Course Title	:	Global Environmental Politics
Course Code	:	POL4303
Recommended Study Year	:	3 and 4
No. of Credits/Term	:	3
Mode of Tuition	:	Sectional Approach
Class Contact Hours	:	3 hours per week
Category in Major Prog.	:	Major in Political Science (Elective Course)
Discipline	:	Political Science
Prerequisite(s)	:	N/A
Co-requisite(s)	:	N/A
Exclusion(s)	:	N/A
Exemption Requirement(s)	:	N/A

Brief 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)

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 Content

1. Introduction: What Is "Global Environmental Politics"?

2. Theories of Environmental Politics and Different Environmental Philosophies

3. Power, Actors & Policy Making in Environmental Politics

4. Major Issues in Global Environmental Politics

5. Selected Issues of Environmental Politics in China and Hong Kong

Teaching Method

The lectures of this course are divided into three parts. The first part is related to key thoughts on environmental politics; the second part focuses on the actors, institutions, and policy-making process and policy formulation in environmental policies at national levels. Finally, selected environmental issues (such as air pollution, water pollution, sustainable development, and climate change) in Hong Kong, China, and at the global level are discussed in the third part.

Classroom discussion will be used mainly in both the lectures and tutorials to convey basic concepts and developments of environmental politics. Students are encouraged to seek the linkage between the theories and case studies in the tutorial sessions and give comments on them. Films will be also used in the course.

Measurement of Learning Outcomes

Participation in discussions during classes; presentations; and your term paper. All contribute to learning outcomes 1-2.

Assessment

The Continuous Assessment (100%) comprising the following:

Term paper:	15%
Tutorial presentation:	25%
Two in-class written test(s):	50%
Participation in classroom discussion:	10%

Required/ Essential Readings

Chasek, Pamela S., Downie, David L. and Brown, Janet Welsh (2017). *Global Environmental Politics*, 7th ed., Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Recommended / Supplementary Readings

Bernauer, Thomas and Caduff, Ladina, "In Whose Interest? Pressure Group Politics, Economic Competition and Environmental Regulation," *Journal of Public Policy* 24:1 (January-April 2004): 99-126.

Cater, Neil, *The Politics of the Environment: Ideas, Activism, Policy*, 2nd ed. UK: Cambridge Press, 2007.

Carter, Neil T., and Mol, Arthur P.J., eds. *Environmental governance in China*, London: Routledge, 2007.

Devall, Bill and Sessions, George, *Deep Ecology*, Salt Lake City: Gibbs M. Smith, 1985.

Durant, Robert F., Fiorino, Daniel J., and O'Leary, Rosemary, *Environmental Governance Reconsidered: Challenges, Choices, and Opportunities*, MIT Press, 2004.

Engine, Idling, *Hong Kong's Environmental Policy in a Ten-Year Stall (1997-2007)*, Hong Kong, Civic Exchange, 2007.

Gardiner, Stephen M. et al. (2010). *Climate Ethics: Essential Readings*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Jardins, Joseph R. Des, *Environmental Ethics: An Introduction to Environmental Philosophy*, Wadsworth, 1993.

Jasanoff, Sheilan and Martello, Marybeth Long, eds., *Earthly Politics: Local and Global in Environmental Governance*, MIT Press, 2004.

Kraft, Michael E., *Environmental Policy and Politics*, 7th ed. Longman, 2017.

Keller, David R. (ed.) (2010). *Environmental Ethics: the big questions*, West Sussex: Blackwell.

Kütting, Gabriela ed. (2018). *Global Environmental Politics*, 2nd ed., New York, NY: Routledge.

Paterson, Matthew, *Global Warming and Global Politics*, Routledge, 1996.

Matthews, Jessica Tuchman, ed., *Preserving the Global Environment: The Challenge of Shared Lead ership*, Norton, 1991.

Mitchell, Ronald B. (2010). *International Politics and the Environment*, London: Sage Publications Ltd.

O'Neill, John *et al.* (2008). *Environmental Values*, London: Routledge.

O'Lear, Shanon (2010). *Environmental Politics: scale and power*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pralle, Sarah B., *Branching Out, Digging In: Environmental Advocacy and Agenda-Setting*, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2006.

Rabe, Barry G., "Beyond Kyoto: Climate Change Policy in Multilevel Governance Systems", *Governance*, 20:3 (July 2007): 423–444.

