

# Ethics Olympiad Scoring Criteria



The Ethics Olympiad scoring criteria should be used in conjunction with the score sheet and the rules and guidelines. Please remember, teams are strongly encouraged to think of themselves as being on the same side rather than as opponents. That is, both teams are working together to solve a difficult problem – while impressing the judges with thoughtful analysis and support. Listening to the other team with an aim to affirm, supplement, or build on their argument is a prudent approach.

## Part 1: PRESENTING Team's initial presentation (15 Points Total)

A) Did the presentation **clearly and systematically address the moderator's question?** (5 points)

- 5 = Extremely clear presentation that systematically addressed the key dimensions of the question.
- 4 = Reasonably clear presentation that systematically addressed most key dimensions of the question.
- 3 = Hard to follow the argument. Significant dimensions of the question missed (passable).
- 2 = Serious logical problems or underdeveloped argument (poor).
- 1 = Incoherent presentation.

B) Did the team **clearly identify and thoroughly discuss the central moral dimensions** of the case? (5 points)

- 5 = Clearly and precisely identified central moral dimensions, and discussed these dimensions thoroughly.
- 4 = Mostly identified central moral dimensions and discussed major issues.
- 3 = Adequately identified and discussed some central moral dimensions (passable).
- 2 = Misidentified some moral dimensions of the case and inadequately discussed (poor).
- 1 = Misidentified the central moral dimensions.

C) Did the team's presentation **indicate both awareness and thoughtful consideration of different viewpoints, including especially those that would loom large in the reasoning of individuals who disagree with the team's position?** (5 points)

- 5 = Insightful analysis and discussion of the most significant viewpoints, including full and careful attention to opposing points of view.
- 4 = Solid analysis and discussion of some different viewpoints.
- 3 = Underdeveloped discussion of different viewpoints (passable).
- 2 = Minimal consideration of different viewpoints (poor).
- 1 = Minimal awareness of different viewpoints.

## Part 2: RESPONDING Team's Commentary on Opposing Team's Initial Presentation (10 Points)

To what extent has the team effectively and directly responded to and engaged the presenting team's argument?

- 10 = Especially insightful, complete, and composed commentary.
- 8-9 = Key points excellently addressed.
- 6-7 = Solid response to presenting team's points.
- 3-5 = Some points made, but few insights or constructive ideas (passable).
- 1-2 = Weak or irrelevant response or merely asking a series of questions (poor).
- 0 = Failure to respond to presenting team or resorting to personal attacks.

**Please continue to other side...**

# Ethics Olympiad Scoring Criteria



## **Part 3: PRESENTING Team's Response to Opposing Team's commentary (15 Points)**

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

- 15 = Especially insightful, complete, and composed response.
- 12-14 = Key points are excellently addressed.
- 9-11 = Solid response to commenting team.
- 6-8 = Some relevant points are made (passable).
- 3-5 = Weak or irrelevant response (poor).
- 1-2 = Failure to respond to commentary.

## **Part 4: PRESENTING Team's Response to Judges' Questions (15 Points)**

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

- 15 = Especially insightful, complete, and composed response.
- 14 = The most pressing points are identified and discussed.
- 13-12 = Several of the most important points are identified and discussed.
- 11-10 = Some relevant points are made (passable).
- 9-4 = Weak or irrelevant response (poor).
- 3-1 = Failure to respond to commentary and judges.

## **Overall: Points for engaging in Respectful Dialogue, as opposed to Combative Debate (5 Points)**

*Did the team demonstrate their awareness that an ethics bowl is about participating in a collaborative discussion aimed at earnestly thinking through difficult ethical issues?*

- 5 = Respectfully engaged all parties in exceptionally productive and collaborative discussion.
- 4 = Respectfully engaged other team's arguments and points.
- 3 = Respectful of other team's argument but only marginal engagement and pursuit.
- 2 = Unengaged with other team's arguments.
- 1 = Combative or dismissive of other team's arguments.