

Kacy Abeln College of Dupage

I will listen to every argument a debater presents. However, as much as I try, I do find it difficult to divorce myself from my knowledge of fallacious argumentation. Thus, I tend to focus on logical links and how they tie back to the weighing mechanism of the round. If there are the links to nuclear war are easily broken, I am unlikely to vote on impacts to nuclear war. IPDA should be dramatically different than parli. When a debater turns an IPDA round into a parli round, I am likely to vote for the OTHER debater in the round. Delivery, organizational, and ethos matter significantly more in IPDA than in parli.

I highly value courteous and respectful debate. I believe strongly in the idea that one of the major distinctions between debate argumentation and "verbal fighting" is the high degree of respect debaters show each other in and out of rounds. Ethos has its place in debate and respect to others does impact ethos. I strongly believe in the distinction between fact, value, and policy resolutions. The burdens for each are vastly different and require teams to focus the debate in drastically different ways. I hold true to the idea that setting up a case using the correct 'resolutional' type is a burden of the government team. In voting, I equally weigh prima facia issues and the weighing mechanism of the round. I expect debaters to impact their arguments directly to the weighing mechanism established in the round. IMPACT, IMPACT, IMPACT Speed sometimes occurs, but should not be relied upon. I will make it clear when the speed becomes so quick that I can no longer flow the debate by simply putting my pen down. It should be a clear nonverbal indicator to every debater that I am no longer flowing the debate because of speed, and therefore will not vote on the arguments that are not on my flow. I also believe that speed impacts credibility. While debate relied heavily upon logos, ethos and pathos should not be ignored. Beyond speed, I also highly encourage debaters to use strong organization including, taglines, roman numerals, capital letters, etc. Labeling and numbering arguments is one of the easiest ways to ensure that both teams and the judge(s) are on the same page. Jargon alone does not make an argument; a debater's explanation of the jargon makes an argument. Jargon alone will never be voted on by me. I expect debaters to explain why the jargon is significant to the round and how it should impact my voting. Technicalities can matter but only if the debater(s) impact out why the technical elements have a bearing on the round itself. Procedural arguments are a part of debate for a reason but should not be relied upon solely to win rounds. If procedurals are present, debaters should feel free to run them, but not force them to work.

Tim Anderson Elgin Community College

Joan Andrews Tyler Junior College

That they are clear and don't use jargon because I am not a debate judge. They must be polite and not condescending to me nor to the other debater(s). I would be pretty open. I would hate speed and jargon and do not know what technical elements are.

Joel Anguiano El Paso Community College

Argumentation that makes sense: logical reasoning. Professionalism. Ones that make sense. Keep speed should fit the debaters ability as well as the audience's ability to understand. Jargon/technical elements should be kept to a minimum.

Krista Appelquist Moraine Valley

Meredith Aquila Northern Virginia Community College

Clear organization, impact arguments. Be polite! Avoid meta debate, stick to the issues I don't like speed debate

Jay Arntson Pasadena City College

This judging philosophy only pertains to parliamentary debate. I perceive my role as adapting myself to the sort of round the debaters would like to have more so than debaters adapting to me. I will pretty much entertain any argument a debater wishes to advance. I typically see debate as a game rather than a requirement to reflect the so-called real world. I don't mind debaters being assertive but needs to be balanced with empathy and compassion. I believe language has power and debaters should own the implications of their rhetoric. The argument I vote for will only be the one the debaters in the round assert and not one of my own. My RFD will always be specific to an argument the debaters made in the round. I am fine with debaters kicking arguments. In-round abuse is easier to vote for than potential abuse. I am willing to vote on any procedural or kritik/project. I am comfortable with debate theory. I will adapt to whatever speed the debaters choose to have. Please adjust to debaters with disability concerns. I am familiar with flowing speed and understanding technical jargon. I have judged debate for 10+ years in a variety of formats (Policy, Parliamentary, Lincoln-Douglas, IPDA, etc). I graduated from UC Berkeley as a double major in Philosophy and Rhetoric. My Masters is in Communication Studies from Cal State Long Beach. I have been a debate coach for 12 years.

Roxan Arntson Mt. San Antonio College

The merit of your arguments is the foremost deciding factor for me. The debater(s) who has the strongest arguments should win. As a personal preference, I like well structured debates. If I can easily flow what you're saying and where you're refuting your opponent, it makes it much easier for me to make a fair decision without interjecting into your round. Try not to be a douchebag. There is really no reason to be rude or condescending; these are strategies of aggression that are usually employed by debaters who lack more refined skills of actual argumentation. You should address me, the judge, not each other. You can communicate with your teammate, but it should not be excessive or distracting... and I will only flow what actually comes out of the speaker's mouth. (Additionally, it always appears like there's not great partner trust when one person tries to dominate his/her partner... and I start to doubt your credibility.) I recommend that you stand when you speak and employ good public speaking traits: articulation, limit non-verbal distractions, fluid delivery with few verbal fillers, eye contact, expressiveness, etc. I am willing to listen to anything you'd like to discuss. However, it is your responsibility to explain clearly why I should prefer your argument to another. This applies to the use of procedurals; running a procedural isn't a guarantee of a win. Your responsibility as a debater is to explain exactly what the violation is and how it impacts the round or to explain clearly why the violation did not occur or how it is irrelevant to the round. Similarly, I will listen to a K, but you have to convince me that this is more significant than the resolution... or why it isn't. Do your job to flush out arguments and rebuttals so I don't have to! I feel speed is a weak strategy as it promotes quantity over quality of

arguments. I'd rather hear fewer, more developed arguments than a long list used as a time suck... which sucks. If I can't keep up with your spreading, I will simply stop flowing the round; if your argument doesn't make it onto my flow, I won't consider it when making my decision. Use of jargon is fine, as long as you are using it correctly and linking it specifically into the debate. Don't use jargon for jargon sake; integrate it into the specific debate. If you have other questions, feel free to ask me! But if you ask for my preferences and are not willing to adapt to them, I'd rather you just didn't even ask.

Bryan Asbury Illinois Central College

Allan Axibal-Cordero Pasadena City College Logic of arguments and quality of delivery. Assess the most important argument rather than trying to spread a lot of them. They should be extremely courteous to each other. Any kind of sarcastic or aggressive behavior will probably result in an automatic drop. Good ones with reasonable evidence I hate speed. Antithetical to education in the round. Should appeal to the lay person.

Araceli Bachner Northern Virginia Community College

Support for your positions is most important. I expect debaters to be nice and avoid personal attacks
Predispositions: None. I need to understand the debate so please avoid speed and explain terms

Nichole Barta Irvine Valley College

The most important criteria I consider when evaluating a debate is argumentation/persuasion and using that connected with the weighing mechanism. I expect debaters to be courteous to one another both verbally and nonverbally during the round. In NPDA I believe that at least one point of information should be taken in each constructive. Do not make ad hominem arguments. Some things that I am predisposed to listen to and consider when I vote is who met the weighing mechanism the best throughout the debate. I love organization, tag lines, evidence, impacts, argumentation, and clash. Please, avoid logical fallacies. I can only flow so fast. Therefore, you may speak quickly but do not spread. I believe that debaters should adjust to their judges. I will listen to anything if the argument is ran well. I do not like listening to topicalities that are ran to suck up time and in turn, later dropped. You are here to debate, not complain.

Robert Becker Northwest College

Left to my own devices, I will evaluate procedurals (topicality) first, then look to disadvantages and then case. I'll evaluate kritik wherever you tell me to place them in the order of things. If you don't tell me where to place a kritik, I will probably evaluate it among the disadvantages. As a critic, I believe my task is to weigh the issues presented in the round. I don't enjoy intervening, and try not to do so. To prevent my intervention, debaters need to use rebuttals to provide a clear explanation of the issues. Otherwise, if left on my own, I will pick the issues I think are important. All of that said, I am not an information processor. I am a human being and so are you. If you want me to consider an issue in the round, make sure you emphasize it and explain its importance. When weighing issues, I always look to jurisdictional issues first. I will give the affirmative some leeway on topicality, but if they can't explain why their case is

topical, they will lose. I think there needs to be resolitional analysis to justify affirmative choices. Although some arguments are more easily defeated than others, I am willing to listen to most positions.

Especially at Phi Rho Pi, we are debating people from different regions of the country, and have different styles, techniques, and positions with which we have familiarity. Don't assume that I know your case or DA because it's a position you use a lot. Make sure you explain things. You want to win because you were smarter, more strategic, and better debaters. You don't want to win because you were sneaky or duped the other team. Don't try to suck up to me. You can be friendly without being smarmy. Be professional. Don't act like you are the smartest person in the room, even if you are. That said, I'm here to have fun, and I hope you are, too. When it stops being fun, we need to think about the chess club.

