

WASHINGTON STATE HIGH SCHOOL ETHICS BOWL 2022

GENERAL INFORMATION AND RULES

General Introduction

Modeled after the Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl, the High School Ethics Bowl involves teams of students analyzing a series of wide-ranging ethical dilemmas. The competition utilizes case studies relevant to youth, such as questions about plagiarism, peer pressure, abuse of social media, free speech, gun control, cloning, parental consent, and stem cell research.

The Ethics Bowl is about giving an insightful perspective on each case, one that an intelligent layperson should be able to follow. The program values students' reasoning abilities, and the emphasis is more on the broader ethical implications of the cases and less on a rule-oriented approach. It's not about memorizing ethical theories or the names of philosophers, and teams should not focus on citing philosophers or moral theories.

We want to know why students believe something is morally right or wrong and what reasons/evidence they give to support this view. It's harder to build up a case than to tear one down, and so a good objection to another team's analysis may be to agree with their view but point out a complication or worry and then respond constructively to that complication or worry.

This program is designed to promote thoughtful, civil dialogue about difficult questions.

Teams should score highly when they demonstrate good ethical reasoning, clarity about and consistency in their views, and a willingness to engage thoughtfully with points made by the other team. Mock-trial and debate-team style presentations, in which students press a particular point of view without consideration for furthering a dialogue, are not favored.

Program Structure

Like the 2020–2021 program, the 2021–2022 program will be a more flexible program. Schools can register and begin practices at any point in the year. Once a school is registered and has begun practices, if you are interested in a scrimmage with another team, please reach out to other schools on your own or to contact the Center to arrange a scrimmage for you. Scrimmages can be online or in person, depending on the teams' preferences and the Covid situation at the time. Please let us know you are ready for a scrimmage by emailing Kate Goldyn at kgoldyn@uw.edu and the Center can arrange any of the following, as needed: an online forum, judges, and a moderator. Depending on the Covid situation, we hope to hold a traditional, in-person, scored event on Saturday April 2, 2022, at the University of Washington. The following rules and guidelines apply to the planned April 2 event.

Structure of the Event

The bowl will be comprised of five rounds involving multiple rooms. Each room includes two teams (3-5 students per team, with up to five alternates, so that each team has a maximum of 10 students), three judges and a moderator (as well as any family, friends, and other spectators).

From the fall up until the event, all of the team members will work to prepare their responses to the cases that will be the subjects of all of the rounds except round 3 (see below), though the team members do not have advance knowledge of which cases will be presented at the event.

Round 3 will involve two cases that none of the students have seen. The purpose of this is to have one round in which none of the students arrive with prepared presentations, in order to give the students a chance to demonstrate their skills at thinking on their feet to develop arguments in light of a new set of facts and ethical issues. In this round, teams will have more time to confer, but otherwise Round 3 will otherwise proceed in the same fashion as all other rounds, as follows:

Team members must be selected and seated at the table before the round begins. Each round will begin with the moderator flipping a coin. The team that wins the toss decides if it wants to go first (becoming Team A on the score sheets) or second (becoming Team B on the score sheets). The moderator will then distribute copies of the first case to the competitors and judges, and will read aloud the summary of the first case.

1. **Presentation.** In all rounds except Round 3, team A will have up to 2 minutes to confer, after which any member(s) of Team A may speak for up to 6 minutes. *[In Round 3, both teams will have 10 minutes to confer before the presentations are delivered.]* Team A can earn up to 10 points from each judge for this portion of the round. The presentation should begin with a statement of the question or questions the team thinks are most important in considering the case, and the remainder of the presentation should address that question or questions.

Please note: Although in their preparation of the cases, teams may have done some factual research, facts external to the case may not be relied upon in the presentation (as there is no way for the judges to determine the accuracy of outside factual claims).

2. **Open dialogue.** In this part of the competition, instituted for the first time for the 2019 bowl, the teams will engage in a self-moderated open dialogue for eight minutes. The idea is for both teams to think together about the issues that emerge in the presentation. The open dialogue will begin by team B responding to the points made in Team A's presentation. Teams will be evaluated on the extent to which they listen to and consider the other team's analysis and questions and on the civility and depth with which the teams discuss the case. Each team can earn up to 5 points from each judge for this part of the round, and these points will determine the winner of the Award for Civil Dialogue.

3. **Non-Presenting Team Summary.** After Open Dialogue, both teams have up to 3 minutes to confer, and then Team B will provide a summary of the presentation and open dialogue, including their reflections about the round thus far, for up to 4 minutes. Team B can earn up to 5 points from each judge for the summary.

4. **Judges' questions to Presenting Team.** Ten minutes (total, for questions and answers) Before asking questions, judges may confer briefly. Each judge may ask members of the presenting team a question related to the case. If time remains, judges may ask additional questions. Team members are not expected to confer for more than 30 seconds after a question has been asked. Team A can earn up to 7 points from each judge for their responses to the judges' questions.

The judges will make individual scoring decisions for the first case after the question period for Team A. Then the moderator will give copies of a new case and question to the same competitors and judges. The competition will proceed with Team B presenting, another period of open dialogue, Team A offering a summary, and then to judges' questions.

