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

| **Motion:** This House prefers international climate agreements with fewer parties but strong, binding enforcement over agreements with universal participation but weak or non-existent enforcement |
| --- |

| 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 | | | | | |
| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are minutes’ long.]  On the set-up:   * The context of existential global crisis is not necessarily useful for Prop unless we prove that the wider scale of buy-in translates towards collective global action. * Before the mech, explain first that this debate is about comparing Paris versus Kyoto!   + On the enforcement mechanism, we should be utilising both the carrot and stick approach; with a greater focus on capacity-building to enable signatories to meet their obligations.   + Well done referencing that the wider buy-in builds a new global order, but we can put this in the argument instead, since it’s not really a mech.     - It’s unclear as well how soft power is a mech, what will they be doing to non-compliant nations? * We also need to clarify the scale of obligations imposed here, is it not weaker obligations in comparison to Kyoto?   On the first argument:   * All of the analysis on the weakness of enforcement mechanisms equally applies to you!   + If the strategic goal is just to decimate Opp’s winning pathway and call enforcement a wash, we should keep it at the very bottom of the cash.   + Otherwise, we sound defensive without ever defending why Paris is better, and we just undermined the urgent context we set above, since you’re proving that both sides will fail at achieving any real change. * We can flip it towards positive incentives outlined in Paris to actually help countries to meet their obligations.   + When we explained the failures of punitive measures, reference the inability of the US and Canada to convince their local parliaments to ratify these treaties.   I can only buy the impact on the harms to the environment if you’re winning anything positive on the scale, at this point, it sounds like a wash for both sides.   * When we analysed having more accountability mechanisms on your side, it isn’t clear why all of the criticisms above do not apply to your version of a treaty!   Good job characterising things like Clean Development Mechanism, can we then explain why Opposition cannot have it? They also have enforcement mechs, so focus on the scaling difference.  Don’t say “I remember I read this somewhere,” quote evidence with confidence!   * Good conclusion that on a scale, more environmental efforts will be done if we have them on board and doing things gradually vs the rejection of withdrawing completely from these agreements.   It isn’t clear when we transitioned to the 2nd argument, it sounded like one large argument.  Slow down! You’re too fast to track completely.  8.13 | | | | | | |