



Appendices

Appendix A: Judges' Orientation

Judges' Role

- Review ethics cases prior to the Ethics Bowl.
- Understand how an Ethics Bowl is different from a debate. (See Introduction.)
- Be familiar with evaluation criteria. (See below.)
- For each round:
 1. Complete scoring sheets for Team A and Team B.
 2. Ask probing questions of Team A at designated time. (See Sample Questions below.)
 3. Complete written feedback to each team, including observations and advice.

Note: During a round, judges should only converse with each other during the question period and while writing feedback. Judges should not converse with students about any of the cases between rounds.

Evaluation Criteria

Does Team A (as lead team)

- focus on what is ethically important about the case and related issues?
- address the complexities of the issue?
- articulate why the issue is polarizing? why it may be difficult to find agreement?
- identify alternate perspectives that animate the issue?
- demonstrate flexibility and adaptability in their thinking?
- weigh possibilities and take a stance on the issue(s)?
- use evidence and research to support their position?
- demonstrate active listening?
- after hearing ideas raised by Team B, just reiterate their original position, or synthesize new ideas to reach clarity and deep understanding?
- demonstrate respect for Team B and the judges?
- answer the question posed by the moderator?

Does Team B (as responding team)

- demonstrate active listening?
- show respect for Team A?

- understand Team A's position, or ask for clarification?
- acknowledge perspectives raised by Team A, which they support?
- use evidence and research to support their position?
- challenge Team A's assumptions? correct factual errors or misperceptions?
- simply agree with, or argue with Team A? or, present new perspectives to help take the dialogue to a deeper level?
- simply restate what they understood Team A to mean? or, ask probing questions that help Team A expand their thinking?
- help Team A strengthen or change their position?

Judges' Question Period

- Judges should confer with each other before asking questions of the students.
- Judges *should not* put students on the spot, ask students to defend positions, or use leading questions to impose their own beliefs on students.
- Questions should
 - be reflective and probing
 - prompt deeper or expanded thinking
 - be open-ended, require the application of new knowledge, or help to surface underlying assumptions, implications, or issues not yet articulated

Sample Questions

- Can you clarify what you meant when you said _____?
- Team B raised the idea that _____. Can you explore this idea more deeply?
- Who in society would be most affected by a change in how we handle this issue in Canada today?
- The issues in this case focus on the micro level. Can you address the macro/big picture perspectives? (or vice versa)
- How can we soften or mitigate problems that might arise?
- How might your position on this issue affect _____? (e.g., name a particular group of people; the environment; other countries)
- Do you foresee any implications of your position that have not yet been raised in this conversation?
- What in society or history makes this a relevant issue for us, here and now?
- How might _____? What if _____? Tell me more about _____.

Judges' Scoring Rubric and Judges' Score Sheet

Ethics Bowl Scoring Rubric

Part 1: Presenting Team's Initial Presentation (15 points total)

a. Did the presentation clearly and systematically address the moderator's question?

- 5 = Comprehensive presentation. Clearly and systematically addresses important issues and demonstrates excellent understanding of moderator's question. Takes a clear position and articulates reasons for point of view, including relevant and corroborating evidence.
- 4 = Reasonably comprehensive and systematic presentation. Addresses and develops most issues relevant to the question. Provides some degree of rationale and corroborating evidence for position.
- 3 = Minimal awareness of issues surrounding moderator's question and unclear position. Limited corroborating evidence for position. Many important issues are missed entirely.
- 2 = Underdeveloped presentation. Little attention paid to moderator's question. Serious problems with logic of position.
- 1 = Presentation is confusing. No understanding of important issues. Does not address or answer moderator's question.

b. Were the central ethical and moral dimensions of the case clearly and thoroughly discussed?

- 5 = Demonstrate thorough understanding of the ethical and moral dimensions of the case. Also explores socio-cultural values surrounding related issues. Explicit and rational reasoning is evident.
- 4 = Ethical and moral dimensions of the case are identified. Demonstrates good understanding of related issues. Rationale and corroborating evidence for position are also presented.
- 3 = Adequate understanding of ethical and moral dimensions of the case. Underdeveloped discussion.
- 2 = Minimal understanding of issues related to the case. Inadequate discussion of ethical and moral dimensions.
- 1 = Little or no understanding of ethical and moral dimensions of the case.

c. Did the presentation indicate awareness and thoughtful consideration of different and conflicting viewpoints?

