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Course description

This course is designed to study how environmental issues are interconnected with politics, power relationship, and globalisation. Through examining main global environmental challenges that the international community (including Hong Kong and China) is facing (e.g. climate change, biodiversity loss, deforestation, depletion of natural resources etc.), the course intends to help students develop theoretical visions and practical insights to understand the prominent global environmental issues, and to apply conceptual tools to explain current situation.

Aims

In this course, students will examine environmental issues armed with a range of key concepts in the course: which political actors are reacting to what, how power is distributed in environmental issues, and how environmental issues / policies at both national and international levels are affecting our lives.

Learning outcomes (LO)

At the end of this course, students will be able to:

Upon completion of this course, students are expected to:

1. learn to cultivate critical perspectives from which to make their own judgments about the possibilities and limits inherent in different kinds of ecological thought;
2. to demonstrate a capacity to employ theories in the critical analysis of concrete instances of environmental politics, and to examine how the political actors, institutions, and forces are influencing the natural environment.

**Indicative contents**

- Introduction to environmental politics and global environmental governance
- Multi-level actors in the environmental arena
- International environmental laws (treaties and conventions) and policy-making process
- Political analysis on major global environmental issues including climate change, biodiversity, marine environment, hazardous waste, and toxic chemicals
- Sector-specific issues related to sustainable development at a global level such as agriculture, energy, fishery, and trade

**Teaching and learning methods**

*Format:*

Each session (*3-hours per week*) will be divided into three parts:

- **Lecture:** Reading and learning materials together with a lecture outline will be uploaded on the Moodle before each class. Lecture slides will be uploaded after the class.
- **Student-centered interactive activities (30 mins)** (e.g. team exercise, discussions, short briefing on case studies, quizzes, debates) to ensure that students achieve the learning outcomes and acquire intellectual skills (analytical and research methods, critical thinking, and oral and written communication skills).
- **Tutorial class for students’ presentation followed by discussions (50 mins.):** Detailed topics and schedule for tutorial classes will be decided between 2nd-3rd week of the term. Students are expected to submit an outline of presentation per group by 18 September via email (jeongwonpark@LN.edu.hk).

**Main textbook (required reading)**


Table of contents: [https://westviewpress.com/books/global-environmental-politics/](https://westviewpress.com/books/global-environmental-politics/)


**Lecture schedule and readings:**

I. **Theories and approaches**

- **4/Sep: Introduction**

  *Please note that there will be no tutorial for the 1st week.*
11/Sep: International regimes, governance and paradigms in global environmental politics

Required reading:
- Ch. 1 ‘The Emergence of Global Environmental Politics’ and Ch.5 ‘Effective Environmental Regimes: Obstacles and Opportunities’ in Pamela S. Chasek, David Leonard Downie, and Janet Welsh Brown (2017) 7th ed. Global Environmental Politics (Boulder, CO: Westview Press)

Recommended reading:

Tutorial: orientation and topic discussion

18/Sep: Understanding main actors and interests forming a global governance

Required reading:

Recommended reading:
- Ch.3 ‘Who’s behind the green waves?’ in Daniel C. Esty (2006) Green to Gold: How Smart Companies Use Environmental Strategy to Innovate, Create Value, and Build Competitive Advantage (New Heaven: Yale University Press)

Tutorial will be replaced with individual/group consultation on presentation.

II. Global environmental issues and political analysis

25/Sep: Biodiversity (1): overview and discussions on related issues (eg. deforestation, land management, hazardous chemicals, waste)

Required reading:

Recommended reading:

Tutorial schedule: Presentation of Group 1
• 9/Oct: Biodiversity (2): case analysis
Required reading:
Recommended reading:

Tutorial schedule: Presentation of Group 2

• 16/Oct: mid-term written test

• 23/Oct: Issues on water and ocean environment (1) (overview and related issues e.g. water, fishery, and conflicts over resources)
Required reading:
Recommended reading:

Tutorial schedule: Presentation of Group 3

• 30/Oct: Issues on water and ocean environment (2) case analysis
Required reading:
Recommended reading:

Tutorial schedule: Presentation of Group 4

• 6/Nov: Climate change (1) (overview and related issues e.g. energy, air pollution)
Required reading:
  Recommended reading:

Tutorial schedule: Presentation of Group 5

- 13/Nov: Climate change (2) case analysis
  Required reading:
  Recommended reading:

Tutorial schedule: Presentation of Group 6

- 20/Nov: Sustainable development as a global agenda
  Required reading:
  Recommended reading:

Tutorial schedule: Presentation of Group 7

- 27/Nov: final written test

Sources of course materials:
Handouts and/or PowerPoint based on textbook, academic journal articles, and recommended readings
Quantitative data update (statistical information)
Newspaper articles
Documentary films and other audio-visual resources
Official documents produced by national governments and inter-governmental bodies
Legal documents (international environmental conventions and treaties)
Other relevant sources (speeches, public lectures etc.)

