Judge’s Guidelines for Scoring

Reasonable disagreement
The ethical case studies are designed to address controversial issues about which intelligent, thoughtful people can reasonably disagree. The scores of the teams, therefore, should be based on the quality of their arguments, not on whether or not they adopted one position rather than another. The team that makes the strongest argument should win the most points. Moral decisions are made case by case based on applying critical thought to difficult situations. When evaluating teams, judges should not let agreement/disagreement with the team’s conclusion influence their assessment.

Research
Successful presentations should include a clear and detailed understanding of the facts given in the case. Since cases often involve details that are not general knowledge, research will often be necessary. Students should be prepared to identify sources of facts gained through independent research. While research is helpful, even necessary as a learning tool, judges should focus predominantly on the quality of arguments presented.

Presentation style
The focus of the ethics bowl is on the arguments the students provide. This means that judges must evaluate, and only evaluate, a team on aspects of its presentation that relate directly to the four criteria identified on the judge's score-sheet. Judges may not consider in their scoring other aspects of the team's presentation (e.g. the voice quality of presenters, whether they maintain eye contact with the judges, etc.)

Moral theories
Moral theories and other moral perspectives (such as professional codes) can be useful for drawing out what is ethically significant in a case. However, the mere mention of a moral theory or other moral perspective does not, by itself, strengthen the presentation.

Scoring note:
At the end of each round you should enter the following scores:
a) The presenting team’s presentation score
b) The presenting team’s response to commentary
c) The presenting team’s responses to judges’ questions
d) The responding team’s commentary score