

Student Ethics Case Presentation Judges Rubric and Criteria



Was the team's presentation on the case clear and systematic?

- 5 = Extremely clear presentation that systematically addressed the key dimensions of the question.
- 4 = Reasonably clear presentation that systematically addressed most key dimensions of the question.
- 3 = Hard to follow the argument. Significant dimensions of the question missed (passable).
- 2 = Serious logical problems or underdeveloped argument (poor).
- 1 = Incoherent presentation.



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

- 5 = Clearly and precisely identified central moral dimensions, and discussed these dimensions thoroughly.
- 4 = Mostly identified central moral dimensions and discussed major issues.
- 3 = Adequately identified and discussed some central moral dimensions (passable).
- 2 = Misidentified some moral dimensions of the case and inadequately discussed (poor).
- 1 = Misidentified the central moral dimensions.



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

- 5 = Insightful analysis/discussion of the most significant views; full and careful attention to opposing points of view.
- 4 = Solid analysis and discussion of some different viewpoints.
- 3 = Underdeveloped discussion of different viewpoints (passable).
- 2 = Minimal consideration of different viewpoints (poor).
- 1 = Minimal awareness of different viewpoints.



Response to Judges Questions

- 20 = Especially insightful, complete, and composed response.
- 19-17 = The most pressing points are identified and discussed.
- 16-13 = Several of the most important points are identified and discussed.
- 12-9 = Some relevant points are made (passable).
- 8-5 = Weak or irrelevant response (poor).
- 4-1 = Failure to respond to commentary and judges.



TOTAL SCORE