



## 5. Judging criteria and rubric

Judges are responsible for scoring matches objectively based on the following rubric. See the [Judges' Scoring sheet](#) used to report scores in appendix.

### Part 1: Leading Team's Initial Presentation (15 points total)

#### a. Did the presentation clearly and systematically address the moderator's question?

- 5 = Comprehensive presentation. Clearly and systematically addresses important issues and demonstrates excellent understanding of the moderator's question. Takes a clear position and articulates reasons for point of view, including relevant and corroborating evidence.
- 4 = Reasonably comprehensive and systematic presentation. Addresses and develops most issues relevant to the question. Provides some degree of rationale and corroborating evidence for position.
- 3 = Minimal awareness of issues surrounding the moderator's question and unclear position. Limited corroborating evidence for position. Many important issues are missed entirely.
- 2 = Underdeveloped presentation. Little attention paid to the moderator's question. Serious problems with logic of position.
- 1 = Presentation is confusing. No understanding of important issues. Does not address or answer the moderator's question.

#### b. Were the central ethical and moral dimensions of the case clearly and thoroughly discussed?

- 5 = Demonstrate thorough understanding of the ethical and moral dimensions of the case. Also explores socio-cultural values surrounding related issues. Explicit and rational reasoning is evident.
- 4 = Ethical and moral dimensions of the case are identified. Demonstrates good understanding of related issues. Rationale and corroborating evidence for position are also presented.
- 3 = Adequate understanding of ethical and moral dimensions of the case. Underdeveloped discussion.
- 2 = Minimal understanding of issues related to the case. Inadequate discussion of ethical and moral dimensions.
- 1 = Little or no understanding of the ethical and moral dimensions of the case.

#### c. Did the presentation indicate awareness and thoughtful consideration of different and conflicting viewpoints?

- 5 = Insightful awareness, analysis, and discussion of different viewpoints, including conflicting viewpoints.
- 4 = Good awareness of different viewpoints. Good analysis and discussion of differing perspectives on the issue.
- 3 = Very basic awareness and underdeveloped discussion of different viewpoints. Does not fully address opposing viewpoints.
- 2 = Minimal awareness or consideration of different viewpoints. Little understanding of the complexities of the issue.
- 1 = Does not address different viewpoints or complexities of the issue.



**Part 2: Responding Team's Commentary on Initial Presentation (10 points)**

**To what extent has the responding team addressed and engaged with the position of the presenting team?**

- 10 = Especially insightful response. Demonstrates active listening, as well as a spirit of respectful challenge. Takes intellectual risks to create new ways of thinking. Asks probing questions and provides ample evidence for positions taken.
- 9 = Solid response. Demonstrates strong listening skills, addresses most of the issues, and poses insightful questions. Challenges opposing team's position by exploring alternative viewpoints. Provides good evidence for positions taken.
- 7-8 = Good response. Demonstrates good listening skills and understanding of issues. Makes some attempt to challenge and examine opposing team's point of view, using some evidence. Asks good questions.
- 5-6 = Adequate response. Some important points made, but few insights. Some demonstration of active listening. Few, if any, questions posed.
- 3-4 = Inadequate response. Mostly argues for own viewpoint. Minimal attempt to explore different perspectives. No questions posed.
- 1-2 = Does not address or engage with the ideas presented by opposing team. Argues only for own viewpoint.

**Part 3: Leading Team's Response to Responding Team's Commentary (10 points)**

**How did the presenting team respond to the opposing team's commentary?**

- 10 = Excellent, insightful response. Open to, and synthesizes, new ideas presented by opposing team to take original position to another level.
- 8-9 = Very good response. Acknowledges and addresses key points raised by opposing team. Demonstrates some flexibility of thinking and openness to new ideas and ways of thinking.
- 6-7 = Good response. Demonstrates understanding of ideas presented by opposing team, but incorporates few, if any, new points of view that would take original position to a new level.
- 4-5 = Response seriously lacking. Team mostly restates original position, with little or no consideration of issues raised by opposing team.
- 1-3 = Inadequate response. Restates position; ignores commentary from opposing team.

**Part 4: Presenting Team's Response to Judges' Questions (20 points)**

**How did the presenting team respond to the judges' questions?**

- 20 = Exceptional response. Evidence of deep reflection and expanded thinking.
- 17-19 = Solid response. Thoughtfully addresses key points raised by judges. Demonstrates reflective analysis.
- 13-16 = Good response to judges' questions. Demonstrates understanding of issues raised.
- 9-12 = Mostly restates original position. Addresses some issues raised by judges' questions.
- 5-8 = Minimal understanding of issues raised by judges' questions.
- 1-4 = No understanding of, and/or minimal response to, issues raised by judges' questions.



**Part 5: Respectful dialogue in the entire match (5 points)**

**Did the teams engage in respectful dialogue? (5 Points per Team)**

- 5 = Respectfully engages all parties in an exceptionally open and productive discussion.
- 4 = Respectfully engages with opposing team's arguments and ideas.
- 3 = Respectful of opposing team's argument, with marginal engagement.
- 2 = Dismissive of other team's presentation and position.
- 1 = Combative and dismissive of opposing team's position.