

HAWAI'I SPEECH LEAGUE DEBATE BALLOT

Round _____ Room _____ Judge _____

EVENT: **Beginning PFD** **Advanced PFD** **Novice LD** **Champ LD** **Jr. Varsity Policy** **Varsity Policy**

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 16-18	Average 19-21	Good 22-24	Excellent 25-27	Superior 28-30	Neg Points: (Fill in Value)

Comments

Provide detailed comments (both positive and constructive) designed to help the debaters and their coaches; for example, suggestions for improving case construction, refutation, logic, and delivery.

Affirmative

Please provide speaker points for each debater or team in this area. Speaker points for the affirmative and negative can be the same (tied).

Negative

Competitors will write down their name and code on the board. Please make sure you assign the names and codes to the correct side.

Provide constructive criticism for the affirmative and negative sides. You can comment on things like case construction, presentation of arguments, use of evidence, and refutation of opponent's arguments. You may also want to discuss presentation skills in this section.

If you believe that the debater who or team that prevailed in the debate deserved fewer speaker points, based on delivery skills, check this box.

Reason for Decision

Provide detailed justification, referring to the central issues the debaters presented in the round.

Please provide reasons for why you voted for the affirmative or negative side. In this section, review the arguments that you felt were most compelling or the style you felt was most persuasive.

Write the code of the debater who or team that you thought won the debate

Decision: <input type="checkbox"/> Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative	Team/Code: _____	Low-point win? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
--	------------------	---

Check the side of the debater who or team that you thought won the debate.

Judge's Signature

INSTRUCTIONS TO JUDGES

FOR ALL DEBATES:

- Debate should emphasize clear communication. Judges should evaluate arguments on clarity and comprehension. Competitors should display civility and professionalism throughout the debate.
- *Rebuttal/Final Focus*: Judges should disregard new arguments introduced in these final speeches. However, debaters may introduce new evidence in support of points already established or refute arguments introduced by opponents.
- *Prep Time*: Competitors may use preparation time in each round before any of their speeches.
- *Clash*: Debates must involve the denial or minimization of the opposition's main arguments (i.e., clash). Competitors should not be rewarded for speeches that ignore the arguments of the opposition. Cross-examinations/crossfires should be used to 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		
	JV Recess	5 min	2 nd Affirmative rebuttal	3 min	Speaker 1 Summary	2 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 team 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. No plan or counterplan should be offered by debaters; instead, the debate should focus on reasoning to support a general principle. Debaters may present 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)

Public forum 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, both teams should provide reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing either the side (Aff or Neg) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round. The losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the names of the speakers.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS:

In most circumstances, debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution they are to advocate, judges must be objective in deciding the winner of the round. Judges should evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments they would have made. In arriving at a 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 manner.

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 Skills: 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.

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.