- 5 = Insightful awareness, analysis, and discussion of different viewpoints, including conflicting viewpoints.
 - 4 = Good awareness of different viewpoints. Good analysis and discussion of differing perspectives on the issue.
 - 3 = Very basic awareness and underdeveloped discussion of different viewpoints. Does not fully address opposing viewpoints.
 - 2 = Minimal awareness or consideration of different viewpoints. Little understanding of the complexities of the issue.
 - 1 = Does not address different viewpoints or complexities of the issue.
-

Ethics Bowl Scoring Rubric

Part 2: Responding Team's Commentary on Opposing Team's Initial Presentation (10 points)

To what extent has the responding team addressed and engaged with the position of the presenting team?

- 10 = Especially insightful response. Demonstrates active listening, as well as a spirit of respectful challenge. Takes intellectual risks to create new ways of thinking. Asks probing questions and provides ample evidence for positions taken.
- 9 = Solid response. Demonstrates strong listening skills, addresses most of the issues, and poses insightful questions. Challenges opposing team's position by exploring alternative viewpoints. Provides good evidence for positions taken.
- 7-8 = Good response. Demonstrates good listening skills and understanding of issues. Makes some attempt to challenge and examine opposing team's point of view, using some evidence. Asks good questions.
- 5-6 = Adequate response. Some important points made, but few insights. Some demonstration of active listening. Few, if any, questions posed.
- 3-4 = Inadequate response. Mostly argues for own viewpoint. Minimal attempt to explore different perspectives. No questions posed.
- 1-2 = Does not address or engage with the ideas presented by opposing team. Argues only for own viewpoint.

Part 3: Presenting Team's Response to Opposing Team's Commentary (10 points)

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

- 10 = Excellent, insightful response. Open to, and synthesizes, new ideas presented by opposing team to take original position to another level.
- 8-9 = Very good response. Acknowledges and addresses key points raised by opposing team. Demonstrates some flexibility of thinking and openness to new ideas and ways of thinking.
- 6-7 = Good response. Demonstrates understanding of ideas presented by other team, but incorporates few, if any, new points of view that would take original position to a new level.
- 4-5 = Response seriously lacking. Team mostly restates original position, with little or no consideration of issues raised by opposing team.
- 1-3 = Inadequate response. Restates position; ignores commentary from opposing team.

Ethics Bowl Scoring Rubric

Part 4: Presenting Team's Response to Judges' Questions (20 points)

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

- 20 = Exceptional response. Evidence of deep reflection and expanded thinking.
- 17–19 = Solid response. Thoughtfully addresses key points raised by judges. Demonstrates reflective analysis.
- 13–16 = Good response to judges' questions. Demonstrates understanding of issues raised.
- 9–12 = Mostly restates original position. Addresses some issues raised by judges' questions.
- 5–8 = Minimal understanding of issues raised by judges' questions.
- 1–4 = No understanding of, and/or minimal response to, issues raised by judges' questions.

Did the teams engage in respectful dialogue? (5 Points per Team)

- 5 = Respectfully engages all parties in an exceptionally open and productive discussion.
- 4 = Respectfully engages with other team's arguments and ideas.
- 3 = Respectful of other team's argument, with marginal engagement.
- 2 = Dismissive of other team's presentation and position.
- 1 = Combative and dismissive of other team's position.

High School Ethics Bowl Judges' Score Sheet

Judge's Name

Match No.

