**APT British Parliamentary Debate Ballot**

Motion:



Room No:

Round:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Opening Government | **Team Name:** | | 1. **90‐100** Excellent to flawless. The standard of speech you would expect to see from a speaker at the Semi Final / Grand Final level of the tournament.      1. **80‐89** above average to very good. The standard you would expect to see from a speaker at the finals level or in contention to make to the finals.      1. **70‐79** Average. The speaker has strengths and weaknesses and roughly equal proportions.      1. **60‐69** Poor to below average. The team has clear problems and some minor strength.      1. **50‐59** Very poor. This speaker has fundamental weaknesses and few, if any, strengths. | Speaker Points | Sum Speaker Points |  | Team Rank | |  |
| PM |  |  |  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| DPM |  |  |
| Opening Opposition | **Team Name:** | | Speaker Points | Sum Speaker Points |  | Team Rank | |  |
| OL |  |  |  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| DOL |  |  |
| Closing Government | **Team Name:** | | Speaker Points | Sum Speaker Points |  | Team Rank | |  |
| MG |  |  |  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| GW |  |  |
| Closing Opposition | **Team Name:** | | Speaker Points | Sum Speaker Points |  | Team Rank | |  |
| MO |  |  |  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |
| OW |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Trainee*** Name and Sign | ***Panelist*** Name and Sign | ***Chair*** Name and Sign |

**Adjudication Sheet**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **N/A** | **Role Fu** | | **lfilment** |  | **Matter** | |  | **Manner** | | **Speaker Points** |
| Prime  Minister | **A** | *30-34* |  | **A** | 30-33 |  | **A** | 30-33 |  |  |
| **B** | *28-30* | **B** | 26-30 | **B** | 26-30 |
| **C** | *24-28* | **C** | 23-26 | **C** | 23-26 |
| **D** | *20-24* | **D** | 20-23 | **D** | 20-23 |
| **E** | *18-20* | **E** | 16-20 | **E** | 16-20 |
| Opposition Leader | **A** | *30-34* |  | **A** | 30-33 |  | **A** | 30-33 |  |  |
| **B** | *28-30* | **B** | 26-30 | **B** | 26-30 |
| **C** | *24-28* | **C** | 23-26 | **C** | 23-26 |
| **D** | *20-24* | **D** | 20-23 | **D** | 20-23 |
| **E** | *18-20* | **E** | 16-20 | **E** | 16-20 |
| Deputy Prime Minister | **A** | *30-34* |  | **A** | 30-33 |  | **A** | 30-33 |  |  |
| **B** | *28-30* | **B** | 26-30 | **B** | 26-30 |
| **C** | *24-28* | **C** | 23-26 | **C** | 23-26 |
| **D** | *20-24* | **D** | 20-23 | **D** | 20-23 |
| **E** | *18-20* | **E** | 16-20 | **E** | 16-20 |
| Deputy  Opposition Leader | **A** | *30-34* |  | **A** | 30-33 |  | **A** | 30-33 |  |  |
| **B** | *28-30* | **B** | 26-30 | **B** | 26-30 |
| **C** | *24-28* | **C** | 23-26 | **C** | 23-26 |
| **D** | *20-24* | **D** | 20-23 | **D** | 20-23 |
| **E** | *18-20* | **E** | 16-20 | **E** | 16-20 |
| Government Member | **A** | *30-34* |  | **A** | 30-33 |  | **A** | 30-33 |  |  |
| **B** | *28-30* | **B** | 26-30 | **B** | 26-30 |
| **C** | *24-28* | **C** | 23-26 | **C** | 23-26 |
| **D** | *20-24* | **D** | 20-23 | **D** | 20-23 |
| **E** | *18-20* | **E** | 16-20 | **E** | 16-20 |
| Opposition  Member | **A** | *30-34* |  | **A** | 30-33 |  | **A** | 30-33 |  |  |
| **B** | *28-30* | **B** | 26-30 | **B** | 26-30 |
| **C** | *24-28* | **C** | 23-26 | **C** | 23-26 |
| **D** | *20-24* | **D** | 20-23 | **D** | 20-23 |
| **E** | *18-20* | **E** | 16-20 | **E** | 16-20 |
| Government Whip | **A** | *30-34* |  | **A** | 30-33 |  | **A** | 30-33 |  |  |
| **B** | *28-30* | **B** | 26-30 | **B** | 26-30 |
| **C** | *24-28* | **C** | 23-26 | **C** | 23-26 |
| **D** | *20-24* | **D** | 20-23 | **D** | 20-23 |
| **E** | *18-20* | **E** | 16-20 | **E** | 16-20 |
| Opposition Whip | **A** | *30-34* |  | **A** | 30-33 |  | **A** | 30-33 |  |  |
| **B** | *28-30* | **B** | 26-30 | **B** | 26-30 |
| **C** | *24-28* | **C** | 23-26 | **C** | 23-26 |
| **D** | *20-24* | **D** | 20-23 | **D** | 20-23 |
| **E** | *18-20* | **E** | 16-20 | **E** | 16-20 |

