

Lincoln-Douglas Debate Ballot

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Tournament Date: | | Tournament Location: | | |
| Round/ Flight: | Room: | Division: | Judge Name: | Judge School: |
| Affirmative: | | | Name or ← Code → | Negative: |
| Aff Points: | ← Award speaker points to each debater (based on the range below) → | | | Neg Points: |
| Decision: <input type="checkbox"/> Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative | | | | Winning Team/Code: |
| | | | | Low-point win? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |

- The resolution evaluated is a proposition of value, which concerns itself with what ought to be instead of what is. Values are ideals held by individuals, societies, governments, etc., which serve as the highest goals to be considered or achieved within the context of the resolution in question.
- Each debater has the burden to prove their side of the resolution more valid as a general principle. It is unrealistic to expect a debater to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. The better debater is the one who, on the whole, proves their side of the resolution more valid as a general principle.
- Students are encouraged to research topic-specific literature and applicable works of philosophy. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion.
- Communication should emphasize clarity. Accordingly, a judge should only evaluate those arguments that were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to them as a judge.
- After a case is presented, neither debater should be rewarded for presenting a speech completely unrelated to the arguments of their opponent; there must be clash concerning the major arguments in the debate. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments.
- The judge shall disregard new arguments introduced in rebuttal. This does not include the introduction of new evidence in support of points already advanced or the refutation of arguments introduced by opponents.
- Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.

Comments: provide detailed comments (both positive feedback and constructive criticism) designed to help both the debater and the coach; for example, suggestions on improving case construction, refutation, logic, delivery, etc.



Reasons for Decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Affirmative Constructive.....6 min.
 Neg Cross-Examines Aff3 min.
 Negative Constructive7 min.
 Aff Cross-Examines Neg3 min.
 Affirmative Rebuttal4 min.
 Negative Rebuttal6 min.
 Affirmative Rebuttal3 min.
 Each debater has 4 minutes of prep used before their own speaking times, at their discretion.