



**2015-16 NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL ETHICS BOWL
RULES, PROCEDURES, and GUIDELINES**



UNC

PARR CENTER FOR ETHICS

SQUIRE FAMILY FOUNDATION

Advancing Philosophy Education

Table of Contents

I.	Organization.....	3
II.	National High School Ethics Bowl.....	3
	A. Event Format	
	B. Competition Match Format	
	C. Competition Match Rules	
	D. Case Questions	
III.	Regional Qualifying Ethics Bowls.....	8
IV.	Teams – Rules and Guidelines.....	11
	A. Rules	
	B. Guidelines	
V.	Judges – Rules and Guidelines.....	15
	A. Rules	
	B. Guidelines	
VI.	Moderator – Procedures.....	18

I. ORGANIZATION

The National High School Ethics Bowl (NHSEB) is dedicated to hosting, nurturing, and promoting high school ethics bowls across North America. NHSEB's day-to-day operations are overseen by an Executive Committee and advised by a larger Steering Committee. As needed, topic-specific advisory committees and work groups (such as, Outreach, Fundraising, Resources, and Rules) may be formed by the Executive Committee. When the NHSEB Executive Committee contact is referenced below, please email nhseb@unc.edu.

II. NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL ETHICS BOWL

Currently one time per academic year, NHSEB hosts and organizes a National High School Ethics Bowl event ("the National bowl"). Invitations to the Bowl are extended to teams based on their performance at a Regional Qualifying Ethics Bowl ("regional bowl") in accordance with the procedures in Section III. The 2015-2016 National Bowl will take place April 15-16, 2016 at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

A. Event Format

The cases used in the National Bowl will be released to the participating teams and to the public approximately seven weeks before the Bowl. The Bowl will begin on Friday, April 15, 2016 with a plenary session required for all participating teams (students and coaches). The National Bowl will field 22 teams.

Each team will participate in four seeding matches on April 15-16, 2016 with teams assigned to matches by random draw. At the end of the fourth round, teams will be ranked by the number of wins (0-4). When two or more teams have the same number of wins, the following tiebreakers will be exercised, in this order:

- **Lowest number of losses** (so a team that has 2 wins, 1 tie, and 1 loss will rank higher than a team with 2 wins and 2 losses)
- **Highest number of judge votes** (over the course of four rounds, a team has the opportunity to win the votes of 12 judges. If two teams finish with 4 wins, but one team has 11 judge votes and the other has 10, the team with 11 votes is ranked higher)
- **Greatest point differential** over all four matches (If two teams have 3 wins and 1 loss and 9 judge votes, and Team A has a total point differential of +30 [winning two matches by 12, winning one match by 10, and losing one match by 4] while Team B has a point differential of +28 [winning one match by 11, winning two matches by 9, and losing one match by 1], Team A will be ranked higher in the standings).
- **Highest point total** over all four matches.
- **Coin toss**

The top eight ranked teams after the four seeding matches will advance to the quarterfinals. The eight quarterfinal teams will be announced after lunch on Saturday, April 16.

The rules and procedures for the quarterfinals, semifinals and finals will be identical to the other rounds. The winning teams from each of these rounds will advance (with tiebreakers as determined above). The winning team of the finals match will be named the National High School Ethics Bowl Champion. In the event of a tie of judges' votes during the championship, the two top-ranked teams will be named co-champions. If more clarification is needed on tiebreakers during the semifinals, quarterfinals, or finals, please contact the NHSEB Executive Committee.

Closing ceremonies, featuring a celebratory reception for all participants and award presentations, will follow the finals round.

B. Competition Match Format

Matches feature two teams meeting face-to-face. Each team can be composed of three to five members in any one match. The team members must be selected and seated at the table before the moderator opens the match. Each match will have three judges and one moderator. Judges evaluate teams based on their performance during the match. Moderators "run the room." They keep time and move the match through its various components while ensuring that all participants and spectators comply with Bowl rules. For more on the roles of judges and moderators, see Section V and Section IV.

Each match will begin with a coin toss. The team that wins the coin toss may elect to present first (designated as Team A) or to have the other team present first (in this situation, the winner of the coin toss is then designated as Team B).

