

Lincoln Douglas Debate Ballot

Round/Flight _____ Room _____ Judge _____

AFF code: _____ NEG code: _____

School: _____ School: _____

Points: _____

Points: _____

| Description Point Range | Rude Behavior <20 | Unprepared (F) 22-23 | Needs Work (D) 24-25 | Avg (C) 26-27 | Above Avg (B) 28-29 | Best of the Day (A) 30 |
|----------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
|----------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|

Winner: _____ on the AFF or NEG (circle one)

Comments

Provide detailed comments (both positive feedback & constructive criticism) designed to help both the debater and the coach—e.g., suggestions on improving: case construction, refutation, logic, delivery, etc.

AFF

NEG

|

REASON FOR DECISION (Provide a detailed justification of your decision, referring to the central issues the debaters presented in the round.)

LINCOLN DOUGLAS JUDGING GUIDELINES

1. A decision *SHOULD NOT* be based upon:

a. *Personal bias* – A judge's preference for a side of the resolution or a topic bias should not enter into the decision. A judge must decide the round based on the arguments presented in that round. Objectivity is the primary responsibility of any judge.

b. *Partiality* – The judge should not be influenced by the reputation of or relationship with the debaters, schools, or coaches. If a situation arises where impartiality is in doubt, the judge has the responsibility to report this potential conflict of interest to the tab room.

c. *New arguments introduced in rebuttals* – The judges shall disregard new arguments introduced in the rebuttals. This does not include the introduction of new evidence in support of points already advanced or the answering of arguments introduced by opponents.

2. A decision *SHOULD BE* based upon the consideration of any or all of the following questions:

a. *Burden of proof* - Which debater has proven his/her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle by the end of the round? No debater can realistically be expected to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. A judge should prefer quality and depth of argumentation to mere quantity of argumentation. A judge should base the decision on which debater more effectively resolved the central questions of the resolution rather than on insignificant dropped arguments.

b. *Value structure* – Which debater better established a clear and cohesive relationship between the argumentation and the value structure?

c. *Argumentation* – Which debater better presented his/her arguments with logical reasoning using appropriate support? Which debater best utilized cross-examination to clarify, challenge, or advance arguments?

d. *Resolutionality* – Which debater best addressed the central questions of the resolution?

e. *Clash* – Which debater best showed the ability to both attack his/her opponent's case and to defend his/her own?

f. *Delivery* – Which debater communicated in a more persuasive, clear, and professional manner? A judge should give weight only to those arguments that were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to him or her as a judge.

1. In LD debate, the resolution to be evaluated is a proposition of value. Values are ideals held by individuals, societies, governments, etc. that serve as the highest goals to be considered or achieved within the context of the resolution in question. A proposition of value concerns itself with what ought to be instead of what is.

2. Each debater has the burden to prove his or her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle. No debater can realistically be expected 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.

3. 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.

4. Communication in LD debate 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.

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. Because LD 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.