

JUDGE: \_\_\_\_\_ TEAM #: \_\_\_\_\_

**JUDGES' FORM  
ON-CAMPUS COMPETITION NOVEMBER 19  
ALL TEAM COMPETITION JANUARY 31**

**GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS**

The team's job is address the specific issues faced by the non-profit entity (hereafter referred to as the NFP) and propose an integrated solution to those issues.

As appropriate to their case, the team should describe the legal, business, financial and ethical dimensions of the problem. In the same vein, their solution should be legal, make sense financially and be ethically sound.

**I. LEGAL DIMENSION (10% of final score)**

**In evaluating how well the team covered the legal aspects of the case, please base your score on how well they answered the following questions:**

- Do any laws or regulations determine or limit what the NFP may or may not do in trying to resolve this problem?
- Do any major court cases determine or limit what the NFP may or may not do in trying to resolve this problem?
- Is there any likelihood of law suits?
- Is the solution legal?
- If no laws or cases apply, did the team make this clear?

**SCORING**

**Overall, how well did the team explain the legal dimensions of the problem and its solution?**

*Satisfactory performance*

1. OUTSTANDING--Everything one could reasonably expect, plus more.
2. GOOD--Everything one could reasonably expect.
3. ACCEPTABLE--Most of what one could reasonably expect.

*Unsatisfactory performance*

4. MARGINAL--Much of what should be there, but not enough.
5. WEAK--Some of what should be there, but seriously incomplete.
6. POOR--Very weak.

## **II. BUSINESS DIMENSION (20% of final score)**

**In evaluating how well the team covered the business (non-profit industry) aspects of the case, please base your score on the following:**

- Did any business factors contribute to the problem?
- Are the business implications of any legal issues pointed out?
- Are the business implications of any ethical issues pointed out?
- What are the business implications of the solution?
- Does the solution make sense from a business perspective?

### **SCORING**

**Overall, how well did the team explain the business dimensions of the problem and its solution?**

#### *Satisfactory performance*

1. OUTSTANDING--Everything one could reasonably expect, plus more.
2. GOOD--Everything one could reasonably expect.
3. ACCEPTABLE--Most of what one could reasonably expect.

#### *Unsatisfactory performance*

4. MARGINAL--Much of what should be there, but not enough.
5. WEAK--Some of what should be there, but seriously incomplete.
6. POOR--Very weak.

### **III. FINANCIAL DIMENSION (20% of final score)**

**In evaluating how well the team covered the financial aspects of the case, please base your score on the following:**

- Did any financial factors contribute to the problem?
- Are the financial implications of any legal issues pointed out?
- Are the financial implications of any ethical issues pointed out?
- What are the financial implications of the solution?
- Does the solution make sense from a financial perspective?
- Is the solution affordable?

### **SCORING**

**Overall, how well did the team explain the financial dimensions of the problem and its solution?**

#### ***Satisfactory performance***

1. **OUTSTANDING**--Everything one could reasonably expect, plus more.
2. **GOOD**--Everything one could reasonably expect.
3. **ACCEPTABLE**--Most of what one could reasonably expect.

#### ***Unsatisfactory performance***

4. **MARGINAL**--Much of what should be there, but not enough.
5. **WEAK**--Some of what should be there, but seriously incomplete.
6. **POOR**--Very weak.

#### IV. ETHICAL DIMENSION (20% of final score)

Teams were instructed to discuss the ethical issues in a simple and straightforward way and to relate them clearly to the central issues associated with running a business. In evaluating how well the team covered the ethical aspects of the case, please base your score on the following:

- From the standpoint of a secular, philosophical perspective, precisely why is the problem an ethical issue?
- What is the amount and type of tangible good and harm involved in the problem and solution?
- Are the actions themselves in this case (in the problem and solution) ethically defensible?
- Is there a conflict of rights? Is this resolved?
- Is the solution ethically acceptable?
- How well did the team present the ethical issues simply and clearly?