To open the first half of the match, copies of the first case and question will be distributed to the judges and teams. The moderator will then read the question. Neither judges nor the teams will know in advance which case will be presented or which question will be asked.

Team A will then have up to two minutes to confer, after which any member(s) of Team A may speak for up to five minutes (total) in response to the moderator's question, based on the team's research and critical analysis. This is known as the Presentation period. Team A must address and answer the moderator's question during the Presentation period.

Next Team B will have up to one minute to confer, after which Team B may speak for up to three minutes in response to Team A's presentation. This is known as the Commentary period.

Team A will then have up to one minute to confer, followed by three minutes to respond to Team B's challenge. This is known as the Response period.

The judges will then begin their ten-minute question-and-answer session with Team A. Before asking questions, the judges may confer briefly. Each judge should have time for at least one question, and may ask more questions if time permits.

More than one team member may respond to a given judge's question. Teams should not confer for longer than 20 to 30 seconds after a question has been asked. Judges then evaluate the Presentation, Response, and Responses to Judges' Questions by Team A and the Commentary by Team B, and score the teams based on the judges' guidelines found in Section V.

The judges will score each team as follows:

- 1-15 for a team's Presentation to the Moderator's case question (15 best). In evaluating a team's answer to the moderator's question, the judges will give the team a score of 1-5 on each of the three evaluation criteria on the score sheet:
 - Did the presentation clearly and systematically address the question asked?
 - Did the presentation identify and thoroughly discuss the central moral dimensions of the case, raised by the question asked?
 - Did the presentation indicate both awareness and thoughtful consideration of different viewpoints, including those that would loom large in the reasoning of individuals who disagree?
- 1-10 for the opposing team's Commentary (10 best)
- 1-10 for the presenting team's Response to the opposing team's commentary (10 best)
- 1-20 for the presenting team's Responses to the Judges' Questions (20 best)
- At the end of the entire round, 1-5 for each team's display of respectful dialogue (5 best)

The judges should not discuss their scoring decisions with each other; each judge is to rely on his or her own private judgment. For more information on the guidelines and rules for judges, see Section V.

After the judges have made their scoring decisions, the moderator will read the second case and question to the same two teams, beginning the second half of the match.

The event will proceed as above, with Team B presenting in the second half, Team A offering commentary, Team B responding, and then Team B participating in the judges' question and answer session. Thus, in each match, each team will have the opportunity to present one case and to respond to the other team's presentation of another case, for a total of 60 points possible from each of the three judges.

Moderators will validate scores with the judges and tabulate, based on the scores, which team wins each judge's vote. The winner of the match will be the team with the highest number of votes (out of three totals). For example:

Judge 1: Team A 48, Team B 43 (1 vote for Team A)

Judge 2: Team A 45, Team B 44 (1 vote for Team A)

Judge 3: Team A 39, Team B 49 (1 vote for Team B)

Here, Team A is the winner of the match with two judges' votes despite the fact that Team B had a higher overall point total.

If a judge scores both teams equally (a tie), both teams are awarded $\frac{1}{2}$ of that judge's vote. A match can end in a tie – if all three judges score the match a tie, or one judge votes for Team A, one for Team B, and one scores a tie. Point differential is not a factor in determining the winner of an individual match although it is a criterion that is used as a tiebreaker when ranking teams at the end of the seeding rounds. (See Section II-A)

At the end of the match, the moderator will ask all the judges to hold up their match tally sheets and announce their votes. Next, the moderator will name the winning team (or announce a tie) and

the number of judges' votes for that team. Moderators will then pass score sheets to a room staffer who will return all materials to the Bowl headquarters for compilation with scores from other matches.

C. Competition Match Rules

There are no limits to the resources that may be used in researching the questions prior to the Bowl. Students are encouraged to consult all resources to understand the full breadth of the cases, determine their positions, and make the strongest possible presentation. Although teams may use outside research to prepare for a match, they should not assume that merely presenting factual information will impress the judges. Teams need to propose valid, sound, persuasive arguments that are buttressed by fact to score well. If a team introduces a specific fact not contained in the case, the team should cite the source (e.g. "according to a 2011 article in National Geographic...").

At the start of each match, scratch paper will be provided for team members to make notes during the match, but outside notes and materials are prohibited. All notes and cases will be collected at the end of each case.

