



Oregon High School Ethics Bowl
Engaging Students for a Better Future

Round 1 Schedule

9:30-10:30 AM

<p>CH 053</p> <p>Columbia River 1 vs. Village Home 2</p>	<p>Moderator: Nick Cortright</p> <p>Judges: Brad Berman Christi Houser Michelle Spahr</p>	<p>CH 071</p> <p>Columbia River 2 vs. Village Home 1</p>	<p>Moderator: Sean McGuire</p> <p>Judges: Priscilla Rader Sarah Bradley Steve Friedland</p>
<p>CH 150</p> <p>Columbia River 3 vs. Lincoln 1</p>	<p>Moderator: Nick Kerr</p> <p>Judges: Jenessa Datema Brad Loveall Tom Dyke</p>	<p>CH 158</p> <p>St. Mary's 1 vs. Clackamas</p>	<p>Moderator: Alex Stephen</p> <p>Judges: Claire Michie Michael Dawson Stacy Spahr</p>
<p>CH 183</p> <p>St. Mary's 2 vs. Village Home 3</p>	<p>Moderator: Katarina Casciato</p> <p>Judges: Brittany Hill Merrill Ahrens Becko Copenhaver</p>	<p>CH 221</p> <p>Lincoln 2 vs. Tigard 2</p>	<p>Moderator: AJ Jinkins</p> <p>Judges: Robert Bremmer Frances Dyke Courtney Rae</p>
<p>CH 250</p> <p>Lincoln 3 vs. Tigard 3</p>	<p>Moderator: Laurel Cullen</p> <p>Judges: Marion McNamara Kirke Wolfe DeEtte Waleed</p>	<p>CH 258</p> <p>Jesuit 1 vs. Tigard 1</p>	<p>Moderator: Emily Higley</p> <p>Judges: Leslie Johnson Les Wardenaar Cindy Brown</p>
<p>CH 271</p> <p>Jesuit 2 vs. Vancouver</p>	<p>Moderator: Jason Davis</p> <p>Judges: Beverly Briggs Richard Josephson Nick Orfanakis</p>	<p>CH 283</p> <p>No Match</p>	



Oregon High School Ethics Bowl
Engaging Students for a Better Future

Round 2 Schedule

10:45-11:45 AM

<p>CH 053</p> <p>Vancouver vs. St. Mary's 1</p>	<p>Moderator: Nick Cortright</p> <p>Judges: Wynne Wakkila Claire Howe Bob Gillis</p>	<p>CH 071</p> <p>Tigard 3 vs. Columbia River 1</p>	<p>Moderator: Sean McGuire</p> <p>Judges: Jenessa Datema Merrill Ahrens Bryan Cwik</p>
<p>CH 150</p> <p>Tigard 1 vs. Lincoln 3</p>	<p>Moderator: Nick Kerr</p> <p>Judges: SA Anders Stacy Spahr Annie Kirschner</p>	<p>CH 158</p> <p>Tigard 2 vs. Lincoln 1</p>	<p>Moderator: Alex Stephen</p> <p>Judges: Martha Bailey Steve Friedland DeLys Ostlund</p>
<p>CH 183</p> <p>No Match</p>		<p>CH 221</p> <p>Clackamas vs. Village Home 3</p>	<p>Moderator: AJ Jinkins</p> <p>Judges: Luis Valls Beverly Briggs Brittany Hill</p>
<p>CH 250</p> <p>Jesuit 2 vs. Village Home 1</p>	<p>Moderator: Laurel Cullen</p> <p>Judges: Shirlee Geiger Avram Hiller Courtney Rae</p>	<p>CH 258</p> <p>Columbia River 3 vs. Jesuit 1</p>	<p>Moderator: Emily Higley</p> <p>Judges: Michelle Spahr Andrew Valls Claire Michie</p>
<p>CH 271</p> <p>Village Home 2 vs. Lincoln 2</p>	<p>Moderator: Jason Davis</p> <p>Judges: Michael Dawson Anthony Petchel Leslie Johnson</p>	<p>CH 283</p> <p>St. Mary's 2 vs. Columbia River 2</p>	<p>Moderator: Benji Echt</p> <p>Judges: Nick Orfanakis Christi Houser Bennett Gilbert</p>



