

MHL Lincoln-Douglas Ballot

Round/Flight _____ Room _____ Judge _____

AFF code: _____ NEG code: _____

Name: _____ Name: _____

Points: _____

Points: _____

THE WINNING DEBATER IS [please circle] AFF/NEG, code: _____

AC= 6 mins; CX= 3 mins; NC= 7 mins; CX= 3 mins; 1AR = 4 mins; NC = 6 mins; 2AR = 3 mins. 5 mins prep each team

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

Comments: Please provide detailed comments (both positive feedback & constructive criticism) to help both the debater and the coach (for example, 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.)

MHL Rules

- * Low-point wins are not allowed. Ties and half points are acceptable.
- * Only the tab room can assign judges. Do not switch judges without first consulting tab.
- * Do not mix and match the debaters of the different A & B flights.
- * Judges may call "Speed" up to three times as a signal for a speaker to slow down with no penalty to the speaker. If a student continues to speak too quickly after being warned three times, the judge is free to reflect this in speaker points.
- * Neither students nor judges nor coaches will not disrupt classrooms in any way. No one is allowed to sit at a teacher's desks. No food is allowed in classrooms (water bottles are acceptable).
- * Judges are not allowed to use cell phones, iPods or any other distraction from their responsibility of seriously judging their rounds. Judges who flout these or any rules will be removed from the tournament along with 4 of their school's LDers.
- * Debaters whose cell phones go off during rounds will be given automatic losses & 25 points.

JUDGING GUIDELINES

- * 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.
- * Each debater has the burden to prove his or her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle. 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.
- * 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.
- * 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 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. A judge's preference for a side of the resolution or a topic bias should not enter into the decision.
- * A decision should be based upon the consideration of any or all of the following questions:
 - *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? 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.
 - *Value structure*—Which debater better established a clear and cohesive relationship between the argumentation and the value structure?
 - *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?
 - *Resolutionality*—Which debater best addressed the central questions of the resolution?
 - *Clash*—Which debater best showed the ability to both attack his/her opponent's case and to defend his/her own?
 - *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.