The moderator will keep official time of each portion of the match. *The moderator is allowed to use a device that stores data or connects to the internet (this includes most cellular phones and tablets) to keep accurate time for matches.* Teams may use their own timers with the following restrictions and conditions:

- The timer cannot be any device that stores data or connects to the internet
- A team may not time the portions of the match when the other team speaks or confers.
- The moderator may allow a team to finish a sentence/thought once time has expired.

All teams will get two standardized time notifications from the moderator during their Presentations: one when three minutes remain and one when one minute remains. During the Commentary and Response portions, the moderator will give notifications when one minute remaining. When judges ask questions, the moderator will notify the panel when there are two minutes remaining.

The moderator controls the room during matches and should address any unacceptable behavior including, but not limited to:

- Coaches, parents, or audience members communicating with (verbally or non-verbally), or demonstrably reacting to, team members during a match
- Judges showing hostility or asking inappropriate questions to team members. Inappropriate questions include, but are not limited to, any that highlight a participant's race, religion, gender, gender identity, ethnicity, disability, national origin, sexual orientation, appearance, etc. Judges should direct their constructive questions to teams based on the discussion, not to individuals
- Anyone in the room who intentionally makes distracting noises while one of the teams, judges, or moderator has the floor

- Foul, insulting, or excessively graphic language or confrontational behavior by anyone in the room

Teams must answer the moderator's question during the Presentation period. Teams are judged and scored on how well its members clearly and systematically address and respond to the question asked.

Teams will not be penalized or rewarded by the judges depending on whether one person speaks or everyone contributes. To dispel any preconceptions that a judge may harbor, we strongly urge that a team outline its presentation when it begins – that is, the team should explain who will be discussing which aspect(s) of the case and why. This way, a judge will know what kind of presentation to expect. We have let the judges know that they should neither penalize nor reward a team for using either approach: both are welcome

When one team confers or speaks, the other team and audience members must remain silent although writing and passing notes is permitted. (For example, when Team A is given the case and question, they are allowed to confer for two minutes and then present for five minutes. During those seven minutes, Team B is permitted to write notes, but must remain silent.)

D. Case Questions

National Qualifying teams and coaches should use the National case set and their accompanying study questions to practice for the National Bowl. **The study questions do not necessarily include the questions moderators will ask teams during the competition.** Study questions are designed to help teams prepare for the Bowl and to think more deeply about the issues at hand.

III. REGIONAL QUALIFYING ETHICS BOWLS

Regional Qualifying Ethics Bowls (“regional bowls”) will be held between September 1, 2015 and February 6, 2016. Each regional needs to be pre-certified by the NHSEB Executive Committee as a 2016 RQEB either before that regional bowl takes place or by December 4, 2015, whichever is first.

In order to be a pre-certified RQEB, a regional bowl must be either:

- a) **Large Regional Bowl** which will be categorized as large after December 4, 2015 or after the regional bowl takes place; whichever is first. Large Regionals are those bowls with the highest number of competing schools in the total field of regional bowls (see Section IV). The winning school of a large regional will automatically advance to the National Bowl.

OR

- b) **Small Regional Bowl** which will be categorized as small after December 4, 2015 or after the regional bowl takes place; whichever is first. Small Regionals are those bowls with the lowest number of competing schools in the total field of regional bowls (see Section IV). The winning school of a Small Regional bowl will compete in a virtual playoff against the winner of another Small Regional. This playoff will consist of a single match between the two teams, and the winner of this match will qualify for the National Bowl. Small regional playoffs will be matched according to time zone region and/or on a rolling basis (e.g. if two small regionals take place on the same weekend) between January 15 and February 20, 2016. The Parr Center for Ethics will coordinate the pairing of small regionals and organization of the virtual playoff.

The NHSEB Executive Committee will be using a general formula to decide the field of Large and Small Regional Bowls. For 2016 National Bowl, 22 schools will field the competition (x), and the number of regionals competing in the season (y), then:

Large Regional Bowl = largest $2x-y$ bowls

Small Regional Bowl = smallest $2(y-x)$ bowls, in which will compete in $y-x$ virtual playoffs to determine which school will compete at the National Bowl

In the event that some, but not all, of the bowls with a given number of schools competing can be defined as Large Regionals according to this formula, the NHSEB Executive Committee will use a random process to determine which of those regionals will count as Large Regionals, and which will count as Small Regionals.

