

Ohio River Valley Regional Guide to Scoring – For Judges and Teams including Added Spirit Points

Use the Following Guide for 1-10 Point Scores:

Score		Description	Approximate Grade Equivalence
10	=	Exceptional	A+ (100%)
9	=	Outstanding	A
8	=	Very Solid Job	B+ / A-
7	=	Solid Job	B
6	=	Noticeable weaknesses or omissions	C+ / B-
5	=	More serious weaknesses or omissions	C- / C
3 - 4	=	Seriously flawed or largely absent	D
1 - 2	=	Almost completely or completely absent	F

Issues to Keep in Mind for Each Score:

Initial Presentation

Clarity and Organization

- The team should make their answer to the moderator's question clear.
- The team should present a discussion that is clear and easy to follow.
- Terminology used should be explained or be such that an educated person could follow it.
- Teammates should not talk over one another.
- The following things should **not** be considered as part of this score:
 - The attire or physical appearance of the team members
 - The volume of speech or eye contact of team members
 - The number of team members that speak in the presentation

Ethical Analysis

- Teams should show clear use of ethical reasoning in support of their position.
- The team's analysis should be logically plausible.
- An analysis may include explicit use of ethical theory but does not need to do so.
- Any use of ethical theory should be explained or clear to an educated person.
- The value of the use of ethical theory entirely depends on whether it advances or deepens an understanding of the salient ethical features of the case.
- The mere presence or absence 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.
- Disagreement with a team's view should not negatively impact a judge's score for a team.
- Judges should separate a logical flaw in an argument from a disagreement with a team's conclusion.

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 sets of reasons that might support an alternative view.
- Teams should not just mention arguments in favor of opposing views, or objections to the team's views, but also show evidence of appreciating the merits of those views, responding thoughtfully to them.
- Teams do not need to necessarily say the words "now we will consider objections" to do this well.

Commentary on Initial Team's Presentation

- Team's commentaries should show clear evidence of having listened carefully to the initial presentation, responding to points raised by the presenting team, or pointing out omissions of salient points.
- Team's commentaries should reflect a good faith effort to have accurately understood the initial team's presentation.
- Teams should offer their commentary in the spirit of a collegial conversation intended to deepen the ethical analysis of the case.
- Commentary 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 do not need to disagree with the initial team's position on the case.

Response to Commentary

- 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 commentary team.
- Judges should decide whether the team has dealt with the most pressing issues raised by the commentary team.
- Teams should respond to commentaries in the spirit of a collegial conversation intended to deepen the ethical analysis of the case.

Response to Judge's Questions

Expectations of Judges

- Judges have up to 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 to the presenting team, and, if there is time left after this, may ask additional questions.
- 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 teams 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. A good guideline to use is that the better the presentation, the tougher the question, so that teams that had a weaker presentation may have a chance to deepen their analysis and teams that had solid presentations can further develop their analysis.
- 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 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.

Spirit Points

Score		Description	Approximate Grade Equivalence
5	=	Exceptional respect and collegial engagement	A (100%)
4	=	Strong respect and constructive tone, minor lapses	B
3	=	Generally respectful, but with noticeable weaknesses (e.g. occasional dismissiveness or sharp tone).	C
2	=	Serious weaknesses in collegial engagement (e.g., repeated interruptions, dismissive responses)	D
1	=	Hostile or disrespectful behavior (e.g., personal attacks, combative debate)	F

Expectations of Judges

- Judges should award higher scores when teams clearly demonstrate respectful engagement, collaborative tone, and constructive dialogue.
- Judges should deduct points within this range when a team engages in adversarial or disrespectful behavior, including personal attacks, ridicule, or hostility.
- Judges should keep in mind that disagreement and critical engagement are expected, but the manner in which disagreement is expressed is the key criterion for this score.
- Spirit points should be used to encourage civility and ensure the Ethics Bowl reflects the values of reasoned, respectful, and inclusive discussion.

Expectations of Teams

- Teams should engage one another in a manner consistent with collegial academic dialogue.
- Teams should listen attentively, acknowledge the contributions of others, and respond in a way that deepens conversation rather than dismisses it.
- Teams should avoid combative debate tactics, hostile tones, interruptions, or personal remarks directed at other participants.
- Teams should demonstrate that ethical inquiry is best advanced in a spirit of mutual respect and shared pursuit of understanding.