# Violations of Rules & Penalties

* Teams may receive zero points where they fail to arrive at the round of debate more than five minutes after the scheduled time for the round.
* Teams may receive zero points where the adjudicators unanimously agree that the Member has (or Members have) harassed another debater on the basis of religion, sex, race, color, ethnicity, or disability. Debate is a means of promoting tolerance and those kinds of acts undermine healthy discussion and are disrespectful.
* Prime minister may be penalized if he or she unfairly defines *(explained in section of Adjudicating Definitions)* the motion. **Penalty: *Deduct 10 points from Role fulfillment.***
* Opposition leader may be penalized if he or she challenges a fair definition by the Prime Minister or if (s) he does not provide an alternative definition after challenging an unfair definition. **Penalty: *Deduct 10 points from Role fulfillment.***
* Coaching is not allowed during the 15 minutes of preparation time. Teams may be penalized if they are caught being coached. **Penalty: *Deduct 10 points from Matter.***
* Using electronic devices for means of access to information is not permissible; teams may be penalized if they are seen using electronic devices during the 15 minutes of preparation time. However, hard copies of previously organized research, data and case studies are allowed. **Penalty: *Deduct 10 points from Matter.***
* Knifing: Member speeches (and also Whip speeches) need to be consistent with earlier speeches made on their side of the debate – indirectly contradicting other teams/speakers on their side of the debate or flatly stating that their arguments were false is termed ‘knifing’. Teams should receive little if any credit for arguments that contradict the claims of earlier speakers. ***Penalty: Deduct 10 points from Role fulfillment.***  Debaters should be penalized if they don’t take POIs despite being offered several times**. Penalty: *Deduct 5 points from Role fulfillment.***
* *Barracking/Badgering*: After a POI has been offered to a speaker and rejected by them, another POI should not be offered within the next ten seconds by any debater. Persistently breaching this rule, i.e. continuously offering points of information to a speaker in quick succession, is known as barracking or badgering. This is not permitted, as it is disruptive to the debate and unfair to the speaker. Whoever is identified by a unanimous decision of the judges to be deliberately barracking should be penalized. **Penalty: *Deduct 5 points from manner.***

# Judging Role fulfillment

**Opening Government team:**

Has the 1st speaker presented a clear and reasonable definition with, if appropriate, a good model?

Has each speaker supported their case with convincing reasons? Normally each speaker would present 1 to 3 reasons/arguments, but the key is quality, not quantity.

**Opening Opposition team:**

Have they attacked the Proposition case, and dealt with the arguments presented?

Has each speaker supported their case with convincing reasons? Normally each speaker would present 1 to 3 reasons, but the key is quality, not quantity.

For the second speaker, have they defended their partner’s points where appropriate?

**Closing Government Team:**

Did they avoid \* “knifing” the other team on their side?

Has the 3rd speaker on the proposition presented a clear \*extension?

Has the 4th speaker (the Whip) summarized the debate from the point of view of the proposition, and shown why their side has won the debate? Has the 4th speaker avoided adding new arguments?

**Closing Opposition Team:**

Did they avoid “knifing” the other team on their side?

Has the 3rd speaker on the opposition presented a clear extension?

Has the 4th speaker (the Whip) summarized the debate from the point of view of the opposition, and shown why their side has won the debate? Has the 4th speaker avoided adding new arguments?

**General (everyone):**

Did everyone, other than the 1st prop speaker, deal with the arguments presented in the speech immediately before theirs? Did they also deal with key issues in the case presented by the other side?

Did they offer POI’s (a rough guide would be for each debater to offer 2 per opposing speech)? Did they accept at least 1 and no more than 2, assuming enough were offered?

Did the second teams on each side avoid” knifing” (contradicting or disagreeing with) the first team on their side?

You are suggested to keep this checklist with yourself during a tournament you attend or ask the organizers to provide you with one.
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Extra Notes: