Judges' Scoring Rubric and Judges' Score Sheet

Ethics Bowl Scoring Rubric

Part 1: Presenting Team's Initial Presentation (15 points total)

a. Did the presentation clearly and systematically address the moderator's question?

5 = Comprehensive presentation. Clearly and systematically addresses important issues and demonstrates excellent understanding of moderator's question. Takes a clear position and articulates reasons for point of view, including relevant and corroborating evidence.

4 = Reasonably comprehensive and systematic presentation. Addresses and develops most issues relevant to the question. Provides some degree of rationale and corroborating evidence for position.

3 = Minimal awareness of issues surrounding moderator's question and unclear position. Limited corroborating evidence for position. Many important issues are missed entirely.

2 = Underdeveloped presentation. Little attention paid to moderator's question. Serious problems with logic of position.

1 = Presentation is confusing. No understanding of important issues. Does not address or answer moderator's question.

b. Were the central ethical and moral dimensions of the case clearly and thoroughly discussed?

5 = Demonstrate thorough understanding of the ethical and moral dimensions of the case. Also explores socio-cultural values surrounding related issues. Explicit and rational reasoning is evident.

4 = Ethical and moral dimensions of the case are identified. Demonstrates good understanding of related issues. Rationale and corroborating evidence for position are also presented.

3 = Adequate understanding of ethical and moral dimensions of the case. Underdeveloped discussion.

2 = Minimal understanding of issues related to the case. Inadequate discussion of ethical and moral dimensions.

1 = Little or no understanding of ethical and moral dimensions of the case.

c. Did the presentation indicate awareness and thoughtful consideration of different and conflicting viewpoints?

5 = Insightful awareness, analysis, and discussion of different viewpoints, including conflicting viewpoints.

4 = Good awareness of different viewpoints. Good analysis and discussion of differing perspectives on the issue.

3 = Very basic awareness and underdeveloped discussion of different viewpoints. Does not fully address opposing viewpoints.

2 = Minimal awareness or consideration of different viewpoints. Little understanding of the complexities of the issue.

1 = Does not address different viewpoints or complexities of the issue.

Ethics Bowl Scoring Rubric

Part 2: Responding Team's Commentary on Opposing Team's Initial Presentation (10 points)

To what extent has the responding team addressed and engaged with the position of the presenting team?

10 = Especially insightful response. Demonstrates active listening, as well as a spirit of respectful challenge. Takes intellectual risks to create new ways of thinking. Asks probing questions and provides ample evidence for positions taken.

9 = Solid response. Demonstrates strong listening skills, addresses most of the issues, and poses insightful questions. Challenges opposing team's position by exploring alternative viewpoints. Provides good evidence for positions taken.

7–8 = Good response. Demonstrates good listening skills and understanding of issues. Makes some attempt to challenge and examine opposing team's point of view, using some evidence. Asks good questions.

5–6 = Adequate response. Some important points made, but few insights. Some demonstration of active listening. Few, if any, questions posed.

3–4 = Inadequate response. Mostly argues for own viewpoint. Minimal attempt to explore different perspectives. No questions posed.

1–2 = Does not address or engage with the ideas presented by opposing team. Argues only for own viewpoint.

Part 3: Presenting Team's Response to Opposing Team's Commentary (10 points)

How did the presenting team respond to the opposing team's commentary?

10 = Excellent, insightful response. Open to, and synthesizes, new ideas presented by opposing team to take original position to another level.

8–9 = Very good response. Acknowledges and addresses key points raised by opposing team. Demonstrates some flexibility of thinking and openness to new ideas and ways of thinking.

6–7 = Good response. Demonstrates understanding of ideas presented by other team, but incorporates few, if any, new points of view that would take original position to a new level.

4–5 = Response seriously lacking. Team mostly restates original position, with little or no consideration of issues raised by opposing team.

1–3 = Inadequate response. Restates position; ignores commentary from opposing team.

Ethics Bowl Scoring Rubric

Part 4: Presenting Team's Response to Judges' Questions (20 points)

How did the presenting team respond to the judges' questions?

20	=	Exceptional response. Evidence of deep reflection and expanded thinking.
17–19	=	Solid response. Thoughtfully addresses key points raised by judges. Demonstrates reflective analysis.
13–16	=	Good response to judges' questions. Demonstrates understanding of issues raised.
9–12	=	Mostly restates original position. Addresses some issues raised by judges' questions.
5–8	=	Minimal understanding of issues raised by judges' questions.
1–4	=	No understanding of, and/or minimal response to, issues raised by judges' questions.

Did the teams engage in respectful dialogue? (5 Points per Team)

5	=	Respectfully engages all parties in an exceptionally open and productive discussion.
4	=	Respectfully engages with other team's arguments and ideas.
3	=	Respectful of other team's argument, with marginal engagement.
2	=	Dismissive of other team's presentation and position.
1	=	Combative and dismissive of other team's position.

High School Ethics Bowl

Judges' Score Sheet

Judge's Name | Match No.

Case #1

Team A

1. Presentation (Criteria Part 1)	Score
a. Did the team's presentation answer the moderator's question in a clear and coherent manner? (1 to 5)	
b. Was the team able to discuss the moral and ethical dynamics of the case? (1 to 5)	
c. Did the team demonstrate the capacity and awareness of competing viewpoints, including those of the opposing team? (1 to 5)	
Total a, b, c	**/15**
2. Response to Feedback from Team B (Criteria Part 3)	/10
3. Response to Judges' Questions (Criteria Part 4)	/20
Total 1, 2, 3	**/45**
End of **Team A** Session	
Team A Commentary on Team B on Case #2 (Criteria Part 2)	/10
Team A Respectful Dialogue	/5
Grand Total	**/60**

Judge's Comments

High School Ethics Bowl

Judges' Score Sheet

Case #2

Team B

1. Presentation (Criteria Part 1)	Score
a. Did the team's presentation answer the moderator's question in a clear and coherent manner? (1 to 5)	
b. Was the team able to discuss the moral and ethical dynamics of the case? (1 to 5)	
c. Did the team demonstrate the capacity and awareness of competing viewpoints, including those of the opposing team? (1 to 5)	
Total a, b, c	**/15**
2. Commentary to Feedback from Team A (Criteria Part 3)	/10
3. Response to Judges' Questions (Criteria Part 4)	/20
Total 1, 2, 3	**/45**
End of **Team B** Session	
Team B Commentary on Team A on Case #1 (Criteria Part 2)	/10
Team B Respectful Dialogue	/5
Grand Total	**/60**

Judge's Comments