



3518 FREMONT AVE N #353 SEATTLE, WA 98103  
WWW.PLATO-PHILOSOPHY.ORG

## IN-CLASS ETHICS BOWL GENERAL INFORMATION AND RULES

### Structure of the Event

#### *Round Structure:*

1. Team Conferral Time (2 minutes)
2. Team A Presents (3 minutes)
3. Team B Presents (3 minutes)
4. Team Conferral Time (2 minutes)
5. Open Dialogue (10 minutes with Team A starting)
6. Questioning Judges' Conferral Time (2 minutes)
7. Questioning Judges' Questions to Team A (10 minutes)
8. Questioning Judges' Conferral Time (2 minutes)
9. Questioning Judges' Questions to Team B (10 minutes)
10. Team Conferral Time (2 minutes)
11. Final Question for Team A & Team B (1 minute each with Team B starting)
12. Scoring Time (5 minutes)

Scratch paper is provided for teams to make notes during the cases, but **outside notes and materials are prohibited except for one 3x5 notecard per team member.**

The Ethics Bowl begins with the moderator flipping a coin. The team that wins the toss decides if it wants to go first (becoming Team A on the score sheets) or second (becoming Team B on the score sheets). The moderator then distributes copies of the case to the team members and judges. If there are spectators, the moderator reads the case aloud.

The moderator controls the room during the rounds. When a team is conferring or speaking, the other team, judges, and audience members must remain silent, although teams can pass notes. Teams will receive time notifications from the moderator at their request. When judges are asking questions, the moderator will notify them when there are 2 minutes remaining.

After the moderator finishes reading the case aloud, the round is structured as follows:

**1. Presentations.** Both teams have up to 2 minutes to confer. After this, any member(s) of Team A may speak for up to 3 minutes. Team A can earn up to 10 points from each judge for its presentation. After this, any member(s) of Team B may speak for up to 3 minutes. Team B can earn up to 10 points from each judge for its presentation.

**2. Open dialogue.** Both teams have up to 2 minutes to confer after the presentations. Then the two teams engage in a self-moderated open dialogue for up to 10 minutes. The idea is for the teams to think together about the issues that emerged in the presentations. The open dialogue

begins with Team A speaking. Teams are evaluated on the extent to which they listen to and consider the other team's analysis and questions and on the civility and depth with which the teams discuss the case. Each team can earn up to 10 points from each judge for open dialogue.

**3. Questioning Judges' Questions to Both Teams.** Questioning judges have 2 minutes to confer and then up to 20 minutes for this portion of the round (10 minutes for each team for questions and answers). Each judge may ask team members a question related to the case. If time remains, judges may ask additional questions. Team members should not confer for more than 30 seconds after a question is asked. Each team can earn up to 10 points from each judge for their responses to the judges' questions.

**4. Final Question.** Both teams will have 2 minutes to confer, and then each will respond to the following question: ***What point or points did the other team make that really made you think?*** Team B will respond to the question first, for up to 1 minute, and then Team A will respond to the question for up to 1 minute. Each team can earn up to 5 points from each judge for their response to the final question.

At that point, the scoring judges complete their scoresheets and provide feedback to the teams. Judges score individually, without conferring with one another. **Judges cannot have any ties.** If a judge completes the scoresheet and there is a tie, the judge must revise the scoresheet.

The moderator will then check the math of each scoresheet and make sure the winner is circled on each judge's scoresheet. The moderator will then announce the winner.

**The winning team receives the highest score on the scoresheets of the majority of judges.** The winner of the round is determined by number of judge wins, not total number of points.

### **Guidelines for Questioning and Scoring Judges**

- Questioning judges should not interrupt teams during the presentation, commentary, or response periods with questions, prompts, or gestures.
- Questioning judges should direct questions to the whole team and not individuals or subsets of a team.
- Questioning judges' questions should be short and succinct (usually 30 seconds or less) and should be designed to help probe the team's understanding of the case.
- Scoring judges should not base scores on whether one person, several people, or all team members speak. Each team decides how to divide speaking time.
- Scoring judges should not discuss their scoring decisions with each other.
- Scoring judges should evaluate teams based on the quality of their thinking about a difficult ethical situation and their contribution to a reasoned conversation. Teams should have considered different viewpoints and explained why they reached their conclusions.

- Scoring judges should not score based on whether the judge agrees or disagrees with the team's position.