

# Guide to Scoring – For Judges and Teams

## Guide for Scoring

### Round Sequence:

1. Moderator welcomes teams and judges.
2. Coin flip determines **presenting** and **responding** team. *Each round includes two cases so that teams play the role of presenting and responding team once each round.*
3. Moderator announces case + case question. Moderator distributes copies of the case and question to judges and teams.
4. 2 min team conference.
5. 10 min for presenting team to give their answer to the case question.
6. Judges score the **presenting** team's presentation.
7. 1 min team conference.
8. 5 min for responding team to answer.
9. Judges score the **responding** team, making sure they put the score on the *opposite side of the page from their score for the presenting team.*
10. 1 min for presenting team to confer on their reply.
11. 5 min for presenting team to reply to the commentary team.
12. Judges score the presenting team for their response to commentary.
13. 1 min for judges to confer on questions they will ask presenting team.
14. 10 min for judge's question and answer session with the presenting team.
15. Judges score the presenting team for their response to judge's questions.
16. Judges should *not* yet have a total score for *either* team.
17. Moderator distributes question for the 2<sup>nd</sup> case (timing repeats as above).
18. After the conclusion of the 2<sup>nd</sup> case, moderators will ask judges for scores.

# Guide to Scoring – For Judges and Teams

## Issues to Keep in Mind for Each Score:

### Clarity and Organization

- The team position should be responsive to the moderator's question; teams are responsible for making the link clear (it's possible that a team may have prepped a position/argument that fails to be responsive to the question asked).
- The team should present a position that is clear and easy to follow.
- Terminology must be defined and explained.
- Teammates should not talk over one another.
- Although the following might be considered important to professional presentation, they should **not** be considered as part of this score:
  - o The attire or appearance of the team members
  - o The volume of speech or eye contact of team members
  - o The number of team members that speak during the presentation

### Ethical Analysis

- Teams should explain the reasoning in support of their position. In doing so, teams should be clear about how the evidence leads logically to a particular conclusion.
- The team's analysis may include explicit use of ethical theory, but this is not required.
- If a team chooses to frame their position within a particular ethical theory, they should explain the theory (it is **not** enough to drop the name of a theory or philosopher).
- The value of explaining the ethical theory depends entirely on whether the team can show how it advances or deepens an understanding of the salient ethical features of the case.
- The mere presence of research should not impact scores; the value of research depends entirely on whether it advances or deepens the understanding of the salient ethical features of the case. In other words, the burden is on the team to make it very clear how their research is relevant and impacts the case.

## Guide to Scoring – For Judges and Teams

- Disagreement with a team's conclusion/position should not negatively impact a judge's score for a team. Judges must separate their own conclusions from a careful assessment of the rational strength of an argument.
- Likewise, if a judge agrees with a team's conclusion, it takes extra vigilance to avoid assuming unstated evidence/missing links on behalf of the team.

### Considering Alternative Viewpoints

- Teams should show an awareness that there may be more than one set of reasons in support of their conclusion.
- Teams should show an awareness that there are reasons that might support an alternative view. Teams should be sensitive to possible counterexamples and objections.
- In demonstrating this awareness, it is **not enough** to mention arguments in favor of opposing views. Teams must show evidence of appreciating the merits of those views, and should respond thoughtfully to them.
- Teams should **not** be penalized for questioning a case's presuppositions (both in the case itself and in its questions). The same goes for the research underlying a case and the works cited by the case overview - **teams should not be penalized for questioning and challenging the case. Teams might even argue that a case question is offensive because of the assumptions underlying the question.** The possibility for this kind of critique is a necessary part of the activity.

---

### **Commentary on/Response to Initial Team's Presentation**

- Responding Teams must give a commentary which shows clear evidence of having listened carefully to the initial presentation. Responding teams may choose to agree OR disagree with points raised by the presenting team. Responding teams may also point out omissions of salient points.
- Team commentaries should reflect a good faith effort to understand the initial team's presentation and identify common ground.