In reality I probably have a somewhat high threshold for topicality, so if you want to win, you need to spend some time on it and not give the aff any way out of it. In-round abuse is not necessary, but if that argument is made against you, then you need to explain why topicality is important (jurisdiction, aff always wins, etc.) I am fine with critical arguments, but you need to explain how they impact the round. I have found few students can explain how I should evaluate real-world impacts in a debate world, or how I should evaluate and compare real world and debate world impacts. I'm fine with critical affs, but you better have some good justification for it. "We don't like the resolution" doesn't cut it with me. If your critical arguments conflict with your disad, you better have some "contradictory arguments good" answers. I believe parliamentary debate, LD, and IPDA should develop different skills regarding research and delivery, but I do not believe that they should differ in their development of critical thinking. Parliamentary debate is still debate. It needs to have clash and argument. Goofing off for an hour or so is not a good use of my time, or of yours. You can use debate terminology in front of me. Inherency, stock issues, topicality, evidence, plans, etc., are all DEBATE terms, just like voting issues are not exclusively parliamentary debate terms or practices. Once again, impress me with your ability to explain the issues to me don't mind speed, but sometimes I physically can't flow that fast. I will tell you if I can't understand you. Remember, it is YOUR responsibility to make sure I understand what you are saying. Above all, be professional. This activity is fun. That's why I'm here, and I hope that is the reason you are here as well.

Matthew Beifuss College of DuPage

A clearly articulated criterion and weighing mechanism are the foundation of a good round, and should be used consistently throughout. Nothing is more annoying than judging criteria which are given as pro-forma bullet points and then basically ignored the rest of the debate. Debaters should remain polite and civil to their opponents. I should only be able to hear one person per speech--opponents should confer as quietly as possible, preferably with sticky notes, and signalling or prompting your partner during their speech is not ok. I am perfectly comfortable with burden sharing and split negatives. I am not a very conscientious flower, so moderate speed and clear voting issues are a must. I prefer the fiat world to procedural stuff, and I'm annoyed by extreme terminal impacts--talking about accommodating the disabled or diversity in children's books or whatever are perfectly valuable discussions without turning them into triggers for extinction-level holocausts. Don't run bad-faith K's, and don't run critique Affs at all, please. I am fairly hostile to speed outside of a 1AR, jargon should be limited, and

technical elements should be treated as tools for a purpose rather than a way to run the same three or four rehearsed arguments every single round.

August Benassi Moorpark College

Logic and empirically based evidence. I expect competitors to be immensely respectful to one another. Personal insults or a snarky, sarcastic tone will weigh heavily against those that use them. Again logic and more importantly absence of logical fallacies. In particular be careful of the slippery slopes (not everything leads to nuclear war) and false cause (ipso hoc ergo propter hoc and non causa pro causa). Debate (and especially ipda since it was sold as a "laymen's debate") should be accessible and understandable to EVERYONE. Speed and jargon make this impossible. Speed especially is the kiss of death. Jargon follows pretty closely after.

Saleha Bholat Northern Virginia Community College

Clear organization is most important. Be kind and respectful. No predisposition on arguments. The Debate should be accessible to everyone.

Tyler Billman Southeastern Illinois College

Analysis of impacts is most important for me. I prefer them to stand for speeches and I expect professionalism and to be courteous. I don't like technical debate. Students should focus on ideas. I don't prefer technical elements or speed. I view debate as a presentation event. Jargon and technical language should be explained very well.

Margaret Bilos Harper College

Civility, thoughtfulness and good communication skills. I think that people should respectfully disagree. They should enjoy the clash with a smile on their faces, like good-natured people who like to challenge each other. For IPDA specifically, I think that debate should feel like a spirited argument between friends. When it turns into a one-person Parli round, I am inclined to believe that you do not value the spirit of IPDA, which should be accessible to a lay person. I prefer students to speak with an ear towards understanding the arguments. I believe debate should be accessible to anyone and that jargon is not valued above the quality of a thoughtful debater.

Francesca Bishop El Camino

I try my best to be tabula rasa. While to be perfectly tab is impossible, I attempt to vote on what comes out of your mouth whenever possible. That means I will listen to anything, write it down, and take it at face value (unless you lie to me, then all bets are off). I expect debaters to make all the necessary links and internal links—don't have me to do it for you; I may make associations you don't like. Tell me why I should care about a particular argument. Saying, "it's a voter!" isn't compelling; tell me why and weigh the impacts. I look to the criteria or framework, so be sure there is one, and that your arguments flow

through it. In the case of a tie, or a mess, I'll vote opp on presumption. At PRP, the culture is to stand up when speaking. I don't like tag-team arguing—so unless your partner is about to lose you the round, let him or her speak. Passing a note or asking your partner an occasional POI is fine. You can ask me questions if you like, but just be civil and have fun. I had my years of debating; it is now your turn. There are lots of things I believe about debate and the world in general, but I try not to bring them into the round. Absent instructions from you, my preconceptions are as follows: I believe there is a distinction between value and policy propositions (I would never run a fact case, but you can if you want to). If it is a policy resolution, I like to have harms somewhere in the case even if they are tagged something else. I think kritiks are often silly in parli debate, but I vote on them quite often, because I vote on what wins. Just know that my behavior has never been changed by some prefiat alternative, so win on the flow. I believe that topicality is a voting issue and I don't need articulated abuse, unless someone tells me I do. I think the Government should uphold the resolution, and the Opposition should negate it; therefore, without instructions otherwise, I will default against a topical counterplan. Because I try to base my decision based only on arguments that are made in the round, I don't assume anything. Therefore, you need to tell me why something matters. For example, don't expect me to assume climate change is happening or that it's bad, or for that matter, that nuclear war is bad. Likewise, you don't have to run only liberal positions. Arguments are just that—arguments. I don't assume you believe them or care if they are "true." In general, know that I believe that debate is a game. For parli, any speed is fine but if you're seizing through your speech, you may need to slow down. NFA/LD: I default to the rules when it comes to delivery and evidence, though it is wise to invoke them if you want me to vote on a particular violation. I often call for cards after the round.

Brianna Bitout Harper Community College

The weighing mechanism. In order for any argument to hold weight, one must prove that it matters to the round via the weighing mechanism. No ad hominem attacks. No yelling at anyone. Basically, be respectful. I'm willing to hear anything out as long as it's explained to me throughout the round. I won't make the argument for you. I don't flow speed well, so I don't recommend using it as a strategy (though if you want to give it a go, I won't knock you for it). I'm fine with jargon and using procedurals as long as it's supported well.

Justin Blacklock San Antonio College

The most important areas for my determination of a debate round are persuasiveness and clarity. Whether it is IPDA or Parli, it is important to remain professional and practice sportsman-like conduct. I prefer arguments to stay on case rather than making meta arguments about how the debate is run. Speed is okay, but if it is unable to be deciphered, then what is the point of the debate. It's about quality of the content discussed of the quantity of arguments made. Professionalism is key. Always remain calm, collected and courteous throughout the course of the debate. Despite where the debate goes content-wise, it is important to maintain decorum. I prefer that arguments stay on-case, as opposed to getting to involved with meta-arguments and performative strategies. Don't get out of control with speed. Jargon is fine as long as the debate does not start to consist solely of jargon. I will evaluate technical arguments as long as they do not stray from the education of the round.

Thomas Bovino Suffolk County Community College

The strength of the argument supported by credible documentation is most important. I expect great levels of civility toward one another and general politeness. I am not inclined to reward speed talking as I want time to process statements. I do not believe someone should win a debate based on technicalities but rather on their arguments.

Allison Bowman Moorpark College

I try to just look at arguments made in the round. Both sides should weigh their impacts and explain why they should win. I expect everyone to be respectful to their opponents. Also, don't feel like you need to stand when speaking. I love counterplan debate. I am not the biggest fan of Ks. If you do choose to run a K spend extra time on alt. solvency. I have no problem with speed or jargon.

Kevin Briancesco Los Angeles Valley College

Brianna Broady Santa Monica College

I evaluate -The clarity of the arguments -The debaters ability to respond to one another and create clash -Clear speaking #NAME? As long as there is clear reasoning and appropriate, productive arguments used during the debate, we should have a friendly debate round! Try to stay away from jargon Stay away from spreading please I enjoy road maps.

Nate Brown Santa Monica College

The completeness and reasonability of an argument is my first criteria. Too many arguments in competitive debate are incomplete (missing warrants, missing backing, missing clear claims, etc.) I also strongly evaluate clarity of arguments and case. Even if an argument is complete and reasonable, if it is delivered poorly (poor organization, fast talking, poor delivery skills) then I devalue those arguments. I expect debaters to be professional, but I do value some appropriate use of humor. We all need to have fun and laugh. If you can entertain a little bit without being offensive or mean, that is good. I value professional appearance, but I don't think I have ever voted against a team for appearance. POI's should be taken or rejected quickly, not ignored. POI's should be requested often, but not abusively often. I rarely consider Kritiks. We are all hear to debate the motion. Kritiks are not the motion. I evaluate speed very negatively. I don't like it. I don't want to listen to it. I will vote against it. I prefer a debate that is light on jargon and technical elements. Treat me like a lay judge. Win your case on clarity and reason, not on jargon or games.

Kathleen Bruce San Joaquin Delta College Debate is a game I look at all the pieces and evaluate through the criteria lens set up by the Affirmative team. TO vote on critical arguments I evaluate the Framework arguments above all else. NEG has to win framework to win my ballot. Have smart arguments. Try not to be rude, but be tough. I like theory, critical arguments, and warrants. The MO and the PMR are the most strategic speeches in the event...You should be collapsing to a focused strategy. Do not run value or fact in front of me. Interpret all resolutions to be policy...thank you. My pen can keep up to 270 wpm as far as speed. Jargon is fine. I am probably more fluent than you on

jargon. Technical elements: Please have clash during the debate. Two ships passing in the night equals a neg win.