References


Assessment

The Continuous Assessment (100%) comprising the following:

Short essays and research briefs: 15%
Tutorial presentation and comments: 25%
Two in-class written tests: 50%
Participation in classroom discussion: 10%
Attendance requirement

The updated university’s regulations governing undergraduate studies are available at the Registry’s website <http://www.ln.edu.hk/reg/ug4yr.php>. Please find the relevant information on p.12, under "Class Attendance and Leave of Absence". Students who fail to meet the attendance requirement are not eligible for taking the final written test of the course.

Important Notes:

(1) Students are expected to spend a total of 6-7 hours (i.e. 3 hours of class contact and 3-4 hours of personal study) per week to achieve the course learning outcomes.
(2) Students shall be aware of the University regulations about dishonest practice in course work, tests and examinations, and the possible consequences as stipulated in the Regulations Governing University Examinations. In particular, plagiarism, being a kind of dishonest practice, is “the presentation of another person’s work without proper acknowledgement of the source, including exact phrases, or summarised ideas, or even footnotes/citations, whether protected by copyright or not, as the student’s own work”. Students are required to strictly follow university regulations governing academic integrity and honesty.
(3) Students are required to submit writing assignment(s) using Turnitin.
(4) To enhance students’ understanding of plagiarism, a mini-course “Online Tutorial on Plagiarism Awareness” is available on https://pla.ln.edu.hk/.

☞ Plagiarism warning:

