

#### **Overview**

This is a chapter competition. In this competition, the chapter must debate an ethical education-related dilemma. This competition requires members to think deeply about an ethical issue, employ critical-thinking skills, and use persuasive communication techniques to collaboratively debate an ethical dilemma.

To participate, each member of the chapter must first thoroughly consider the ethical issue and begin to form an individual position on the topic. Then the chapter members must debate the topic together, listening carefully to each other's opinions. Through the discussion, the chapter members must come to a consensus on the topic and then prepare a 10-minute presentation stating their chapter's view.

The chapter must work as a team to develop the presentation and then select at least four and no more than eight students from the chapter to present the chapter's opinion and how it was reached to a panel of judges.

Four (4) entries total will be accepted. Entries will be accepted on a first-come, first-served basis and will be limited to the number of participants.



#### **Competition Guidelines**

- A. The sponsoring teacher must submit the Online Competition Entry Form by 5:00 pm on Friday, October 27, 2023.
- B. During a chapter meeting, present the ethical dilemma narrative included at the end of this PDF.
- C. Spend adequate time discussing the dilemma. This deliberation may take several chapter meetings. As a group, answer the ethical dilemma questions listed with the ethical dilemma narrative included at the end of this PDF.
- D. When the discussions have concluded and a consensus has been reached, prepare a 10-minute live presentation stating the chapter's view on the dilemma.
- E. No fewer than four and no more than eight student representatives from competing chapters will participate in a 15-minute interactive session with a panel of judges. During the interactive session, the chapter representatives will deliver their live, 10-minute presentation to a panel of judges. The presentation should be a

- professional, clear, and decisive response to the dilemma. How the decision was reached and what factors were considered should be included in the presentation.
- F. Use of AV materials (ex. an original PowerPoint or Prezi presentation, short video, etc.) is permitted but entirely optional for the 10-minute presentation. The presentation file must be stored on a USB flash drive. There will not be an internet connection available in the meeting room.
- G. After the live presentation and for the balance of the 15-minute interactive session, the judges will ask the students questions about their deliberation process, the factors that were considered when making a decision, how they reached a consensus, and other questions relevant to the deliberation process.
- H. One judge will also serve as a timekeeper during the presentation. Chapter representatives will receive an indication that there is one minute remaining when they reach the nine-minute mark of their presentation

#### **Judging and Scoring**

- A. Competitors must be present at the scheduled time or will be considered disqualified.
- B. The judges' decision is final.
- C. Competitors agree to be bound by the FEA General Competition Rules.
- D. The entry will be scored using the Ethical Dilemma Competition rubric.

#### **How to Enter**

- A. All entries for individual and/or chapter competitions must be submitted by the chapter's sponsoring teacher via the Online Competition Entry Form by 5:00pm, on Friday, October 27, 2023.
- B. Entries submitted by email will not be accepted.
- C. Four (4) entries will be accepted for this competition. Entries will be accepted on a first-come, first-served basis.



#### **Ethical Dilemma Scenario**

Ms. Ramirez is a first-year language arts teacher and yearbook advisor who is employed in the small community in which she was raised.

Richard and Mandi are two of Ms. Ramirez's language arts students and both are on the yearbook committee. Mandi, the yearbook editor, lives in Ms. Ramirez's neighborhood, and Mandi's mother works in the school's front office. Richard is new to the school and quiet in class. It was Ms. Ramirez's suggestion he join the yearbook committee as a photographer.

Over time, Ms. Ramirez noticed Richard became quieter and more withdrawn during the regular yearbook work sessions and at school. She privately asked him if anything was bothering him, and he denied any issues. Later that evening, however, he directly messaged Ms. Ramirez on Instagram. In his message, he shared several of Mandi's posts to him about his "sloppy" photography, how nobody liked him, and criticizing where he lived. He knew she had also shared her opinions with other classmates as many were not as friendly as they had been. He begged Ms. Ramirez not to talk to Mandi about her posts as "It would just make things worse." He said it would be better if he just quit the yearbook committee.