Cody Campbell Glendale Community College

I am Tabula Rasa, that is for the debaters to decide. No expectations. That is up to the debaters I am high flow, fine with jargon, and good with tech. Run whatever you want

Daniel Cantrell Mt. San Antonio College

My primary voting paradigm is clash. Please engage the other team's arguments. Otherwise, run what you think is persuasive and we will see how it works out in the round. Please do not be rude - rudeness is not good debating. In NFA-LD, "Rapid-fire delivery, commonly called 'spread delivery,' is considered antithetical to the purpose and intent of this event" - I take this part of the rules very seriously. Please ensure that you have a copy of all evidence read into the round ready to give to your opponent.

Patrick Carberry College of Lake County

Daren Carpenter Tyler Junior College

I am not a debate judge and have no experience doing it. I am a good listener however and have an open mind. I would want them to be polite at all times. I would want them to talk plainly since I have only judged a few rounds of IPDA. I do not like speed and I don't understand jargon nor technical elements.

Sean Connor Orange Coast College

1. Most Important criteria you consider when evaluating a debate? My most important criteria for evaluating a debate would be weighing the arguments in conjunction with whatever had been offered as the criteria established by the debaters. If none is established, I generally weigh on net benefits or utilitarianism. 2. What are your expectations for proper decorum from the debaters? I expect the debaters to be cordial with one another, and have little tolerance for belittling comments, condescending remarks, or disrespectful nonverbal communication. 3. What strategies/positions/arguments are you predisposed to listen to and consider when you vote? I am open to most strategies including topicality and kritik so long as it makes logical sense. 4. How do you evaluate speed, jargon, and technical elements? I am primarily an IE coach so some of the jargon or nuance (including speed) of debate may escape me. However I can only judge on what I understand and believe the better debater is willing to adapt their language to meet the needs of their audience.

Sarah Contreras Del Mar College

Attitude and Credibility. I appreciate a student with good critical thinking skills and respect for the event, the judge, and their opponent. I do not like for students to talk over their competitors. I want a nice clash, but with respect for one another. I dislike speed...I cannot STAND jargon and technical elements. This is IPDA...not CX or NDT...there is a difference. In IPDA (and NPDA for that matter) I

believe the competitors should analyze their audience and make their arguments understandable to anyone.

Victor Cornejo Pasadena City College

I'm open to any criteria you have in mind as long as it is fair to all debaters involved. I expect you to be respectful at all times. Attack arguments not each other (or people not in the physical space of your debate) I have no predisposed winning positions or strategies. I'm open to hear any argument you deem important. I think debate should be whatever you want it to be. With that being said, being organized, weighing arguments, and having a clear criteria for me to analyze the round with is helpful. I value quality over quantity and word choice over speed. Being structured and signposting makes for a cleared debate.

Christine Courteau Stephen F. Austin State University

Melissa Courteau Stephen F. Austin State University

Christopher Cox Moraine Valley Community College

TOULMIN'S MODEL: I look for strong warrants, connections to impact, connections to value criteria and theoretic frameworks. I consider all areas of performance, but prefer stronger rhetoric, argument construction, source credibility and direct refutation. Stock issues are always considered. If a critique is ran, a thorough understanding of the theory is VITAL and direct application to the case is needed to sway me. I HIGHLY value ethical, respectful, polite, and friendly decorum in debate. Students are attacking each others' arguments, NOT the other student. Ad Hom will not be tolerated in my rounds. Stock issues- especially solvency and topicality- if and only if they are warranted and well supported with direct linkage to the impact and voters. Strong analytical arguments are my favorite. Jargon and tech speak are fine with me, however a nice blend of that and lay speak is preferred. It is just much more enjoyable to listen to and digestible. While I am used to quick speeds, I do prefer a more regulated, moderate pace for clarity sake. I will ask "clear" out loud in the round if I cannot follow the speaker.

Steven Cruz Tallahassee

I am looking for valid and sound arguments. A well-structured, organized, fluid case that debates the ideas and themes of the round, will almost always win over a case built on topicality or technical (something). Organization is key to creating a sound argument. I expect courtesy and respect at all times. Passionate debates are entertaining and encouraged. I like strong speakers who can be tough, but I do not tolerate brashness, belittling, or patronization. I want the debaters to have fun, and use wit and humor when applicable, but do not damage the education integrity of the activity. A weight of argument or Cost/Benefit analysis are strategies I'm partial too, where you pin two ideas against each other and see which one is the strongest based solely on merit of argument. As far as positions go with 'liberal' or 'conservative', I'm tabula rasa. Speed/tempo would only hurt a speaker if they were too slow to be engaging or too fast to flow. Jargon and technical elements are encouraged, and to some extent vital to

the efficacy of the event. However, I will not be fooled by the flash of fanciful lexicon or technical elements, it comes down to the soundness of the argument.

Paul Cummins Southeastern Illinois College

Toni Dach Northern Virginia Community College/Ohio University

Whether the speaker directly addresses the topic presented and their opponent's arguments for or against it is most important. They should not interrupt their opponents during their individual address times, or engage in distracting behavior like making verbal utterances, shuffling papers beyond what is necessary, or otherwise physically or verbally displaying annoyance. They should allow their opponents to answer questions presented during cross examination without cutting them off, unless the opponent is rambling. They should not be so rushed to make their point that they speak at a rate beyond comprehension, especially with the intent to confuse the audience by saying as much as they can as fast as they can. I don't think that I'm predisposed to prefer a certain strategy, position, or argument. I dislike "baiting" tactics like gaslighting, where a speaker misrepresents an opponent's position and forces them into a debate of what they said, rather than the topic at hand. But, overall, I look for the debaters to make constructive points and ask constructive questions in support of their position. Speed is always subjective, and I am fine with debaters speaking at a fairly rapid pace. But there are limits. If you are tripping over your words to the point that your point is unclear, you're speaking too fast. Jargon is similarly fine if an explanation is proffered. If you spend 5 seconds telling me what something means, go ahead and keep talking about that term. I know my typical speech and debate terms from my time competing. I always evaluate on technical elements because of my time competing. I will be the first to admit that, when it comes to LD, I don't know everything. But I do know the basics like the affirmative must prove harm, inherency, and solvency. I'm also familiar with voting deciders like topicality.

Toni Dach Northern Virginia Community College

Evidence to support claims is important. Be polite, follow the rules. No predispositions. I Dislike speed, and overuse of debate jargon.

Kevin Daily Ranger College

Shahin Davari Orange Coast College

Clarity Reasoning Warranted claims are all important elements. Civility is long. No need to go over the top but be loud. I will follow you wherever you take me. Just explain it. No speed/Jargon makes debate less accessible, but I am familiar with it.

James Delahoussaye Saddleback College

Cynthia Dewar City College of San Francisco

Jim Dobson Las Positas College

Do the competitors look at debate as an opportunity to compete with one another rather than against one another. Everyone should be considerate and polite. Personality goes a long way. I do not have enough experience to answer this question properly. I just don't know. Jargon is no good in any aspect of life. It is a key contributor to people being taken advantage of in life. It stinks and I hate it.

Kevin Doss Lamar State College - Orange

When evaluating a debate, I look at who is able to establish their claims with the most reasonable type of supporting proof. That proof may be evidence, reasoning, or just pure logic. I am more interested in the quality of a debater's argumentation than the quantity of arguments. I expect polite and respectful behavior from all debaters in a round. I do not like arguments that are just put up for a time suck. Arguments should apply from one to the other. I like a round that has good quality and direct clash.

If I can't understand it, then I can't flow the argument. Communicate your arguments clearly and always LISTEN to your fellow debaters.

Justin Dougherty Nassau Community College

Be clear, be cordial, be persuasive, use evidence and advocacy. Use plenty of real-world examples and make sure your claims have legitimate warrants. I expect debaters to be cordial and follow the rules. I do not enjoy excessive speed or spreading. I will not tolerate rude behavior during the round. I expect to use all of your time and use it wisely. Do NOT use kritiks in front of me. I will NEVER vote on them! Also, refrain from topicality positions - especially in IPDA, unless they really apply. In IPDA, I do not believe in specific plans for policy resolutions, rather, I believe in simple advocacy of the resolution. In NPDA, I still that parli should be parli, therefore speed and/or any CEDA jargon or procedurals will most likely lose you my ballot. Debate is a communication activity. Therefore, I expect you to "communicate" with me in a clear, concise, and conversational manner. I primarily judge/coach individual events so you need to keep my background in mind. I am partial to the use of creative and persuasive rhetoric as opposed to meta-debate.

