

## Judge's Score Sheet Team TWO FRONT

ROUND 1 2 F (circle)


Judge's Name \_\_\_\_\_

PRESENTING team \_\_\_\_\_

### Part 1: PRESENTING Team's initial presentation (7 minutes; 40 total points)

1. Was the presentation clear and systematic? Regardless of whether or not you agree with the conclusion, did the team give a coherent argument in a clear and succinct manner?


1-10



1-2 = Incoherent presentation  
3-4 = Serious logical problems in the argument (poor)  
5-6 = Hard to follow the argument (passable)  
7-8 = Reasonably clear and systematic  
9 = Crystal clear presentation  
10 = Exceptional

2. Did the team avoid ethically irrelevant issues? Or was the team preoccupied with issues that are not ethically relevant or are of minor ethical relevance to the case?


1-10



1-2 = Whole argument irrelevant  
3-4 = Major irrelevance in the argument (poor)  
5-6 = Some distractions from main argument (passable)  
7-8 = Minor irrelevancies  
9 = Exactly on point  
10 = Exceptional

3. Did the team's presentation clearly identify and thoroughly discuss the central moral dimensions of the case?


1-10




1-2 = Failure to cover any relevant moral dimensions  
3-4 = Serious missing or underdeveloped dimensions (poor)  
5-6 = Some significant dimensions are missing or poorly covered (passable)  
7-8 = Most dimensions are present and well developed  
9 = All dimensions present and clarified appropriately  
10 = Exceptional

4. 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?

1-10



1-2 = Minimal awareness of different viewpoints  
3-4 = Minimal consideration of different viewpoints.... (poor)  
5-6 = Underdeveloped discussion of different viewpoints.... (passable)  
7-8 = Solid analysis and discussion of different viewpoints, including careful attention especially to those that would loom large....  
9 = Insightful analysis and discussion of different viewpoints, including full and careful attention especially to those that would loom large....  
10 = Exceptional



Total from front (maximum 40, copy to back)

TURN OVER after initial presentation

## Judge's Score Sheet Team TWO BACK

### **Part 2: OPPOSING Team's Commentary (5 minutes; 10 total points)**

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

1-2 = Failure to respond to presenting team  
3-4 = Weak or irrelevant response (poor)  
5-6 = Some points are made (passable)  
7-8 = Solid response to presenting team's points  
9 = Key points zeroed in on (crystal clear)  
10 = Exceptionally composed commentary

**1-10  
Points for  
OPPOSING  
Team**

**These points are  
added to the  
other score sheet**

### **Part 3: PRESENTING Team's Response to Commentary and Judges (5 minutes; 10 total points)**

*How did the team respond to the opposing team's commentary and the judges' questions?*

1-2 = Failure to respond to commentary and judges  
3-4 = Weak or irrelevant response (poor)  
5-6 = Some points are made (passable)  
7-8 = Solid response to commenting team's and judge's points  
9 = Key points zeroed in on (crystal clear)  
10 = Exceptionally composed commentary

**1-10  
Points for  
PRESENTING  
Team**

**TOTAL SCORE FOR TEAM**

**Total from  
Front**

+

**Response  
to Commentary**

+

**Commentary  
on other team  
[from other  
score sheet]**

=

**Total  
Score (maximum 60)**

←