For example, if the total regional field for 2015-2016 is 29 regionals, then 15 regionals will be categorized as a Large Regional Bowl and 14 regionals will be categorized as a Small Regional Bowl. The Small Regional Bowls (14) will be matched according to time zone region and/or on a rolling basis; creating 7 virtual playoffs. The virtual playoffs will be one match. The winner of the virtual playoff will advance to the National Bowl creating a field of 22 teams.

Schools that win a (i) pre-certified Large Regional Bowl or (ii) a Small Regional Bowl playoff (see above) will be invited to participate in the National High School Ethics Bowl, given school and regional bowl compliance with all required NHSEB rules and procedures. If a winning team cannot attend the National Bowl, the NHSEB Executive Committee will allow the regional or virtual

playoff runner-up to participate. The NHSEB Executive Committee must be notified in advance if a school cannot attend the National Bowl.

The NHSEB Executive Committee places no maximum limit on the number of schools or teams in any regional bowl; however, Regional Organizers are allowed to cap the number of participating teams per school to enable a fair competition. Schools may enter more than one team, but only one team from any school can qualify for the NHSEB. **Team composition is allowed to change from the regional bowl to the NHSEB; the high school is being represented at the National Bowl.** Multiple teams from one high school that competed in a qualifying regional bowl can combine to form one NHSEB team with up to seven members. All members from multiple teams need to be registered and must have competed in their regional bowl in order to create one team for the National Bowl.

If members of a winning team cannot compete at the National Bowl, the result of which the team has fewer than three members and the high school has no additional teams, the coach/advisor should contact the NHSEB Executive Committee to request permission to add new members to the team.

A school may only participate in one qualifying regional bowl during an academic year. Schools are required to participate in the regional bowl closest to their geographical area. Schools may apply to the NHSEB Executive Committee for a waiver to participate in a different regional bowl in lieu of their most local bowl. In order to be recognized as a participating school in a regional bowl, a team must comply with all provisions of Section IV.

Regional bowls are strongly encouraged to use the NHSEB format and score sheet. Teams from regionals with different policies and formats have found themselves at a significant disadvantage at the NHSEB. If a regional bowl has policies, formats, or cases that differ from the standard NHSEB format and procedures, the regional organizer should notify the NHSEB Executive Committee of these changes.

Regional bowl matches must be judged by **three neutral judges** (not parents, coaches, or teachers from participating schools), see Section V.

A winning regional team must have a school administrator (e.g. principal, dean, head of school) complete the Authorized Team Registration form and all participants (students, coaches/advisors and official chaperones) must complete Participant Disclosure and Release forms. These forms must be submitted to the Parr Center for Ethics *no less than four weeks* from the National Bowl.

In order to be recognized as a participating school in a regional bowl, **a school must pay a registration fee of \$75 to NHSEB at least four weeks before the regional bowl.** The preferred method is through the online registration linked at <http://nhseb.unc.edu/local/registration/>. If schools cannot pay online using a credit card, they may remit a check to the Squire Family Foundation (the address can be found on the webpage listed above). In the event of economic hardship, a school should consult the NHSEB Executive Committee for scholarship opportunities. *Regional organizers may charge additional registration fees for schools/teams in order to cover regional bowl expenses.*

When a school pays its registration fee to the NHSEB, this does not automatically register the school to compete in a regional bowl. The coach/advisor of a team(s) must contact the regional organizer to participate in that bowl. Information on how to contact your regional bowl organizer is linked at <https://nhseb.unc.edu/local/>. Additionally, some regional bowls have additional registration fees or forms.

Upon completion of a regional bowl, the regional organizer should certify complete results, rank the teams from first to last-place, and forward this information to the NHSEB Executive Committee.

The NHSEB Executive Committee reserves the right to make exceptions to these rules in the interests of fairness and consistency or when in the best interest of the NHSEB participants and the overall event.

