

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:
	20-21 Below Average	22-23 Average	24-26 Good	27-28 Excellent	29-30 Outstanding
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 his or her 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 his/her 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 him/her as a judge. Throughout the debate, the competitors should display civility as well as a professional demeanor and style of delivery.
- After a case is presented, neither debater should be rewarded for presenting a speech completely unrelated to the arguments of his or her 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 Constructive6 min.
Neg. Cross-Ex of Aff.3 min.
Negative Constructive7 min.
Aff. Cross-Ex of Neg.3 min.
Affirmative Rebuttal4 min.
Negative Rebuttal6 min.
Affirmative Rebuttal3 min.
Each debater has 4 min. prep used before their own speaking times, at their discretion.