

ETHICS BOWL (EB)

Culminates in Quiz 5

RESOURCES:

<http://www.saa.org/AbouttheSociety/AnnualMeeting/EthicsBowl/EthicsResources/tabid/198/Default.aspx>

Specifically, for the class:

- Class will be divided into 4 TEAMS.
- Each Team is designated by a number (Team 1, 2, 3, 4)
- 2 cases will be posted online for each Ethics Bowl. You should prepare for both since both will be used. If you are NOT a member of a competing team that day YOU SHOULD STILL PREPARE: You may be a judge; also the class contributes short comments and votes for the winners. It is important that you have thought about the problem BEFORE coming to class. It is even better if you have thought about the problem AND have done the readings.

First Round: Case 1 – Should the Parthenon (Elgin) Marbles be Repatriated?

- Ethics Bowl 1: Team 1 (For) vs. Team 2 (Against)
- Ethics Bowl 2: Team 3 (For) vs. Team 4 (Against)

The rest of the students who are neither team members nor judges will have to provide an overall GRADE and a short-answer explaining their choice for winner. These comments will be given to the teams (not the scores) and will be part of the final/overall score for the semifinals.

Second Round: Should Native American Remains Be Repatriated? To Whom?

- Second Round 1: Team 1 (Against) vs. Team 4 (For)
- Second Round 2: Team 2 (Against) vs. Team 3 (For)

The rest of the students who are neither team members nor judges will have to provide an overall GRADE and a short-answer explaining their choice for winner. These comments will be given to the teams (not the scores) and will be part of the final/overall score for the semifinals.

Ethics Bowl Guidelines (Following SAA Guidelines)

Ethics Bowl Judges' Guidelines in Considering Outside Research of Ethics Bowl Teams (from a handout developed for the 9th Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl of the Association of Professional and Practical Ethics)

1. When a team makes use of factual information based on outside research, the judges should pay special attention to whether the team has presented a clear, well-focused (i.e. not too narrow and not overly broad), and deliberately thoughtful analysis to explain why the team considers the independent factual information it presents in a case as ethically relevant.
2. When a team makes use of factual information based on outside research, the judge should pay special attention to whether the team has identified its sources, and presented reasonable grounds for considering the information worthy of being given significant weight.
3. If a team bases its response to a question on independently obtained information that conflicts with information presented in a case then:
 - a. The judge should consider the team as required to present clear and convincing reasons (beyond a mere preponderance of the evidence) for its reliance upon the conflicting information, and
 - b. The judge should not, in any case, penalize a team for relying on information provided in the case.
4. If a team makes use of factual information not provided in a case, the volume of such information that the team acquired through research, as reflected in its presentation, should not be considered, in itself, as a factor in favor of the team's presentation.
5. Teams and all event participants should be sensitive to the diversity of opinions and concerns of the class, following the SAA and the many constituencies it represents. Teams should be encouraged to conduct themselves as representatives of their university.

Ethics Bowl Rules & Procedures (adjusted to fit class requirements)

1. In an Ethics Bowl match, each team will be questioned by a moderator on a case. (For this class) the cases are made available ahead of time, as is the side of each case the teams will be arguing. 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. [1] minute
4. The team will have one (1) minute to confer, after which one spokesperson for the team may use up to three (3) 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 three (3) minutes.
6. The first team will have one (1) minute to confer, after which it may have up to two (2) minutes to respond to the opposing team's statement or question.
7. The TWO judges have one (1) minute to confer. Each judge asks one question [2 minutes], with the option of one brief immediate follow-up question [1 minute]
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.

Summary/ timing

Moderator reads question	: 1 min	} 12 minutes
Team A confers	: 1 min	
Team A responds	: 3 min (max)	
Team B confers	: 1 min	
Team B responds/challenges:	3 min (max)	
Team A confers	: 1 min	
Team A responds	: 2 min	

Judges confer : 1 min
Judges question + follow up : 3 min per judge= 6 min

Team A confers : 1min/ question= 2 min
Team A responds : 2 min/question= 4 min

Team B confers : 1 min/ question= 2min
Team B responds : 2 min/ question= 4min

Total time : 31 minutes/ round

Scoring. Each team will be evaluated on the basis of four (4) criteria:

1. **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?
2. **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.
3. **Focus**—To what extent does the team's statement and defense of its position avoid issues that are ethically irrelevant to the case?
4. **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.

10. 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 ten based on the same criteria. The team will earn extra credit points equivalent to their score.

11. Teams switch roles, and steps 3-9 are repeated with a different case.

12. The winner is announced (although the scores are not). The team with the most points wins the match. Judges are invited to make any final comments to the participating teams.