

HAWAI'I SPEECH LEAGUE DEBATE BALLOT

Round _____ Room _____ Judge _____

EVENT: Varsity Policy Jr. Varsity Policy Champ LD Novice LD Advanced PFD Beginning PFD
 (Circle one)

Affirmative Code:		Negative Code:				
Aff Speaker 1 Name:		Neg Speaker 1 Name:				
(Aff Speaker 2 Name):		(Neg Speaker 2 Name):				
Aff Points: (Fill in Value)	Below Average 20-21	Average 22-23	Good 24-26	Excellent 27-28	Superior 29-30	Neg Points: (Fill in Value)

Comments

Please provide positive feedback and constructive criticism designed to help both the debater and his or her coach (e.g., suggestions for improving case construction, refutation, logic, delivery, etc.)

Affirmative

Negative



Reason for decision

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

The team that won this debate is _____ representing the Affirmative / Negative side.
Team Code *(Circle one)*

Judge's Signature

INSTRUCTIONS TO JUDGES:

FOR ALL DEBATES:

- Debate should emphasize clear communication. Accordingly, a judge should only evaluate arguments presented in a clear and understandable manner. The competitors should display civility and professional demeanor throughout the debate.
- *Rebuttal/Final Focus:* A judge should disregard new arguments introduced in these final speeches. This does not include the introduction of new evidence in support of points already established or the refutation of arguments introduced by opponents.
- *Prep Time:* Each debater/debate team has preparation time in each round, which can be used prior to any of that debater's speeches.
- *Clash:* There must be clash concerning the major arguments in the debate. A debater should not be rewarded for presenting a speech completely unrelated to the arguments of his or her opponent. Cross-examination/crossfire should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments.

Speaking Order/Time Limits of Speeches

POLICY			LINCOLN-DOUGLAS		PUBLIC FORUM	
1 st	Aff constructive	8 min	Aff constructive	6 min	Speaker 1	4 min
	Neg cross-examination	3 min	Neg cross-examination	3 min	Speaker 2	4 min
1 st	Neg constructive	8 min			Crossfire (1 & 2)	3 min
	Aff cross-examination	3 min	Neg constructive	7 min		
2 nd	Aff constructive	8 min	Aff cross-examination	3 min	Speaker 3	4 min
	Neg cross-examination	3 min			Speaker 4	4 min
2 nd	Neg constructive	8 min	1 st Affirmative rebuttal	4 min	Crossfire (3 & 4)	3 min
	Aff cross-examination	3 min	Negative rebuttal	6 min		
			2 nd Affirmative rebuttal	3 min	Speaker 1 Summary	2 min
	JV Recess	5 min			Speaker 2 Summary	2 min
					Grand Crossfire (All)	3 min
1 st	Negative rebuttal	5 min				
1 st	Affirmative rebuttal	5 min			Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min
2 nd	Negative rebuttal	5 min			Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min
2 nd	Affirmative rebuttal	5 min				
5 minutes of prep time per side			4 minutes of prep time per side		2 minutes of prep time per side	

POLICY DEBATE: Junior Varsity (JV) and Varsity (V)

Policy debate involves the analysis of a policy-oriented question. The debate is conducted by teams of two people with sides alternating speeches. In policy debate, emphasis is placed on well-researched arguments. It is necessary for the affirmative to advocate a plan by which the resolution can be affirmed. The affirmative team has the burden of proof. The negative attacks this plan through various methods of their choice.

LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE: Novice (NLD) and Championship (CLD)

Lincoln-Douglas debate is designed to focus on a proposition of value. A proposition of value is concerned with what ought to be instead of what is. A value is an ideal held by individuals, societies, governments, etc. Debaters are encouraged to develop arguments based on a values perspective. To this end, no plan (or counterplan) will be offered by the debaters. Instead, the debate should focus on reasoning to support a general principle. Debaters may offer generalized, practical examples or solutions to illustrate how the general principle could guide decisions.

PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE: Beginning Public Forum (BPF) and Advanced Public Forum (APF) debate focuses on advocating a position derived from issues presented in the resolution, not a prescribed set of burdens. Neither the affirmative nor negative side is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan; rather, they should provide reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.

Before **EVERY** round, a coin flip is used to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the coin flip has the option to choose either the side (Aff or Neg) OR speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS:

Given that debaters, in most circumstances, cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective in deciding the winner of the round. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments the debaters made and not on personal opinions or arguments you would have made. In arriving at your decision, consider whether the debaters demonstrated effective:

Analysis: Identified the heart of the question and explained the most important issue(s) in the resolution.

Organization: Presented the arguments in a clear, logical fashion.

Proof: Supported their arguments with facts, expert opinions or other evidence when appropriate.

Argumentation: Employed sound reasoning and reached logical conclusions derived from the evidence.

Adaptation: Clashed with the arguments raised by the opponent.

Refutation: Countered the arguments of the opponent while reinforcing their own.

Cross-Examination/Crossfire: Asked relevant and succinct questions, answered responsively, and interacted with each other professionally.

Delivery: Spoke in a communicative style that was persuasive, civil, and understandable.