

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE EUROPEAN ETHICS BOWL COMPETITION



EUROPEAN
ETHICS BOWL

EEB Guidelines

2021/2022

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3
ABOUT THE FOUNDERS.....	3
ELIGIBILITY – MEMBER INSTITUTIONS.....	3
STRUCTURE	4
COMPETITION FORMAT	4
EEB RULES	5
EVALUATION	5
GUIDELINES FOR TEAMS	5
GUIDELINES FOR JUDGES.....	7
EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	8
EEB RULES OF PARTICIPATION	10

INTRODUCTION

The ability to identify and critically debate ethical issues is a crucial skill for European and global leaders. However, current university curricula rarely provide students with the opportunity to practise and exercise this skill. Nevertheless, in these times of accelerated European and global integration and the challenges we face, it remains the responsibility of educational institutions to foster critical thinking in the generation they educate.

The European Ethics Bowls (EEB) connects undergraduate and postgraduate students across geographical and academic borders. It aims to raise awareness about the relevance and complexity of business ethics issues in the European context, and to enable participants to broaden their horizons.

ABOUT THE FOUNDERS

The EEB was initiated by four institutions who recognised the importance of ethics in business life in an engaging and meaningful way throughout Europe. The founders are coming from different European countries and wish to encourage dialogue about issues in the light of ethical dilemma.

The founding members of the European Ethics Bowl are:

- European Investment Bank Institute, Luxembourg
- Goethe University Frankfurt (Department of Economics and Business), Germany
- School of Economics and Business, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
- Université Paris Dauphine, France

The EEB headquarters office is located at the School of Economics and Business, University of Ljubljana and also serves as the operations office.

The founding members form the EEB Advisory board.

The EEB gratefully acknowledge the pioneering work of the National High School Ethics Bowl (U.S.) at the Parr Center for Ethics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (NHSEB) that provided the general format for the European Ethics Bowl.

ELIGIBILITY – MEMBER INSTITUTIONS

All EU universities and institutions with an academic programme are eligible to participate in the competition. In order to officially participate, they agree to host the qualification phase, which will determine a winning team that will advance to the quarter-finals. Universities and EU institutions with an educational mission can become members of the EEB by contacting info@europeanethicsbowl.eu.

All participating institutions agree to the rules of participation of the EEB and undertake to comply with the competition rules and organisational schedule listed at the end of this document.

All member institutions must appoint a coordinator who will be the contact person for both the participants and the organisers of the EEB. Each institution manages its applications independently, following the structured process provided by the EEB. Adhering universities can open registrations to its alumni. Institutions with only one registered team can join another institution for the qualification phase.

All member institutions meet together with the EEB founders once a year to work together on the further development of the EEB.

STRUCTURE

The EEB is an annual competition in which teams of students debate business ethical dilemmas presented to them as case studies. The case studies are provided each year by the EEB and relate to a broader topic of social and economic relevance. The cases are made public through the case presentation event organised for the representatives of the member institutions and subsequently published on the official website of the EEB. The date for the official case presentation will be in May.

The qualification phase will take place at the institutional level. After that, the teams will participate in the inter-institutional quarter-final, which will take place on the 3rd Wednesday in October at Global Ethics Day.

In all phases, teams of three will work on a solution and compete against other teams. All teams will be judged on their preliminary work in the form of short videos, as well as their debating skills during the competition. Teams will not be judged on the solution itself, but on the coherence of their arguments and their presentation skills (see the section on the evaluation criteria).

The winning team from each institution will compete in the quarter-finals. The winning teams of the quarter-finals will compete in the semi-finals using the same system as in the quarter-finals. The semi-finals will be held in November at International Fraud Awareness Week. A maximum of six teams will compete in the EEB Finals, which will be organised at Global Anti-Corruption Day.

COMPETITION FORMAT

Competition format of institutional competition, quarter- and semi-finals

The first three stages of EEB are based on (1) video contributions, and (2) live debates and follow a standard structure.

1. Submission

Teams submit their solution to the case in the form of a 3–5 minutes long video.

2. Evaluation

- a. Before the live competition, judges evaluate the videos and prepare questions for the debate.
- b. On the day of the debate, teams peer-review the video of one randomly chosen competing team.