Fred Ebert Northwest College

I tend to look at the argument as a whole. That being said, I'll listen to and evaluate a wide variety of strategies with an open mind. If at the end of the round, your strategy solves most, in regard to the topic, that's where my vote will lie. I expect people to be respectful of each other. Having some good fun is fine. I expect the seated partner to be mostly quiet while the standing partner is speaking. Notes are fine but adding to the speech is not. I will listen to a wide variety of strategies and positions with an open mind. I get pretty annoyed with 'time-suck' strategies such as an unfounded T. If you are going to ask me to vote on procedurals, please follow it all the way through. I flow reasonably well. Speed is fine as long as what you are saying is clear and understandable. Don't try to dazzle in the round with excess jargon.

Stephanie Eisenberg Todd Chabot College

I was a policy debater who predominantly ran kritik and performance style arguments, but this impacts the way I like arguments explained much more than the type or style of argument I prefer to evaluate. I will always vote for a well explained argument that is fully warranted over the line by line. AKA, I frequently vote for people who are winning the fundamental thesis of their argument over people who are winning minor drops on the flow. I will give leeway to drops on the flow if you are winning your central claims and doing a good job of impact analysis. If you plan to win on minor drops in front of me, you had better impact them well and go all in on them. I believe many debaters could benefit from some sort of overview or round framing argument in their speeches, especially in the rebuttals. In debates where neither side is giving me a clear view of how I should evaluate the round, what I should prioritize or how I should weigh impacts, I will generally default to the side who I feel is most persuasive from a rhetorical perspective. I think debate is a game of arguments. I do not care about "decorum" including thank you's and other formalities. I DO expect you to treat everyone in the room with respect; however I am focused primarily on the flow and the arguments. I don't mind partner cross-talk so long as it's minimal, however I'm not going to flow anything your partner tells you unless you've set up a framework for sharing speeches...aka, if your partner wants to help you with an argument, you need to say it for it to end up on my flow. I am not cool with one partner dominating another partner's speech time, cross ex, etc. I will reject any team that engages in racism, sexism and other forms of discrimination. I enjoy a good, specific K debate where a complex theory is both clearly explained and applied strategically. I enjoy an alternative that does more than simply "reject the team" and love debaters who can tell me what the world looks like post-alt. I enjoy and miss the lost art of the case debate and think that it's an excellent strategy against any style aff. I enjoy an interesting framework debate on both ends of the spectrum; however you should know that if you want to use FW or T as a round-winning argument you would do best to treat it like a disad with a clear impact. Otherwise I think framework and topicality are great strategies to pin the aff to a specific advocacy to garner links in the debate. I enjoy a well-developed policy-focused affirmative with real world, coherent impacts. I enjoy affirmatives that include performance, style and alternative methodologies. Pretty much, I enjoy good debate. I'd say my biggest dislike or pet peeve is when debaters use theory arguments to avoid engaging the arguments from the other team. If you are going to go for theory at the end of the debate, I need a clearly explained impact scenario and why this means the other team should lose the entirety of the debate. I'm very sympathetic to "reject the arg, not the team." I am always going to protect teams from new arguments in rebuttals, so you probably don't need to call a billion points of order to let me know what's up. I am fine with speed, jargon and technical aspects of debate, however make sure to read my first point in this philosophy for how I evaluate dropped arguments vs overall round framing.

Darren Elliott Kansas City KS Community College

Scott Elliott Kansas City Kansas Community College Special Note for Novice and Junior Varsity Debaters: After years of consideration, I have made the decision to make TOPICALITY an absolute voting issue in novice and junior varsity debate. By this I mean that if the affirmative's 1AC is not topical, they will lose the debate. Extra-topical advantages or extra-topical or non-germane critical aspects of the affirmative 1AC will not be considered in my reason for decision. That being said, what constitutes a

"topical" affirmative case is still open to debate. Especially given this year's college topic wording, the traditional framing of the agent of action, or whether really is an agent of action is very much open to debate. Competing interpretations should be debated out. In other words, addressing why one interpretation is better for debate, education or better for students is still open to debate. You can use whatever types of warrants and data to support the claim (the resolutive statement). This means that if you want to "perform" your 1AC (all 1AC speeches are performances anyway), that is fine. If you want to use forms of poetics or aesthetics to support your defense of the resolution, I am willing to listen to it. Topicality is a gateway issue and will be decided before anything else in my decision except for instances of some egregious behavior from debate participants that violates standards and norms of the activity (.e.g. ethics challenge, certain language choices, intimidation or physical confrontation). Topicality is a minimum affirmative burden of proof. It is not a reverse voter. I do not want any more persons telling stories thirty years from now about the time they won a debate round on an RVI. In case you are confused, let me give you some examples of 1AC's that would not be topical, and would thus LOSE the debate, if the negative team made and properly defended a topicality argument all the way through the debate: 1) Debaters need to eat healthier; 2) not enough ramps on campus for disabled debaters; 3) debate participants have been somehow abused or neglected by the debate community, other debaters, or coaches prior to the reading of the 1AC; 4) the general shittiness of your ontological or epistemological existence; 5) the refusal to affirm the resolution because you object to one or more of its terms; 6) you feel like academic policy debate unfairly constrains your freedom; 7) the world, or the debate activity, is generally racist, homophobic, abelist, sexist, capitalist and any other form of oppression that is not tied directly to affirmation of the 2014-2015 Cross Examination Debate Association resolution for policy debate for CEDA/NDT tournaments or the assigned resolution in a parliamentary debate tournament. If you do not like this portion of my judging philosophy, I suggest that you either do not prefer me or debate in open division. For persons in open/varsity debate and other issues related to debate: I prefer a standard topical plan with advantages affirmative case versus counterplans and disads from the negative team. That being said, I listen to, and vote for, critical affirmatives and I have voted for many kritiks. See below! Common Issues: Topicality and Framework. I will vote on topicality. I think a lot of negative teams allow themselves to be run over by critical affirmatives' framework arguments. There are good reasons why topicality should be a voting issue. Develop them. I think the smartest argument I have heard on the T/framework debate is, "it's not the ground we lose, it's the ground you gain." That pretty much encapsulates why T should be a voter. That being said, I often vote for critical and non-topical affirmatives because the negative team fails to make good arguments, or kicks T/framework in the 2NR. Disadvantages. Run them if you have them. There should be plenty on this topic this year. I am usually not a fan of politics debates. However, on this topic, I think there are actually real links to political capital and elections disads. I think link turns are really good offense because, at worst, they function to take out the link to a disad, or make it a wash. Affirmatives should note, impact turns are fine with me. Counterplans. Please do. There should be plenty of counterplan ground on this topic. Agent counterplans seem pretty legit (Ex-O, Congress, maybe courts or States) until proven otherwise on theory or based on the topic literature. Consult---maybe, but you are going to have to read some topic specific evidence to justify it. As long as it is grounded in the topic literature, I am probably going to accept the legitimacy of a counterplan. PIC's.... I think people read blocks that are nonsensical on both sides. Kritiks: I will vote for them. I find a lot of them to be nonsense.

But, many affirmatives do not know how to respond to nonsense. Debate it out. Affirmatives probably need to discuss the transition to the end-state envisioned by the K authors. Things I tend to do in rounds: 1) I try to be fair to the teams. That means I will listen to any argument and try to figure out to the best of my ability what the speaker is trying to say; 2) I protect the 2NR. I don't give much weight to new 2AR arguments. The 1AR better extend and explain an argument if you want the 2AR to go for it; 3) I evaluate what went on in the round, not what I think your (K or solvency) author really thinks; 4) I usually look at evidence only when the last two speakers ask me to make an evaluation or comparison. I will rarely call for every card read in the round and reconstruct it as I see fit. 5) I like the last two speakers to tell me, "we win this debate for the following reasons" and "even if they win this argument(s), we still win because." On the other hand, I tend to dislike five minute overviews. Be responsive to the other team's arguments. Do not make me do all the work. Allowing me to connect the dots will often lead to an outcome that you did not anticipate and you will not like; 6) If I think I missed something in your speech, I will ask during the round what the argument was. If I say clear, and you don't change your rate or style, be prepared to not have those arguments evaluated in the round. I don't read your speech documents as you speak. But I will ask for it after the round as a matter of team policy; so I can post cites and argument outlines to the debate caselist. Memorable examples of ways teams have unexpectedly picked up my ballot: 1) Voted for Baylor one time because Emory misspelled their plan text; 2) Voted for Emporia once because their plan wiped-out the universe, destroying all life (you had to be there); 3) Voted numerous times on anthro kritiks, De-Dev, Cap K's, anarchy, malthus, space, aliens A-Life, etc.; 4) voted for a counter-performance because it made me feel more emotional than the 1AC narrative; 5) voted for porn good turns; 6) voted for genocide reduces overpopulation turns; 7) did not vote, but the team won, because they took my ballot filled it out, gave themselves the win and double 30's; 8) voted once on a triple turn--link turned, impact turned, and turned back the impact turn (had to be there); 9) voted on inherency; 10) voted on foul language in a round--both ways--foul language bad and "yeah, we said F***, but that's good" turns; 11) voted for veganism K while eating a cheeseburger. One last point: All of you need to flow the round. The speech document they flash over to you is not the debater's actual speech. Look. Listen. You may be surprised what the other team is actually saying.

