| **Student Name:** Stephanie Kwok |
| --- |

| **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 8 minutes’ long.]  Good job linking the hook to the final motion, you might be better off making a strategic observation on the false comparative Prop has created that no enforcement is tantamount to zero climate actions.  Good job establishing the legitimacy of the Paris Agreement. You might as well cover criticism of the Kyoto Protocol to make your side stronger here. Example: major countries (including US) are not always likely to follow through, as well as it does not extend environment friendly policies beyond developed countries. Furthermore, as much as its true that a few are major polluters, other countries will be too in the future as they grow economically. For a much better preparation, its important to extend responsibility across everyone. Also, when you have global agreement, you have global discourse. Its not the best approach to allow the biggest polluters to keep one another accountable, that simply cannot have the best result.  Steph, counter set-up first before rebuttals!!   * 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. * We also need to clarify the scale of obligations imposed here, is Paris not requesting weaker obligations in comparison to Kyoto? What are the likely actions taken by these countries under Paris? * What is your burden/winning pathway?   Good rebuttal that the states can still face public scrutiny and accountability under the Paris Agreement, but if the entire premise of the argument is that these obligations are not binding, why will this political pressure be effective? They are not technically violating anything.  When you say it doesn’t punish countries for falling short, it is necessary you explain why that is a good thing. This is not a point that is intuitively favored towards your side.  While it is understandable that the risk of withdrawal is much less on your side, you need to take this idea a step forward and argue how you are still likely to get good results.  The analysis that countries are facing economic struggles is helping Proposition prove their point that your level of buy-in is tokenistic and not meaningful enough to contribute towards climate solvency!   * So rather than going deeply into the developing nations having the right to pollute, we should use this analysis to show why the Kyoto Protocol will STILL collapse under binding mechanisms.   + The buy-in is subject to volatile political climates, and it regresses over time when countries are in a bad economic state.   Steph, the speech structure is all over the place! We need clear placements for rebuttals, set-up and arguments!  Please offer more POIs today!  6.09 | | | | | | |