IV. TEAMS – RULES AND GUIDELINES

A. Rules

A team must meet the following criteria to qualify for, and to participate in, the National High School Ethics Bowl and to count as a qualifying team in their regional bowl:

- A team must be composed of *at least three high school students*. NHSEB teams will be capped at seven students (all of whom participated on a qualifying team at a regional bowl – see below), but keep in mind that **only five students can be seated on a team in any one match**.
- A team must represent an accredited and certified school that offers classes for grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12 in the United States and *must* have the official endorsement of the school administration to participate in High School Ethics Bowls.
- Homeschool exception: Regional bowl organizers may, at their discretion, allow a team or teams of homeschool students to participate. Regional organizers should attempt to verify age and encourage homeschool students to form a team from multiple families. Participants may not be otherwise enrolled in another accredited high school.
- All teams must have a coach or advisor vetted and approved by school administration. *If a team does not have an adult coach or advisor approved by the school's administration, the team cannot compete at the Regional or National bowl.*
 - Homeschool exception: the coach or advisor of a homeschool team will be vetted and approved by the NHSEB Executive Committee.

The student composition of the team is allowed to change from the regional bowl to the NHSEB

- The high school is represented at the National Bowl; not individual teams.
- If a school enters multiple teams into a regional bowl, those teams can combine to form a new team for the NHSEB with up to seven members. All members from both teams need to be registered and must have competed in their regional bowl in order to create one team for the National Bowl.
- A team may substitute members from round to round if a team has more than five registered members; substitution cannot occur not during a match.
- If members of a winning team cannot compete at the National Bowl, the result of which the team has fewer than three members and the high school has no additional teams, the coach/advisor should contact the NHSEB Executive Committee to request permission to add members to the team.
- It is NHSEB policy to encourage schools and regional bowls to build strong, committed, larger teams rather than to divide the pool of interested students into a larger number of smaller teams.

All members of the team must be enrolled at the participating high school during the semesters that both the RQEB and NHSEB take place. No graduates may participate.

The team must have paid the NHSEB registration fee prior to the regional bowl.

All team members (students, coaches, and official chaperones) are expected to follow all federal, state, and local laws while traveling to/from and attending either their regional bowl or the National Bowl. Illegal activity and/or disruptive behavior (including, but not limited to, intoxication, violence, verbal abuse, or harassment) may result in the removal of the participant(s) and disqualification of the team.

B. Guidelines

Ethics bowl is not Debate, and this is an important distinction. In ethics bowl, teams are not required to pick opposing sides, nor is the goal to “win” the argument by belittling the other team or its position. Ethics Bowl is, at heart, a collaborative discussion during which the first team presents its analysis of a question about the ethical dilemma at the core of the case being discussed, offering support for its position but also considering the validity of other positions.

The goal is to demonstrate breadth and depth of thinking about difficult and important ethical situations. In fact, teams are rewarded for the degree to which they eschew adversarial positioning and instead adopt a more collegial, collaborative stance.

- *In other words, 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 trying to solve a difficult problem—while impressing the judges with thoughtful, considered analysis and support. Listening to the other team with an aim to affirm, gently correct, supplement, or build on their argument is a prudent approach.*
- Additionally, because an ethics bowl encourages collaboration, team members are encouraged to remain seated rather than stand during a match.

In the past, there has been some concern that teams were penalized or rewarded depending on whether one person speaks or everyone contributes. We understand that each team has its own process:

- Some divide up the cases so that individuals are responsible for a certain number of cases; as a result one person would present. Other teams ask that each member of the team become responsible for a different aspect of all the cases; as a result, all team members would speak.
- **Either of these strategies (or variations) is feasible and scoring is neutral on this issue.** However, judges do not know which approach a team will take unless they are informed. Therefore, to dispel any preconceptions that a judge may harbor, we strongly urge that a team outline its presentation when it begins – that is, the team should explain who will be discussing which aspect(s) of the case and why. This way, a judge will know what kind of presentation to expect.

- *We have let the judges know that they should neither penalize nor reward a team for using either approach: both are welcome.*

Successful analyses will include a clear and detailed understanding of the facts of a case. Since cases are often highly complex, researching the topic or incident involved may be helpful. Although teams may use outside research to prepare for a match, they should not assume that merely presenting factual information will impress the judges. Teams need to propose valid, sound, persuasive arguments that are buttressed by fact to score well. If a team introduces a specific fact not contained in the case, the team should cite the source (e.g. “according to a 2011 article in National Geographic...”).