Melissa Entzminger Highland Community College

I am a tabula rasa judge. Impact your arguments. Tell me why your argument is important in the round and how it impacts your opponent's case. Telling me why your position and arguments are better than your opponents is key to winning the round. I expect students to be polite. Being polite in the debate round is very important to me. The ability to argue without losing your temper is a sign of a mature debater. No predispositions. I do not like speed. This form of debate is one in which anyone can judge meaning there should not be a lot of technical jargon and elements. I prefer arguments about the issues rather than just a topicality argument.

Joseph Evans El Camino

I have been involved in forensics for 10 years. I debated HS LD for 2 years, and then 4 years of college parli debate at El Camino College and UCLA. I coached at CSULB while in graduate school, and I am now

currently a full-time professor and coach at El Camino College. I view debate as a game of intellect, and therefore I believe that any method of debate is viable when used as a strategic ploy to win. I will try to list my views on the major themes within debate. The way I evaluate the round: I tend to fall back to evaluating the round through the eyes of a policy maker. Unless I am told otherwise, I tend to fall back on Net Benefits. This means that I will evaluate the arguments based on how clear the impacts are weighed for me (probability, timeframe, and magnitude). I will however evaluate the round based on how you construct your framework. If (for example) you tell me to ignore the framework of Net Benefits for an ethics based framework... I will do so. On the flip side, I will also listen to arguments against framework from the Neg. You win the framework if you provide me clear warranted arguments for your position, and weigh out why your framework is best. Counter Plans: I will listen to any CP that is presented as long as it is warranted. In terms of CP theory arguments... I understand most theory and have been known to vote on it. All I ask is for the theory argument to be justified and warranted out (this also goes for perm theory on the aff). Topicality: I have a medium threshold for T. I will evaluate the position the same as others. I will look at the T the way the debaters in the round tell me. I don't have any preference in regards reasonability vs. competing interps. You run T the way you see fit based on the round. If the neg decides to kick out of the position, I usually don't hold it against them (unless there is offense). I will vote on T if the Aff makes a strategic mistake (it is an easy place for me to vote). Kritical Arguments: I believe that any argument that is present is a viable way to win. Kritical arguments fall into that category. I am well versed in many of the theories that most critical arguments are based in. Therefore if you run them I will listen to and vote on them as long as they are well justified. I will not vote on blips as kritical arguments. Framework: I will listen to any alt framework that is presented (narrative, performance, kritical Etc.) If you decide to run a different framework that falls outside the norm of debate... you MUST justify the framework. Evidence: Have it (warranted arguments for parli)! Speed: I am usually a fast debater and thus I believe that speed is a viable way of presenting as much evidence as possible within the time allotted. I can flow just about anything and I'm confident that you can not out flow me from the round. That being said, I value the use of speed combined with clarity. If you are just mumbling your way through your speech, I won't be able to flow you. While I won't drop you for the act of being unclear... I will not be able to get everything on the flow (which I am confident is probably just as bad).

Joe Faina Los Angeles Valley College

Arguments that directly clash between teams. Faithful interpretations of the resolution, allowing for sufficiently justified creativity. Avoiding topical critiques unless absolutely necessary. This is an activity emphasizing professionalism and competitors are expected to act in kind. Excessive aggression or disrespectful demeanor, whether verbally or nonverbally, will negatively impact my ballot no matter how sound the argument. Debate is more productive and more fun when competitive yet civil. I am open to just about anything so long as it is clearly justified by the resolution and supported with sound argumentation. Debaters skilled in the language and stylistic conventions of debate can feel free to lean on those conventions during a round. I encourage students to use their specialized knowledge and training to their advantage. However it should not take the place of good arguments and efforts to

address those of their opponents. Debate style should not obfuscate debate substance. It should enhance it.

Kelsey Figiel College of DuPage

Organization is key! Finally, respect each other! Enjoy yourself and learn something from your competitors! When you present a weighing mechanism, please bring it throughout the entire debate. For me, that continues the organization of the debate from start to finish. Please do not speed, as that does not show me your critical thinking or argumentation skills.

Bonnie Gabel McHenry County College

Organization and superior reasoning is most important. Civility is also important. Arguments that emphasize impacts are what I am predisposed to. Don't like speed and jargon.

Rachel Garnett

Making/backing a complete argument is most important. Verbal and physical respect is essential. No predispositions to arguments. Yes, everything presented gets judged.

Tyler Gillette Kansas City KS Community College

Jimmy Gomez Orange Coast College

Christine Goss Jefferson State

Ashley Graham El Camino

This is probably the most important thing to know about me: I believe that debate is a game. Therefore everything to me is viewed as a way to win. While education can happen and critical thinking can happen, ultimately you want the ballot otherwise there's no impact to how I judge debate rounds. Overall a clear framework and specifically a way to evaluate the round are going to be important in finding a way to evaluate the arguments in round. That being said, impacts win rounds. Structure and signposting are also extremely important. On Topicality: this is a voter for me; however it can also be used as a tool to secure ground or for competing interpretations. This is up to you as whether or not going for the T in the LOR is the best choice. I don't dislike T debates just multiple poorly warranted T rounds. On Kritiks: I will vote on the K as long as there is some type of legitimate alternative/solvency mechanism. I have voted on the K and have no unique pre-disposition against them. On Speed: Overall speed is okay. Usually I find that an increase in speed leads to a decrease in clarity. Most times speed is unnecessary but again it is your strategic choice. On NFA-LD: here the rules are much more explicit and I will vote where the rules tell me to. This does not mean I will outright intervene, but it does mean that I will have a higher propensity to vote on procedurals that are run when the rules are violated. For example if there is a position about speed, then the chance that I will vote on it is high unless there's some brilliant response.

Shonette Grant Northern Virginia Community College

I am not a debater so please make sure your speaking style is clear and persuasive. Treat everyone in the room with respect. Persuasive speaking style and evidence I do not like speed or debate specific jargon.

Joshua Green Prairie State

Angelica Grigsby Palomar College

Ryan Guy Modesto Junior College

My full JP is attached here. Scroll down if you want answers to the PRP specific questions. General Approach to Judging: I really enjoy good clash in the round. I want you to directly tear into each other's arguments (with politeness and respect). From there you need to make your case to me. What arguments stand and what am I really voting on. If at the end of the round I'm looking at a mess of untouched abandoned arguments you all have epic failed. Organization is very important to me. Please road map and tell me where you are going. I can deal with you bouncing around—if necessary—but please let me know where we are headed and where we are at. Clever tag-lines help too. As a rule I do not time road maps. I like to see humor and wit in rounds. This does not mean you can/should be nasty or mean to each other. Avoid personal attacks unless there is clearly a spirit of joking goodwill surrounding them. If someone gets nasty with you, stay classy and trust me to punish them for it. If the tournament prefers that we not give oral critiques before the ballot has been turned in I won't. If that is not the case I will as long as we are running on schedule. I'm always happy to discuss the round at some other time during the tournament. Video Recording: I usually have a webcam with me. If you would like me to record your round and send it to you ask me. I'll only do it if both teams want it, and default to uploading files as unlisted and only sharing them with you. Specifics: Speaker Points: Other than a couple off the wall occurrences my range tends to fall in the 26-30 range. If you do the things in my "General Approach to Judging" section, your speaks will be higher. Topicality: Hey Aff...be topical. T and other procedural debates are awesome if you can break free of the boring generic T debates we seem to hear in every round. I'm cool with the "test of the aff" approach but please be smart. I'll vote on T, just make sure you have all the components. I prefer articulated abuse, but will vote on potential abuse if you don't answer it well. I'm unlikely to vote on an RVI. In general I enjoy a good procedural debate but also love rounds where we get to talk about the issues. That said if you are going for a procedural argument...you should probably really go for it in the end or move on to your other arguments. Critiques: I tend to be more of a fan of policy rounds. That said I do enjoy critical theory and will vote on the K. Please keep in mind that I have not read every author out there and you should not assume anyone in the round has. Make sure you thoroughly explain your argument. Educate us as you debate. Make sure your alternative solves for the impacts of K. I'm not a fan of this memorizing evidence / cards trend in parli. If you don't understand a critical / philosophical standpoint enough to explain it in your own words, then you might not want to run it in front of me. Weighing: Please tell me why you are winning. Point to the impact level of the debate. Tell me where to look on my flow. I like clear voters in the rebuttals. The ink on my flow (or pixels if I'm in a laptop mood) is your evidence. Why did you debate better in this round? Do some impact calc and show me why you won. Speed: I think going a little bit faster than normal conversation can be good for debate. That being said; make sure you are

