



# NHSEB Scoring Criteria

*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.*

## Part 1: PRESENTING Team's initial presentation (15 Points Total)

- A) Did the presentation **clearly and systematically address the moderator's question?** (5 points)
- 5 = Crystal clear presentation with all key dimensions appropriately addressed.
  - 4 = Reasonably clear and systematic with most key dimensions well developed.
  - 3 = Hard to follow the argument. Significant dimensions missed (passable).
  - 2 = Serious logical problems or underdeveloped argument (poor).
  - 1 = Incoherent presentation that ignored relevant moral dimensions.
- B) Did the team **clearly identify and thoroughly discuss the central moral dimensions** of the case? (5 points)
- 5 = Exactly identified and thoroughly discussed.
  - 4 = Mostly identified and major issues discussed.
  - 3 = Adequately identified and discussed (passable).
  - 2 = Misidentified some moral dimensions of the case and inadequately discussed (poor).
  - 1 = Misidentified the central moral dimensions.
- C) 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 team's position?** (5 points)
- 5 = Insightful analysis and discussion of different viewpoints, including full and careful attention to differing points of view.
  - 4 = Solid analysis and discussion of different viewpoints, including careful attention given to differing points of view.
  - 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 engaged the presenting team's argument?*

- 10 = Especially insightful 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 just asking questions (poor).
- 2-1 = Failure to respond to presenting team or resorting to personal attacks.

## 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 zeroed in on.
- 8-7 = Solid response to commenting team.
- 6-5 = Some 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 = Exceptionally composed commentary.
- 19-17 = Key points zeroed in on.
- 16-13 = Solid response to commenting team's and judge's points.
- 12-9 = Some 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 a team demonstrate their awareness that an ethics bowl is about participating in a collegial, collaborative, philosophical discussion aimed at earnestly thinking through difficult ethical issues?*

- 5 = Respectfully engaged all parties in exceptionally productive discussion
- 4 = Respectful engagement of other team's arguments and points
- 3 = Respectful of other team's argument but only marginal engagement and pursuit
- 2 = Dismissive of other team's argument
- 1 = Combative and dismissive of other team's argument