Ms. Ramirez was unsure how to proceed. She neither wanted Richard to experience retaliation nor quit the committee. She was not sure if Mandi's behavior rose to the level of bullying, but it was, in her opinion, hurtful and rude. She did know Mandi's mother was very vocal at school and in the neighborhood, not holding back her opinion about specific teachers.

Ms. Ramirez's mentor teacher advised her to be careful. She shared an earlier situation in which Mandi's mother had openly sided with her daughter about a poor grade she received from another teacher's class, which had become a topic of discussion around the school. As a new teacher, Ms. Ramirez hoped to avoid a similar situation.

#### RECOMMENDED READING

Students often confide in their teachers with personal concerns, and many educators embrace the opportunity to have a meaningful role in the lives of their students outside the classroom. What are some possible unintended consequences of communicating with students using personal (e.g., Instagram), not professional profiles? Read on for various perspectives:

- The Model Code of Ethics for Educators, available at <a href="https://www.nasdtec.net/page/MCEE">https://www.nasdtec.net/page/MCEE</a> Doc
- Cyberbullying, available at <a href="https://www.stopbullying.gov/">https://www.stopbullying.gov/</a>
- Excerpts from Cybertraps for Educators 2.0



#### QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER DURING YOUR DEBATE OF THE DILEMMA

- ➤ Discuss how the teacher-student relationship differs between classroom instruction and school activities that are outside the classroom.
- ➤ Discuss some possible unintended consequences of communicating with students not only outside of the school day but also using personal (e.g., Instagram), not professional profiles.
- ➤ Discuss Ms. Ramirez's concern about potential issues arising that may cause others to question her competency as a teacher.
- ➤ Discuss if Ms. Ramirez should honor Richard's request not to address the issue with Mandi for fear of retaliation.
- ➤ What might be the best course of action for Ms. Ramirez?
- > How might this situation have been prevented or could it have been prevented?
- ➤ How can teachers best prepare for the myriad of unexpected situations that occur when working with students and their families?
- ➤ This scenario frames several core ethical axioms confidentiality, student safety and welfare, technology, and multiple relationships. Consult the Model Code of Ethics and find specific standards that discuss those issues. Use the standards to determine 1) the greatest priorities in the scenario that need to be addressed, 2) the possible consequences for different courses of action, 3) determine other stakeholders that are not mentioned in the scenario that may be impacted by Ms. Ramirez's courses of action, and finally 4) discuss other examples in which those core axioms are present in the teaching profession with your colleagues.



## **Presentation and Q&A**

| Points Available | Accomplished   | Commendable  | Developing   | Needs Improvement  |
|------------------|--|--|--|--|
|                  | 16 – 13  | 12 – 9   | 8 – 5  | 4 – 1  |
| Depth            | The presentation reflects a deep and comprehensive understanding of multiple factors and points of view involved in the issue. It succeeds in uncovering root issues and proposing compelling, well-founded paths forward. | The presentation reflects an understanding of the issue and succeeds in proposing well-founded solutions for some but not all of the issues in play in the scenario.   | The presentation is on-topic. Responses offer multiple good points but would benefit from more exploration, detail, or research. The solution may only partially address the scenario.                         | The presentation reflects a limited or flawed understanding of the issue in the scenario. The solutions offered are not plausible, appropriate, or justified.                  |
| Insight          | The content of the highly focused presentation reflects a keen understanding and striking insight into all sides of the issue at play in the scenario.   | The presentation offers useful, well-detailed ideas that warrant further exploration beyond this session. The presentation may explore most but not all sides of all issues at play in the scenario.   | The presentation offers basic, intuitive ideas that would have benefited from further unpacking in this session. This presentation may not explore many of the issues or perspectives at play in the scenario. | The presentation may offer ideas that are flawed, illogical, or only partially developed and feel incomplete. Few perspectives or issues at play in the scenario are explored. |
| Creativity       | The presentation conveys its message in creative, inventive ways that expertly maximize engagement and impact for the audience.  The creative risks taken pay off impressively.  | The presentation employs creative ideas to convey its message, although the stylistic or thematic choices do not entirely maximize impact for the audience.  Creative choices at 1 or 2 points in the presentation may distract from or limit the impact for the audience. | The presentation would benefit from more inventive or distinctive choices. Clichés may be present.   | The presentation needs significant improvement to engage the audience or deliver meaningful impact related to its intended message.  |