Case #1

Team A

1. Presentation (Criteria Part 1)	Score
a. Did the team's presentation answer the moderator's question in a clear and coherent manner? (1 to 5)	
b. Was the team able to discuss the moral and ethical dynamics of the case? (1 to 5)	
c. Did the team demonstrate the capacity and awareness of competing viewpoints, including those of the opposing team? (1 to 5)	
Total a, b, c	/15
2. Response to Feedback from Team B (Criteria Part 3)	/10
3. Response to Judges' Questions (Criteria Part 4)	/20
Total 1, 2, 3	/45
End of Team A Session	
Team A Commentary on Team B on Case #2 (Criteria Part 2)	/10
Team A Respectful Dialogue	/5
Grand Total	/60

Judge's Comments

High School Ethics Bowl Judges' Score Sheet

● Case #2

● Team B

1. Presentation (Criteria Part 1)	Score
a. Did the team's presentation answer the moderator's question in a clear and coherent manner? (1 to 5)	
b. Was the team able to discuss the moral and ethical dynamics of the case? (1 to 5)	
c. Did the team demonstrate the capacity and awareness of competing viewpoints, including those of the opposing team? (1 to 5)	
Total a, b, c	/15
2. Commentary to Feedback from Team A (Criteria Part 3)	/10
3. Response to Judges' Questions (Criteria Part 4)	/20
Total 1, 2, 3	/45
End of Team B Session	
Team B Commentary on Team A on Case #1 (Criteria Part 2)	/10
Team B Respectful Dialogue	/5
Grand Total	/60

Judge's Comments

Regional High School Ethics Bowl
Judges' Team Feedback

Team

Match No. 1 2 3

The team's strong points include the following:

The team could improve in the following areas:

Thank you for being part of the Manitoba High School Ethics Bowl!

Appendix B: Moderator's Instructions and Script

In an envelope will be the following:

- moderator's script
- 14 copies (one for each team member, judge, and moderator) of each case and question
- three judges' score sheets
- three criteria rubric forms
- a coin
- scrap paper
- two judges' feedback forms

The moderator needs to bring his or her own stopwatch or smartphone app.

Distribute the score sheets and rubric forms to the judges. Make sure that the judges have had time to write their names on the score sheets. Do not distribute the cases or questions. Teams should have shaken hands prior to the start of the match.

1. Welcome everyone. Start off with the following acknowledgement:

We would like to acknowledge that we are located on the original lands of the [insert appropriate Indigenous Peoples for your location—for example, in Winnipeg, "Anishinaabeg, Cree, Oji-Cree, Dakota, and Dene Peoples, and on the homeland of the Métis Nation"]. We recognize the colonization endured by Indigenous Peoples, and we are committed to working in partnership with Indigenous communities toward justice, equity, and reconciliation.

Introduce the schools involved in the match and yourself, and ask the judges to introduce themselves.

2. Welcome the schools and ask each team to introduce themselves.

3. State the rules:

Teams can only consult with their own teammates. No one from the audience including the coaches can communicate verbally or nonverbally. The audience must remain quiet throughout the match when it is not their turn to speak. Judges can only consult with each other at the end when deciding which question will be asked and when filling out the feedback form for the teachers. Students can use the scrap paper to communicate amongst themselves and for note taking.

4. Turn to the team to your left and ask the following: *Heads or tails?* The team calls, and you flip the coin.

The coin is [heads/tails]. The winning team decides if they want to present first or have the other team present first.

The team will make its choice—either to present first or to allow the other team to present the first case. Turn to the team that will present first.

If the winning chooses not to go first, they will go first in the second half of the round.

5. Okay, _____ [name of high school], you will present first and are known as **Team A**. Judges, please note this on your score sheet that _____ [name of high school] is **Team A**, and _____ [name of high school] is **Team B**.
6. At this point, distribute a copy of the case/question to the judges and face down to the teams. We are ready to begin! The case is # _____ [read the case]. The question is _____ [read case question].
7. Team A, you now have **up to two minutes** to confer before beginning your presentation. Either team may take notes, but Team A is the only team allowed to speak during this time.
Give Team A two minutes to confer.
8. Team A now has **five minutes** to make its presentation. Any member of the team may speak, one at a time. Team A, I will give you reminders when there are **three minutes** and **one minute remaining**.
Give Team A five minutes for its presentation, giving them the time reminders. If teams use up all of their time, tell them that time is up, but allow them to finish the last sentence.
9. Judges, please mark your scores for Team A's presentation.
Wait a few moments for the judges to mark their score sheet.
10. Team B, you now have **one minute** to confer. Either team may take notes, but Team B is the only team allowed to speak during this time.
Give Team B one minute to confer.
11. Team B, you now have **up to three minutes** to comment on Team A's presentation. Any member of your team may speak, one at a time. Team B, I will indicate when you have **one minute remaining**.
Give Team B up to three minutes for its commentary, giving them a one minute reminder.
12. Judges, please write down your scores for Team B's commentary.
Wait a few moments for the judges to mark their score sheets.
13. Team A, you now have **one minute** to confer. Team A is the only team allowed to speak during this time.
Give Team A one minute to confer.