## Guide to Scoring – For Judges and Teams

- Teams should offer their commentary in the spirit of a collegial conversation intended to deepen the ethical analysis of the case.
- Responding teams should attempt to differentiate between what they take to be the *most pressing issues* to which they'd like to see the initial team respond, and what issues are more peripheral.
- **Teams are not required to disagree with the initial team's position on the case.** There are many ways the responding team can contribute to an analysis of the case: They can elaborate upon the lead team position, further bolstering the lead team position with new reasons and evidence. Alternatively, they may agree with the lead team verdict but on different grounds (i.e. they could agree with their position but not the reasoning behind it). Another alternative: they may present an objection that warrants a revision to the lead team position.

### Presenting Team Reply to Commentary

- Presenting teams should attempt to address the points raised by the commentary team, but should decide for themselves which points are *most pressing* and which are less so.
- Teams do not need to address *every* point raised by the responding team and should not be penalized if they focus time on the most prominent (though they should strive to say, briefly, why the other points are spurious or inconsequential to the disagreement).
- Judges should decide whether the team has dealt with the most pressing issues raised by the commentary from the responding team.
- Teams should address commentaries in the spirit of a collegial conversation intended to deepen the ethical analysis of the case.

### Judge's Questions

#### *Expectations of Judges*

- Following comments from the responding team, Judges have one minute to confer about which questions to ask before the time for the question and answer period begins.
- Each judge is allowed to ask one question and one follow-up question to the presenting team, and, if there is time left after this, may ask additional questions.

## Guide to Scoring – For Judges and Teams

- There is no requirement that a judge ask a question; a judge may yield his or her question to another judge. However, if a judge felt there were omissions or errors in the presenting team's view, judges should ask a question about these. (In other words, choosing not to ask a question while giving a team a low score is not in the spirit of allowing opportunities to deepen the ethical analysis of the case.)
- Judge's questions should be in the spirit of a collegial conversation intended to deepen the analysis of the case.
- Judges should be mindful of the fact that there are only ten minutes for the question and answer period, and so be mindful of the length of their questions.
- Judges should try to refrain from asking a new question of a team when there is less than 30 seconds remaining.

### *Expectations of Teams*

- Teams may confer briefly (no more than 30 seconds) before answering a judge's question. They should not be penalized for taking time to confer before answering a judge's question.
- Teams should be mindful of the fact that the question and answer period only lasts ten minutes, striving to give a full yet concise answer to a judge's question.
- Teams should respond to the questions from judges in the spirit of a collegial conversation intended to deepen the ethical analysis of the case.
- Teams should be aware that a question from a judge that indicates disagreement with the team's position does not necessarily mean either that the judge in fact disagrees with the team's position or that disagreement with the team's position impacted the judge's score.

### *Considerations for Judge Questioning:*

- **It is helpful to familiarize yourself with the cases in advance of the competition.** Teams have had several weeks with the cases, have done significant research on them, and so have thought about them in depth. If a team fails to address one of the case elements, or does not do so as thoroughly as you would

## Guide to Scoring – For Judges and Teams

wish, you should follow up with them about the issue during the judges' questions section of a round.

- **Listen carefully to the commentary team's response to the presenting team.** Often a commentary team brings up issues that the presenting team had not covered, or raise possible objections/counterexamples. A judge may only address questions to the presenting team, but might wish to expand on a point raised by the commentary team in doing so.
- **You can challenge a team's view even if you ultimately agree with the view.** Many teams struggle to engage with arguments against their own position, so this is an area where judges can press. It is important that your score not be based on whether you agree with a team's view, but on how well they present their case. Even if (especially if) you agree with a team's position, you should ask probing questions to see if they can handle objections to their view.
- **Feel free to "change the case" slightly with a question.** Perhaps a team has successfully defended the case question. However, you might consider offering a hypothetical question that changes a particular fact of the case, in order to see if/how such a change impacts the team's view.
- **You don't need to ask a question.** You may yield your question to another judge. So, please don't feel pressure to ask a question (10 min goes *very* quickly). We ask you to consider that questions are especially important for student learning when a team did not offer a presentation of high quality; sometimes a simple question asking them to clarify or restate a reason/piece of evidence can be helpful. The goal of the competition is to foster a collegial and thoughtful discussion of ethical issues, and judges play a vital role in this.