Oregon High School Ethics Bowl
Engaging Students for a Better Future

Round 3 Schedule

12:00-1:00 PM

CH 053 No Match		CH 071 Village Home 2 vs. Jesuit 2	Moderator: Sean McGuire Judges: Frances Dyke Ramona Ilea Tom Dyke
CH 150 Village Home 3 vs. Vancouver	Moderator: Nick Kerr Judges: DeLys Ostlund SA Anders Bryan Cwik	CH 158 Tigard 1 vs. St. Mary's 2	Moderator: Alex Stephen Judges: Lynne Wakkila Luis Valls DeEtte Waleed
CH 183 Columbia River 2 vs. Lincoln 2	Moderator: Katarina Casciato Judges: Marion McNamara Andrew Valls Ted Kaye	CH 221 Tigard 2 vs. Village Home 1	Moderator: AJ Jinkins Judges: Claire Howe Anthony Petchel Kirke Wolfe
CH 250 Jesuit 1 vs. Lincoln 1	Moderator: Laurel Cullen Judges: Doreen Binder Les Wardenaar Annie Kirschner	CH 258 Columbia River 1 vs. Lincoln 3	Moderator: Emily Higley Judges: Robert Bremmer Brad Loveall Beverly Briggs
CH 271 Columbia River 3 vs. Clackamas	Moderator: Jason Davis Judges: Rob Fullmer Martha Bailey Nick Orfanakis	CH 283 St. Mary's 1 vs. Tigard 3	Moderator: Benji Echt Judges: Shirlee Geiger Courtney Rae Richard Josephson



Oregon High School Ethics Bowl
Engaging Students for a Better Future

Middle School Ethics Bowl Schedule

All matches take place in CH 359

<p>Round 1 – 9:30-10:30</p> <p>Vancouver vs. Metro 1</p>	<p>Moderator: Hye Kelly</p> <p>Judges: Ted Kaye Bennett Gilbert Martha Bailey</p>
<p>Round 2 – 10:45-11:45</p> <p>Metro 1 vs. Metro 2</p>	<p>Moderator: Hye Kelly</p> <p>Judges: Priscilla Rader Becko Copenhaver Doreen Binder</p>
<p>Round 3 – 12:00-1:00</p> <p>Vancouver vs. Metro 2</p>	<p>Moderator: Hye Kelly</p> <p>Judges: Avram Hiller Cindy Brown Bob Gillis</p>



Oregon High School Ethics Bowl
Engaging Students for a Better Future

High School Semi-Finals

2:00-3:00 PM
CH 053/CH 071
4 teams TBD

Moderator CH 053:
Sean McGuire

Judges CH 053:
Shirlee Geiger
Ramona Ilea
Michael Reese

Moderator CH 071:
Jason Davis

Judges CH 071:
Monica Mueller
Alex Sager
Andrew Valls

High School Finals

3:30-4:30 PM
CH 053
2 teams TBD

Moderator:
Sean McGuire

Judges:
Ramona Ilea
Monica Mueller
Michael Reese

Guidelines for Judges
Oregon High School Ethics Bowl

We summarize here some of the principal points for judges from the 2017-18 National High School Ethics Bowl: Rules, Procedures, and Guidelines.

Format of Ethics Bowl

Round 1: Moderator distributes cases to teams and judges (neither teams nor judges will know the case to be discussed before the round starts).

Team A: 2 minutes to confer, 6 minutes to present

Team B: 1 minute to confer, 3 minutes to respond to Team A's presentation

Team A: 1 minute to confer, 3 minutes to respond to Team B's challenge

Judges: 10 minutes to ask questions

Contrast between the Ethics Bowl and High School Debate

In the Ethics Bowl

- Responding teams are not required to oppose the presenting team's position (e.g., they can agree with the position and show things that the team overlooked or demonstrate how the team could have made a stronger case).
- Students are judged on their ability to identify and fairly consider opposing positions.
- Students may decide to change their position or part of their position after receiving feedback from the other team or after considering judges' questions. This is not necessarily a weakness in a presentation. Instead, judges should evaluate teams on the breadth and understanding of the issues.

