



SHANGHAI INTERSCHOLASTIC ETHICS BOWL

Match Format, Rules, Procedures, and
Guidelines for 2020

This page intentionally left blank

This document is adapted from the Program Rules, Procedures, and Guidelines for 2019-2020
of the National High School Ethics Bowl with special permission. Any reproduction without authorization from
the NHSEB is illegal.

I. THE SIEB FORMAT

Individual Match Format

Ethics bowl matches feature two teams meeting face-to-face to discuss and evaluate case studies which feature tricky moral questions or dilemmas. These cases come from the SIEB's **Case Set**. The Case Set is scheduled to release after registration is closed. Each match will also have three judges and one moderator, and spectators are encouraged to attend as well.

While each team participating in a match may be composed of up to seven members, only up to five members may be seated for any given match. These team members must be selected and seated at the table before the match opens. Substitutions may not occur during a match. Throughout the match, judges will evaluate each team based on their performance. A moderator will be in charge of the room during matches. They keep time and move the match through its various components (see below) while ensuring that all participants and spectators comply with the rules. For more on the respective roles of judges and moderators, see Section II below.

Each match will begin with a coin toss. The team that wins the coin toss may elect to present first (designated as Team A) or to have the other team present first (in this situation, the winner of the coin toss is then designated as Team B).

To open the first half of the match, copies of the first case and question will be distributed to the judges and teams. The moderator will then read the case number, title, and a question for competition. Neither judges nor the teams will know in advance which case will be presented or which question will be asked. We'll refer to this as the **Moderator's Period**. The first half will then proceed as follows:

1. **Presentation Period:** After the case and question are introduced, Team A will have up to two minutes to confer, after which any member(s) of Team A may speak for up to six minutes in response to the moderator's question, based on the team's research and critical analysis. Team A must address the moderator's question during the time allotted.
2. **Commentary Period:** Next, Team B will have up to one minute to confer, after which Team B may speak for up to three minutes to comment on Team A's presentation.
3. **Response Period:** Team A will then have up to one minute to confer, followed by three minutes to respond to Team B's commentary.
4. **Judges' Period:** The judges will then begin their ten minute question and answer session with Team A. Before asking questions, the judges may confer briefly. Each judge should have time for at least one question, and may ask more questions if time permits.

Teams are allowed to briefly confer (20 to 30 seconds) before answering a judge's question. More than one team member may respond to a given judge's question. Judges then evaluate the Presentation, Response, and Responses to Judges' Questions by Team A and the Commentary by Team B, and assess the teams based on the judging guidelines found in Section II below.

Upon the conclusion of each half of the match, judges will score each team as follows:

- **Team's Presentation on the Moderator's Question (up to 15 points):** In evaluating a team's answer to the moderator's question, the judges will give the team a score of 1-5 on each of these three evaluation criteria:
 - Did the presentation clearly and systematically address the case question asked?

- Did the presentation identify and thoroughly discuss the central moral dimensions of the case raised by the question asked?
 - Did the presentation indicate both awareness and thoughtful consideration of different viewpoints, including those that would loom large in the reasoning of individuals who disagree?
- Opposing Team's Commentary (up to 10 points)**
- Presenting Teams' Response to the Opposing Team's Commentary (up to 10 points)**
- Presenting Team's Responses to Judges' Questions (up to 20 points)**
- Each team's display of Respectful Dialogue throughout the match (up to 5 points)**

The judges should not discuss their scoring decisions with each other; each judge is to rely on their own private judgment. For more information on the guidelines and rules for judges, see Section II below.

After the judges have made their scoring decisions, the moderator will read the second case number, title, and question to the same two teams, beginning the second half of the match. The second half will proceed as above, with Team B presenting, Team A offering commentary, Team B responding, and then Team B participating in the judges' question and answer session.

Thus, in each match, each team will have the opportunity to present one case and to respond to the other team's presentation of another case, for a total of 60 points possible from each of the three judges.

As each match concludes, moderators will help validate scores with the judges and tabulate, based on the scores, which team receives each judge's vote. The winner of the match will be the team with the highest number of votes (out of three totals). For example:

Judge 1: Team A 48, Team B 43 (1 vote for Team A)

Judge 2: Team A 45, Team B 44 (1 vote for Team A)

Judge 3: Team A 39, Team B 49 (1 vote for Team B)

Here, Team A is the winner of the match with two judges' votes despite the fact that Team B had a higher overall point total.

