

Ethics Bowl Rules & Procedures

1. In an Ethics Bowl match, each 3 to 5 member team-representing no more than two universities-will be questioned by a moderator on a case. Although the cases are made available ahead of time, none of the participants will know in advance which of the cases they will be asked to address in the Ethics Bowl competition, nor will they know the questions. Books and notes will not be allowed. However, blank scrap paper to jot down thoughts is permitted.
2. At the beginning of each match, the moderator will flip a coin. The winner of the coin toss will choose to go first or second.
3. The moderator will read aloud the case and a question about the case.
4. The team will have one (1) minute to confer, after which one spokesperson for the team may use up to five (5) minutes to respond to the moderator's question.
5. The opposing team receives one (1) minute to confer, after which it may choose to present a response to the other team's answer and/or pose a question to the other team. The opposing team's response/question may not exceed five (5) minutes.
6. The first team will have one (1) minute to confer, after which it may have up to five (5) minutes to respond to the opposing team's statement or question.
7. The judges have one (1) minute to confer. Each judge asks one question, with the option of one brief immediate follow-up question. The entire period for the judges' questions should not exceed sixteen (16) minutes.
8. The first team has one (1) minute to confer after each question and two (2) minutes to respond to each question. Different team members may respond to the questions of different judges. However, only one team member may respond to a judge's question.
9. When the first team is done answering the judges' questions, the opposing team will have one (1) minute to confer, and then have two (2) minutes to make a closing statement or rebuttal.
10. Scoring. Each team will be evaluated on the basis of four (4) criteria:
 - i. **Intelligibility**—Has the team stated and defended its position in a way that is logically consistent? Has the team expressed its responses with enough clarity and precision that the judges can understand it?
 - ii. **Depth**—To what extent does the team's statement and defense of its position indicate an awareness and understanding of the issues that the judge views as ethically central to the case.
 - iii. **Focus**—To what extent does the team's statement and defense of its position avoid issues that are ethically irrelevant to the case?
 - iv. **Judgment**—To what extent, in the judge's view, has the team made a careful and reasonable comparative assessment of considerations it identifies as ethically relevant to the case.
11. Each of the four criteria will be rated on a scale from one to five, five being the highest score, one being the lowest. When the scores for the four criteria are tallied, a team may

receive as many as twenty (20) points per judge or as few as four (4). A perfect score for a panel of three judges would be sixty (60) points. Each judge will give the opposing team an overall score of one to five-five (5) being the highest score-based on the same criteria.

12. Teams switch roles, and steps 3-9 are repeated with a different case.
13. The winner is announced (although the scores are not). The team with the most points wins the match, and continues on to the next round of competition until it either wins the tournament or is defeated. Judges are invited to make any final comments to the participating teams.