When researching cases, teams should think of this as an opportunity to gather and assess arguments supporting a wide range of points of view rather than to seek only those sources that support opinions the team already holds. As team members analyze the range of arguments, they should strive to get inside the heads of those who have different beliefs than the ones with which they are familiar. What motivates people to have certain beliefs? What are their values? A team should also ask, “Why is this case hard?” If it doesn’t seem hard, it is a good sign a team is not probing deeply enough. The cases are supposed to challenge worldviews. Asking questions like these will help a team solidify its own position.

During a Presentation, a team should make sure it introduces the case and identifies the central moral question. A team must clearly and systematically address the question asked by the moderator. After presenting a position, a team should explain how others might have different points of view. Empathize with this position even if your team disagrees with it.

During the Commentary, a team’s role is to help the other team perfect its presentation, NOT to present its own position on the case. When team members comment, they should think of themselves as thoughtful, critical listeners. Their goal is to point out the flaws in the presentation, to comment on its strengths, note what has been omitted or needs further development; all this is in the interest of making the presentation of the case stronger.

Although teams are allowed to and should pose questions during Commentary, the first team is under no obligation to answer any or all questions raised by the second team (or vice versa). The presenting team, however, should be able to answer the most crucial or morally pressing question or two (in the event that there are more than two questions).

- Teams are expected to ask insightful questions that target the primary position, key implications, or unaddressed central issues.
- When scoring Commentary, judges will consider the questions raised by the opposing team and whether the questions addressed truly substantive issues—both in relation to the presentation and the moderator’s question.
- **A “question shower” or “spit-fire questioning,” during which a team rapidly asks many questions in an attempt to overwhelm or dominate the other team, is inconsistent with the aims of Ethics Bowl, and will not merit a high score.**

On occasion, team members may discover that they want to modify or perhaps change an aspect of their initial “position” as a result of the second team’s commentary. Some judges may

think this indicates that the team did not fully think through its initial position. However, because the ethics bowl is about ethical inquiry, and because these are high school students, and changing one's mind can be considered a sign of fluid rather than crystallized intelligence – a hallmark of higher-order thinking – *changing or modifying a position is not necessarily negative*.

Judging the quality of a team's analysis is subjective and difficult. It is easy for teams to fault or blame judges if that team loses a match. To fully understand how judges reach their decisions, make sure to read the guidelines for judges (Section V-B). Judges come from diverse backgrounds: some are philosophers or professional ethicists; others come from a range of fields such as business, education, medicine, journalism; and some are fans of ethics bowls. Part of the task of a successful ethics bowler is to communicate reasoning effectively to judges who have different viewpoints and life experiences.

Because of judges' backgrounds are so diverse, teams do not have to reference specific ethicists or ethical theories: doing so is not a requirement of a good answer, nor is it indicative of a poor answer. *The argument matters; it is not necessary to name the philosopher associated with the argument*. Keep in mind that a team is speaking to a broad audience: many judges have no formal background in philosophy or ethics, and may not understand your reference to "Kantianism." A good strategy is to explain ethical reasoning in terms everyone can understand.

However, if a team member does refer to "deontology," for example, make sure the reference is accurate. A judge may question you about it during the judges' questioning portion of the match. **In short, remember that philosophical name-dropping is not a substitute for presenting a sound argument.**

V. JUDGES – RULES AND GUIDELINES

A. Rules

All matches at the NHSEB or a qualifying regional bowl should be judged by a panel of *three neutral judges*. (That is, a judge should not be a coach or parent of a child on any participating team; teachers should not judge their own students; judges should not have other obvious conflicts of interest.) If a regional organizer is unsure if a judge is neutral, contact the NHSEB Executive Committee before assigning the judge in question.

Judges should not interrupt teams during their presentation, commentary, or response periods by asking questions, offering prompts, or gesturing. Judges should maintain a judicial and unbiased tone towards all teams. Socializing with teams and/or their coaches before or after to a match is discouraged (e.g. greeting teams or coaches you may know). This behavior can appear to confer an unfair advantage to one team over another. Please wait until the competition has completely ended to approach teams or coaches to avoid the appearance of unfair judging.

