Online Symposium for Students

Debating human rights issues in the mega-sport event context

December 8 and 9, 2020 (Tuesday and Wednesday)

Hosted via Zoom

Purpose: Increase student engagement across countries via student interaction in debates, that is, formal discussions on particular matters in public meetings or legislative assemblies in which opposing arguments are put forward and in which a vote is made for, or against, a particular matter. Students will acquire the needed competencies to win a debate on societally relevant topics (e.g., sustainability, human rights) in sport in general and mega-sport events in particular.

Goals: The online symposium aims at the acquaintance of debating skills in the area of mega-sport events and sustainability/human rights; the symposium also aims at the acquaintance of cross-cultural competency by teaming up, and debating, with students from universities from abroad.

Participants: Master students from Coventry University, Technical University of Munich, and University of the West of Scotland as well as students who are interested from other institutions.

Format: We form groups with an international representation for each side of the debate. There will be focused debate topic issues, to ensure each group really explores the topic in-depth. A senior-level 'expert' in that specific area participates as a judge in the competition.

Added value for participants: (1) improvement of debate competencies in cross-cultural contexts; (2) increase in personality development of students by receiving personal feedback from senior-level mentors from the hosting universities; and (3) increase in understanding of how to design and host sport events that lever sustainability and human rights.

Technical University of Munich
Department of Sport and Health Sciences
Dr. Joerg Koenigstorfer

University of the West of Scotland
School of Business & Creative Industries
Dr. David McGillivray

Coventry University
Centre for Business in Society
Dr. Ian Brittain and
Dr. Rui Biscaia

...

1/9

UNIVERSITY OF THE
WEST *of* SCOTLAND
UWS

Coventry
University

TUM

Overview of the event

Schedule: December 8, 12.45-13.00 GMT: Welcome

December 8, 13.00-18.30 GMT: Debates

December 9, 13.00-18.30 GMT: Debates

December 9, 18.30-18.45 GMT: Closure

Sessions

December 8, 12.45-13.00 GMT

All Groups: Welcome and introduction to the format

December 8, 13.00-15.40 GMT

Group 1: Mega-sport events represent a progressive means of protecting and promoting human rights

Time	Statement to be debated (moderator: David McGillivray)	Student groups
13.00-13.45	Mega-sport event organisers promote human rights and prevent rights abuses.	Pro: N.N., N.N., N.N. Con: N.N., N.N., N.N.
13.45-14.30	Mega-sport events lead to the infringement of labour rights in the host city	Pro: N.N., N.N., N.N. Con: N.N., N.N., N.N.
14.30-14.40	Break	
14.40-15.25	The Qatar 2022 FIFA World Cup threatens freedom of expression in the media and politics.	Pro: N.N., N.N., N.N. Con: N.N., N.N., N.N.
15.25-15.40	Feedback from expert judge	

December 8, 15.45-18.30 GMT

Group 2: Mega-sport events transform the infrastructure and living conditions of the cities and countries that host them for the better

Time	Statement to be debated (moderator: Joerg Koenigstorfer)	Student groups
15.45-16.30	Mega-sport events are a means to increase the sustainability of the urban infrastructure in the host area.	Pro: N.N., N.N., N.N. Con: N.N., N.N., N.N.
16.30-17.15	Mega-sport events are a means to promote gentrification and forced evictions of host area residents.	Pro: N.N., N.N., N.N. Con: N.N., N.N., N.N.
17.15-17.25	Break	
17.25-18.10	Mega-sport events improve the quality of life of host area residents.	Pro: N.N., N.N., N.N. Con: N.N., N.N., N.N.
18.10-18.25	Feedback from expert judge	
18.25-18.30	Concluding remarks	

December 9, 13.00-15.40 GMT

Group 3: Mega-sport events provide a platform to promote greater equality, diversity, and inclusion

Time	Statement to be debated (moderator: Ian Brittain)	Student groups
13.00-13.45	Mega-sport events are an effective platform for athletes to stand up against racism in professional sport.	Pro: N.N., N.N., N.N. Con: N.N., N.N., N.N.
13.45-14.30	Mega-sport events are an effective platform to increase diversity and inclusion in the general population.	Pro: N.N., N.N., N.N. Con: N.N., N.N., N.N.
14.30-14.40	Break	
14.40-15.25	Paralympic Games are an effective platform to promote the inclusion of people with disabilities.	Pro: N.N., N.N., N.N. Con: N.N., N.N., N.N.
15.25-15.40	Feedback from expert judge	

December 9, 15.45-18.30 GMT

Group 4: The application for, and planning of, mega-sport event hosting provides best practice examples for human-rights based agendas in decision-making