3. Debating

Three groups debate in the presence of a moderator, judges, and an audience. Only judges and the competing teams are allowed to ask questions. Judges announce the winning team after an alignment break right after the debate.

Competition format of the finals

For the EEB Finals, the competing teams will not submit their videos but instead they will receive the case study on the morning of December 9th.

The finalists debate in the presence of a moderator, judges, and an audience. Only judges and the competing teams are allowed to ask questions. Judges announce the winning team after an alignment break right after the debate.

Debates

The live debates follow the same routine which may slightly vary depending on the number of participating teams. The following sequence exemplifies the standard structure of all debates.

Example agenda of the debate

1. Welcome and introduction
2. Preparation time for teams and judges to watch the video submissions and prepare questions.
3. Debates¹
4. Keynote address (while judges assess the teams)
5. Announcement of the winning team

EEB DEBATE RULES

All participants commit to agree to the following rules that apply to all debates.

1. The moderator is in charge of the agenda and timekeeping during the debates.
2. All procedural questions are directed to the moderator.
3. During a debate, team members may privately communicate with each other (via private chat in the online format).
4. Each debate starts with a brief introduction of all team members and the judges to the audience.
5. Before answering questions from the judges or the competing team, all team members may ask for clarifications. Teams are encouraged to nominate one team member to respond to the questions.
6. Judges score teams based on a provided scorecard and based on the set evaluation criteria. The team with the highest score wins the debate.

EVALUATION

Teams are evaluated by a group of independent judges who have been nominated by the member institutions. Judges differ in their backgrounds and shall represent the academic, private, and public sectors. Each debate will be evaluated by at least two judges.

Before the official debate, teams submit a 3–5-minute video in which they present their arguments on the assigned case. Videos are assessed by the judges prior to the debate. Videos that are shorter than 3 minutes or longer than 5 minutes will not be accepted for the debate.

To encourage peer-learning, each team reviews the video of their competitors before the debate. Based on the video, they will define questions that will start the debate – and proceed to the judges' questions.

Teams are evaluated according to a standard scorecard and based on evaluation as stated in the respective section below.

Further, teams are assessed on their level of inclusiveness, integrity, and respect for diversity embedded in the proposed way forward.

All members of participating teams receive an official certificate for their participation and contribution.

GUIDELINES FOR TEAMS

Registration

Teams register via a member institution through the registration form. Due to logistical reasons, students cannot register independently. Teams are composed of three members from the same institution but not necessarily from the same faculty or department. If the member institution agrees, alumni are also eligible for registration.

Case studies

¹ Depending on the number of competing teams, these may be organised in parallel sessions or, over in a sequence.

The case for the first stage (national competition/ qualification stage) will be published on the EEB website on a specific date and will relate to a broader issue of social and economic relevance. The cases for the quarter-finals and semi-finals are sent out simultaneously to all participating teams at the launch of each competition, so that everyone competes under the same conditions. The teams participating in the finals will receive the case on the morning of the final competition.

Teams shall focus on three areas:

To win the competition, teams must convince the independent judges of their capacity to understand and analyse the ethical dilemma, and of their ability to research relevant background information, as well as related facts and figures in support of their line of reasoning.



ANALYSIS

Understanding of the key ethical dilemma.

Analytical reasoning.

Different perspectives: inclusiveness, integrity, and respect for diversity.



VIDEO

Submission of the conclusion via video.

Between 3-5 minutes.

Submit via email before the deadline.



EVALUATION

Assessment of the moral & ethical dilemma.

Address complexities.

Openness to different perspectives

Process

The general process consists of these five steps:

1. Three students/alumni register as one team and submit a short team video, introducing all team members.
2. Once the first case is published on the EEB website it marks the official opening of the EEB.
3. Teams register to compete by filling out a registration form and submitting a 3–5-minute-long video, based on the case before the official deadline (of the member institution or the stage of the competition).
4. On the day of the competition, they review the videos of their competitors.
5. They debate against teams of their home institution during the qualifying phase, and teams of other institutions once they win.

With the exception of the EEB Finals, teams have to submit a 3–5-minute video based on the case. In this video, one or more team members present their solution in a way that is understandable by the judges and competing teams. Videos that are longer than 5 minutes or shorter than 3 minutes and videos that are submitted after the deadline will not be accepted for the competition.

