

NHSEB Scoring Rubric

Part 1: PRESENTING Team's initial presentation (15 Points Total)

A) *Was the presentation clear and systematic?*

- 5 = Crystal clear presentation with all key dimensions appropriately addressed.
- 4 = Reasonably clear and systematic with most key dimensions well developed.
- 3 = Hard to follow the argument. Significant dimensions missed (passable).
- 2 = Serious logical problems or underdeveloped argument (poor).
- 1 = Incoherent presentation that ignored relevant moral dimensions.

B) *Did the team clearly identify and thoroughly discuss the central moral dimensions of the case?*

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

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

- 5 = Insightful analysis and discussion of different viewpoints, including full and careful attention especially to differing points of view.
- 4 = Solid analysis and discussion of different viewpoints, including careful attention given to differing points of view.
- 3 = Underdeveloped discussion of different viewpoints (passable).
- 2 = Minimal consideration of different viewpoints (poor).
- 1 = Minimal awareness of different viewpoints.

Part 2: RESPONDING Team's Commentary on Opposing Team's Initial Presentation (10 Points)

To what extent has the team effectively engaged the presenting team's argument?

- 10 = Especially insightful and composed commentary.
- 9 = Key points excellently addressed.
- 8-7 = solid response to presenting team's points.
- 6-5 = Some points made, but few insights or constructive ideas (passable).
- 4-3 = Weak or irrelevant response or just asking questions (poor).
- 2-1 = Failure to respond to presenting team or resorting to personal attacks.

Part 3: PRESENTING Team's Response to Opposing Team's commentary (10 Points)

How did the team respond to the opposing team's commentary?

- 10 = Especially insightful, complete and composed response.
- 9 = Key points zeroed in on.
- 8-7 = Solid response to commenting team.
- 6-5 = Some points are made (passable).
- 4-3 = Weak or irrelevant response (poor).
- 2-1 = Failure to respond to commentary.

Part 4: PRESENTING Team's Response to Judges' Questions (15 Points)

How did the team respond to the judges' questions?

- 15 = Exceptionally composed commentary.
- 14-12 = Key points zeroed in on.
- 9 = Key points zeroed in on.
- 11-10 = Solid response to commenting team's and judge's points.
- 9-7 = Some points are made (passable).
- 6-4 = Weak or irrelevant response (poor).
- 3-1 = Failure to respond to commentary and judges.

Points for PRESENTING TEAM engaging in Productive and Respectful Dialogue, as opposed to Combative Debate (10 Points)

- 10-9 = Respectfully engaged all parties in exceptionally productive discussion
- 8-7 = Respectful engagement of other team's arguments and points
- 6-5 = Respectful of other team's argument but only marginal engagement and pursuit
- 4-3 = Dismissive of other team's argument
- 2-1 = Combative and dismissive of other team's argument