Time	Statement to be debated (moderator: Rui Biscaia)	Student groups
15.45-16.30	The IOC has a good governance structure that allows for the protection and promotion of human rights in all its activities.	Pro: N.N., N.N., N.N. Con: N.N., N.N., N.N.
16.30-17.15	The hosting of Olympic Games (including all event stages) excludes vulnerable stakeholder groups in the decision-making process.	Pro: N.N., N.N., N.N. Con: N.N., N.N., N.N.
17.15-17.25	Break	
17.25-18.10	The FIFA has a good governance structure that allows for the protection and promotion of human rights in all its activities.	Pro: N.N., N.N., N.N. Con: N.N., N.N., N.N.
18.10-18.25	Feedback from expert judge	
18.25-18.30	Concluding remarks	

December 9, 18.30-18.45 GMT

All Groups: Closure and feedback

Participants

Maximum number of students: 72 students

Format of the debates

Preparing for the debate:

- International teams are set-up (typically 3 persons per team)
- The teams receive literature on the topic
- Teams research the topic and prepare logical arguments
- Teams gather supporting evidence and examples for positions taken
- Teams anticipate counter arguments and prepare rebuttals
- Team members plan order and content of speaking in debate

Conducting the debate:

Debates will 30 min (each group has 15 [3 times 5] minutes, the time will be monitored with a chess clock that is visible in Zoom). After the 30 min, there will be an open discussion, where all six students can contribute.

Marking: one expert will be the judge and mark the performances.

The marking scheme is illustrated on the last page.

Debate opens with the affirmative team (the team that supports the resolution) presenting their arguments, followed by a member of the negative team (the opposing team). This pattern is repeated for the second and third speaker in each team. Speakers should speak slowly and clearly. The judge will take notes as the debate proceeds. A typical sequence for debate, with timelines, is as follows:

- The teams will be informed about their position (affirmative vs. opposing) on the day before the debate so that they can prepare the debate

- The first speaker on the affirmative team presents arguments in support of the resolution (5 minutes)

- The first speaker on the opposing team presents arguments opposing the resolution (5 minutes)

- The second speaker on the affirmative team presents further arguments in support of the resolution, identifies areas of conflict, and responds to the arguments given by the opposition speaker (5 minutes)

- The second speaker on the negative team presents further arguments against the resolution, identifies further areas of conflict, and respond to the arguments given by the previous affirmative speaker (5 minutes)

- The third speaker on the affirmative team presents further arguments in support of the resolution, identifies areas of conflict, and responds to the arguments given by the opposition speaker (5 minutes)

- The third speaker on the negative team presents further arguments against the resolution, identifies further areas of conflict, and respond to the arguments given by the previous affirmative speaker (5 minutes)

- There will be a five-minute break, in which the speakers can discuss their strategy for the final 5 minutes.

- After the break, there is an open discussion with brief statements (< 20 seconds each). Everyone can contribute. The debate ends with concluding statements from one person from each group (< 1 minute each).

- The moderator (= expert judge) will provide feedback on the performances of the groups. (There will be voting tool for the spectators on who wins the debate, and the results will be published then together with the feedback.)

Criteria	Levels of performance				
	Fail (5-6)	**Adequate (4)**	**Satisfactory (3)**	**Good (2)**	**Very good (1)**
1. Organization and clarity: viewpoints and responses are outlined both clearly and orderly	Unclear and without order in all parts	Unclear and without order in most parts	Clear and orderly in some parts but not in others	Clear and orderly in most parts	Completely clear and orderly presentation
2. Use of arguments: reasons are given to support a viewpoint	No relevant reasons given	Few relevant reasons given	Some relevant reasons given	Most reasons given: fairly relevant	The relevant reasons are given
3. Use of facts and examples: they are provided to support reasons, with references	No relevant supporting examples/facts	Few relevant supporting examples/facts	Some relevant examples/facts given	Most examples/facts given	The relevant supporting examples and facts are given
4. Use of rebuttal: arguments made by the other teams are responded to and dealt with effectively	No effective counter-arguments made	Few effective counter-arguments made	Some effective counter-arguments made	Most effective counter-arguments made	Highly effective counter-arguments made
5. Presentation style: tone of voice, use of gestures, and level of enthusiasm are convincing to audience	No style features were used; not convincing	Few style features were used; mostly not convincing	Some style features were used; partly convincing	Most style features were used; mostly convincing	The style features were used; convincing
6. Teamwork: overall teamwork and being a team player	Poor team performance, no team player	Part of an adequate team and not really a team player	Part of a satisfactory team and some evidence of teamwork	Part of a good team and works well with the team	Part of an excellent team and helps the team
7. Emotional appeal: appealing to the audience	No use of emotional appeals; not convincing	Few emotional appeals were used; mostly not convincing	Some emotional appeals were used; mostly not convincing	Most emotional appeals were used; mostly convincing	The emotional appeals were used; convincing

Notes