clear, organized and are still making good persuasive arguments. If you can't do that and go fast, slow down. If someone calls clear...please do so. Badly done speed can lead to me missing something on the flow. I'm pretty good if I'm on my laptop, but it is your bad if I miss it because you were going faster than you were effectively able to. Side Note on NFA-LD: I get that there is the speed is "antithetical" to nfa-ld debate line in the bylaws. I also know that almost everyone ignores it. If you are speaking at a rate a trained debater and judge can comprehend I think you meet the spirit of the rule. If speed becomes a problem in the round just call "clear" or "slow." That said if you use "clear" or "slow" to be abusive and then go fast and unclear I might punish you in speaks.NFA-LD SPECIFIC THINGS: Files: I would like to be on the email chain: ryanguy@gmail.com. If there is not an email chain I would like the speech docs on a flashdrive before the speech. Preptime stops when you hit send on the email or pull the flash drive. Disclosure: I'm a fan of the case list I think it makes for good debate. If you are not breaking a brand new aff it better be up there. If it is not I am more likely to vote on "accessibility" and "predictably" standards in T. I am very persuaded by wikispec arguments for teams that do not disclose. Here is the case list as of 2017. Get your stuff on it: <https://nfald.paperlessdebate.com/LD> with no cards: It might not be a rule, but I think it is abusive and bad for LD debate. I might even vote on a procedural that articulates that.IPDA:I'm a NPDA and NFA-LD judge for the most part. Even in IPDA I prefer that you signpost your arguments and follow the typical structure for advantages, disadvantages, contentions, etc. You get 30 minutes prep, you should cite sources and provide me with evidence. Arguments supported with cited evidence and empirics are more likely to get my ballot. In general I am okay with anything in IPDA that I am okay with in LD and NPDA. Meaning I will vote on procedurals, Kritiques, and other debate theory if it is run well. I'm also generally okay with a little bit of speed under the guidelines I provided above. In general I follow arguments on my flow. Make sure to respond to each other because a debate without clash is boring. Q1: What is the most important criteria you consider when evaluating a debate?:Good argumentation, cited warrants, clash. Q2: What are your expectations for proper decorum from the debaters?Hotels are awkward. Do what makes you comfortable. Sit, stand, it is all the same to me. I care what you have to say, not how you plan to say it. I am fine with partner communication, but it is probably a good idea (generally) to not puppet your partner. Help them if needed, but let them be awesome too. Q3:What strategies/positions/arguments are you predisposed to listen to and consider when you vote?I prefer policy debate. I'll still listen and vote on critical arguments, but tend to enjoy rounds that follow a more traditional inherency/Plan/advantages kind of setup. In recent years I have found myself less fond of value and fact resolutions. I think policy resolutions let us have better debates about the issues. If you want to run F and V resolutions as a policy, I will probably be okay with that...but you should be ready to justify why policy resolutions are better if they TRICOT you (because our judge likes it is a bad counter standard). In LD I will vote on WikiSpec if your stuff is not on the case list. <https://nfald.paperlessdebate.com/Q4>:How do you evaluate speed, jargon, and technical elements? See above for my thoughts on speed (a little is good). Jargon and technical elements are part of the event. Use them.

Hannah HAGHIGHAT Saddleback College

David Hale East Los Angeles College

Doug Hall Casper College

Logos Be competent communicators in all manner of speaking. I carry no predispositions into the round with the exception of a predisposed hatred for procedurals and kritiks. Don't run them in my rounds unless you want to lose. Argue the resolution in front of you. If there is a true violation, I will hear the procedural, but it better be walked out and clearly applied. Permutations must also be clearly spelled out. I want a perm text and a clear argument for why the CP isn't competitive and why doing both is preferable. If you perm as a strategy, and it doesn't make sense to do so, I will drop you. If the speed, jargon, and technical elements are excessive or misplaced I will evaluate them harshly. Be a person. Talk to me and your opponent like we're one as well.

Robert Hawkins Diablo Valley College

Tim Heisler Las Positas College

Are the speakers easy to understand and do the arguments make sense? That is what I am looking for primarily. Everyone should be as polite as Duane Fish or Lisa Benedetti. I do not have enough experience in debate to answer this question effectively. Now buying shoes? Ask me about that! Speed works to the detriment of Public Speaking ability. Debates should be centered so that an inexperienced judge should be able to follow the debate.

Adrian Herrera Tallahassee

Logic is the most important thing for me. If an argument is well built, with every point supporting and advancing the point prior to it, that's going to win the round for me. I expect debaters to respect each other and do everything they can to keep a round fun and educational. I don't mind jabs or jokes, in fact I expect them, but any rude or mean spirited comments will not fly with me. I don't have a preference for any particular tactic. I just like arguments that make sense and are well supported, regardless of if they're using a tried and true technique, or something from left-field. Spreading is a great way to lose a round in my book. If you're speaking too fast for me as a judge to maintain flow of the round, how can I say you won when I have no idea what you said? It's a cheap tactic. As far as jargon and technical elements, I like when they are used and it definitely helps me understand a debaters strategy, but knowing the technical terms won't be enough to win a round if the argument is weak.

Wade Hescht The Honors College @ LSC

Organization and logic are most important. I prefer polite debate. Not of fan of speed in either NPDA nor IPDA. Not of fan of jargon in IPDA.

Beth Hewes College of Southern Idaho

I want the debaters to follow the rules of IPDA--no jargon, no speed, a 9th grader should be able to digest all of the information provided. There should be a clash of the points provided. I am looking for organized arguments with credible evidence to back them up. Debaters should be professional. There is no need for attacks or attitude. If competitors are rude, that will impact their ability to win the round. In IPDA, I am interested in any argument that is grounded in evidence. I follow the philosophy of IPDA--no jargon, no speed, limited tech.

Jeremy Hodgson George Mason University

Clear argumentation, polished speaking coupled with support for positions. Courtesy is key. Explain terms, avoid speed.

Christopher Holfester Suffolk County Community College

Strength of argument with credible support is most important. Civility between competitors and general politeness is a must. Jargon and rate of speaking have little to no effect on my decisions--it is about the arguments presented.

Lucy Holsonbake Northern Virginia Community College

Ian Hopkins Northern Virginia CC

Clear arguments with support is most important. Be respectful. No Predispositions. IPDA is not NPDA

Ian Hopkins George Mason University

Clear arguments with inherent links, good clash civil, clean clash I am open to all arguments and strategies. I am fine with it

Jason Hough Hartnell College

I am a flow judge. Affirmative has the burden of proof, and I will be looking for the stock issues (formal in NFA LD; informally but necessary in IPDA). If you speak faster than I flow, that is a problem. I will let you know if need to slow down. Maintain professionalism and focus on the arguments; not one another. I expect clash and if I have an argument from one side on my flow I fully expect a counter argument from the other side. Do NOT drop arguments. Speed is ridiculous, not reflective of real life scenarios and if you sound like an 80s cassette playing on fast forward it may cost you. I don't need the jargon. It is superfluous. I want to hear the arguments. My technical elements are focused on the stock issues.

Jeannie Hunt Northwest College

I want to be able to judge the round with the least amount of intervention on my part. That means a couple of things. You need to establish a framework that I can follow to evaluate the round. I don't care what that framework is, but I want one. If there is debate about that criterion, make sure that the theory is clear and there are specific reasons why one framework is preferable to the other. That framework is what I will follow, so please don't set the round up as a discourse round and then ask me to look at only net benefits at the end. More importantly, give me something to look at in the end. I would love to hear some impact analysis, some reasons to prefer, something tangible for me to vote on. Absent that, I have to intervene. You should make your own arguments. If you are speaking for, or allowing your partner to speak for you, I am not flowing it. It should be your argument, not a regurgitation of what your partner said three seconds ago. Prompting someone with a statement like, "go to the DA" is fine. Making an argument that is then repeated is not. Delivery styles are much less important to me than the quality of the argument, but that doesn't mean you should have no style. You

should be clear, structured and polite to everyone in the round (including your partner if it is team). You can at least take off your hat. Having a bad attitude is as bad as having a bad argument. Speed is not a problem if it is clear. Someone is going to be unhappy at the end of the round - that's how the game works. I will not argue with anyone about my decision. By the time I am disclosing I have already signed the ballot. I am not opposed to answering questions about what could have been done differently, but asking how I evaluated one argument over another is really just you saying think you should have won on that argument. There are no specific arguments that I prefer over another. I will vote on pretty much anything and I am game for pretty much anything. I do expect that you will not subject yourself to performative contradictions or present narratives that you don't want attached to the currency of a ballot, which is what presenting the narrative in the round really comes down to. If you run a K you should be willing to live in the round with the same K standards you are asking us to think about. However, it is the job of the opposing team to point that out... This is true of any theory based argument you choose to run. I am old, which means that I think the 1AC is important. If you are not going to address it after the 1AC, let me know so I don't have to spend time flowing it. You should have some offense on the positions you are trying to win, so it doesn't hurt to have some offense on case as well. Critical rounds invite the judge to be a part of the debate, and they bring with them a set of ethics and morals that are subjective. I love critical debate, but competitors need to be aware that the debate ceases to be completely objective when the judge is invited into the discussion with a K. Make sure the framework is very specific so I don't have to abandon objectivity all together. Because I don't want to intervene, I don't appreciate points of order. You are asking me to evaluate the worth of an argument, which skews the round in at least a small way. Additionally, I think I flow pretty well, and I know I shouldn't vote on new arguments. I won't. If you feel particularly abused in the round, and need to make a point of some sort, you can, but as a strategy to annoy the other team, or me, it is ill advised. I have been coaching Parli since 2005. I coached policy before that for seven years and competed in CEDA in college.

Kush Jenkins Northern Virginia Community College

Clarity in argument is most important. Clash is also important. Be polite. Refrain from speeding. Debate is about communication. Make the debate clear.

