| **Student Name:** Kevin Hu |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  I think there is a simpler, more urgent characterisation that uses the exact problem you’ve identified - we have to work on our phrasing! You can say: real progress on climate change requires tangible action, and tangible action now. You can only achieve this on our side.  Set-up - we took far too long to get through this! We have to be more efficient!   * Why do they have incentive to join? I buy the dis-incentive that developing countries have; on developed countries, what positive incentive exists outside of the capacity to do so given their stage of development? * ‘The problem will be really big’ - we can do better than this in terms of characterising why climate change is an urgent and pressing problem hence necessitating action.   + More frequent and intense hurricanes, droughts, floods, and wildfires will displace millions, destroy infrastructure, and strain global resources. Rising sea levels will inundate coastal cities and island nations, displacing populations and causing immense economic damage. We discussed this two classes ago! * On feasibility; clear on numbers + capacity. Good observation. * On transparency - you can add in audits, and you eventually do; should have come out earlier!   Argument 1 - at 4:40! So late!   * We’re repeating a fair bit of content from set-up here; we need to get through set-up faster, and focus our analytical depth here. * On developing nations - we outline that developed nations generally have greater financial and technological resources to implement ambitious climate policies and adapt to the impacts of climate change. This is fine, but the focus must be on why these are the countries that need to join, and most need to change their ways.   + While some developing nations are experiencing rapid emissions growth, developed nations still account for a significant portion of current global emissions.   + On why developed nations join - it is that citizens in developed nations are increasingly demanding action on climate change. This creates political pressure on governments to join and comply with strong international agreements. * We have to do the big picture comparison! How does this compare to the Opp’s solution?   07:01 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Clarisse Poon |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Clear opening. If you’re engaging in a call out up top, deal with it and then move on than the fragmentation  Where is signposting?  Responses must be structured. We flagged we’d first respond to characterisation, but then the response gets slightly prolonged and extends beyond just the characterisation.  The clarification on characterisation should be the first part of set-up! Explain this in the context of your own case; this helps you shape the narrative of the debate. The actual response showcases the lack of explanation on their side, and establishes clearly the positive incentive for development to continue even within developed states - you need to explain why they can ignore the rising urgency of climate change/the impacts we can physically and literally see; it’s developing states that are geographically positioned in danger zones.  On the value of universal approaches - explain how there is a free rider problem that this addresses; if only some nations take strong action, others can benefit and put off these harms without making a sacrifice; prolonging buy-in; this in turn disincentives action because you don’t want to be the state that suffers economically. Countries can also engage in carbon leakage - where emissions-intensive industries relocate to countries with weaker regulations. Most importantly, a universal agreement facilitates technology transfer and capacity building - which means states that cannot contribute are able to eventually.  Are we in an argument? Are we in rebuttal? Are we in set-up? What’s happening?  On the norm - explain why there is just enough political will to buy-in to this; and why this norm even matters. Why is this slow, organic change + belief in the value of climate action compatible with the urgency of change that a Proposition could have characterised this debate to be happening in the context of?  What does it mean to solve climate change? You need to establish what the metric is, not just within the context of what I assume is the argument, but in set-up! We engaged in no set-up at all, outside of the characterisation coming after rebuttal.  You are speaking so incredibly fast, that it is hard to track you and give you feedback on all elements of your speech!  07:05  Good POI to Daryl! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Daryl Ng |
| --- |

| **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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  I want a higher impact opening! You need to explain why your side is able to get the states that matter, the states that set the rules of the liberal international order; so this is the way in which we get the ball rolling.   * Developed nations often hold significant influence within international institutions and set the norms and standards for global governance. Their participation in a strong climate agreement with robust enforcement mechanisms can create a ripple effect, encouraging other nations to follow suit. The EU's Emissions Trading System (ETS) has influenced the development of similar carbon pricing mechanisms in other countries.   Who is a climate leader is actually a big contention between the US and China; climate action (prior to Trump) was grounds for competition in terms of hegemony/who is a leader; it helps states gain soft power.  Why are the states you get to buy-in the ones that are necessary for climate action? While some developing nations are experiencing rapid emissions growth, developed nations still account for a significant portion of current global emissions. Give me examples, give me a clear explanation on this.   * The United States and European Union countries have historically been the largest emitters, and their cumulative emissions far outweigh those of most developing nations.   Good on justifying why these are the states that join!  Good reference to domestic awareness and pressure - give me examples of what this looks like! Reference the growing strength of climate advocacy we discussed two weeks ago!  You do need to engage with the POI Clarisse asks, in reference to why this is a movement that is politically powerful and overcomes the short termist incentives voters have.  Argument 1   * We analyse the incentives of these countries, but how is this distinct from our rebuttal, or what Kevin says? Is this a new argument?   Clash? What is the structure of this speech? Why do we suddenly have a clash?   * Don’t argue backlash! Backlash always happens! You have to explain why this backlash is meaningful!   07:15 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Marvis Leung |
| --- |

| **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:  What is this opening? It’s lots of call outs, without any actual responses. Jump to the actual responses/engage with the biggest issue up top.  On who joins?   * Good use of the Kyoto example! Good on the economic race these states are all tied into, and hence how this shapes their willingness; good link to who pollutes. Good trade off that you force onto Prop. Stop and explain what the implication of this is; presumably the states that end up joining, literally don’t matter. THEN, GO ON THE COMPARATIVE. Explain to me how your side deals with this, and meets the incentives of states here. * On domestic pressure: excellent work analysing what this actually looks like, especially with the link to the high standard of living these citizens are used to, and how sacrifices are less likely. Link this to their POI answer; where they say the citizens are okay with it BECAUSE they have high standards of living. Punish them! * Give me examples of these states to highlight the lack of change; they probably engage in climate friendly policies and changes ANYWAYS. We eventually do this with the Netherlands and the US! Good! * You can also ask who can afford to avoid and put off climate action - you need to explain why they can ignore the rising urgency of climate change/the impacts we can physically and literally see; it’s developing states that are geographically positioned in danger zones.   We’re entering repetition territory in terms of economic incentives. On who breaks the regulations and punishments; did they say this would happen?  Positive comparative missing! On the value of universal approaches - explain how there is a free rider problem that this addresses; if only some nations take strong action, others can benefit and put off these harms without making a sacrifice; prolonging buy-in; this in turn disincentives action because you don’t want to be the state that suffers economically. Countries can also engage in carbon leakage - where emissions-intensive industries relocate to countries with weaker regulations. Most importantly, a universal agreement facilitates technology transfer and capacity building - which means states that cannot contribute are able to eventually.  The positive extensions are rushed, barely explained. You also never specify what these extensions are, or why they matter in the round!  What does it mean to solve climate change? You need to establish what the metric is, not just within the context of what I assume is the argument, but in set-up! We engaged in no set-up at all at first, so you need to fill this in!  You are speaking so incredibly fast, that it is hard to track you and give you feedback on all elements of your speech!  07:11 | | | | | | |