

Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl

A night sky with a dark blue background. A bright, white, curved light trail, resembling a comet or a rocket launch, starts from the bottom left and curves upwards and to the right. The trail is composed of many small, bright points of light. The overall image has a high-contrast, dramatic feel.

Prepared by Ed Carr 10/26/06

Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl

The Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl takes place as part of the annual meeting of the Association for Practical and Professional Ethics (APPE).

APPE is committed to encouraging interdisciplinary scholarship and teaching of high quality in practical and professional ethics by educators and practitioners who appreciate the theoretical and practical impacts of their subjects.

To advance this broad purpose, the Association facilitates communication and joint ventures among business and nonprofit organizations, centers, schools, colleges, and individual faculty concerned with the interdisciplinary study and teaching of practical and professional ethics, and supports efforts of colleges and universities, centers, professional associations, and local, state, and national governmental agencies that seek to foster curricular development and scholarly research on ethical issues.

Table of Contents

- **Executive Board**
- **Purpose**
- **History**
- **Educational Objectives**
- **Scoring Criteria**
- **Committees**
- **IEB National Champions (1995-2006)**
- **New IEB Format in 2006-07**
- **Event Logistics**
- **Procedural Rules**
- **Scoring Rules**

Executive Board

Robert Ladenson

Naomi Block

Richard Greene

Mike Ingram

Mike Maxwell

David Ozar

Julie Pedroni

Robert Skipper

Becky Cox-White

Chair

Southeast Regional Ethics Bowl

Wasatch Regional Ethics Bowl

Northwest Regional Ethics Bowl

Central States Regional Ethics Bowl

Upper Midwest Regional Ethics
Bowl

Northeast Regional Ethics Bowl

Texas Regional Ethics Bowl

California Regional Ethics Bowl

Purpose

The Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl (IEB) is an academic competition combining fun and excitement with a valuable educational experience for undergraduate students. Its format, rules, and procedures all have been developed to model the best approaches to reasoning in practical and professional ethics.

In the IEB a moderator poses questions to teams of undergraduate students. Questions address a wide array of subjects – e.g. academic ethics, business or professional ethics, ethics in personal relationships, or social and political ethics. Each team receives a set of mini-cases in advance of the competition, and questions posed to teams are taken from that set. Panels of judges evaluate the teams' responses.

The IEB has received special commendation for excellence and innovation from the American Philosophical Association.

History

The IEB was created by Robert Ladenson, Professor of Philosophy at the Illinois Institute of Technology. Ladenson first conducted an intramural ethics bowl tournament in 1993. Two years later he invited several nearby schools to take part, and in 1997 inaugurated the IEB as a national event by organizing a competition with fourteen teams from colleges and universities throughout the United States, held in conjunction with the Annual Meeting of the Association for Practical and Professional Ethics (APPE). By 2003 the field of participating schools had grown to forty, the largest number of teams that could be accommodated in a single day event owing to logistical and space considerations. From 2003 through 2006, more than twenty teams were wait-listed each year.

Beginning in 1999, other ethics bowls, modeled on the IEB, created by Ladenson, were organized throughout the United States. To accommodate the large number of schools wanting to take part in the IEB, a reorganization/expansion plan was developed linking eight regional ethics bowls into a tiered competition. Under the plan, which goes into effect this year (2006-07), the top scoring teams in the eight regional ethics bowls will compete for the national championship of the IEB on February 22, 2007, at the APPE Annual Meeting in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Educational Objectives

In an ethics bowl match, teams are not assigned “pro” and “con” sides of an ethical issue. Rather, each team’s goal – in its preparations prior to the ethics bowl – is to ensure it has identified the ethically relevant considerations relative to the issues raised by the assigned cases, and to analyze the importance of the considerations to reach agreement upon positions that the team feels it can explain and defend. Likewise, an opposing team’s comment in an ethics bowl match is based upon its judgment concerning a position it can reasonably explain and defend on the case. The opposing team’s role is not necessarily to argue against the presenting team’s response, but to continue the discussion in a manner that exemplifies the best methods of ethical reasoning about complex, difficult to resolve, and highly viewpoint-dependent cases.

Thus, “one-upsmanship,” and verbal aggressiveness will not win, and probably will lose, points in an ethics bowl match.

The judges’ evaluation criteria reinforce efforts by a team to analyze issues presented by a case in a clear, focused, and thoughtful manner, helping them to understand and appreciate the force of considerations that weigh heavily in the thinking on the issues of others who take differing positions from their own.

Scoring Criteria

Clarity and Intelligibility – Has the team stated and defended its position in a way that is logically consistent and which allows judges to understand clearly the team's line of reasoning?

Focus on Ethically Relevant Factors – Has the team identified and discussed the factors the Judges consider ethically relevant in connection with the case?

Avoidance of Ethical Irrelevance – Has the team stayed on track by avoiding preoccupation with issues that the Judges do not regard as ethically relevant, or as having only minor ethical relevance, in connection with a case?

Deliberative Thoughtfulness – Does the team's presentation of its position on a question indicate both awareness and thoughtful consideration of different viewpoints, including especially those that could loom large in the reasoning of individuals who might disagree with the team's position?