Judges should direct their questions to a team as a whole and not an individual or a subset of the team. It would be particularly inappropriate to ask a question of student(s) based on an immutable characteristic, such as race, religion, gender, gender identity, ethnicity, disability, national origin, sexual orientation, appearance, etc. (e.g. addressing a question about immigration to a student who speaks with an accent).

Judges should score based solely upon content, not on whether one person, a few, or all team members speak.

- Each team decides for itself how to divide up speaking time during all portions of the match. Some teams choose to have an individual “own” a certain case. Other teams prefer to have each person on the team speak for a portion of the match.
- *Teams should be neither rewarded nor penalized for taking either approach.* Teams have been advised to explain who will speak at the beginning their Presentation so that everyone has an idea of how the presentation will be structured.

Judges should not discuss their scoring decisions with each other; each judge is to rely on her or his own private judgment.

It is counterproductive when judges talk to teams about their scoring (particularly, other judges’ scoring). Teams will receive score sheets with comments after the event is over. *Please refrain from explaining scores, giving overt criticism to a team during or after a match, or expressing disagreement with a fellow judge’s scoring.* Teams need to focus on their next match, not a comment that a judge made at the end of the previous match.

The moderator “rules the room.” The moderator will direct the match by indicating whose turn it is to speak and how much time remains. At the end of the match, the moderator will collect the judges’ score sheets, check the math, and then ask individual judges’ to announce their team vote and score. In the unlikely event that something out of the ordinary occurs or the match is disrupted, the moderator will direct participants on next steps.

B. Guidelines

A judge's role in ethics bowl is to gauge a team's breadth and depth of thought as applied to a specific ethical scenario (called a case). These guidelines will help to explain how to evaluate a team's performance:

- Teams have received the cases several weeks, if not months, in advance. They have “practiced” by meeting to discuss the ethical components of the cases and to formulate their analyses. During Ethics Bowl, the teams know that the cases they will discuss come from this set, but they don't know which case will be used in any given round, nor do they know the question asked (until announced by the moderator).
- A good answer indicates both breadth and depth of thought. A prepared team recognizes that there are multiple viewpoints or possible “answers,” discusses them, and then explicates its own position about the case. The presentation should clearly and systematically address the moderator's question.
- The second team then has time to comment on the first team's presentation. **This commentary should be focused on the primary team's answer.** That is, during the commentary, the second team can ask for clarification, point out contradictions, ask for more information, etc. The second team should NOT use this time to present its analysis of the case. They will have the opportunity to present a case during the other half of the match.

During the Commentary, the first team is under no obligation to answer any or all questions raised by the second team (or vice versa). The presenting team, however, should be able to answer the most crucial or morally-pressing question or two (in the event that there are more than two questions).

- Teams are expected to ask insightful questions that target the primary position, key implications, or unaddressed central issues.
- When scoring Commentary, judges will consider the questions raised by the opposing team and whether the questions addressed truly substantive issues—both in relation to the presentation and the moderator's question.
- A “question shower” or “spit-fire questioning,” during which a team rapidly asks many questions in an attempt to overwhelm or dominate the other team, is inconsistent with the aims of Ethics Bowl, and will not merit a high score.

During the answer, commentary and response, judges do not ask questions or comment. However, after the primary team responds to the other team's commentary, the moderator will indicate that it is time for the judges to ask questions. *This is the longest individual portion of the match because the questions posed give students the opportunity to think on their feet – they cannot prepare for this portion of the match.* As a result, judges will gain more insight into the breadth and depth of the team's analysis of the case.

- A judge's question should be short and to-the-point (usually 30 seconds or less) and should be designed to help probe the team's understanding of the case. *Please do not use this opportunity to argue your own perspective.*

- Most importantly, please remember that the main criterion for judging is to evaluate teams based on the breadth and depth of their thinking about a difficult ethical situation. This includes addressing and evaluating opposing or different viewpoints. Judges should NOT engage a team in an argument based on a personal viewpoint nor score a team based on whether the judge agrees or disagrees with the team's position.