Roberts, J. Timmons and Parks, Bradley C., *A Climate of Injustice: Global Inequality, North-South Politics, and Climate Policy*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006.

Rogers, Peter P. et al. (2008). *An Introduction to Sustainable Development*, Sterling VA : Earthscan.

Rosenbaum, Walter A., *Environmental Politics and Policy*, 7th ed., Washington D.C.: CQ Press, 2007.

Salleh, Ariel, *Ecofeminism as Politics: Nature, Marx, and the Postmodern*, Atlantic Highland, N.J.: Zed Books, 1997.

Smith*, Zachary, *The Environmental Policy Paradox*, 4th ed. U.S.: Prentice Hall, 2004.

UNEP and UNU-IHDP(International Human Dimensions Program) (2012). *Inclusive Wealth Report 2012: Measuring Progress towards Sustainability*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Warren, Karen J., ed., *Ecofeminism: Women, Culture, Nature*, Indiana UP, 1997

Waterman, Richard W., *Bureaucrats, Politics, and the Environment*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2004.

Wells, Donald T., *Environmental Policy: A Global Perspective for the Twenty-First Century*. U.S.: Prentice Hall, 1997.

Zedillo, Ernesto, ed., *Global Warming: Looking Beyond Kyoto*, Washington D.C.: Brookings, 2007.

Important Notes:
(1)   Students are expected to spend a total of 9 hours (i.e. 3 hours of class contact and 6 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/.

Grading Rubric for Presentation: (25 marks)

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

General Comments:

Grading rubric for comments/participation in discussion (10 marks)

Assessment Criteria	Outstanding (10-7)	Acceptable (6-3)	Need Improvement (below 3)	Score
Provides relevant comments	• Comments are specific, relevant, thoughtful, reflective and original, provokes other questions or comments	• Most comments are appropriate and reflect some thoughtfulness	• Comments are superficial, off topic or simply restate questions	
Provides meaningful feedback on information or research with application of theories/concepts	• Comments are based on solid knowledge on theories/concepts • Comments include specific suggestions for additional information or resources for consideration	• Comments indicate correct analysis of the information or research with some attempts on relating theories/concepts	• No comments is provided on information or research's accuracy, relevance and completeness • Analysis on the information or research is incorrect	
Provides meaningful feedback on the logic, assumptions, and recommendations the presenters has drawn	• 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	• Comments illustrate useful analysis of logic and assumptions and identify potential problems	• No comments or comments provided are not logical or incorrectly state assumptions	
Provides comments in a positive, encouraging, and constructive manner	• Comments praise specific strengths of the presentation as well as constructively address weaknesses with alternatives that might be considered	• Comments include positive feedback and suggestions	• Comments might be interpreted as insulting	

Grading rubric for term paper (25 marks)

		Assessment Rubrics			
CATEGORY	Excellent (25-23)	Good (22-19)	Satisfactory (18-12)	Unsatisafactory (below 12)	POINTS
Research Question	__ points	__ points	__ point	__ points	___/X
	Wrote clear, creative and interesting questions which fit the topic.	Wrote clear questions which fit the topic.	Wrote some questions which did not fit the topic.	Wrote mostly irrelevant questions	
Argument	__ points	__ points	__ point	__ points	___/X
	Arguments both well supported and compared to conflicting explanations	Main arguments valid, systematic, and well supported	Some arguments valid and well supported	Weak, invalid, or no argument, a simple assertion	___/X
Use of Data or Evidence	__ points	__ points	__ point	__ points	
	Fully exploits the richness of the data/evidence/ideas, and is sufficiently persuasive	feasible evidence, appropriately selected and not over-interpreted	Some appropriate use of evidence but uneven	Draws on little or no evidence, mostly relies on assertions or opinions, or evidence not clearly presented	
Organization and Writing	__ points	__ points	__ point	__ points	___/X
	Structure enhances the argument, strong sections and logical flow. Clear writing	Structure supports the argument, clearly ordered sections fit together well. Some minor English errors.	Bad structure (inconsistent, redundant, or disconnected). Frequent English errors.	Needs significant re-organization. Too many grammatical errors Low readability.	
				TOTAL POINTS	/X

Grading rubric for written tests (50 marks)

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

Final Overall Grade

Mark Ranges	Grade
85 -100	A
80-84	A-
75-79	B+
70-74	B
65-69	B-
60-64	C+
55-59	C
50-54	C-
45-49	D+
40-44	D
0-39	F