*The NHSEB scoring criteria should be used in conjunction with the NHSEB score sheet and NHSEB judge 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 and one that expresses the ideals of the NHSEB.*

**Part 1: PRESENTING Team’s initial presentation (15 Points Total)**

1. *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.

1. *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.

1. *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.

9 = Key points excellently addressed.

8-7 = Solid response to presenting team’s points.

6-5 = Some points made, but few insights or constructive ideas (passable).

4-3 = Weak or irrelevant response or merely asking a series of questions (poor).

2-1 = Failure to respond to presenting team or resorting to personal attacks.

**Please continue to other side…**

**Part 3: PRESENTING Team’s Response to Opposing Team’s commentary (10 Points)**

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

10 = Especially insightful, complete, and composed response.

9 = Key points are excellently addressed.

8-7 = Solid response to commenting team.

6-5 = Some relevant points are made (passable).

4-3 = Weak or irrelevant response (poor).

2-1 = Failure to respond to commentary.

**Part 4: PRESENTING Team’s Response to Judges’ Questions (20 Points)**

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

20 = Especially insightful, complete, and composed response.

19-17 = The most pressing points are identified and discussed.

16-13 = Several of the most important points are identified and discussed.

12-9 = Some relevant points are made (passable).

8-5 = Weak or irrelevant response (poor).

4-1 = 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.