| **Student Name:** Charles Wang |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 6 minutes’ long.]  Nice hook but preferring things of substance that actually achieves something, but this is definitely contingent on you actually proving that universal subscription doesn’t actually lead to tangible outcomes.  On the set-up:   * The setup is reasonable. However, when it comes to ‘punishment’ try to add more examples. More examples: countries failing to achieve the goal on specified time will have to do 30 percent more, along-completing previous agreement in a later date (reference: kyoto protocol) * I appreciate that we’re also setting up the comparative that Opp has to defend. * The burden is far too high; it’s a contentious winning pathway since Opp will also argue that the scale of subscription will be more impactful in moving us closer to a global climate solution!   On the first argument:   * When we are characterising the low level of political buy-in in these societies, this may also work against you because in the Kyoto Protocol, these societies ended up not ratifying the agreement which led to its collapse. * I think you’re spending a lot of time talking about how people won’t be able to understand the details (repetitions included). Better to spend much less time there, and utilize the rest to add more nuances/sub-points. * Maybe argue that countries for whom the contract is binding are generally wealthier nations with lesser corruption and more resources to make an impact. Alternatively, you get a collective action problem on the opposition side. Furthermore, it is much easier to keep a few transparent than everyone. * Interesting conclusion that the average voter will think we have done enough and not make tangible changes, but why won’t they then accept the kind of green policy reforms that the state will attempt to pass after signing on to Paris?   + We need to also then analyse why the state won’t go as far as to actually propose meaningful green policies after subscribing to Paris.     - E.g. Green policies are still deeply unpopular due to its economic impact, so the state has no incentive to actually go above and beyond.     - Explain the legal loophole on the executive signing it, but the legislative branch not ratifying it, thus there’s no real legal obligation to meet any of the self-defined obligations.   We’re doing a good job criticising Paris, but without constructing the real benefits of Paris. While Paris is flawed, we need to be more comparative in order to prove our self-defined burden above.   * At the end of the day, it’s a climate crisis debate, so spend time explaining why tangible action is the only one uniquely important towards its solvency.   We should have two arguments as the first speaker!!  Good job offering POIs today!  5.59 - Speak until 6 minutes! | | | | | | |