Committees

Rules, Format and Procedures

Pat Croskery – Chair
Lida Anestidou
Richard Greene
Mike Maxwell
Chris Naticchia

Chair's Advisory Council

Anthony Brinkman
Pat Croskery
Joanne Ladenson
Sarah Pfatteicher

Case Writing - Regional

Rhia Dodds – Chair
Ed Carr
Raquel Diaz-Sprague
Brenda Dillard
Jeremy Jones
Mark Matalski
Richard Miller
Adam Potthast
Terry Russell

Case Writing - National

Peggy Connolly – Chair
Ruth Ann Althaus
Lida Anestidou
Anthony Brinkman
Martin Leever
Robert Skipper
Christina Bellon

IEB National Champions

IEB I	1995	Western Michigan University
IEB II	1996	United States Air Force Academy
IEB III	1997	University of Montana
IEB IV	1998	United States Military Academy
IEB V	1999	United States Military Academy
IEB VI	2000	University of Washington
IEB VII	2001	Texas A&M University, Corpus Christi
IEBVIII	2002	Wright State University
IEB IX	2003	United States Naval Academy
IEB X	2004	Indiana University
IEB XI	2005	University of Washington
IEB XII	2006	United States Military Academy
IEB XIII	2007	TBD – March 2007 – Cincinnati, OH

Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl

IEB XII Teams (March 2006 – Jacksonville, FL)

California State University at Chico
California State University at San Bernardino
Clemson University
Concordia University
DePauw University
University of Detroit-Mercy
Eastfield College
Eckerd College
Flagler College
University of Florida
Illinois Institute of Technology
Indiana University
John Brown University
Loyola University
Manhattan College
Millikin University
Northern Kentucky University
Oakland University
University of Richmond
Saint Louis University
St. Petersburg College

San Jose State University
Seton Hall University
Southern Methodist University
St. Mary's University
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi
Texas State University
Texas Wesleyan University
Tuskegee University
Union College
United States Air Force Academy
United States Military Academy
United States Naval Academy
Utah Valley State College
Valparaiso University
Villanova University
University of Washington
Weber State University
Western Michigan University
Williams College
Wright State University

NEW IEB FORMAT IN 2006-07

Beginning in 2006-07, the IEB will be a tiered competition. During the Fall of 2006, eight regional ethics bowls will take place in various locations throughout the United States. The top scoring teams in the regional ethics bowls will then compete in a national ethics bowl at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the Association for Practical and Professional Ethics (APPE). Any college/university that wishes to compete in the national ethics bowl must first compete and place at one of the regional ethics bowls.

Event Logistics

Participants (teams, judges and moderators) will be able to check-in for the Ethics Bowl on the evening before the event and continue to check-in the day of the National Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl. The morning begins with a breakfast prepping session for the judges and moderators followed by a kick-off meeting with all participants to review the format and rules of the National Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl. Each team will compete in three matches against a different team in each match.

The eight top scoring teams will be announced in the afternoon, followed by four quarter final matches that will take place concurrently. The semi-final matches follow with the top four scoring teams. The final match takes place in the evening with the top two scoring teams to determine the championship team.

Procedural Rules

1. In an Ethics Bowl match each team will be questioned by a moderator on a case. Each team will have previously received fifteen cases. Each of the cases will be 1 to 2 pages in length. The cases on which teams will be asked questions at the Ethics Bowl will be taken from these fifteen cases. The teams will not know in advance which of the cases they will be asked about at the Ethics Bowl or what the questions will be. Judges and Moderators will also receive the fifteen cases.
2. Teams can be any size but only 5 or fewer can be active participants at any time. Substitutions cannot be made once the initial 5 or fewer are seated and ready for action. Substitutions cannot be made once the case is announced. Team members must be undergraduates.
3. During competition books and notes will not be allowed, however, scrap paper to jot down thoughts is permissible. The teams will be given a copy of the case and the question to which they must respond.
4. The Moderator will indicate the case with which the team that goes first (hereinafter Team 1) will deal, and then read Team 1's question about the case.
5. Team 1 will then have one minute to confer, after which one spokesperson for the team may use up to ten minutes to respond to the Moderator's question.
6. The opposing team (hereinafter Team 2) receives one minute to confer, and then may use up to five minutes to comment about Team 1's answer to the Moderator's question. The commentary may include the posing of a question to Team 1. More than one team member may contribute to the commentary, but only one team member may speak at a time.
7. Team 1 receives one minute to confer and then may use up to five minutes to respond to Team 2's commentary. More than one team member may respond to the commentary, but only one team member may speak at a time.
8. The judges then may ask questions to Team 1. Each judge may ask no more than one question with a brief follow-up question. The entire period for judges questions shall last no more than ten minutes. Before asking questions, the judges may confer with one another to discuss briefly areas that they want to cover during the question period. Different team members may respond to the questions of different judges. Teams may huddle briefly to discuss their answers to the judges questions.
9. The judges will evaluate Team 1 and Team 2 on score sheets provided to them. At this point, however, the judges will not announce to the teams the scores they have given them.
10. Team 1 and Team 2 will reverse roles for a second round with a different case.
11. At the close of the second round the Moderator will ask the judges to announce the teams' scores for the match

Scoring Rules

1. Judges shall evaluate the responses of teams solely in terms of the following criteria:
 - Clarity and Intelligibility
 - Avoidance of Ethical Irrelevance
 - Identification and Discussion of Central Ethical Dimensions
 - Deliberative Thoughtfulness
2. Judges shall score each team as follows:
 1. 0-40 points for a team's answer to the Moderator's question
 2. 0-10 points for the opposing team's commentary
 3. 0-10 for the response to the opposing team's commentary, and for the response to the judges questions, by the team that answered the Moderator's question
 4. Both in evaluating a team's commentary, and the other team's response to the commentary, the judges will take into account the four evaluation criteria indicated above, but give the teams an overall score, rather than a separate point score relative to each of the criteria.