For the finals, participants do not prepare videos. All teams receive the case in the morning after a briefing and then have the day to work on their solution. In the evening, teams present their solutions to the audience, including the judges, moderator, and competing teams. The starting team will be randomly selected by the moderator.

After their presentations, the teams have 10 minutes to prepare questions for each other with which they will begin the debate.

The teams' questions shall remain open-ended and give the other team the opportunity to deepen or expand their reasoning. Questions shall be driven by respect and curiosity, by the willingness to understand instead of the urge to respond. Teams will be judged on their way of questioning (20% of the total score as stated in the section below) and judges have the right to interfere if the teams' way of questioning does not respect these guidelines.

Peer-Review Process

Teams review the video of their competitors as part of the process. Besides sharing their constructive feedback with their opponents, teams also define questions that help them understand the core arguments and line of ethical reasoning. This process should support the quality of the live debate.

Tips for the general preparation of the EEB

To prepare for the EEB, teams should follow these steps:

- Read the cases carefully and prepare pertinent arguments, including an aligned team position.
- Reflect on other, opposing positions and find arguments in favour and against.
- Do research on the ethical dilemma to include facts and figures in the argumentation.
- Think of a creative way to record the solution without neglecting the case's complexity.
- On the day of the debate:
 - Watch the video of the competing teams with curiosity. Derive open-ended questions that may help you understand their point of view and challenge their way of reasoning.
 - Keep in mind that the goal is not to be right but to reflect and argue according to strong arguments.

GUIDELINES FOR JUDGES

Judges of the EEB have three key tasks:

1. Assessment of the teams' video submissions according to the standard scorecard.
2. Engagement with the teams during the debate with probing questions and comments, as well as the evaluation of their performance.
3. Submission of written feedback to each team, including observations and advice.

During a competition, judges may only converse with each other during the question period and while writing feedback. Judges shall not communicate with students about any content of the cases between rounds.

Evaluation Criteria

To assess the teams' performance, judges reflect whether team members

- Address the complexities of the issue,
- Articulate the controversy of the dilemma,
- Identify alternate perspectives related to the ethical issue,
- Weigh possibilities and take a stance on the issue(s),
- Use evidence and research to support their position.

Further, judges assess the teams' way of debating, namely whether the team members

- Understand their opponent team's position, or ask for clarification,
- Acknowledge opposing perspectives and respond in an appropriate way,
- Use evidence and research to support their position,
- Challenge the other team's assumptions,
- Correct factual errors or misperceptions,
- Argue in a manner that takes the dialogue to a deeper level,
- Ask probing questions that help the other team expand their thinking,
- Help the other team to strengthen or change their position.

Finally, judges pay attention to the team member's behaviour, namely whether the team members

- Demonstrate flexibility and adaptability in their thinking,

- Demonstrate active listening,
- Synthesize ideas provided by the opposing team (or the judges) to reach clarity and deep understanding,
- Adequately answer question,
- Demonstrate respect towards other teams and the judges,
- Show inclusiveness, integrity, and respect for diversity in their way of interaction.

Judges' Question Period

After the introductions, judges may take time for bilateral alignment before returning with questions to both teams. Judges may not put students on the spot, ask students to defend positions, or use leading questions to impose their own beliefs on students.

The judges' questions will prompt deeper or expanded thinking of the teams and their members. Questions are open-ended and generally require the application of new knowledge, or help to surface underlying assumptions, implications, or issues that have not yet been articulated.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Judges and teams use the following criteria to evaluate the teams' contributions to the debate. They fill in the standard score card and allocate up to 5 points for each area. The team with the most points wins.

Evaluation of the video – 20%

Was the team able to discuss the moral and ethical dynamics of the case in the video?

POINTS	MEANING
5	The video demonstrates thorough understanding of the ethical and moral dimensions of the case. The team's explicit and rational reasoning is evident.
4	Ethical and moral dimensions of the case are well identified. The team demonstrates good understanding of related issues.
3	Adequate understanding of ethical and moral dimensions of the case. The team's elaboration of the dilemma remained underdeveloped.
2	Minimal understanding of issues related to the case. The team showed an inadequate discussion of ethical and moral dimensions.
1	Little or no understanding of ethical and moral dimensions of the case.

