PRESENTING Team’s Initial Presentation (up to 10 points total)
A) Did the team clearly and systematically identify and thoroughly discuss the case’s central ethical dimensions? (up to 5 points)
   5 = Clearly identified ethically relevant question(s) and thoroughly discussed key ethical dimensions.
   4 = Mostly identified and discussed in a reasonably clear way the key ethical dimensions of the case.
   3 = Adequately identified and discussed some key ethical dimensions, with significant dimensions missed and or part of the argument hard to follow (passable).
   2 = Misidentified and/or inadequately discussed some key ethical dimensions and/or demonstrated some serious problems in logic and/or reasoning (poor).
   1 = Incoherent presentation that ignored relevant ethical dimensions of the case.

B) Did the presentation indicate awareness and thoughtful consideration of different viewpoints, including those likely to loom large in the reasoning of individuals who disagree with team’s position? (up to 5 points)
   5 = Insightful analysis of different viewpoints, including careful attention to differing viewpoints.
   4 = Solid analysis of different viewpoints, including careful attention to differing viewpoints.
   3 = Underdeveloped discussion of different viewpoints (passable).
   2 = Minimal consideration of different viewpoints (poor).
   1 = Minimal awareness of different viewpoints.

OPEN DIALOGUE (up to 5 points per team per case)
   5 = Engaged in an exceptionally productive open dialogue with thoughtful attention to drawing out and responding to the views of the other team
   4 = Engaged in a productive open dialogue with responsiveness to the views of the other team
   3 = Respectful of other team’s point of view and engaged in the dialogue to some extent
   2 = Respectful of other team's point of view, but marginal engagement in the dialogue
   1 = Dismissive and/or combative in team’s engagement with the other team’s point of view

NON-PRESENTING Team’s Summary of Presentation and Open Dialogue (up to 5 points)
   5 = Especially insightful, complete, and composed summation of the presentation and open dialogue.
   4 = Key points excellently addressed and a thoughtful response to the presentation and open dialogue.
   3 = Some points made, but few insights or constructive ideas (passable).
   2 = Weak or irrelevant response or just asking questions (poor).
   1 = Failure to respond to the presentation and open dialogue or resorting to personal attacks.

PRESENTING Team’s Response to Judges’ Questions (up to 10 points)
   10 = Exceptionally composed, complete, and thoughtful responses.
   9 = Responded in a well-reasoned way to almost all the questions.
   8 = Responded in a well-reasoned way to most of the questions, with some dimensions missed.
   7 = Several of the most important points were identified and covered thoughtfully.
   6 = Solid response to most of the questions, with some gaps or inconsistencies.
   5 = Responded to most of the questions but line of reasoning was sometimes hard to follow.
   4 = Responded to some of the judges’ questions but line of reasoning was often hard to follow.
   3 = Weak or irrelevant responses to most questions.
   2 = Weak or irrelevant responses to almost all the questions.
   1 = Failure to respond in any relevant way to any question.