



Ethical Dilemma Competition

Overview

The Ethical Dilemma competition challenges chapters to engage in an ethical debate centered around an educational dilemma. Participants will delve into an ethical issue, applying critical-thinking skills and persuasive communication to collaboratively explore and debate their stance.

Each chapter member begins by thoroughly examining the ethical issue and forming an individual position. Subsequently, members engage in a structured debate, actively listening to diverse viewpoints within the chapter. The goal is to collectively reach a consensus on the topic, culminating in a 10-minute presentation that articulates the chapter's unified perspective.

Teams must collaborate closely to develop the presentation, selecting between four and eight students to present their stance and the process behind it to a panel of judges.

Participation Details

- This is a chapter competition.
- Only one (1) entry per chapter will be accepted.
- A maximum of four (4) entries total will be accepted, on a first-come, first-served basis.

The guidelines for the FIU Ethical Dilemma Competition are adapted from the national Educators Rising competition guidelines and are used for educational purposes. All credit for the original competition structure, objectives, and evaluation criteria goes to Educators Rising. FIU's adaptations are intended to align with our institutional context and support student success within our programs



Ethical Dilemma Competition

Competition Guidelines

- A. During a chapter meeting, present the ethical dilemma narrative included at the end of this PDF.
- B. 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.
- C. When the discussions have concluded and a consensus has been reached, prepare an 8-10-minute live presentation stating the chapter's view on the dilemma.
- D. 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, 8-10-minute presentation to a panel of judges. The presentation should be a professional, clear, and decisive response to the dilemma. The process by which the decision was reached, and the factors considered should be included in the presentation.
- E. Use of AV materials (ex., an original PowerPoint or Prezi presentation, short video, etc.) is permitted but entirely optional for the 8-10-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.
- F. After the live presentation and for the remainder of the 15-minute interactive session, the judges will ask the students questions about their deliberation process, the factors considered when making decisions, how they reached a consensus, and other relevant questions related to the deliberation process.
- G. 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; otherwise, they will be 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. This is a chapter competition. Only one (1) entry per chapter will be accepted.
- B. All entries for individual and/or chapter competitions must be submitted by the chapter's sponsoring teacher via the Online Competition Entry Form **by 5:00 pm on Friday, October 30, 2026.**
- C. Four (4) entries total will be accepted for this competition. Entries will be accepted on a first-come, first-served basis.
- D. Entries submitted by email will not be accepted.



Ethical Dilemma Competition

Ethical Dilemma Scenario

Ms. Ramirez is in her sixth year of teaching English at a large public high school. She is known for building strong relationships with her students and encouraging them to take ownership of their writing. She also incorporates technology into her classroom and regularly discusses the importance of using digital tools responsibly.

At the beginning of the school year, Ms. Ramirez reviews the school's academic integrity policy with her classes. The policy requires students to submit their own original work and prohibits unauthorized assistance but does not specifically address the use of generative artificial intelligence (AI). Ms. Ramirez tells students that AI may sometimes be useful for brainstorming or understanding difficult concepts, but students should not use it to write assignments for them.

For a major argumentative essay, students are required to complete research, an outline, a first draft, peer feedback, and a final paper. The assignment is intended to demonstrate both critical thinking and writing skills.

When reviewing Jordan's final essay, Ms. Ramirez notices that several sections are significantly more polished than the student's earlier drafts and do not sound like Jordan's typical writing. However, the argument and supporting ideas closely follow the work Jordan completed in class.

Ms. Ramirez meets privately with Jordan, who admits to using a generative AI tool while revising the essay. Jordan explains that the research, argument, and first draft were completed independently. AI was then used to suggest stronger organization, improve transitions, and make some paragraphs sound more academic. Jordan incorporated several of those suggestions into the final paper.

"I didn't ask AI to write my paper," Jordan explains. "The ideas are mine. I thought it was like using Grammarly or getting help editing."

Jordan also points out that neither the school's written policy nor the assignment specifically explained what types of AI assistance were prohibited. Jordan says several classmates use AI in similar ways and believed this type of editing assistance was acceptable.

Ms. Ramirez is now unsure how to proceed. She believes parts of the final essay may no longer accurately demonstrate Jordan's independent writing ability. At the same time, Jordan's drafts show that the research and central ideas are original. If she reports the situation as academic dishonesty, school procedures require parent and administrator notification and the consequence could affect Jordan's grade and academic record. If she allows the paper to stand, she worries that she may be accepting inappropriate assistance and creating an unfair situation for students who completed the assignment without AI.

Ms. Ramirez also recognizes a larger issue: **technology is evolving faster than many school policies, leaving both students and educators to determine where appropriate assistance ends and academic dishonesty begins.**

What is the appropriate course of action for Ms. Ramirez to take?



Ethical Dilemma Competition

RECOMMENDED READING

- The Model Code of Ethics for Educators (MCEE): 2nd edition, available at https://www.nasdtec.net/page/MCEE_Doc
- AI Guidance for Schools Toolkit, TeachAI <https://www.teachai.org/teachai-ai-guidance-for-schools-toolkit>
- Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research, UNESCO <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693>

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER DURING YOUR DEBATE OF THE DILEMMA

- Does Jordan's use of AI constitute academic dishonesty? Why or why not?
- Where is the line between acceptable AI assistance and AI doing a student's work?
- How should unclear school or classroom policies affect Ms. Ramirez's decision?
- How should Ms. Ramirez balance fairness to Jordan with fairness to other students?
- What responsibility does Jordan have for ensuring submitted work is truly their own?
- What responsibility do teachers and schools have for establishing clear AI expectations?
- How can educators allow responsible AI use without compromising student learning or academic integrity?

Ethical Dilemma Competition

Presentation and Q&A

Points Available	Accomplished 16 – 13	Commendable 12 – 9	Developing 8 – 5	Needs Improvement 4 – 1
Depth	The presentation demonstrates a profound and comprehensive understanding of the multiple factors and perspectives involved in the issue. It succeeds in uncovering root issues and proposing compelling, well-founded paths forward.	The presentation demonstrates an understanding of the issue and proposes well-founded solutions for some, but not all, of the issues at 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 helpful, well-detailed ideas that warrant further exploration beyond this session. The presentation may explore most, but not all, sides of the 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 fully explore all the issues or perspectives at play in the scenario.	The presentation may offer ideas that are flawed, illogical, or only partially developed, leaving the audience with a feeling of incompleteness. Few perspectives or issues are explored in the scenario.
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 on the audience.	The presentation would benefit from more inventive or distinctive choices. Clichés may be present.	The presentation requires significant improvement to effectively engage the audience and deliver a meaningful impact related to its intended message.

Ethical Dilemma Competition

Points Available	Accomplished 16 – 13	Commendable 12 – 9	Developing 8 – 5	Needs Improvement 4 – 1
Presence	The competitors' sustained eye contact, effective posture, and professional demeanor expertly complement the substance of the presentation, delivering the maximum possible impact to the listener. All team members, whether speaking or not, constantly reinforce the intended impact of the presentation.	The competitors mostly maintained eye contact, displayed positive posture, and maintained a pleasant demeanor, complementing 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 team's 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, attire, speech, attention to detail, and quality of materials — reflect an essentially equitable effort among all members and a commendable level of professionalism.	Aspects of the team's performance — including demeanor, attire, speech, attention to detail, and quality of materials — reflect a mixed level 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 reflect successful attempts to address most of the material posed to them. The competitors demonstrate a substantial 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 quality levels from answer to answer.	The competitors' responses in the Q&A session may reflect evident effort and passion, but are inconsistent in terms of depth, accuracy, understanding, and insight offered in their responses.

Ethical Dilemma Competition

Presentation and Q&A Cont.

Points Available	Accomplished 16 – 13	Commendable 12 – 9	Developing 8 – 5	Needs Improvement 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 unexplored or unexplained, the presentation is not entirely persuasive.	The presenters should look for deeper, more precise, and well-founded rationales for considering all aspects of the scenario and responding persuasively.	The presenters do not make a persuasive case for handling the situation professionally.
Overall Impact	The presentation's professional-caliber and highly persuasive exploration of the issues, along with its clear explanation of decision points, delivers 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 points, the content and delivery may not effectively complement each other or may reflect a partial lack of understanding or professional judgment. This may limit the presentation's impact.	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.