## **Presentation and Q&A Cont.**

| Points Available           | Accomplished   | Commendable   | Developing   | Needs Improvement   |
|----------------------------|--|---|--|---|
|                            | 16 – 13  | 12 – 9  | 8 – 5  | 4 – 1   |
| Presence                   | The competitors' sustained eye contact, effective posture, and professional demeanor expertly complement the substance of the presentation to deliver the maximum possible impact to the listener.  All team members, whether speaking or not, always reinforce the intended impact of the presentation. | The competitors' mostly sustained eye contact, positive posture, and pleasant demeanor complement the content of the presentation quite well.  One or more of the presenters may appear to slip in and out of professional character at moments during the session.                           | The competitors' inconsistent eye contact, posture, and demeanor reflect a straightforward recital of the material.  The speakers could do more to fully capitalize on the added impact possible with a focused, sustained presence. | The competitors display effort but eye contact, posture, and demeanor from multiple team members could benefit from more practice and coaching so that the speakers' presence consistently complements the content.   |
| Teamwork & Professionalism | All aspects of the teams' performance — including demeanor, dress, speech, attention to detail, and quality of materials — reflect an equitable effort among all the members and a consistently high level of professionalism.   | Most aspects of the team's performance — including demeanor, dress, speech, attention to detail, and quality of materials — reflect a mostly equitable effort among all the members and a commendable level of professionalism.   | Aspects of the team's performance — including demeanor, dress, speech, attention to detail, and quality of materials — reflect mixed levels of professionalism. The responsibility load may appear imbalanced among team members     | The responsibility load appears highly imbalanced among team members. Multiple aspects of the competitors' performance — including demeanor, dress, speech, attention to detail, and quality of materials—need significant improvement to be considered professional caliber. |
| Q&A Responses              | The competitors' responses in the Q&A session demonstrate consistent thoughtfulness and professional-caliber insight, rooted in the deep experience of the material.  The competitors display impressive, professional-level depth of knowledge and understanding given their experience and research    | The competitors' responses in the Q&A session demonstrate thoughtfulness and reflected successful attempts to address most of the material posed to them.  The competitors display some substantive knowledge and understanding of the selected topic based on their experience and research. | The competitors' responses in the Q&A session reflect a broad spectrum of levels of quality from answer to answer  | The competitors' responses in the Q&A session may reflect evident effort and passion but are inconsistent in the depth, accuracy, understanding, or insight offered in responses  |



## Presentation and Q&A Cont.

| Points Available | Accomplished<br>16 – 13   | Commendable<br>12 – 9  | Developing<br>8 – 5   | Needs Improvement<br>4 – 1   |
|------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Persuasiveness   | The presenters are entirely persuasive with clear and well-founded rationales for their position.   | The presenters make a commendable case but by leaving some areas not fully explored or explained, the presentation is not entirely persuasive.   | The presenters should look for deeper or more clear and well-founded rationales for considering all aspects of the scenario and responding persuasively.  | The presenters do not make a persuasive case for how to handle the situation professionally.   |
| Overall Impact   | The presentation's professional-caliber and highly persuasive exploration of the issues and explanation of decision points deliver maximum impact and understanding to the audience.  The presentation content & delivery effectively complement each other to craft a highly impactful, professional-caliber experience. | The content and delivery work together to offer a commendable and persuasive presentation.  With minor revisions and delivery tweaks, the project could be considered of professional caliber. | The minimally persuasive presentation demonstrates effort. At multiple moments, the content and delivery may not effectively complement one another or may reflect a partial lack of understanding or professional judgment. This may limit the impact of the presentation. | The unpersuasive presentation demonstrates inconsistent, unprofessional, or superficial aspects in content or delivery.  The audience is frequently distracted from the intended impact by aspects of the content or delivery. |

## Length

| Points Available | 4   | 2   | 0  |
|------------------|---|---|--|
| Length           | The presentation is between 8 and 10 minutes. | The presentation is between 5 and 7 minutes or 11 and 12 minutes. | The presentation is shorter than 5 minutes or had to be stopped at 12 minutes. |