#### SCORING

**Overall, how well did the team explain the ethical dimensions of the problem and its solution?**

##### *Satisfactory performance*

1. OUTSTANDING--Everything one could reasonably expect, plus more. Complicated ethical issues were made remarkably easy to understand. Relevance to business concerns were clear and insightful.
2. GOOD--Everything one could reasonably expect. Ethical issues were explained simply. Connection to business concerns was clear.
3. ACCEPTABLE--Most of what one could reasonably expect. The explanation wasn't everything it should be, but you got the general idea of the ethical issues and their connection to business concerns

##### *Unsatisfactory performance*

4. MARGINAL--Much of what should be there, but not enough. You only partially understood either the ethical issues (explanation wasn't clear enough or it was too technical) or their connection to the NFP's concerns.
5. WEAK--Some of what should be there, but seriously incomplete. The explanation was seriously lacking. You just barely understood the ethical issues (explanation wasn't clear enough or it was too technical) and/or their connection to business concerns
6. POOR--Very weak. Ethical issues &/or their connection to business concerns not at all understandable

## **V. PRESENTATION SKILLS (15% of final score)**

**In evaluating the team's presentation skills, please base your score on the following:**

- Were speakers comfortable enough with the material that they did not read from a text?
- Could all of the speakers be heard?
- Were the graphics program, visual aids and/or handouts used effectively?
- Did the team manage their time well?
- Did they handle the question and answer session effectively?

**Please consider these serious errors if the team does any of these:**

- reading from a text
- one team member presenting substantially less than his/her teammates
- so enamored with graphics that the speaker simply fades into the role of a narrator

## **SCORING**

**How polished and professional was the presentation?**

### *Satisfactory performance*

1. OUTSTANDING--Everything one could reasonably expect, plus more.
2. GOOD--Everything one could reasonably expect.
3. ACCEPTABLE--Most of what one could reasonably expect.

### *Unsatisfactory performance*

4. MARGINAL--Much of what should be there, but not enough.
5. WEAK--Some of what should be there, but seriously incomplete.
6. POOR--Very weak.

## **VI. OVERALL PERSUASIVENESS (15% of final score)**

**In evaluating how persuasive the team was, please base your score on the following:**

- Were the problem and the solution clearly explained?
- Were the analyses thorough and well-informed?
- Is the solution realistic and practical?
- Is the solution legal, financially responsible and ethical?

### **SCORING**

**On the basis of what you've just heard, how convinced were you by the team's overall analysis of the problem and suggestion for a solution?**

#### ***Convinced***

1. **ABSOLUTELY AND TOTALLY CONVINCED**--You have no reservations whatsoever
2. **CONVINCED**--You have reservations, but nothing major.
3. **MORE OR LESS CONVINCED**--You have reservations (maybe one large one, or a series of small ones), but the presentation left you more convinced than unconvinced. (Ambivalence that ends up on just this side of the fence.)

#### ***Unconvinced***

4. **ALMOST CONVINCED**--You have major reservations that leave you more unconvinced than convinced, but you found parts of the presentation convincing. (Ambivalence that ends up on just the other side of the fence.)
5. **UNCONVINCED**--The presentation may have had some good points, but clearly not enough to convince you.
6. **TOTALLY UNCONVINCED**--Not a prayer.

## **VII. COMMENTS**

Is there anything else about the group's performance (good or bad) that you'd like to note?

**JUDGE:** \_\_\_\_\_ **TEAM #:** \_\_\_\_\_

**FINAL SCORING SUMMARY**

	TOTAL POINTS	Satisfactory performance			Unsatisfactory performance		
		OUTSTANDING	GOOD	ACCEPTABLE	MARGINAL	WEAK	POOR
<b>Legal dimension</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Business dimension</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Financial dimension</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Ethical dimension</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Presentation skills</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>
		<b>ABSOLUTELY AND TOTALLY CONVINCED</b>	<b>CONVINCED</b>	<b>MORE OR LESS CONVINCED</b>	<b>ALMOST CONVINCED</b>	<b>UN-CONVINCED</b>	<b>TOTALLY UN-CONVINCED</b>
<b>Overall persuasiveness</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>						