

Yale Ethics Bowl (YEB) Match and Scoring Format

Individual Match Format

Yale Ethics Bowl matches feature two teams meeting face-to-face to discuss and evaluate case studies presenting complex moral questions or dilemmas. These cases are drawn from the YEB's annually released Case Sets. Each match will have one judge who also serves as the moderator. Spectators are encouraged to attend.

Team Composition: Each team consists of 3 to 5 students. All participating team members must be seated before the match begins. Substitutions are not permitted during a match.

Judge and Moderator: The judge fulfills a dual role as both the evaluator and the moderator of the match, ensuring rules are followed and time is kept accurately.

Match Procedure

Determining Presentation Order

Each match begins with a random method (e.g., coin toss) to decide which team will present first. The winning team chooses to present first (Team A) or to have the other team present first (making themselves Team B).

First Half of the Match

1, Moderator's Period

The judge reads the case number, title, and the question for competition.

Neither teams nor the judge know in advance which case or question will be presented.

2, Presentation Period (Team A)

Conferral: Team A has 2 minutes to confer.

Presentation: Team A presents for up to 5 minutes, responding to the question based on their analysis and research.

Requirement: The presentation must address the moderator's question.

3, Commentary Period (Team B)

Conferral: Team B has 2 minutes to confer.

Commentary: Team B offers a 3-minute commentary on Team A's presentation.

4, Response Period (Team A)

Conferral: Team A has 2 minutes to confer.

Response: Team A responds for 3 minutes to Team B's commentary.

5, Team Question Period (Team B)

Team B engages Team A in a 10-minute question-and-answer session.

Procedure: Team B may briefly confer before asking questions.

Each member of Team B should have the opportunity to ask questions.

Team A may confer briefly (10-20 seconds) before responding. Any Team A member may answer.

6, Judge's Question Period (Optional)

The judge may ask questions for up to 2 minutes. This period does not affect the final match result.

Second Half of the Match

The roles reverse, and the match proceeds with a new case:

1, Moderator's Period

The judge presents a new case and question.

2, Presentation Period (Team B)

Conferral: Team B has 2 minutes to confer.

Presentation: Team B presents for up to 5 minutes.

3, Commentary Period (Team A)

Conferral: Team A has 2 minutes to confer.

Commentary: Team A offers a 3-minute commentary on Team B's presentation.

4, Response Period (Team B)

Conferral: Team B has 2 minutes to confer.

Response: Team B responds for 3 minutes to Team A's commentary.

5, Team Question Period (Team A)

Team A engages Team B in a 10-minute question-and-answer session.

6, Judge's Question Period (Optional)

The judge may ask questions for up to 2 minutes (non-scoring).

Match Timing Overview

Period	Time Allocation
Moderator's Period	~3 minutes
Presentation Period	2 min conferral, 5 min presentation
Commentary Period	2 min conferral, 3 min commentary
Response Period	2 min conferral, 3 min response
Team Question Period	10 minutes Q&A
Judge's Question Period	Up to 2 minutes (non-scoring)
Total Time per Half	Approximately 30 minutes

Scoring and Advancement

Case Scoring:

For each case, the judge determines which team performed better based on criteria:

Persuasiveness, clarity, depth of analysis, and consideration of moral dimensions.

Points: The winning team for each case earns 1 point. A match is allowed result in a tie if each team wins one case. Each match, each team will be given an overall speaker point is grade on a scale of 60.

Competition Format:

The YEB uses a round-robin format consisting of 3 rounds, with 2 cases per match.

Advancement: Teams advancing to the final international round are determined by total points accumulated.

Tie-breakers: In the event of tied scores, speaker scores shall be used to break the tie.

General Rules and Guidelines

Materials:

Teams receive scratch paper at the start of the match.

Prohibited: Outside notes, electronic devices, or pre-written materials.

All materials are collected after the match.

Timekeeping:

The judge keeps official time.

Teams may use non-digital timers (no data storage or internet capability).

Teams can privately time the other team's periods but should not intervene other team's presentation.

Communication:

When one team is presenting, the opposing team must remain silent but may take notes.

During conferral periods, the non-conferring team may speak quietly but must not disrupt.

Conduct:

Respectful dialogue is mandatory.

The judge addresses any inappropriate behavior, including:

Unauthorized communication from coaches or audience members.

Disruptive noises or gestures.

Offensive language or confrontational behavior.

Participation:

All team members may contribute during their team's speaking periods.

Judges evaluate teams without bias toward the number of speakers.

Roles and Responsibilities

Judge/Moderator:

Manages the flow of the match and ensures adherence to rules.
Evaluates team performances based on established criteria.
May ask clarifying questions during the optional question period (non-scoring).

Teams:

Must directly address the case question during presentations.
Should demonstrate critical thinking, ethical reasoning, and collaborative discussion.
Encouraged to consider multiple viewpoints and respond thoughtfully.

In general, this format aims to foster deep ethical discussions, enhance critical thinking, and encourage respectful engagement between teams. The Yale Ethics Bowl emphasizes academic exchange over competition, aligning with its educational objectives.

Appendix 1 Speaker Score Scoring Rubric

Scoring Rubric

For each round, the judge evaluates teams based on the following criteria, totaling **60 points per case**:

- 1. Team's Presentation on the Moderator's Question (Up to 20 points)**
 - Clarity and Systematic Addressing of the Question (0-10 points)
 - Did the team clearly and systematically address the case question?
 - Is the argument well-organized and coherent?
 - Identification and Discussion of Central Moral Dimensions (0-10 points)
 - Did the team identify and thoroughly discuss the central ethical issues?
 - Did they demonstrate depth of understanding and analysis?
- 2. Opposing Team's Commentary (Up to 10 points)**
 - Engagement with Presenting Team's Argument (0-5 points)
 - Did the team engage constructively with the presenting team's points?
 - Did they provide thoughtful insights or raise meaningful questions?
 - Identification of Additional Ethical Considerations (0-5 points)
 - Did they identify ethical aspects not addressed by the presenting team?
 - Did they offer alternative perspectives respectfully?
- 3. Presenting Team's Response to the Commentary (Up to 10 points)**
 - Responsiveness to Commentary (0-5 points)
 - Did the team directly address points raised by the opposing team?
 - Were their responses thoughtful and substantive?
 - Further Elaboration of Argument (0-5 points)
 - Did they strengthen their original position?
 - Did they acknowledge and thoughtfully consider counterarguments?
- 4. Team's Responses during the Team Question Period (Up to 15 points)**
 - Depth and Thoughtfulness of Responses (0-10 points)
 - Did the team provide clear, insightful answers to the questions?
 - Did they demonstrate critical thinking and ethical reasoning?
 - Collaboration and Distribution of Participation (0-5 points)
 - Did multiple team members contribute to the responses?
 - Was there evidence of effective teamwork?
- 5. Respectful Dialogue and Conduct (Up to 5 points)**
 - Demonstration of Respect and Professionalism (0-5 points)
 - Did the team exhibit respectful behavior throughout the match?
 - Did they listen attentively and engage courteously with others?