



Judge Rubric

- (I) **PRESENTATION 15 POINTS**
 - **5** Clarity and systematicity
 - **5** Moral Dimension
 - **5** Different viewpoints
- (II) **COMMENTARY 10 POINTS**
- (III) **RESPONSE TO COMMENTARY 10 POINTS**
- (IV) **JUDGE Q&A 20 POINTS**

PRESENTATION: Clarity and Systematicity (5 POINTS)

Systematicity:

- Following elements present: (1) wrestling with the moral dimension (2) presenting a main argument (3) presenting objections to the main argument (4) responding to those objections.

Clarity:

- Utilizing signpost (e.g., “*Our main position on this case will be...*”, “*A possible objection to our view is...*”).

5	4	3	2	1
<p>All four components are clearly identified:</p> <p>(1) Moral dimension (2) Main argument (3) Objections (4) Responses to objections</p>	<p>One of the following components missing:</p> <p>(1) Moral dimension (2) Main argument (3) Objections (4) Responses to objections</p>	<p>Two of the following components missing:</p> <p>(1) Moral dimension (2) Main argument (3) Objections (4) Responses to objections</p>	<p>Three of the following components missing:</p> <p>(1) Moral dimension (2) Main argument (3) Objections (4) Responses to objections</p>	<p>None of the following components present:</p> <p>(1) Moral dimension (2) Main argument (3) Objections (4) Responses to objections</p>

PRESENTATION: Central Moral Dimension (5 points)

5	4	3	2	1
<p>All four elements present:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Multiple views 2.) Presents views that are charitable and accurate 3.) Presents views that focus mostly on moral and philosophical issues and not legal, procedural, empirical, or political ones 4.) Asks probing moral and philosophical questions which reveals the complexity of the case 	<p>All three elements present:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Multiple views 2.) Presents views that are charitable and accurate 3.) Presents views that focus mostly on moral and philosophical issues and not legal, procedural, empirical, or political ones 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presents multiple views - Presents views that are charitable and accurate - Presents views that focus mostly on legal, procedural, empirical, or political issues rather than moral ones 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presents multiple views - Presents at least one view that is <i>extremely</i> uncharitable or inaccurate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presents only one view

PRESENTATION: different viewpoints (5 points)

5	4	3	2	1
<p>All three components present:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Strong objections to their own view 2.) Strong responses to those objections 3.) <i>Minor</i>, or non-apparent, weakness in the objections or responses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presents strong objections to their own view - Responds to objections - <i>Moderate</i> weakness in the objections or responses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presents strong objections to their own view - Does not attempt, or rushes the process of, responding to objections 	<p>Objections were strawmen, off point, not philosophical, or discussed mechanically</p>	<p>Did not consider objections to their view</p>

COMMENTARY (10 points)

Shotgun questions:

- An unreasonable amount of questions designed to confuse the other team

Critical engagement:

- Raising objections to the opposing team's views

Collaborate engagement:

- Acknowledging possible responses to their own objections
- Framing responses in such a way that invites the other team to further the conversation

10-9	8-7	6-4	3-2	1 No engagement
<p>Engages both:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Critically and 2.) Collaboratively <p>Introduces extremely novel perspectives which <i>reshape</i> and meaningfully <i>further</i> the conversation</p>	<p>Engages both</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Critically and 2.) Collaboratively 	<p>Engages only</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Critically 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shotgun questions - Questions/comments were off-topic or not-philosophical 	<p>Does not engage with the presenting team's views</p> <p>Presents only their own views</p>

RESPONSE TO COMMENTARY 10 POINTS

Critical engagement:

- Raising objections to the opposing team's views

Collaborate engagement:

- Acknowledging possible responses to their own objections
- Framing responses in such a way that invites the other team to further the conversation

10-9	8-7	6-4	3-2	1
<p>Engages both</p> <p>1.) Critically and 2.) Collaboratively</p> <p>Introduces extremely novel perspectives which <i>reshape</i>, and drastically <i>further</i>, the conversation</p>	<p>Engages both</p> <p>1.) Critically and 2.) Collaboratively</p>	<p>Engages only</p> <p>1.) Critically</p>	<p>- Simply agreed or disagreed with the other team</p> <p>- Did not provide meaningful reasons for their agreement or disagreement</p>	<p>- Virtually identical to their opening presentation</p> <p>- no attempt to answer the other team's questions</p>

JUDGE Q&A 20 POINTS

Engagement

- **Defensive:**
 - ❖ Focuses on how the team would respond to a given critique
- **Reflective:**
 - ❖ Focuses on both
 - How team would respond to a given critique and
 - How they would respond to their own responses

Novelty

- Introduces something new which reshapes, enriches, and furthers the conversation in an unexpected way

20-19	18-16	15-10	10-6	5-1
Engagement is mostly 1.) Reflective and, at times, 2.) Novel	Engagement is mostly 1.) Reflective and minimally just 2.) Defensive	Engagement is primarily 1.) Defensive and minimally 2.) Reflective	Entirely fails to <i>engage</i> with two of the questions	Entirely fails to <i>engage</i> with any of the questions