If a judge scores both teams equally (a tie), both teams are awarded 1/2 of that judge's vote. A match can end in a tie—if all three judges score the match a tie, or one judge votes for Team A, one for Team B, and one scores a tie. Point differential is not a factor in determining the winner of an individual match although it is a criterion that is used as a tiebreaker when ranking teams at the end of the seeding rounds.

At the end of the match, the moderator will ask all the judges to individually announce their vote. Next, the moderator will name the winning team (or announce a tie) and the number of judges' votes for that team. Moderators will then pass score sheets to a room staffer who will return all materials to SIEB HQ for compilation with scores from other matches.

Match Timing Overview*

PERIOD	TIME ALLOWANCE	TOTAL TIME
Moderator's Period	can vary (~5 minutes)	~5 minutes
Presentation Period	2 minutes to confer 6 minutes to present	7 minutes 13 minutes
Commentary Period	1 minute to confer 3 minutes to comment	14 minutes 17 minutes
Response Period	1 minute to confer 3 minutes to respond	18 minutes 21 minutes
Judges' Period	10 minutes for Q+A	~31 minutes total

* This chart represents the timing for each *half* of a typical match. After Team A proceeds through the first half as the presenting team with Team B commenting, the process will repeat with Team B making a presentation, Team A commenting, and so on.

Match Rules

At the start of each match, scratch paper will be provided for team members to make notes during the match, but outside notes and materials are prohibited. All materials will be collected at the end of each match by the moderator or room staffer.

The moderator will keep official time of each period of the match. The moderator is allowed to use their own device to keep accurate time. Teams may use their own timers with the following restrictions and conditions: (a) the timer cannot be any device that stores data or connects to the internet, and (b) a team may not time the portions of the match when the other team speaks or confers. The moderator can allow a team to finish a sentence/thought once time has expired.

All teams will get two standardized time notifications from the moderator during their Presentation Period: one when three minutes remain and one when one minute remains. During the Commentary Period and Response Period, the moderator will give notifications when one minute remains. Prior to the match starting, moderators will consult with teams if they prefer auditory (verbal, knocks, etc.) or physical (e.g., a hand gesture, visual representation, etc.) reminders. When judges ask questions, the moderator will notify the panel when there are two minutes remaining.

The moderator controls the room during matches and should address any unacceptable behavior including, but not limited to:

- Coaches, parents, or audience members communicating—verbally or non-verbally, or demonstrably reacting to team members during a match.
- Judges showing hostility or asking inappropriate questions to team members. Inappropriate questions include, but are not limited to, any that highlight a participant's race, religion, gender,

gender identity, ethnicity, disability, national origin, sexual orientation, appearance, etc. Judges should direct their constructive questions to teams based on the discussion, not to individuals.

- Anyone in the room who intentionally makes distracting noises while one of the teams, judges, or moderator has the floor.
- Foul, insulting, or excessively graphic language or confrontational behavior by anyone in the room.

Please note, the moderator can only control the noise within the match room. If there are outside distractions, such as construction or students talking, it is up to the moderator, not coach or parent, to decide if the match should be paused.

Teams must answer the moderator's case question during the Presentation period. Teams are judged and scored on how well its members clearly and systematically address the question asked.

Teams will not be penalized or rewarded by the judges depending on whether one person speaks or everyone contributes. We have let the judges know that they should neither penalize nor reward a team for using either approach: both are welcome.

When one team confers or speaks, the other team and audience members must remain silent although writing and passing notes is permitted. (For example, when Team A is given the case and question, they are allowed to confer for two minutes and then present for six minutes. During those eight minutes, Team B is permitted to write notes, but must remain silent.)

Cases and Questions

Competing teams should use the SIEB case set and the included study questions to practice for the competition. The included study questions do not necessarily include the questions moderators will ask teams during the competition. Study questions are designed to help teams prepare, and to think more deeply about the issues at hand.

II. OFFICIAL RULES + PARTICIPATION GUIDELINES

Rules for Teams

A team must be composed of at least five students. SIEB teams will be capped at seven students, but keep in mind that only five students can be seated on a team in any one match. A team may substitute members from round to round if a team has more than five registered members; substitution cannot occur not during a match.

Team members are expected to follow all Chinese laws while traveling to/from and attending the SIEB. Illegal activity and/or disruptive behavior (including, but not limited to, inappropriate speech, violence, verbal abuse, or harassment) may result in the removal of the participant(s) and disqualification of the team.

Guidelines for Teams

Shanghai Interscholastic Ethics Bowl is not speech + debate, and this is an important distinction. In ethics bowl, teams are not required to pick opposing sides, nor is the goal to “win” the argument by knocking down the other team or its position. Ethics bowl is, at heart, a collaborative discussion during which the first team presents its analysis of a question about the ethical dilemma at the core of the case being discussed, offering support for its position but also considering the merits of other positions.

