

# ENVS 144/POLI 179

Week 8 // Thurs November 16

1. Announcements
2. Looking ahead
3. Ethics Bowl instructions
4. Discussion // work



# Looking forward

## WEEK 9 \*no section\*

- Quizzes #9.1-9.3 due Wed 11/22
- Section: N/A
- Additional office hours: Tues 11/21 10-11am

## WEEK 10

- 2-page Ethics Bowl briefing note due Thurs 11/30
- Quiz #10.1 due Thurs 11/30
- Climate in the News #3 due Thurs 11/30
- Section (11/30): Ethics Bowl

## WEEK 11

- Final Exam available Fri 12/1
- Ethics Bowl Self and Group Assessment due Tues 12/5
- Quizzes #11.1 – 11.2 due Thurs 12/7
- Climate in the News #4 due Thurs 12/7
- Section (12/7): Discussion, course evals, Final Exam group discussions


***Take home final exam due to Canvas by Fri 12/8 at 11:59pm.***

# Looking forward

## WEEK 9 \*no section\*

- Quizzes #9.1-9.3 due **Tues 11/21**
- Section: N/A
- Additional office hours: **Tues 11/21 10-11am**

suggestion: do both posts before break!



## WEEK 10

- 2-page Ethics Bowl briefing note due **Thurs 11/30**
- Quiz #10.1 due **Thurs 11/30**
- **Climate in the News #3 due Thurs 11/30**
- Section (11/30): Ethics Bowl

## WEEK 11

- Final Exam available **Fri 12/1**
- Ethics Bowl Self and Group Assessment due **Tues 12/5**
- Quizzes #11.1 – 11.2 due **Thurs 12/7**
- **Climate in the News #4 due Thurs 12/7**
- Section (12/7): Discussion, course evals, Final Exam group discussions

***Take home final exam due to Canvas by Fri 12/8 at 11:59pm.***

# Climate in the News alternative

## Post:

1. Clearly state **which UNFCCC country + section (1 or 2)** presentation(s) you are discussing.
2. Explain **1-2 recommendations/arguments** you personally agree/disagree with or found interesting.
3. Reflect on **1-2 recommendations/arguments from your own group's Forward Strategy** that are relevant for our discussion and/or that you personally agree/disagree with.

**Reply:** Note something you agree/disagree with or something you learned from someone else's UNFCCC Forward Strategy reflection OR post a standard response to someone's news comment. 1-3 sentences is sufficient.

# ETHICS BOWL THURS 11/30

Should **solar geoengineering** be considered as a **possible climate change response measure**? If so, under **what conditions**? If not, **what should be the alternative**?

**Briefing Paper:** *(2-pages, single-spaced, individual assignment)*

- 2-4 arguments **for** pursuing solar geoengineering
- 2-4 arguments **for not** pursuing solar geoengineering

**Groups:** *(randomly assigned\* on Ethics Bowl day)*

**Team A** *(7-8 students)*: opening argument, Q&A from judges

**Team B** *(7-8 students)*: response argument, Q&A from judges

**Judges** *(7-8 students)*: Q&A, scoring

\*sort of

# ETHICS BOWL THURS 11/30

1. **Breakout Team A** has 3 mins to convene, agree on 3-4 talking points/arguments, and designate 1-2 spokespersons.
2. **Team A** has 5 mins to present to Judges.
3. **Breakout Team B** has 3 mins to convene, construct response to Team A, and designate 1-2 spokespersons.
4. **Team B** has 3 mins to present response to Judges. May agree or disagree with Team A.
5. **Breakout Judges** have 3 mins to confer on questions to ask each team (each team asked ~same # questions).
6. **Judge** asks question (each judge asks at least 1 question).
7. **Breakout Team A/B** has 30 seconds to confer per question.
8. **Team A/B** has 1 min to respond per question.
9. **Breakout Judges** have 5-10 mins to finalize scoring sheets.
10. **Judges** announce winner + explain rationale.

# ETHICS BOWL THURS 11/30

## Judges scoring Teams: \*group points\*

1. Was the Team's presentation clear and systematic? *(0-5 points)*
2. Did the Team clearly identify and discuss the core ethical issues associated with solar geoengineering? *(0-5 points)*
3. Did the Team's presentation reflect thoughtful consideration of different viewpoints, including those that would be important in the reasoning of those who disagree with the Team's argument? *(0-5 points)*
4. Did the Team thoughtfully and convincingly answer the Judges questions using materials that were assigned in preparing for the ethics bowl? *(0-5 points)*
5. Did the Team model respectful dialogue throughout the ethics bowl? *(0-5 points)*

# ETHICS BOWL THURS 11/30

## Teams scoring Judges: \*group points\*

1. Were the judges' questions based on a good understanding of the relevant issues? *(0-5 points)*
2. Were the judges' questions fair to both Teams? *(0-5 points)*
3. Were the judges' comments helpful in moving the discussion forward? *(0-5 points)*
4. Did all judges ask a question and appear engaged in the assignment? *(0-5 points)*
5. Did the judges model respectful dialogue throughout the ethics bowl? *(0-5 points)*



# FINAL EXAM FRIDAY 12/1-12/8

1. 5x short answer questions (~1/3 page per response)
2. Cites at least 8 course readings, including all 5 challenge readings (released week of Final Exam)
3. Last section: small group discussion of questions

1. What are the potential **benefits and risks** of using solar geoengineering as a solution to climate change?
2. **Who should have a voice** in making those decisions?
3. What types of **governance mechanisms** should be developed for solar geoengineering research?