

Ethics Bowl—Procedural Rules

(Modification of "Format, Procedural Rules, and Scoring Rules of the Eighth Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl" prepared by Robert Ladenson of the Illinois Institute of Technology for the Ethics Bowl competition in the 11th annual meeting of the Association for Practical and Professional Ethics)

Introduction: This semester each of Dr. William J. Frey's classes in Engineering Ethics (FILO 4045, Sections 101, 121, 131) will carry out a three-round Ethics Bowl. This round-robin competition will be held within each section. (In future years we plan to expand this to include a competition between sections.) The competition itself will be not be a graded event. Guest judges will be invited to each match to score the competing teams according to the criteria given below. Dr. Frey will carry out a separate assessment based on criteria developed during the semester. Then each group will submit the following: (1) a case study analysis of the case debated during the Ethics Bowl competition; (2) 14 short, summary analyses of the remaining 14 cases forming the pool of Ethics Bowl cases; (3) a self-evaluation that summarizes the group's assessment of how well it has achieved its goals in this activity. (The case analysis and the self-evaluation are described in more detail in the course syllabus.)

General Rules:

1. During each Ethics Bowl competition, two teams will discuss two cases. Team 1 will be presented with a case which they will discuss. During this discussion, they will answer questions from the judges and from the other team. Then roles will be reversed with a second case. Two months before the competition, each team will receive fifteen (15) cases. These cases will be about a paragraph in length and will be taken from one of three sources: (a) the textbook, *Engineering Ethics: Concepts and Cases* (by Charles Harris, Michael Pritchard, and Michael Rabins); (b) the NSPE (National Society of Professional Engineers) BER (Board of Ethical Review)—these cases come from the CD-ROM of *Engineering Ethics: Concepts and Cases*; and (c) UPRM cases developed through National Science Foundation grant, SBR-9810253, and through a series of engineering ethics workshops sponsored by the UPR Central Administration and UPRM College of Engineering.

2. The cases used in the Ethics Bowl competitions will come from this pool of 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 at the same time the teams receive them. Like the teams, they will receive copies of the cases but not copies of the questions. The judges and Moderators, like the teams, will not be informed of the specific cases teams will be asked about at the Ethics Bowl.

3. During the 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.

Procedural Rules for Competition:

1. 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. (The Moderator will not read aloud the entire case.)
2. Team 1 will then have one minute to confer, after which one spokesperson for the team may use up to nine (9) minutes to respond to the Moderator's question.
3. The judges then may ask questions. 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 five (5) 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. Only one team member may speak at a time, however.
4. The opposing team (hereinafter Team 2) receives one minute to confer, and then receives 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.
5. Team 1 receives one minute to confer and five minutes to respond to Team 2's commentary.
6. The judges will evaluate Team 1 and Team 2 on score sheets provided to them (see scoring rules below). At this point, however, the judges will not announce to the teams the scores they have given them.
7. Team 1 and Team 2 will reverse roles for a second round with a different case.
8. At the close of the second round the Moderator will ask the judges to announce the teams' scores for the match (see scoring rules below).

Scoring Rules:

1. Judges shall evaluate the responses of teams solely in terms of the following criteria:

Intelligibility—Has the team stated and defended its position in a way that is logically consistent? Has the team expressed its response with enough clarity and precision that the judge can say he or she reasonably understands it?

Depth—To what extent does the team's statement and defense of its position indicate an awareness and understanding of the issues that the judge views as ethically central to the case?

Focus—To what extent does the team's statement, and defense of, its position avoid discussing issues that the judge considers ethically irrelevant to the case?

Judgment—To what extent, in the judge’s opinion, has the team made a careful and reasonable comparative assessment of the considerations it identifies as ethically relevant in its statement and defense of its position?

2. The judges will score each team as follows:

0-20 for a team’s answer to the Moderator’s question (20 best). In evaluating a team’s answer the judges will give the team a score of 0-5 relative to each of the four evaluation criteria indicated above and total the sum.

0-5 for the opposing team’s commentary (5 best). In evaluating a team’s commentary the judges will take into account the four evaluation criteria indicated above, but give the team an overall score, rather than a separate point score relative to each of the criteria.

3. The three teams that win their competition will advance to the second round of the competition. Furthermore, of the three teams that did not win their competition, the one with the highest score will advance to the second round. The two winners of the second round competition will advance to the final round.