On occasion, team members may discover that they want to modify or perhaps change an aspect of their initial "position" as a result of the second team's commentary. Some judges may think this indicates that the team did not fully think through its initial position. However, because the ethics bowl is about ethical inquiry, and because these are high school students, and **changing one's mind can be considered a sign of fluid rather than crystallized intelligence—a hallmark of higher-order thinking—changing or modifying a position is not necessarily negative.** Before making a judgment, consider several questions: Was the team's initial position well-founded and thought-out? Is their revised position well-founded and thought-out? *In short, modifying or changing a position needs to be judged on its individual merits.*

Judges should maintain a judicial and unbiased tone towards all teams. Socializing with teams and/or their coaches before or after to a match is discouraged (e.g. greeting teams or coaches you may know). This behavior can appear to confer an unfair advantage to one team over another. Please wait until the competition has completely ended to approach teams or coaches to avoid the appearance of unfair judging.

Finally, at the bottom of the score sheet, a team can receive 1–5 points for engaging in productive and respectful dialogue as opposed to combative debate. This is to underscore the importance of civil and respectful dialogue, an essential value of Ethics Bowl. Teams that earn five points in this category demonstrate their awareness that an ethics bowl is about participating in a collegial, collaborative, philosophical discussion aimed at earnestly thinking through difficult ethical issues. *It is not a contest between adversaries.* Teams that score poorly in this category are those that resort to rhetorical flourishes, adopt a condescending, critical tone, and are unduly adversarial

VI. MODERATORS – PROCEDURES

All moderators will use the official NHSEB moderator script to guide the matches. The moderator script can be downloaded from the NHSEB website under “Rules and Resources.” It is essential that moderators adhere to the script, word by word, and not improvise.

The moderator’s timekeeping efforts help the event unfold in a timely manner and ensure that all teams have equal opportunities to express their arguments.

All teams will get two standardized time notifications from the moderator during their Presentations: one when three minutes remain and one when one minute remains. During the Commentary and Response portions, the moderator will give notifications with one minute remaining. During the judges’ questions portion of the match, the moderator will notify the panel when two minutes remain.

No more than five students can be seated on a team. Teams cannot substitute members, review notes or confer with their coach once a match begins. Moderators will provide scrap paper and pens supplied by the event organizer.

The moderator will announce the beginning of the match once everyone is settled by welcoming teams, coaches and judges, and introducing him or herself. Next, judges and the teams will be invited to introduce themselves.

Match Format (in brief):

- a) Each match will begin with a coin toss by the moderator. The coin will be provided ahead of time by the regional organizer. The team that wins the coin toss may elect to present first (designating them as Team A) or to have the other team present first (in which case the team winning the toss is designated as Team B).
- b) In the first half of the match, copies of the first case and question will be distributed to the *judges first* and the participants (*Team A and Team B second*). Neither the judges nor team members will know which case will be presented or what question will be asked. The moderator will distribute copies of the cases and question face down so that no one sees the case before the moderator reads the question.
- c) The moderator will announce the case and reads the question. The moderator should only read the case title and the question; not the entire case, if listed.
- d) **Team A has 2 minutes** to confer. Either team may make notes, but Team B must remain silent.
- e) **Team A has up to 5 minutes** to make its presentation. Any member(s) of the team can talk (see Section IV).
- f) **Team B has 1 minute to confer** (Team A is silent).

- g) **Team B has up to 3 minutes to comment on the presentation.** Any member(s) may comment.
- h) **Team A has 1 minute to confer** (Team B is silent)
- i) **Team A has 3 minutes to respond to Team B.** Any member(s) may respond.
- j) **Judges have 30 seconds to confer** if they would like, and then ask questions of Team A. The question and answer period will last **for up to 10 minutes.** Judges' questions should be brief and clear, and devoid personal commentary.
- k) Judges score Team A's presentation and response, and Team B's commentary.
- l) In the second half of the match, Steps (b) through (k) are repeated with a new case and question, and with the teams reversing positions (Team A becomes Team B).
- m) At the end of the match, the moderator will ask the judges to hold up their match tally sheet and announce their votes. After all the judges state their votes, the moderator will name the winning team (or announce a tie) and the number of judges' votes for that team. Moderators will then pass score sheets to a room staffer who will return all materials back to the Bowl headquarters for compilation with scores from other matches.