



National Debate Competition on Climate Change Competition Guidelines

Background

Climate change is a major threat to Bhutan's environment and its people. The country is already experiencing the effects of climate change, such as more extreme weather events, rising temperatures, and melting glaciers. These effects are having a negative impact on agriculture, water resources, and biodiversity.

The JSW Law School and the College of Natural Resources are committed to raising awareness on climate change and its impacts in Bhutan. National debate on this important issue is essential to inform the public and to develop solutions, particularly our youths.

JSW School of Law and College of Natural Resources is pleased to announce our joint collaboration in organising a national debate.

Objectives

Objectives of the national debate are to:

- Raise awareness of climate change and its impacts in Bhutan
- Promote dialogue and discussion on climate change
- Inspire action to address climate change
- Enhance the confidence, research, analytical and communication skills

Expected Outcomes

The expected outcomes of the national debate are:

- Increased public understanding of climate change
- Students aware of climate change issues
- Students enabled to speak articulately on climate change
- Enhanced debating and public speaking skills

Eligibility

All colleges within Bhutan are eligible to send a team selected by the respective colleges. There is no particular selection criteria from the hosts' side for selection of the team by colleges.

Debate Topic or Resolution

The Inaugural National Debate will be on the resolution (According to protocol of **Public Forum Debate**):

“Resolved: Carbon neutrality pledge impedes Bhutan’s economic development.”

Format of the Debate

The format of the debate shall be a “Public Forum Debate.” Each team will have three (3) members (two speakers and one researcher from each team). The team will focus on affirming or negating specific wording of the debate topic through use of logic, reasoning, and research. This form of debate will force students to encompass their research and arguments into concise speeches, focusing on most important arguments that address the resolution. In addition, there are three questioning/discussion periods known as Crossfires. These periods are unique because they serve as opportunities for both teams to engage in conversation and provide time for clarification.

This form of debate will require the highest degree of research. Following are some of the important Research Tips:

- a) First look at the key words of the resolution, try to learn the basic behind the general topic, this will allow more focussed research;
- b) Now that you know the background, try to figure out what the thesis of the resolution is. Knowing what the resolution’s truth is will help you direct your argument research and construction;
- c) Devise a list of arguments that would support the side of the resolution you are researching. Remember that when doing research, a change in a single word to a similar word can drastically alter results; and
- d) Write down complete source/citations. Even if you don’t think you will quote the article in round, you want to compile your list of sources in case you want to go back and verify something you read. Plus, if you choose to bring up something from that article, now you can include the citation, which both prevents plagiarism and increases your credibility.

Following are stages of debate and times allocated to each stage:

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------|
| a) Pro Case | 4 minutes |
| b) Con Case | 4 minutes |
| c) Crossfire | 3 minutes |
| d) Pro Refutation | 4 minutes |
| e) Con Refutation | 4 minutes |
| f) Crossfire | 3 minutes |
| g) Pro Summary | 2 minutes |
| h) Con Summary | 2 minutes |
| i) Grand Crossfire | 3 minutes |
| j) Pro Final Focus | 2 minutes |
| k) Con Final Focus | 2 minutes |

- a) In the first two speeches, the first speakers for each team present their cases. They will present their version of facts and issues. Define the problems and present suggesting resolutions.
- b) In the first cross-fire, the first two speakers shall use this time to clarify arguments made in case, request additional support or facts, and set up arguments for the second speakers from their team.
- c) In Pro Refutation Round, the second speaker for Pro should spend four minutes articulating why the Con case is wrong and why their Pro case is correct. This can be best done by reviewing the Con case piece by piece and articulating arguments and citing supporting evidence against the Con case.
- d) In Con Refutation Round, the second speaker from the Con team will be given four minutes to defend their case and punch holes in the Pro case.
- e) In the second Cross-Fire Round, the second speakers from each team uses this time to further their argument and to reveal the drawbacks in the opponent's arguments. This round may be used to ensure the strength of your arguments while articulating flaws in your opponent's case.
- f) In the Summary Speeches Round, the first speakers from each side will summarise what has happened in the debate. The arguments shall be narrowed down to the key issues, and the teams should begin to weigh their arguments against their opponents if they haven't already begun this process in earlier speeches.
- g) In the Grand Cross-Fire Round, all the four speakers shall take active part. This three minutes time is provided to clarify questions and set the stage for the final speeches.
- h) In the Final Focus Round, the second speakers will present a final plea or concluding remarks. No new arguments can be made at this point, and time should be spent summing up the points.

Following are some of the important tips for Crossfire Round:

- a. Prepare strategies ahead of time. What do you want your opponent to admit in the crossfire period?
- b. Have a couple of questions ready before the round so you don't have awkward silences or leave opportunities for the opponent to control the crossfire period.
- c. It is important to ensure your opponents get opportunities to speak and ask questions. You may make necessary interruptions, but make sure that interruptions made are civil and minimal.

Following will be judging criteria for the participant:

Score	Criteria	Explanation
< 20	Unethical/Inappropriate Behaviour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor manner disposition • Poor time management
20-23	Below Average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor delivery presentation skills • Poor subject knowledge • Poor analytical skills • Poor quality of research

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor use of evidence
24-26	Average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory delivery presentation skills • Satisfactory subject knowledge • Satisfactory analytical skills • Satisfactory quality of research • Satisfactory use of evidence
27-28	Above Average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good delivery presentation skills • Good subject knowledge • Good analytical skills • Good quality of research • Good use of evidence
29-30	Outstanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent delivery presentation skills • Excellent subject knowledge • Excellent analytical skills • Excellent quality of research • Excellent use of evidence

Sum of total points obtained by members of the team shall be final team points. The highest point scorer will be declared as the winning team, and the member who scores highest points will be declared as the best orator of the competition.

Judges Selection and Protocol

Preliminary Rounds: Accompanying faculty member from each institution will judge the preliminary rounds. Each participating institution will nominate one faculty to accompany their team. However, the hosts will make sure that we avoid any conflict of interest (examples: CNR will not be allowed to judge competitions involving CNR team, or and JSW Law team).

Semi-Final and Final Rounds: Semi-Final and Final Rounds will be judged by professionals (who has expertise in the topic of the debate) from relevant organisations outside colleges.

Prizes:

The Wining team will receive the cash prize of Nu.50,000. Runners up team will receive the cash prize of Nu.35,000. From the final round debaters, one participant will be declared the Best Orator of the Competition.

Resources for Reference:

- Introduction to Public Forum Debate: [Introduction To Public Forum Debate](#);
- Sample debate: [NSDA Nationals 2018 - Public Forum Debate Final Round](#);
- Reading on PFD: [Public-Forum-and-Congressional-Debate-Textbook.pdf](#);
- Other information: [National Speech & Debate Association \(speechanddebate.org\)](#).