Jordan Johnson Casper College

I look for sound logic and quality argumentation. As for other communication skills, I reward debaters for fluidity of speech as well as decorum and civility in the round. I expect the debaters to treat one another with respect and dignity. Degrading a fellow debater, or treating them improperly in any ethically questionable way will result in reduced speaker points and possibly a loss. I deplore a critical argument in Parli debate if they seem to be pre-constructed and ill-fitting in the round. Along those same lines, if a debater runs a procedural it needs to have a clear link to the round. If you attempt to shoehorn a procedural into your argumentation, your efforts will NOT be rewarded. Jargon and technical arguments are fine, but this is a communication event first and foremost, so make sure you're still being an effective communicator with me. I will never reward speed or volume of arguments. If

you're using either of those things as strategies, you will receive diminished points or even be dropped in the round. If I can't flow it, I won't flow it. Then it's as if it was never said.

Sohail Jouya Kansas City KS Community College I appreciate adaptation to my preferences but don't do anything that would make you uncomfortable. Never feel obligated to compete in a manner inhibits your ability to be effective. My promise to you will be that I will keep an open mind and assess whatever you chose. In short: do you.

- Truth > Tech, but I recognize that debate is a game competition that models the world in which we live. This doesn't mean I believe judges should intervene on the basis of reasonability, what it does mean is that embedded clash between opposed positions (the "nexus question" of the round) is of more importance than blippy technical oversights between certain sheets of paper.

- As a coach of a UDL school where many of my debaters make arguments centred on their identity, diversity is a genuine concern. It may play a factor in how I evaluate a round, particularly in debates regarding what's "best" for the community/debate space.

Do you and I'll do my best to evaluate it but I'm not a tabula rasa and the dogma of debate has me to believe the following. I have put a lot of time and thought into this while attempting to be parsimonious, if you are serious about winning my ballot a careful read would prove to serve you well:

All speech acts are performances, consequently debaters should defend their performances including the advocacy, evidence, arguments/positions, interpretations, and representations of said speech acts.

"Are you cool with speed?" In short: yes. But smart and slow always beats fast and dumb. I have absolutely no preference on rate of delivery, though I will say it might be smart to slow down a bit on really long tags, advocacy texts, or on overviews that have really nuanced descriptions of the round. My belief is that speed is typically good for debate but please remember that spreading's true measure is contingent on the amount of arguments that are required to be answered by the other team.

Ethos: I used to never really think this mattered at all. To a large degree, it still doesn't considering I'm unabashedly very flowcentric but I tend to give high speaker points to debaters who performatively express mastery knowledge of the subjects discussed, ability to exercise roundvision, assertiveness, and swag.

I'm personally quite annoyed at many judges who insert a "decorum" clause in their philosophy regarding the "need for civility." These notions are quite loaded and make broad assumptions that ought to be unpacked and questioned, particularly if the deployment of this concern consistently villainizes certain subsets of debaters. I certainly believe debaters should show mutual concern for each other's well being and ought to avoid condescension or physical/rhetorical violence – but I do not conflate this with respectability politics. Arguments are arguments and deserved to be listened/responded to regardless of mainstream notions of digestibility or the personal palate of an opposing team. In all honesty, some humour, shade, and disses have a place in rounds so long as they

aren't too terribly mean-spirited. Please don't misinterpret this as a call to be malicious for the sake of being cruel.

Holistic Approaches: the 2AR/2NR should be largely concerned with two things:

- 1) provide framing of the round so I can make an evaluation of impacts and the like
- 2) descriptively instruct me on how to make my decision

Overviews have the potential for great explanatory power, use that time and tactic wisely.

While I put form first, I am of the maxim that "form follows function" – I contend that the reverse would merely produce an aesthetic, a poor formula for hypothesis testing in an intellectually rigorous and competitive activity. In summation: you need to make an argument and defend it.

The Affirmative ought to be responsive to the topic. This is a pinnacle of my paradigm that is quite broad and includes teams who seek to engage in resistance to the proximate structures that frame the topic. Conversely, this also implicates teams that prioritize social justice - debaters utilizing methodological strategies for best resistance ought to consider their relationship to the topic. Policy-oriented teams may read that last sentence with glee and K folks may think this is strike-worthy...chill. I do not prescribe to the notion that to be topical is synonymous with being resolutional.

The Negative's ground is rooted in the performance of the Affirmative as well as anything based in the resolution. It's that simple; engage the 1AC if at all possible.

I view rounds in an offense/defense lens. Many colleagues are contesting the utility of this approach in certain kinds of debate and I'm ruminating about this (see: "Thoughts on Competition") but I don't believe this to be a "plan focus" theory and I default to the notion that my decisions require a forced choice between competing performances.

I will vote on Framework. That means I will vote for the team running the position based on their interpretation, but it also means I'll vote on offensive responses to the argument. Vindicating an alternative framework is a necessary skill and one that should be possessed by kritikal teams - justifying your form of knowledge production as beneficial in these settings matter.

Framework appeals effectively consist of a normative claim of how debate ought to function. The interpretation should be prescriptive; if you are not comfortable with what the world of debate would look like if your interpretation were universally applied, then you have a bad interpretation. The impact to your argument ought to be derived from your interpretation (yes, I've given RFDs where this needed to be said). Furthermore, Topical Version of the Affirmative must specifically explain how the impacts of the 1AC can be achieved, it might be in your best interest to provide a text or point to a few cases that achieve that end. This is especially true if you want to go for external impacts that the 1AC can't access –

but all of this is contingent on a cogent explanation as to why order precedes/is the internal link to justice.

Presumption is always an option. In my estimation the 2NR may go for Counterplan OR a Kritik while also giving the judge the option of the status quo. Call it “hypo-testing” or whatever but I believe a rational decision-making paradigm doesn’t doom me to make a single decision between two advocacies, especially when the current status of things is preferable to both. I will not “judge kick” for you, the 2NR should explain an “even if” route to victory via presumption to allow the 2AR to respond.

“But what about when presumption flips Affirmative?” I haven’t been in too many of those and if this is a claim that is established prior to the 2NR I guess I could see voting in favour of an Affirmative on presumption.

Role of the Ballots ought to invariably allow the 1AC/1NC to be contestable and provide substantial ground to each team. Many teams will make their ROBs self-serving at best, or at worse, tautological. If they fail to equally distribute ground, they are merely impact framing contentions that may not function well without a good warrant. A good ROB can effectively answer a lot of framework gripes regarding the Affirmative’s affirmation of an unfalsifiable truth claim.

Framing is the job of the debaters. Epistemology first? Ontology? Sure, but why? Where does performance come into play – should I prioritize a performative disad above the “substance” of a position? Over all of the sheets of paper in the round? These are questions debaters must grapple with and preferably the earlier in the round the better.

Analytics that are logically consistent, well warranted and answer the heart of any argument are weighed in high-esteem. This is especially true if it’s responsive to any combinations of bad argument/evidence.

My threshold for theory is not particularly high. It’s what you justify, not necessarily what you do. I typically default to competing interpretations, this can be complicated by a team that is able to articulate what reasonability means in the context of the round, otherwise I feel like its interventionist of me to decode what “reasonable” represents. The same is true to a lesser extent with the voters as well. Rattling off “fairness and education” as loaded concepts that I should just know has a low threshold if the other team can explain the significance of a counter-voter or a standard that controls the internal link into your impact.

I think theory should be strategic and I very much enjoy a good theory debate. Multiple topicality and specification arguments is not strategic, it is desperate.

I like conditionality probably more so than other judges. As a young’n I got away with a lot of, probably, abusive Negative strategies that relied on conditionality to the maximum (think “multiple worlds and presumption in the 2NR”) mostly because many teams were never particularly good at explaining why this was a problem. If you’re able to do so, great – just don’t expect me to do much of that work for you.

I don't find it particularly difficult for a 2AR to make an objection about how that is bad for debate, thus be warned 2NRs - it's a downhill effort for a 2AR.

Furthermore, I tend to believe the 1NC has the right to test the 1AC from multiple positions.

Thus, Framework along with Cap K or some other kritik is not a functional double turn. The 1NC doesn't need to be ideologically consistent. However, I have been persuaded in several method debates that there is a performative disadvantage that can be levied against speech acts that are incongruent and self-defeating.

Probability is the most crucial components of impact calculus with disadvantages. Tradeoffs ought to have a high risk of happening and that question often controls the direction of uniqueness while also accessing the severity of the impact (magnitude).

Counterplan debates can often get tricky, particularly if they're PICs. Maybe I'm too simplistic here, but I don't understand why Affirmatives don't sit on their solvency deficit claims more. Compartmentalizing why portions of the Affirmative are key can win rounds against CPs. I think this is especially true because I view the Counterplan's ability to solve the Affirmative to be an opportunity cost with its competitiveness. Take advantage of this "double bind."

Case arguments are incredibly underutilized and the dirty little secret here is that I kind of like them. I'm not particularly sentimental for the "good ol' days" where case debate was the only real option for Negatives (mostly because I was never alive in that era), but I have to admit that debates centred on case are kind of cute and make my chest feel all fuzzy with a nostalgia that I never experienced— kind of like when a racist puts on a cardigan, eats a Werther's Original, and uncritically watches Mad Men.