The central goal in SIEB competition is to demonstrate breadth and depth of thinking about difficult and important ethical situations. In fact, teams are rewarded for the degree to which they eschew adversarial positioning and instead adopt a more collegial, collaborative stance.

- In other words, 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 trying to solve a difficult problem—while impressing the judges with thoughtful, considered analysis and support. Listening to the other team with an aim to affirm, gently correct, supplement, or build on their argument is a prudent approach and one that expresses the ideals of the SIEB.
- Because an ethics bowl encourages collaboration, team members are encouraged to remain seated rather than standing during a match.

Teams are not penalized or rewarded depending on whether one person speaks or everyone contributes. We understand that each team has its own process:

- Some divide up the cases so that individuals are responsible for a certain number of cases; as a result, one person would present. Other teams ask that each member of the team become responsible for a different aspect of all the cases; as a result, all team members would speak.
- Either of these strategies or variations is feasible and scoring is neutral on this issue.
- Judges should neither penalize nor reward a team for using either approach: both are welcome.

Successful analyses will include a clear and detailed understanding of the facts of a case. Since cases are often highly complex, researching the topic or incident involved may be helpful. As such, there are no limits on the amount of prior research a team can do to prepare. Although teams may use outside research to prepare for a match, they should not assume that merely presenting factual information will impress the judges. Teams need to propose valid, sound, persuasive arguments that are buttressed by fact to score well. If a team introduces a specific fact not contained in the case, the team should cite the source (e.g. “according to a 2019 article in *The Atlantic*...”).

When researching cases, teams should think of this as an opportunity to gather and assess arguments supporting a wide range of points of view rather than to seek only those sources that support opinions the team already holds. As team members analyze the range of arguments, they should strive to understand the perspectives of those who have different beliefs and concerns than the ones with which they are familiar. Some key questions to ask might be: What motivates people to have certain beliefs? What are their values? A team should also ask themselves: “Why is this case difficult or complex?” If it doesn’t seem to be difficult, it is a good sign a team is not probing deeply enough. The cases are designed to challenge world views. Asking questions like these will help a team solidify its own position.

During the Presentation Period, a team should make sure it briefly introduces the case and identifies the central moral question. A team must clearly and systematically address the case question asked by the moderator. After presenting a position, a team should explain how others might have different points of view. Empathize with these other positions even if your team disagrees.

During the Commentary Period, a team’s role is to help the other team perfect its presentation, not to present its own position on the case. When team members comment, they should think of themselves as thoughtful, critical listeners. Their goal is to point out the flaws in the presentation, to comment on its strengths, note what has been omitted or needs further development. All of these contributions are in the interest of strengthening the analysis of the case.

Although teams are allowed to and should pose questions during Commentary, the first team is under no obligation to answer any or all questions raised by the second team (or vice versa). The presenting team, however, should be able to answer the most crucial or morally pressing question or two (in the event that there are more).

- Teams are expected to ask insightful questions that target the primary position, key implications, or unaddressed central issues.
- When scoring Commentary, judges will consider the questions raised by the opposing team and whether the questions addressed truly substantive issues—both in relation to the presentation and the moderator’s case question.
- A “question shower” or “rapid-fire questioning,” during which a team asks many questions in an attempt to overwhelm or dominate the other team, is inconsistent with the aims of the SHSEB, and will not merit a high score.

On occasion, team members may discover that they want to modify or perhaps change an aspect of their initial position as a result of the second team’s commentary. Some judges may think this indicates that the team did not fully think through its initial position. However, because the ethics bowl is about ethical inquiry, and because these are high school students, and changing one’s mind can be considered a sign of fluid rather than crystallized intelligence—a hallmark of higher-order thinking—**changing or modifying a position is not necessarily negative.**

Judging the quality of a team’s analysis can often be subjective and difficult. It is easy for teams to fault or blame judges if they lose a match. To fully understand how each judge will reach their decisions,

please read the guidelines for judges below. Judges come from diverse backgrounds: some are philosophers or professional ethicists; others come from a range of professional fields such as business, education, medicine, or journalism; and some are fans of ethics bowls. Part of the task of a successful team is to communicate reasoning effectively to judges who have different viewpoints and life experiences.

Because of judges' diverse backgrounds, it is not essential for teams to reference specific ethicists or ethical theories: doing so is not a requirement of a good answer, nor is it indicative of a poor answer. The argument matters; it is not necessary to name the philosopher associated with the argument. Keep in mind that a team is speaking to a broad audience: many judges have no formal background in philosophy or ethics, and may not understand your reference to "Kantianism." A good strategy is to explain ethical reasoning in terms everyone can understand.