14. Team A has **three minutes** to respond to Team B's commentary. Any member of your team may speak, one at a time. Team A, I will indicate when you have **one minute remaining**.

Give Team A three minutes for its response, giving them the reminder.

15. Thank you. Judges, please write down your score for Team A's response.

Wait a few moments for the judges to mark their score sheets.

16. Now the judges will have an opportunity to ask Team A questions. The question and answer session may be up to 10 minutes long. Each judge may ask one question and one brief follow-up question. I will let you know when there are **two minutes remaining** in the Q & A.

Judges, would you like 30 seconds to confer or are you ready to ask questions now?

If they need to confer, give them 30 seconds or so.

Okay, judges, you may begin.

Judges will ask questions, and Team A will answer for up to 10 minutes. You may need to remind the judges to keep their questions as brief as possible.

17. Thank you. Judges, please score Team A's responses to your questions. I will collect the used paper while you finish your scoring and comments.

Part 1 of Round Finished

18. Judges are you ready to begin Part 2 with Team B?

Pass out the case and question to each judge and each team.

19. I will now read the case and question for Team B. The case is # _____, [read title of the case]. The question is _____ [read case question].

20. Team B, you now have up to **two minutes** to confer with each other before beginning your presentation. Either team may take notes, but Team B is the only team allowed to speak during this time.

Give Team B two minutes to confer.

21. Team B now has **five minutes** to make its presentation. Any member of the team may speak, one at a time. Team B, I will give you reminders when there are **three minutes** and **one minute remaining**.

Give Team B five minutes for its presentation, giving them the time reminders. If teams use up all of their time, tell them that time is up, but allow them to finish the sentence.

22. Judges, please mark your scores for Team B's presentation.

Wait a few moments for the judges to mark their score sheets.

23. Team A, you now have **one minute** to confer. Either team may take notes, but Team A is the only team allowed to speak during this time.
Give Team A one minute to confer.
24. Team A, you now have up to **three minutes** to comment on Team B's presentation. Any member of your team may speak, one at a time. Team A, I will indicate when you have **one minute remaining**.
Give Team A up to three minutes for its commentary, giving them a one-minute reminder.
25. Judges, please write down your scores for Team A's commentary.
Wait a few moments for the judges to mark their score sheets.
26. Team B, you now have **one minute** to confer. Team B is the only team allowed to speak during this time.
Give Team B one minute to confer.
27. Team B has **three minutes** to respond to Team A's commentary. Any member of your team may speak, one at a time. Team B, I will indicate when you have **one minute remaining**.
Give Team B three minutes for its response, giving them a one-minute reminder.
28. Thank you. Judges, please write down your score for Team B's response.
Wait a few moments for the judges to mark their score sheets.
29. Now the judges will have an opportunity to ask Team B questions. The question and answer session may be up to 10 minutes long. Each judge may ask one question and one brief follow-up question. I will let you know when there are **two minutes remaining** in the Q & A.
Judges, would you like 30 seconds to confer or are you ready to ask questions now?
Judges will ask questions, and Team B will answer for up to 10 minutes. You may need to remind the judges to keep their questions as brief as possible.
30. Thank you. Judges, please score Team B's responses to your questions, finish up your score sheets, and complete the feedback form for the teachers.
31. Thank you to both teams for a great round. Teams can now shake hands. The scores will be given after the third round.
Judges will you please use this time to write your final score and vote for the winning team on your tally sheet.
Pick up all material, place in an envelope, and give to a committee member.

