**JUDGE’S SCORE SHEET FRONT – TEAM ONE**

**JUDGE’S Name:**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**PRESENTING Team:**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Part 1: PRESENTING Team’s (#1) initial presentation (7 minutes: 10 total points)**

**1. Intelligibility** Multiple viewpoints, clear/coherent arguments, and value integrative solutions.

1 = Serious problems that undermine intelligibility (poor)

2 = Hard to follow and barely intelligible (passable)

3 = Reasonable, clear and coherent

4 = Very reasonable and clear presentation

5 = Exceptional Intelligibility

**2. Integrating Ethical Concerns** Reversible positions, weighing key consequences, and integrating key virtues and values.

1 = Minimal integration and/or incorrectly employed ethical concepts

2 = One or two ethical approaches are adequately integrated (passable)

3 = Three ethical approaches are integrated and coordinated in the presentation (pass +)

4 = Three approaches are integrated and guide and constitute the solution/position.

(pass ++)

5 = Exceptional understanding and integration of ethical approaches

**3. Avoiding Ethical Irrelevance** Taking steps to avoid exploring technical, financial, political, and legal implications without tying them to ethical import.

1 = Answer demonstrates complete ethical irrelevance (poor)

2 = Ethical irrelevance does not completely crowd out ethical relevance

3 = Answer is reasonably free of ethical irrelevance (pass +)

4 = Answer is free of ethical irrelevance (pass ++)

5 = Exceptional avoidance of ethical irrelevance

**4. Moral Imagination and Moral Creativity:** Successful framing of ethical problems, multiple framings of ethical problems, identifying and integrating key stakeholder concerns, and generating serious, insightful, and non-obvious solutions and arguments

1 = No projection into different perspectives and no deviation from obvious solutions/arguments

2 = Minimally MI and MC (passable)

3 = Underdeveloped MI and MC (passable)

4 = Clear and effective employment of MI and MC

5 = Exceptional MI and MC

**TOTAL for (front) Initial Presentation TEAM ONE (maximum 10)**

*TURN OVER AFTER INITIAL PRESENTATION & RECORD SCORE*

**JUDGE’S SCORE SHEET BACK – TEAM ONE**

**Part 2: OPPPOSING Team’s (#2) Commentary (7 minutes: 10 total points)**

To what extent has the team effectively dealt with the presenting team’s arguments?

1 = Failure to respond

2 = Weak or irrelevant response (poor)

3 = Some points are made (passable)

4 = Key points zeroed in on (crystal clear)

5 = Exceptionally composed commentary

**1-10 points**

**for OPPOSING**

**Team (#2)**

**These points are**

**added to the**

**other score sheet**

**Part 3: PRESENTING Team’s (#1) Response to Commentary and Peer Review Teams (5 + 15 minutes: 10 total points)**

How did the team respond to the opposing team’s commentary and the judge’s questions?

1 = Failure to respond

2 = Weak Response (poor)

3 = Some points are made (passable)

4 = Key points zeroed in on (crystal clear)

5 = Exceptionally composed response

**1-20**

**points for**

**PRESENTING**

**Team**

**TOTAL SCORE FOR TEAM ONE**

**+ + =**

**Total from Response Commentary TOTAL SCORE**

**the Front to Commentary on other team (maximum 10)**

***(from the other score sheet)***