If a team member does refer to, say, "deontology" for example, make sure the reference is accurate. A judge may question a team about that specific theory during the judges' question & answer portion of the match.

In short, just remember that philosophical name-dropping is *not* a substitute for presenting a sound argument.

Rules for Judges

All matches should be judged by a panel of three neutral judges. That is, a judge should not be a coach or parent of a child on any participating team; teachers should not judge their own students; judges should not have other obvious conflicts of interest.

Judges should not interrupt teams during their presentation, commentary, or response periods by asking questions, offering prompts, or gesturing. Judges should maintain a judicial and unbiased tone towards all teams. Socializing with teams and/or their coaches before or after to a match is discouraged (e.g. greeting teams or coaches you may know). This behavior can appear to confer an unfair advantage to one team over another. Please wait until the competition has completely ended to approach teams or coaches to avoid the appearance of unfair judging.

Judges should direct their questions to a team as a whole and not an individual or a subset of the team. It would be particularly inappropriate to ask a question of student(s) based on an immutable characteristic, such as race, religion, gender, gender identity, ethnicity, disability, national origin, sexual orientation, appearance, etc. (e.g., addressing a question about immigration to a student who speaks with an accent).

Judges should score based solely upon content, not on whether one person, a few, or all team members speak:

- Each team decides for itself how to divide up speaking time during all portions of the match. Some teams choose to have an individual "own" a certain case. Other teams prefer to have each person on the team speak for a portion of the match.
- Teams should be neither rewarded nor penalized for taking either approach. Teams have been advised to explain who will speak at the beginning their Presentation so that everyone has an idea of how the presentation will be structured.

Judges should not discuss their scoring decisions with each other; each judge is to rely on their own private judgment.

It is counterproductive when judges talk to teams about their scoring (particularly other judges' scoring). Teams will receive score sheets with comments after the event is over. Please refrain from explaining scores, giving overt criticism to a team during or after a match, or expressing disagreement with a fellow judge's scoring. Teams need to focus on their next match, not a comment that a judge made at the end of the previous match.

The moderator "runs the room." Moderators will direct the match by indicating whose turn it is to speak and how much time remains. At the end of the match, the moderator will collect the judges' score sheets, help assist with calculations if needed, and ask individual judges to announce their team vote. In the unlikely event that something out of the ordinary occurs or the match is disrupted, the moderator will direct participants on next steps.

Guidelines for Judges

A judge's role in ethics bowl is to gauge a team's breadth and depth of thought as applied to a specific case. These guidelines will help to explain how to evaluate a team's performance in combination with the score sheet and scoring criteria:

- Teams have received the cases several weeks, if not months, in advance. They have prepared by meeting to discuss the ethical components of the cases and to formulate their analyses. During ethics bowl, the teams know that the cases they will discuss come from this set, but they do not know which case will be used in any given round, nor do they know the question asked (until announced by the moderator).
- A good answer indicates both breadth and depth of thought. A prepared team recognizes that there are multiple viewpoints or possible "answers," discusses them, and then explicates its own position about the case. The presentation should clearly and systematically address the moderator's case question.
- The second team then has time to comment on the first team's presentation. This commentary should be focused on the team's primary answer. That is, during the commentary, the second team can ask for clarification, point out contradictions, ask for more information, etc. The second team should NOT use this time to present its analysis of the case. They will have the opportunity to present a case during the other half of the match.

During the Commentary Period, the first team is under no obligation to answer any or all questions raised by the second team (or vice versa). The presenting team, however, should be able to answer the most crucial or morally pressing question or two (in the event that there are more than two questions).

- Teams are expected to ask insightful questions that target the primary position, key implications, or unaddressed central issues.
- When scoring the Commentary period, judges will consider the questions raised by the opposing team and whether the questions addressed truly substantive issues—both in relation to the presentation and the moderator's question.
- "question shower" or "rapid-fire questioning," during which a team asks many questions in an attempt to overwhelm or dominate the other team, is inconsistent with the aims of the SIEB, and will not merit a high score.

During the Presentation, Commentary and Response periods, judges do not ask questions or comment. After the primary team responds to the other team's commentary, the moderator will indicate that it is

time for the judges to ask questionThis is the longest individual portion of the match because the questions posed give the team an opportunity to think on their feet—they cannot prepare for this portion of the match. As a result, judges will gain more insight into the breadth and depth of the team's analysis of the case.