Evaluation of the debate – 60% (In the finals 70%)

How was the quality of the questions from the teams to each other?

POINTS	MEANING
5	Excellent and insightful peer review and posed questions. Questions synthesized new ideas to take original position of the opposing team to another level.
4	Very good peer review and posed questions. Questions address key points raised by opposing team. Demonstrates some flexibility of thinking and openness to new ideas and ways of thinking.
3	Good peer review and posed questions. Questions demonstrate understanding of ideas presented by other team, but incorporate few, if any, new points of view that would take original position to a new level.
2	Peer review and posed questions are seriously lacking. Team mostly restates original position, with little or no consideration of issues raised by opposing team.

1	Inadequate peer review and posed question. Restates position; ignores commentary from opposing team.
---	--

Did the team answer the judges' questions in a clear and coherent manner?

POINTS	MEANING
5	Comprehensive answers. Clearly and systematically addresses important issues and demonstrates excellent understanding of the judges' questions. The team takes a clear position and articulates reasons for their point of view, including relevant and corroborating evidence.
4	Reasonably comprehensive and systematic answers. Addresses and develops most issues relevant to the question. Provides some degree of rationale and corroborating evidence for their position.
3	Minimal awareness of issues surrounding moderator's question and unclear position. Limited corroborating evidence for position. Many important issues are missed entirely.
2	Underdeveloped answers. Little attention paid to the moderator's question. Serious problems with the logic of the position.
1	Answers are confusing. No understanding of important issues. Does not address or answer the moderator's question.

How did the team response to the opposing team's feedback?

POINTS	APPROXIMATE MEANING
5	Especially insightful response. Demonstrates active listening, as well as a spirit of respectful challenge. Takes intellectual risks to create new ways of thinking. Asks probing questions and provides ample evidence for positions taken.
4	Solid response. Demonstrates strong listening skills, addresses most of the issues, and poses insightful questions. Challenges opposing team's position by exploring alternative viewpoints. Provides good evidence for positions taken.
3	Adequate response. Some important points made, but few insights. Some demonstration of active listening. Few, if any, questions posed.
2	Inadequate response. Mostly argues for own viewpoint. Minimal attempt to explore different perspectives. No questions posed.
1	Does not address or engage with the ideas presented by opposing team. Argues only for own viewpoint.

How did the team response to the opposing team's questions?

POINTS	APPROXIMATE MEANING
5	Comprehensive answers. Clearly and systematically addresses important issues and demonstrates excellent understanding of moderator's question. Takes a clear position and articulates reasons for point of view, including relevant and corroborating evidence.
4	Reasonably comprehensive and systematic answers. Addresses and develops most issues relevant to the question. Provides some degree of rationale and corroborating evidence for position.
3	Minimal awareness of issues surrounding moderator's question and unclear position. Limited corroborating evidence for position. Many important issues are missed entirely.
2	Underdeveloped answers. Little attention paid to moderator's question. Serious problems with logic of position.
1	Answers are confusing. No understanding of important issues. Does not address or answer moderator's question.

Evaluation of the teams' way of communication – 20% (in the finals 30%)

POINTS	APPROXIMATE MEANING
--------	---------------------

5	Respectfully engages all parties in an exceptionally open and productive discussion.
4	Respectfully engages with other team's arguments and ideas.
3	Respectful of other team's argument, with marginal engagement.
2	Dismissive of other team's presentation and position.
1	Combative and dismissive of other team's position.

EEB RULES OF PARTICIPATION

By joining the EEB as a **member institution**, they agree with the following rules:

Member institutions will:

- Nominate one coordinator
- Apply and respect the process stated in the official EEB Guidelines
- Respect all submission deadlines
- Appoint one judge for each further phase of competition their team will be part of
- Do not disclose the case study before the release date
- Do not provide other than logistic support to the participating teams

By joining the EEB as a **team**, team members agree to the following:

- Timely reply to official emails
- Apply and respect the process stated in the official EEB Guidelines
- Respect all submission deadlines
- Respect of other participants
- Agree to the usage of contact details for EEB-related purposes
- Agree to the usage of pictures and videos for (external) communication purposes