

Judge's Score Sheet

Judge's Name _____ Presenting Team _____

Part 1: PRESENTING Team's initial presentation (10 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 - 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 - 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 team's presentation clearly identify & thoroughly discuss the central moral dimensions of the case?*

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 team's presentation indicate both awareness and thoughtful consideration of different viewpoints, especially those that would loom large in the reasoning of individuals who disagree with team's position?*

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 & discussion of different views, including careful attention to those that loom large 9 = Insightful analysis & discussion of different views, including full attention to that loom large 10 = Exceptional

Part 2: PRESENTING Team's Response to Commentary and Judges (5 minutes; 10 total points)

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

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
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Total / 12 =

= Grade