- A judge's question should be short and to-the-point (usually 30 seconds or less) and should be designed to help probe the team's understanding of the case. Please do not use this opportunity to argue your own perspective. When asking your question(s), please be mindful of the time that remains for other judges to ask their questions as well as for the team to respond.
- Most importantly, please remember that the main criterion for judging is to evaluate teams based on the breadth and depth of their thinking about a difficult ethical situation. This includes addressing and evaluating opposing or different viewpoints. Judges should NOT engage a team in an argument based on a personal viewpoint nor score a team based on whether the judge agrees or disagrees with the team's position.

On occasion, team members may discover that they want to modify or perhaps change an aspect of their initial “position” as a result of the second team’s commentary. Some judges may think this indicates that the team did not fully think through its initial position. However, because the ethics bowl is about ethical inquiry, and because these are high school students, and changing one’s mind can be considered a sign of fluid rather than crystallized intelligence—a hallmark of higher-order thinking—changing or modifying a position is not necessarily negative. Before making a judgment, consider several questions: Was the team’s initial position well-founded and thought-out? Is their revised position well-founded and thought-out? In short, modifying or changing a position should be judged on its individual merits.

Finally, at the bottom of the score sheet, a team can receive up to 5 points for engaging in productive and respectful dialogue as opposed to combative debate. This is to underscore the importance of civil and respectful dialogue—values of central importance to the SIEB program. Teams that earn five points in this category demonstrate their awareness that an ethics bowl is about participating in a collegial, collaborative, philosophical discussion aimed at earnestly thinking through difficult ethical issues. Ethics bowl is not a contest between adversaries. Teams that score poorly in this category are those that resort to rhetorical flourishes, adopt a condescending, critical tone, or are unduly adversarial.

Procedures for Moderators

All moderators will use the SIEB Moderator Script to guide matches. The moderator script is available for download at sieb2020.github.io/resources. It is strongly recommended that moderators adhere to the script and not improvise.

The moderator’s timekeeping efforts help the event unfold in a timely manner and ensure that all teams have equal opportunities to express their arguments.

All teams will get two standardized time notifications from the moderator during their Presentations: one when three minutes remain and one when one minute remains. During the Commentary and Response periods, the moderator will give notifications with one minute remaining. Prior to the match starting, moderators will consult with teams if they prefer auditory (verbal, knocks, etc.) or physical (a hand gesture, visual representation, etc.) reminders. During the judges’ questions portion of the match, the moderator will notify the panel when two minutes remain.

No more than five students can be seated on a team. Teams cannot substitute members, review notes or confer with their coach once a match begins. Moderators will provide scratch paper and pens supplied by the event organizer.

The moderator will announce the beginning of the match once everyone is settled by welcoming teams, coaches and judges, and introducing themselves. Next, judges and the teams will be invited to introduce themselves. Matches will then follow the format above. In brief:

1. Each match will begin with a coin toss, either with a physical coin or the use of a coin flip application by the moderator. The team that wins the coin toss may elect to present first (designating them as Team A) or to have the other team present first (in which case the team winning the toss is designated as Team B).
2. In the first half of the match, copies of the first case and question will be distributed to the judges first and then the participants, Team A and Team B. Neither the judges nor team members will know which case will be presented or what question will be asked. The moderator will distribute copies of the cases and question face down so that no one sees the case before the moderator reads the case question.
3. The moderator will announce the case by its title and read the question. The moderator should only read the case title and the question; not the entire case, if listed.
4. Team A has *2 minutes* to confer. Either team may take notes, but Team B must remain silent.
5. Team A has up to *6 minutes* to make its presentation. Any member(s) of the team may speak.
6. Team B has *1 minute* to confer (Team A is silent)
7. Team B has up to *3 minutes* to comment on the presentation. Any member(s) may comment.
8. Team A has *1 minute* to confer (Team B is silent)
9. Team A has *3 minutes* to respond to Team B. Any member(s) may respond.
10. Judges have *30 seconds* to confer, if they would like, and then ask questions of Team A. The question and answer period will last for up to 10 minutes. Judges' questions should be brief, clear, and devoid of personal commentary.
11. Judges score Team A's presentation and response, and Team B's commentary.
12. In the second half of the match, steps 2-11 are repeated with a new case and question, and with the teams reversing positions (i.e., Team A becomes Team B).
13. At the end of the match, the moderator will ask the judges to announce their team votes. After all the judges state their votes, the moderator will name the winning team (or announce a tie) and the number of judges' votes for that team. Moderators will then pass score sheets to a room staffer who will return all materials back to the competition headquarters for compilation with scores from other matches.