Scratch paper is provided for teams to make notes during the cases, but **outside notes and materials are prohibited**. All notes and materials are collected at the end of each case.

When A team is conferring or speaking, the other team, judges, and audience members must remain silent, although teams are allowed to pass notes (for example, when Team A is given the first case, they confer for 2 minutes and then present for 6 minutes. During those 8 minutes, Team B is permitted to write and pass notes, but must remain silent.)

The moderator controls the room during the rounds, including being responsible for keeping time and ensuring that there is no unacceptable behavior, including but not limited to:

- Coaches, parents, or audience members communicating with (verbally or non-verbally), or demonstrably reacting to, competitors during a match.
- Any intentional noise while one of the teams, judges, or the moderator has the floor.
- Judges showing hostility or asking inappropriate questions of competitors.
- Foul, insulting, or excessively graphic language by anyone in the competition room.

All teams will get time notifications from the moderator at their request. When judges are asking questions, the moderator will notify them when there are 2 minutes remaining. Only the moderator keeps official time. However, team members are permitted to keep time on personal devices, as long as the devices do not store data or connect to the Internet (which includes smartphones and tablets), and students may not time opposing teams.

At the end of each round, the moderator will check the math of each scoresheet and make sure the winner is circled on each judge's scoresheet. We will no longer announce the winner of the round. See below for information about how the semifinalists are chosen.

Guidelines for Judges

- Judges should not interrupt teams during the presentation, commentary, or response periods with questions, prompts, or gestures.
- Judges should direct questions to a team as a whole and not an individual or a subset of the team. It is inappropriate to ask questions based on the immutable characteristics of team members, 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 because of a perceived background).
- Judges' questions should be short and succinct (usually 30 seconds or less) and should be designed to help probe the team's understanding of the case.

- Judges should not base scores on whether one person, several people, or all team members speak. Each team decides how to divide up speaking time during each round. Some teams choose to have an individual “own” a certain case. Other teams prefer to have each person on the team speak. Teams should be neither rewarded nor penalized for either approach.
- Judges should not discuss their scoring decisions with each other.
- Judges should not talk to teams about their scoring (or 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 round, or expressing disagreement with a fellow judge’s scoring. Teams should be focused on their next match, not a comment that a judge made at the end of the last one.
- We do encourage judges to make comments on the scoring sheet. After the competition, all of each team’s scoring sheets are sent to them, with judges’ names whited out. In the past, judges’ comments here have been very helpful to teams.
- The main criterion for judging is to evaluate teams based on the quality of their thinking about a difficult ethical situation and their contribution to a reasoned and civil conversation. That means they should have addressed opposing or different viewpoints and explained why they reached the conclusion they did. 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, a team may discover that they want to modify an aspect of its initial position as a result of the second team’s commentary or a judge’s question. Because the Ethics Bowl is about ethical inquiry and changing one’s mind can be considered a sign of fluid intelligence, changing or modifying a position isn’t necessarily negative. Judges should consider whether teams’ initial positions and/or revised positions are well-founded and thoughtfully considered.
- It is unnecessary for a team to present a united front. Team members can disagree with one another as long as what they say is consistent and they are not contradicting themselves.
- Open dialogue: Teams scoring highly in this category contribute to a civil and collaborative discussion aimed at genuinely thinking through difficult ethical issues. Teams that score poorly in this category resort to rhetorical flourishes, adopt a condescending or critical tone, don’t engage with the points made by the other team, or are unduly adversarial.

Award for Civil Dialogue

The Award for Civil Dialogue will be chosen and given to a school that is not a semifinalist, based on the total number of open dialogue points after the three morning rounds.

Finals and Semifinal Rounds

After the third round, teams are ranked by the number of wins in all three rounds. The top six ranked teams then advance to the semifinal round. When two or more teams have the same number of wins, the following tiebreakers are used, in this order:

- **Lowest number of losses** (a team with 2 wins and 1 tie will rank higher than a team with 2 wins and 1 loss)
- **Highest point total over the three rounds**
- **Highest number of judge votes** (over the course of 3 rounds, a team has the opportunity to win the votes of 9 judges. If two teams finish with 3 wins, but one team has 8 judge votes and the other has 7, the team with 8 votes is ranked higher)
- **Greatest point differential** over all three rounds (if two teams have 2 wins and 1 loss, and Team A has a total point differential of +10 [winning one round by 10 and one by 6, and losing one round by 6] while Team B has a point differential of +9 [winning one round by 3 and one by 7, and losing one round by 1], Team A is ranked higher)

The rules and procedures for the semifinals and finals are identical to the other rounds, except judges cannot have any ties. If a judge completes the scoring sheet and there is a tie in the semifinal or final round, the judge must revise the score sheet. The two finalists will be the two teams that won their semifinal round and have the most points in that round. If there is a tie in semifinal round points among any of the three top teams, the tiebreaker is the total number of points earned in all four rounds. The two top semifinals teams then advance to the final round. At the end of the final round, there will be a brief closing ceremony with trophies awarded for first, second, and third places, and the Award for Civil Dialogue.