Debaters may compete as individuals or with a partner. Rounds may be two vs. one, one vs. one, or two vs. two. If one or both sides only has an individual debater, leave the space for the second speaker’s name and points blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points for each speaker: <24 Unethical Behavior 25-26 Below Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Side: Aff Neg

Resolved: Belief in the supernatural is incompatible with belief in science.

1. Because 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 arguments you would have made.

2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.

3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the **affirmative** may have won the round, positive feedback, and constructive criticism:

Reasons why the **negative** may have won the round, positive feedback, and constructive criticism:

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in round):