**About the CIfA Ethics Tournament**

***This borrows heavily from the SAA’s Ethics Bowl. The CIfA Ethics Tournament arises from the CIfA – RPA Memorandum of Understanding and demonstrates an interest from both sides to develop good ethical competence among practitioners and, over time, to work towards an international competition. Therefore, CIfA has simply adopted (and adapted) the SAA procedures and practices.***

The Ethics Tournament is a debate competition for undergraduate and graduate students from different universities (including up to 1 faculty member) and mixed teams from Registered Organisations and Special Interest Groups, compete by debating solutions to the ethical dilemmas archaeologists face in our day-to-day lives. Each year, hypothetical cases are developed using real-life experiences and suggestions from academic, heritage management, and avocational archaeologists around the world. Ethics Tournament teams then formulate and defend reactions and solutions to these ethical dilemmas using their knowledge of numerous ethical guidelines and laws, as well as their personal research and fieldwork experiences. Judges ideally are drawn to represent the diverse employment sectors of archaeology, to have expertise in archaeological ethics as a subject of expertise, and who are sufficient years of professional practice to have encountered ethical dilemmas, grade the teams on their responses, throw them challenging questions that extend or change key components of the cases, and decide which teams advance to the final round and compete for prizes. It’s an awesome experience and a great opportunity to practice ethical decision making before being placed in a hard situation in real life. Judges regularly comment that Ethics Tournament contestants demonstrate stronger ethical decision-making skills than many working archaeologists have sometimes shown.

All rounds are held in front of live audiences during the CIfA Annual Conference.

\*Note: Teams made up of more than one institution are allowed

In an Ethics Tournament, each 3 to 5 member team will be questioned by a moderator on a case. Although the cases are made available ahead of time, none of the participants will know in advance which of the cases they will be asked to address in the Ethics Tournament competition, nor will they know the questions. Books and notes will not be allowed. However, blank scrap paper to jot down thoughts is permitted.

1. At the beginning of each match, the moderator will flip a coin. The winner of the coin toss will choose to go first or second.
2. The moderator will read aloud the case and a question about the case.
3. The first team will have one (1) minute to confer, after which one spokesperson for the team may use up to five (5) minutes to respond to the moderator's question.
4. The second team have one (1) minute to confer, after which it may use up to 5 minutes to respond to the first team's answer or present their own response to the moderator’s question.
5. The judges have one (1) minute to confer. Each judge asks one question, with the option of one brief immediate follow-up question. The entire period for the judges' questions should not exceed sixteen (15) minutes.
6. The first team has one (1) minute to confer after each question and two (2) minutes to respond to each question. Different team members may respond to the questions of different judges. However, only one team member may respond to a judge's question.
7. When the first team is done answering the judges' questions, the second team will then one (1) minute to confer after each question and two (2) minutes to respond to each question. Different team members may respond to the questions of different judges. However, only one team member may respond to a judge's question.
8. The judges will then confer and score the two teams.
9. The first and second teams are replaced by teams 3 and 4 and the process starts again.

**Scoring by the Judges**

The three judges score each team on intelligibility, depth, focus, and judgment. Preliminary rounds are held in the morning, with the finalists challenging each other at an afternoon session, which is open to all meeting participants.

Each team will be evaluated on the basis of four (4) criteria:

1. Intelligibility—Has the team stated and defended its position in a way that is logically consistent? Has the team expressed its responses with enough clarity and precision that the judges can understand it?
2. Depth—To what extent does the team's statement and defence of its position indicate an awareness and understanding of the issues that the judge views as ethically central to the case.
3. Focus—To what extent does the team's statement and defence of its position avoid issues that are ethically irrelevant to the case?
4. Judgment—To what extent, in the judge's view, has the team made a careful and reasonable comparative assessment of considerations it identifies as ethically relevant to the case.

Each of the four criteria will be rated on a scale from one to five, five being the highest score, one being the lowest. When the scores for the four criteria are tallied, a team may receive as many as twenty (20) points per judge or as few as four (4). A perfect score for a panel of three judges would be sixty (60) points. Each judge will give the opposing team an overall score of one to five-five (5) being the highest score-based on the same criteria.

The winner is announced (although the scores are not). The team with the most points wins the match, and continues on to the next round of competition until it either wins the tournament or is defeated. Judges are invited to make any final comments to the participating teams.

**Resources from the SAA are available at:**

[http://www.saa.org/AbouttheSociety/AnnualMeeting/EthicsTournament/EthicsResources/tabid/198/Default.aspx](http://www.saa.org/AbouttheSociety/AnnualMeeting/EthicsBowl/EthicsResources/tabid/198/Default.aspx)

**Tips on Preparation**

Team members need to be able, with only a few minutes lead time, to craft an oral presentation that is focused and effective, and refers to relevant supporting data. So, you should immerse yourself in the literature of archaeological ethics. Be sure to learn about various codes of ethics which have been established by different archaeological organizations. In addition, read the literature which debates these issues in archaeological ethics. Be sure to consider international literature and codes, because many British archaeologists work outside the UK.

You should also practice oral presentation. Develop some strategies for focused, snappy presentations: like a verbal version of bulleted lists on a PowerPoint presentation. Work on the capability to use the allotted time effectively. You don't want to hear the buzzer when you are in the middle of a sentence; on the other hand, you don't want to finish with two full minutes remaining that you could use to state your case. So, you need to practice enough to get a feel for what two minutes are and what five minutes are.

Develop good posture; you will be seated at a table, so sit up straight. Project your voice outward; look at the audience as much as you can even if you have to consult notes. There will be a microphone, so practice using one. (However, also be prepared to speak effectively with or without a microphone; this will serve you well in the future!) Practice extemporaneous, but substantive, speaking so that you can pause without using fillers like "um" or "I guess." Breath instead. Don't be afraid to pause and take a quiet breath.

Think about developing a template for the entire presentation, something along the lines of:

* Opening remarks (e.g., "The focus of this ethical dilemma is . . .")
* Your key points (e.g., "There are three [or whatever] important points to make about this scenario . . ." or "This ethical issue can be approached from two different angles.")
* Closing remarks (e.g., "To conclude, let me summarize my major points . . .")

Practice for your classmates and, if possible, for your professors, and ask for feedback. If it's too scary to start with staff members, then start as a student group and record yourselves. It can be difficult to listen to yourself on recording, but you rapidly will learn what your good (and bad) speaking habits are.

You will receive about a dozen ethical scenarios several weeks before the annual meeting. The final scenarios to be debated in the Ethics Tournament will be chosen from those cases by the organizers only just before the annual meeting. The judges don't know which scenarios will be used any sooner than you do (so they can't sit around and develop malevolently complex questions for you).

If you look over the scenarios, you will see that many tend to fall into basic categories, such as: CRM work, UK archaeologists overseas, relations with local or indigenous communities, or archaeology in museums. You can develop some general points to make for any scenario within these categories.

As you prepare, consider the position of the moderator who will ask the very first question in each round. The moderator's goal is to open up discussion as widely as possible, so she or he will ask something like "What ethical issues does John Doe have to consider in making his decision?" or "What do you advise Mary Smith to do in this case?"

For each scenario, consider what outside information you want to bring in to the discussion. Various codes of ethics are obvious; remember that there are other codes than the CIfA's, which may turn out to be useful (SAA, RPA, WAC, AIA, AAA, etc). One caveat: the codes should not be cited as if they were legal codes (e.g. "In paragraph 3, section II, of the CIfA code . . ."). Rather, the codes are for the most part guidelines that are meant to invoke thoughtful action and not merely be prescriptions for ethical behaviour. Beyond codes of ethics, you may wish to mention debate or publications that are relevant to the scenario. If you do reference outside information, be sure to provide a brief but appropriate citation (something like, " . . . as proposed by Z in her publication of Samian wares . . .").

Always consider the broad issue of stakeholders. There are likely to be multiple, often competing, stakeholders in each scenario. You may wish to give preference to the interests of certain stakeholders over others; that's fine, but be prepared to explain and justify that choice. Remember: life is full of hard choices, and archaeologists have to make some. It is acceptable to acknowledge competing interests, even when you ultimately privilege one set over another. In fact, your argument will be more realistic and compelling if you explicitly acknowledge the multiple stakeholders than if you suggest that there is one simple answer.

Remember, ethical dilemmas are just that: dilemmas. If they were easy to answer, we wouldn't need codes and debates and Ethics Tournaments. You can expect that an appropriate solution to some scenarios will be unsatisfactory to some parties and/or will be imperfect. Acknowledge that honestly in your response, but clarify your decisions and choices. Ethics, after all, is about the reasons we have to guide the choices we make.

Think about how you can use your response to turn from the specific scenario to more general issues that archaeologists grapple with. For example: can you make an opportunity in your response to consider differences between some of the existing codes of archaeological ethics or gaps in the codes that should be considered in the future? Or, try to consider in your response the future implications of different choices, or the more general ones for archaeologists beyond the specific case. Or, consider future steps that an archaeologist could take once a specific scenario is resolved. In other words: what's the bigger picture?

Consider history, but don't get trapped by it. Some scenarios turn on events that occurred 30 or more years ago. Should we hold archaeologists of that period to standards of behaviour that we have struggled to develop over the past 10 years? If not, what are our responsibilities in the present? It may be moot whether we agree or disagree with the actions of someone years ago. What we have to grapple with is what we should do now.

Finally, remember that the Ethics Tournament is intended to be enjoyable and educational. No one is out to "get you”. In fact, everyone involved—the organizers, moderators, and judges—will want to see you succeed! And simply by preparing, showing up, and earnestly sharing your thoughts, you'll find a measure of success. So relax—and have fun too.