


ONLINE JUNIOR SCHOOL ETHICS OLYMPIAD STUDENTS KIT



The following information is for students who are part of a team at the 2026 Junior School Ethics Olympiad. In conducting the Ethics Olympiad, we hope to raise the profile and promote the study of Ethics in Junior schools. Congratulations on being selected to represent your school.

- Schools are entering teams of four/five students.
- On the day, all students will be involved in a series of three Ethics Olympiad heats.
- You will be meeting students from all over Australasia.
- There are six ethical cases that everyone has access to before the event.
- At the end of each case you will find some questions which your team might be asked to address on the day.
- You will work together as a team to come up with the best response to the question.
- You will be given a short meeting time before your team responds and different judge/moderators will guide you throughout each heat.

- The scoring criteria rewards, clear, concise, respectful discourse around interesting ethical cases. Please familiarize yourself with the cases.
- The results will be collated at the end of the event and we will contact all schools within 24 hours indicating which teams were awarded first second and third place. The top three teams will be invited to participate in an international between Chinese schools and Australasian schools.

Prior to the event

Students will need to be familiar with the ethical cases provided with this kit.

Tech needs

Each team will need to use a laptop or a tablet that has a camera and built-in microphone. Once the team or teams are registered we will provide you with a Zoom link which your coach will access the Olympiad on the day. We will be contacting your coach about how to set up before the event.



On the day

- Make sure you have a copy of the cases.
- You are not allowed to bring notes into the heats.
- Students will need to be dressed in school uniform on the day.
- You are allowed to make notes...So make sure you have a pen and blank note paper.

Program for the Day:

Start times:

8 am - WA, Singapore & Hong Kong
9.30 am - SA
10 am - ACT, N.S.W, Qld, Tas & Victoria
12 pm - New Zealand

Finish times:

12.30 pm - WA, Singapore and Hong Kong
2.00 pm - SA
2.30 pm - ACT, N.S.W, Qld, Tas & Victoria
4.30 pm - New Zealand

Heat Format, Rules & scoring


The heats will be run in a Zoom breakout room. Each room will have two teams and a moderator/judge. After brief introductions, the moderator will toss a coin to determine which is team A and which is team B. The case will then be announced, and the question will be read out. Students will then be invited to have a two-minute team meeting. Students have 2 minutes to discuss and plan their response to the question. Team A then have 5 minutes to present their case. (Only one person can speak at a time) The moderator will provide a stop watch so you know when that time is nearly up. A one-minute conference will then be afforded for Team B to offer their critique. Following that Team B has 3 minutes to present their critique. Team A will then have a 1-minute meeting to prepare their response to the critique. Another three-minute period is provided for Team A to respond, again with a 30 second time warning.



Following this the judge (s) will have 7 minutes Q&A with Team A. (Students can ask to have a 30 second private conference before responding to their questions)

Once the judges have finished their Q&A the judge will read out the next case and Team A swaps rolls with team B and the same process is repeated as above.

At the end of the Heat please make sure you thank the moderator and the judges.



Participants

Teams will be made up of five students. Students from Years 5 - 6 (9-12 year olds) only are allowed to participate in the Junior School Ethics Olympiad. It is important to notify the organisers if you have students from any other year group.

Topics for the 2026 Junior School Ethics Olympiad

Case 1 – Online Sport

Case 2 – Using Animals

Case 3 – Changing Schools

Case 4 – Don’t Let the Pigeon Drive the Bus

Case 5 – The Invention of Lying.

Case 6 – The Giving Tree

You can find these online at:

<http://>

ethicsolympiad.org/2026JuniorSchoolEthicsOlympiad/2026JuniorSchoolEthicsOlympiadCases.pdf

Prizes

Please note that medals will not be awarded during the day but announced within 24 hours to the organising teacher. Gold, Silver and Bronze medals will be posted to the winning schools soon after the event and can then be awarded at a school assembly.



2026 Ethics Olympiad Scoring Criteria

The Ethics Olympiad scoring criteria should be used in conjunction with the score sheet. Please remember, teams are strongly encouraged to think of themselves as being on the same side rather than as opponents. That is, both teams are working together to solve a difficult problem—while impressing the judges with thoughtful analysis and support. Listening to the other team with an aim to affirm, supplement, or build on their argument is a prudent approach.