Plagiarism is considered as a form of dishonest practice in course work, in other words, a case of cheating. As stipulated in the Regulations Governing University Examinations, "A student considered to have cheated in course work should be given a zero mark for that particular piece of work...The case may be brought to the Student Disciplinary Committee if the Programme Director/Head of Academic Unit concerned deems it necessary to do so.” The University has a clear guideline on plagiarism under Academic Integrity. For more information: http://www.ln.edu.hk/info-for/students/orientation/academic-integrity
Grading Rubric for Presentation: (25 marks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Outstanding (25-22)</th>
<th>Acceptable (21-17)</th>
<th>Need Improvement (below 16)</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual understanding of subject matters</td>
<td>- Cover a good range of relevant concepts/theories</td>
<td>- Concepts/theories and important ideas pertinent to the topic are accurately used</td>
<td>- Concepts/theories and important ideas pertinent to the topic are not accurately used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including main issues</td>
<td>- Important ideas pertinent to the topic are skillfully applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation of main questions and clear analysis of the issues</td>
<td>- Thoroughly interpret and evaluate the information</td>
<td>- Information with some interpretation</td>
<td>- List information without interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Comprehensively analyze and synthesize the issues from multiple perspectives</td>
<td>- Basic analysis or synthesis from two perspectives</td>
<td>- Superficially analyze or synthesize the issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of sources and evidence</td>
<td>- Empirical evidence or information (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) is highly relevant</td>
<td>- Empirical evidence or information (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) is generally relevant</td>
<td>- Some information is inaccurate or unverifiable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some information is included is not relevant and inadequate to support the topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to questions and leading discussions</td>
<td>- Responds appropriately to all questions, with answers that demonstrate some knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>- Responds appropriately to the questions, with answers that demonstrate some knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>- Unable to respond the spot questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions &amp; Flow</td>
<td>- The presentation produces coherent understanding</td>
<td>- Fair coherent understanding is demonstrated</td>
<td>- Coherent understanding by the listener is not obtained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Well-structured and different parts are well-integrated in a coherent manner</td>
<td>- Some degree of structure and efforts of integration</td>
<td>- Lack of integration of each part of presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses good body language, eye contact,</td>
<td>- Makes good eye contact with audience</td>
<td>- Makes fairly good eye contact with audience</td>
<td>- Make little or no eye contact with audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate voice tone</td>
<td>- Shows enthusiasm and confidence</td>
<td>- Shows some enthusiasm and confidence</td>
<td>- Shows little or no enthusiasm and confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Uses voice tone effectively</td>
<td>- Uses voice tone relatively effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate time allocation and pace</td>
<td>- Allocated time appropriately and managed time effectively</td>
<td>- Marginally long or marginally short but uses time reasonably effectively</td>
<td>- Significantly too short or too long and did not use time effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Appropriate pace</td>
<td>- Reasonable pace</td>
<td>- Pace is significantly too fast or too slow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes effective use of presentation tools</td>
<td>- Proper use of presentation tools with little or no distractions (e.g. appropriate animation/pictures, appropriate information on one slide, clear titles, etc.)</td>
<td>- Generally good use of presentation tools.</td>
<td>- Poor use of presentation tools and/or many distractions (e.g. too much animation/pictures, too much information on one slide, absence of titles, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(slides and/or handouts)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Some distractions but they are not overwhelming (e.g. reasonable animation/pictures, fair information on one slide, fair titles, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Comments:
## Grading rubric for comments/participation in discussion (10 marks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Outstanding (10-7)</th>
<th>Acceptable (6-3)</th>
<th>Need Improvement (below 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides relevant comments</td>
<td>• Comments are specific, relevant, thoughtful, reflective and original, provokes other questions or comments</td>
<td>• Most comments are appropriate and reflect some thoughtfulness</td>
<td>• Comments are superficial, off topic or simply restate questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides meaningful feedback on information or research with application of theories/concepts</td>
<td>• Comments are based on solid knowledge on theories/concepts Comments include specific suggestions for additional information or resources for consideration</td>
<td>• Comments indicate correct analysis of the information or research with some attempts on relating theories/concepts</td>
<td>• No comments is provided on information or research’s accuracy, relevance and completeness Analysis on the information or research is incorrect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides meaningful feedback on the logic, assumptions, and recommendation s the presenters has drawn</td>
<td>• Comments include specific suggestions for improving or resolving problems with logic or assumptions and help to restate recommendations that are better supported by the evidence</td>
<td>• Comments illustrate useful analysis of logic and assumptions and identify potential problems</td>
<td>• No comments or comments provided are not logical or incorrectly state assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides comments in a positive, encouraging, and constructive manner</td>
<td>• Comments praise specific strengths of the presentation as well as constructively address weaknesses with alternatives that might be considered</td>
<td>• Comments include positive feedback and suggestions</td>
<td>• Comments might be interpreted as insulting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Grading rubric for research briefs and short essays (15 marks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>Excellent (15-13)</th>
<th>Good (12-10)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (9-7)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (below 7)</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Question</strong></td>
<td>__ points</td>
<td>__ points</td>
<td>__ point</td>
<td>__ points</td>
<td>__/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote clear, creative and interesting questions which fit the topic.</td>
<td>Wrote clear questions which fit the topic.</td>
<td>Wrote some questions which did not fit the topic.</td>
<td>Wrote mostly irrelevant questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argument</strong></td>
<td>__ points</td>
<td>__ points</td>
<td>__ point</td>
<td>__ points</td>
<td>__/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments both well supported and compared to conflicting explanations</td>
<td>Main arguments valid, systematic, and well supported</td>
<td>Some arguments valid and well supported</td>
<td>Weak, invalid, or no argument, a simple assertion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Data or Evidence</strong></td>
<td>__ points</td>
<td>__ points</td>
<td>__ point</td>
<td>__ points</td>
<td>__/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully exploits the richness of the data/evidence/ideas, and is sufficiently persuasive</td>
<td>Feasible evidence, appropriately selected and not over-interpreted</td>
<td>Some appropriate use of evidence but uneven</td>
<td>Draws on little or no evidence, mostly relies on assertions or opinions, or evidence not clearly presented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization and Writing</strong></td>
<td>__ points</td>
<td>__ points</td>
<td>__ point</td>
<td>__ points</td>
<td>__/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure enhances the argument, strong sections and logical flow. Clear writing</td>
<td>Structure supports the argument, clearly ordered sections fit together well. Some minor English errors.</td>
<td>Bad structure (inconsistent, redundant, or disconnected). Frequent English errors.</td>
<td>Needs significant re-organization. Too many grammatical errors Low readability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POINTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>__/X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Grading rubric for written tests (50 marks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>Excellent (41-50)</th>
<th>Good (31-40)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (20-30)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (below 20)</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concepts and conceptualization</strong></td>
<td>_ points</td>
<td>_ points</td>
<td>_ point</td>
<td>_ points</td>
<td>___/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered directly relevant concepts and conceptualization which fit the topic.</td>
<td>Used some definitions and concepts that fit the topic.</td>
<td>Included definitions and concepts that do not fit the topic</td>
<td>Used no concepts and showed little effort of conceptualization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argument</strong></td>
<td>_ points</td>
<td>_ points</td>
<td>_ point</td>
<td>_ points</td>
<td>___/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments both well supported and compared to conflicting explanations</td>
<td>Main arguments valid, systematic, and well supported</td>
<td>Some arguments valid and well supported</td>
<td>Weak, invalid, or no argument, a simple assertion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Data or Evidence</strong></td>
<td>_ points</td>
<td>_ points</td>
<td>_ point</td>
<td>_ points</td>
<td>___/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully exploits the richness of the data/evidence/ideas, and is sufficiently persuasive</td>
<td>Feasible evidence, appropriately selected and not over-interpreted</td>
<td>Some appropriate use of evidence but uneven</td>
<td>Draws on little or no evidence, mostly relies on assertions or opinions, or evidence not clearly presented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization and Writing</strong></td>
<td>_ points</td>
<td>_ points</td>
<td>_ point</td>
<td>_ points</td>
<td>___/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure enhances the argument, strong sections and logical flow. Clear writing</td>
<td>Structure supports the argument, clearly ordered sections fit together well. Some minor English errors.</td>
<td>Bad structure (inconsistent, redundant, or disconnected). Frequent English errors.</td>
<td>Needs significant re-organization. Too many grammatical errors Low readability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL POINTS** /X