Spirit of the Ethics Bowl

- The spirit of the Ethics Bowl is collaborative, not competitive.
- The goal is provide the most reasonable, insightful, well thought out analysis possible of complex and controversial ethical cases.
- Teams are expected to engage each other in productive and respectful dialogue and to avoid rhetorical flourishes and undue adversarial responses.

Nature of Ethics Bowl Cases

- Ethics Bowl cases are open-ended.
- Reasonable, well-informed people disagree about how they should be resolved.
- They require considerable knowledge about the world and strong analytic, critical, and creative thinking skills to articulate a plausible ethical answer.

Skills that Students Are Expected to Demonstrate

- Civil dialogue that addresses the topic, not the person, and gives reasons that others should be able to accept.
- Sustained reflection on ethical issues.
- Critical thinking/problem solving.

Things to Keep in Mind When Scoring Presentations

- “The judge’s role in ethics bowl is to gauge a team’s breadth and depth of thought as applied to a specific ethical scenario.”¹
- Judges should address their questions to the team as a whole (not to individuals on the team).
- Judges’ questions should be reasonably short (30 seconds or less) and should aim at probing the team’s understanding of the case.
- Judges should not discuss their scoring with each other.
- Teams can use different strategies for how they present their case (e.g., having one main speaker or having all members contribute part of the argument). Judges should focus on the content and the organization of the presentation. How many people speak should not affect how teams are scored.
- The point of the Commentary is to help the other team perfect its presentation, not to present its own position.
- Students have received the cases months in advance and are allowed to and indeed expected to do outside research on the issues where appropriate.
- Written comments on the Score Sheets from judges, especially on how teams could improve their arguments, are greatly valued. The organizers will provide teams with their Score Sheets at the end of the competition.

Resources

- Training Video for Judges, Parr Center for Ethics, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rO580Q4_25k
- 2018 Regional Cases, Rules, Procedures, and Guidelines, Scoresheets, Scoring Rubrics are all available on our website: <https://oregonethicsbowl.org/>

If you have any questions about judging the Oregon High School Ethics Bowl, please don’t hesitate to contact Dave Weber (dweber@pdx.edu) or Alex Sager (asager@pdx.edu).

¹ 2017-18 National High School Ethics Bowl: Rules, Procedures, and Guidelines, p.14

National High School Ethics Bowl Scoring Criteria

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

- A) *Did the presentation clearly and systematically address the moderator's question?*
- 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 = 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 = Insightful analysis and discussion of different viewpoints, including full and careful attention especially 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.

Points for engaging in Respectful Dialogue, as opposed to Combative Debate (5 Points per Team)

- 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
-

National High School Ethics Bowl Score Sheet

TEAM A _____

TEAM B _____

ROUND # _____

Team A Presentation (First case)

- A. Was Team A's presentation clear and systematic? (1-5) _____
- B. Did the team's presentation identify and thoroughly discuss the central moral dimensions of the case? (1-5) _____
- C. Did the team's presentation indicate both awareness and thoughtful consideration of different viewpoints, including those that would loom large in the reasoning of individuals who disagree with the team's position? (1-5) _____

1. Team A presentation score (Total A-C above) of 15

3. Team A response to commentary of 10

4. Team A response to Judges' questions of 20

-----end of case 1-----

2. Team B commentary of 10

-----end of case 1-----

Team B Presentation (Second case)

- A. Was Team B's presentation clear and systematic? (1-5) _____
- B. Did the team's presentation identify and thoroughly discuss the central moral dimensions of the case? (1-5) _____
- C. Did the team's presentation indicate both awareness and thoughtful consideration of different viewpoints, including those that would loom large in the reasoning of individuals who disagree with the team's position? (1-5) _____

5. Team B presentation score (Total A-C above) of 15

7. Team B response to commentary of 10

8. Team B response to Judges' questions of 20

-----end of case 2-----

6. Team A commentary of 10

9. Team A respectful dialogue of 5

10. TOTAL **of 60**

9. Team B respectful dialogue of 5

10. TOTAL **of 60**

Comments for Team A:

Comments for Team B:



PRINTED JUDGE NAME: _____

ROUND # _____

