just says it exists - frame this far more intensely. You have to explain why or how this principle ends up consuming people - and what kind of art we lose out on in 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.  On engagement: Good work spelling out what the purpose of art is; explain this in terms of how they don’t get this; that is to say full understanding isn’t possible ever. Explain that history/context and authorial intent are too different things; or that this is about a range of perspectives existing, rather than just one predominant one. Explain the implication of this - what does it mean for their path to victory?  2nd Speaker Rebuttal: Call out the lack of mech first; there isn’t any explanation. Good work quoting them. Good on likelihood of engagement; explain how on net engagement is more likely on your side.  Rebuttal   * Good on call out on what they drop; explain why this argument was important such that if they dropped it, they deserve to lose. * Don’t do the quick maths; explain why you get fuller - they narrow it to one specific way of looking at it. Explain that art is a dialogue, as opposed to a one way street. Explain how, using examples, how this dialogue occurs. 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.   + For instance, 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. * Nuance - good; give me examples!   POI: Is the average person more or less likely to engage in art/literature class if its author principle or death of the author? Ground the debate further.  Argument - poor time management!   * Fair claim on more rounded interpretation/merit. * Why is critical engagement always possible? Why don’t people fall into supporting the artist, or slippery slope on monetary support? This is very convenient.   07:15  Please sound more alive when speaking! | | | | | | |