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

A) Did the presentation *clearly and systematically address the moderator's question?* (5 points)

- 5 = Extremely clear presentation that systematically addressed the key dimensions of the question.
- 4 = Reasonably clear presentation that systematically addressed most key dimensions of the question.
- 3 = Hard to follow the argument. Significant dimensions of the question missed (passable).
- 2 = Serious logical problems or underdeveloped argument (poor).
- 1 = Incoherent presentation.

B) Did the team *clearly identify and thoroughly discuss the central moral dimensions* of the case? (5 points)

- 5 = Clearly and precisely identified central moral dimensions, and discussed these dimensions thoroughly.
- 4 = Mostly identified central moral dimensions and discussed major issues.
- 3 = Adequately identified and discussed some central moral dimensions (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 the team's position?* (5 points)

- 5 = Insightful analysis and discussion of the most significant viewpoints, including full and careful attention to opposing points of view.
- 4 = Solid analysis and discussion of some different viewpoints.
- 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 and directly responded to and engaged the presenting team's argument?

- 10 = Especially insightful, complete, 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 merely asking a series of 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 (15 Points)

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

- 15 = Especially insightful, complete, and composed response.
- 12-14 = Key points are excellently addressed.
- 9-11 = Solid response to commenting team.
- 6-8 = Some relevant points are made (passable).
- 3-5 = Weak or irrelevant response (poor).
- 1-2 = 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 = Especially insightful, complete, and composed response.
- 14 = The most pressing points are identified and discussed.
- 13-12 = Several of the most important points are identified and discussed.
- 11-10 = Some relevant points are made (passable).
- 9-4 = Weak or irrelevant response (poor).
- 3-1 = Failure to respond to commentary and judges

Overall: Points for engaging in Respectful Dialogue, as opposed to Combative Debate (5 Points)

Did the team demonstrate their awareness that an ethics bowl is about participating in a collaborative discussion aimed at earnestly thinking through difficult ethical issues?

- 5 = Respectfully engaged all parties in exceptionally productive and collaborative discussion.
- 4 = Respectfully engaged other team's arguments and points.
- 3 = Respectful of other team's argument but only marginal engagement and pursuit.
- 2 = Unengaged with other team's arguments.
- 1 = Combative or dismissive of other team's arguments.

Online Score Sheet

Heat 1 Heat 2 Heat 3

Home Admin Logout

Team A

No Team Selected

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Clarity Was this team's presentation clear and systematic? | 0 / 5 |
| Centrality Did the team's presentation identify and thoroughly discuss the central moral dimensions of the case? | 0 / 5 |
| Thoughtfulness Did the team's presentation indicate both awareness and thoughtful consideration of different viewpoints, including those that would loom large in the reasoning of individuals who disagree with the teams position? | 0 / 5 |
| Commentary Response Did this team's response to the commentary adequately address the questions, concerns, and comments raised by the other team? | 0 / 15 |
| Judge Q&A Response To what extent did this team succeed in identifying the central point of your questions, and responding to them clearly and effectively. | 0 / 15 |
| Commentary To what extent has the team effectively dealt with the presenting teams arguments? | 0 / 10 |
| Respectful "Has this team been consistently respectful of the other team?" | 0 / 5 |
| Give this team an Honorable Mention? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Total Score: 0

Submit Scores for Heat 1

Team B

No Team Selected

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Commentary To what extent has the team effectively dealt with the presenting teams arguments? | 0 / 10 |
| Clarity Was this team's presentation clear and systematic? | 0 / 5 |
| Centrality Did the team's presentation identify and thoroughly discuss the central moral dimensions of the case? | 0 / 5 |
| Thoughtfulness Did the team's presentation indicate both awareness and thoughtful consideration of different viewpoints, including those that would loom large in the reasoning of individuals who disagree with the teams position? | 0 / 5 |
| Commentary Response Did this team's response to the commentary adequately address the questions, concerns, and comments raised by the other team? | 0 / 15 |
| Judge Q&A Response To what extent did this team succeed in identifying the central point of your questions, and responding to them clearly and effectively. | 0 / 15 |
| Commentary To what extent has the team effectively dealt with the presenting teams arguments? | 0 / 10 |
| Respectful "Has this team been consistently respectful of the other team?" | 0 / 5 |
| Give this team an Honorable Mention? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Total Score: 0