KRITIKAL DEBATE

I know enough to know that kritiks are not monolithic. I am partial to topic-grounded kritiks and in all reality I find them to be part of a typical decision-making calculus. I tend to be more of a constructivist than a rationalist. Few things frustrate me more than teams who utilize a kritik/answer a kritik in a homogenizing fashion. Not every K requires the ballot as a tool, not every K looks to have an external impact either in the debate community or the world writ larger, not every K criticizes in the same fashion. I suggest teams find out what they are and stick to it, I also think teams should listen and be specifically responsive to the argument they hear rather rely on a base notion of what the genre of argument implies. The best way to conceptualize these arguments is to think of "kritik" as a verb (to criticize) rather than a noun (a static demonstrative position).

It is no secret that I love many kritiks but deep in every K hack's heart is revered space that admires teams that cut through the noise and simply wave a big stick and impact turn things, unabashedly defending conventional thought. If you do this well there's a good chance you can win my ballot. If pure agonism is not your preferred tactic, that's fine but make sure your post-modern offense onto kritiks can be easily extrapolated into a 1AR in a fashion that makes sense.

In many ways, I believe there's more tension between Identity and Post-Modernism teams than there are with either of them and Policy debaters. That being said, I think the Eurotrash K positions ought to proceed with caution against arguments centered on Identity – it may not be smart to contend that they ought to embrace their suffering or claim that they are responsible for a polemical construction of identity that replicates the violence they experience (don't victim blame).

THOUGHTS ON COMPETITION

There's a lot of talk about what is or isn't competition and what competition ought to look like in specific types of debate – thus far I am not of the belief that different methods of debate require a different rubric for evaluation. While much discussion has been given to "Competition by Comparison" I very much subscribe to Competing Methodologies. What I've learned in having these conversations is that this convention means different things to different people and can change in different settings in front of different arguments. For me, I try to keep it consistent and compatible with an offense/defense heuristic: competing methodologies requires an Affirmative focus where the Negative requires an independent reason to reject the Affirmative. In this sense, competition necessitates a link. This keeps artificial competition at bay via permutations, an affirmative right regardless of the presence of a plan text.

Permutations are merely tests of mutual exclusivity. They do not solve and they are not a shadowy third advocacy for me to evaluate. I naturally will view permutations more as a contestation of linkage – and thus, terminal defense to a counterplan or kritik -- than a question of combining texts/advocacies into a solvency mechanism. If you characterize these as solvency mechanisms rather than a litmus test of exclusivity, you ought to anticipate offense to the permutation (and even theory objections to the permutation) to be weighed against your "net-benefits". This is your warning to not be shocked if I'm extrapolating a much different theoretical understanding of a permutation if you go 5/6 minutes for it in the 2AR.

Even in method debates where a permutation contends both methods can work in tandem, there is no solvency – in these instances net-benefits function to shield you from links (the only true "net benefit" is the Affirmative). A possible exception to this scenario is "Perm do the Affirmative" where the 1AC subsumes the 1NC's alternative; here there may be an offensive link turn to the K resulting in independent reasons to vote for the 1AC.

Sasan Kasravi Diablo Valley College

Natalie Kellner Ohlone College

Clarity of content and the ability to support logical arguments with evidence. Hold my hand through the whole process. Be clear and set up structure that allows me to follow with ease. For me, this activity really boils down to the basics of public speaking, that it is an audience centered. If you lose me then you lost your vote. Don't assume your audience knows exactly what you're talking about, you should be so

clear with your arguments the audience can't help but understand what you are saying. Be respectful and witty, the intention is not to insult each other, I want to see you challenge each other. What is a K (I am unsure of the answer to this question.... so let's not...)? Take your time, clarity is key, if you can speak faster than I can think... we are going to have a problem. I am NOT a debate coach. My IE background frames my perception of the event. I want to see a clear extemporaneous delivery and a concise speech tone that sounds like you are having an informed conversation. This tactic will grab my ear and my interest. Show me some personality and have fun!

Kathryn Kelly Blinn College

Content and quality of argument construction. Debaters can be aggressive, but should always be respectful of their partners and opposition's arguments. Condescending or dismissive tones and gestures would not be considered proper decorum to me. Students should avoid racist, sexist, homophobic language and cases. I most enjoy masterful, classic case construction and rebuttal. Students should demonstrate appropriate stock issues for relevant resolutions (fact, value, policy, etc... if the resolution is obviously value do not turn it into a policy round). Classic development done well shows a better grasp of issues, strategy, and form. Generic disadvantages and counter-plans certainly have their places in good debate- I have no problem with them. Speed should not exceed a knowledgeable debater's flow capabilities. If I can't flow all of your arguments then you aren't going to receive "credit" for them. Jargon should not replace constructive content, but I don't mind it. As for technical elements- a round should not stay bogged down in a Topicality issue any more than the attention given to other flaws in the case. Point out the T, and then move forward "in the best interest of clash and debate". T should be just one element of a case- not a whole debate.

Jared Kubicka-Miller Santiago Canyon College

Reason. Internal contradictions are usually confusing. Be careful that you don't make an argument one way at the beginning of the speech only to make an argument, or have your partner make an argument in the other direction later. If that happen, you need to resolve the contradiction. Don't get personal. Stick to the arguments. Topicality is inherently an issue about ground. The only rules for debate are the ones in the tournament brochure, everything else is negotiable. I'm fine with it. I have seen it used as a cudgel. I don't like that. I give teams that lack speed or jargon a lot of leeway in debates. Don't dismiss your opponents. It is bad for debate and upsets me.

Tara Kubicka-Miller Santiago Canyon College

Katie Lai George Mason University

Clear explanation of terms and support for assertions. Be nice to each other and respectful. No speed.

Chris Langone Oakton Community College

It will depend on the event. I will judge IPDA according to the public-oriented spirit of the event. I will judge pari based on the quality of the arguments and the flow. I will judge LD based strictly on the flow. I have no pre-conceived notions of what LD debate should be and let the debaters define (and debate)

the judging criteria. Have fun. Be smart. Don't pander. I will go to procedurals first. I like counterplan=disad combinations. If you run a K you better understand your argument. I don't like arguments based solely on the identity of the debaters. Speed is fine in LD. Not in IPDA or Parli. I am cool with all jargon, like I know what it means.

K C Larson

No association Standing arguments and voters. Use your rebuttal speeches to crystalize your primary points, as I am convinced just as much by the course of the round as I am by what the speakers Don't be jerks. Poise, dignity, and rationality are paramount, especially in this day and age. Have fun if you can! Logic and argumentation reign supreme. Reasonable procedural will be considered if gross abuse is evident, but I prefer clash and logic any day. Do what you need but at least give an explanation as to where you are coming from. Speed at your own risk. If I miss something critical and you opt for quantity over quality in argumentation, you sleep in the bed you make. I do try to comprehend as much content as I can.

Kyle Larson Harper College

I adjudicate strictly on flow, prefer clash to procedurals, take the weighing mechanism very seriously, and DO time thank yous. I always try to judge according to the weighing mechanism.in regards to considerations, solid argumentation and flow are what goes on the card, and what will be my deciding factor. anything unaddressed in the purview of the round I presume dropped. whoever makes the strongest standing case towards the weighing mechanism wins the round.So make your points clear tie them back to the WM as often as possible, and Impact! Be polite, now more than ever.I am used to up to three Crossex per speech, but feel free to impose limits as the round sees fit.I do not time roadmaps but do time thank yous. cold hard facts. I approach rounds with the mentality of all statements are true until proven false. if gov says sky is green, the sky is green until the opp informs me that anybody who goes outside can tell me the sky is not green.I am not beyond the use of pathos to articulate an argument, but I take the argument foremost.save metaphors for the metaphor round.Finally, the status quo is not a la carte. Biggest mistake being made this year is people cherry pick ongoing evidence to fill a narrative while disregarding happenings that go the other way.How do you evaluate speed, jargon, and technical elements?Do what you think works. if your style as a debater has been speed and technicality, and it has been effective, go for it. But I value quality arguments over quantity.a single well crafted argument can be more persuading then eight arguments given thirty seconds of coverage a piece.Run procedurals if you feel them necessary. If egregious ground loss is happening, make sure your grievances are clear. I do not appreciate procedurals as a just in case.in short, I am familiar with procedurals in debate. But I vastly prefer clash.Run anything else at your own risk.

Viet Le City College of San Francisco

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1x9dFsNb8lyv28lbrB6RtXRWwdtpYGn6K5TISbW0L3BE>

Blake Longfellow Diablo Valley College

Daniel Lopez Hartnell College

Chris Lowry Palomar College

I have not judged a debate for several years so I am unfamiliar with current trends. Beyond using sound logic and reasoning, I expect three things: First, it is important for the students to act in a professional manner (be nice!), especially when handling points of information. Second, please speak with a steady rate (no speed). Finally, take a conscientious effort to organize your speeches by giving me roadmaps and by signposting all of your arguments.

Robert Loy Santa Monica College

I evaluate debates on net benefits but also on the team that best upholds their burdens of the round. Respectful, competitive, learning and having fun are critical elements. I care about the knowledge produced in debate rounds. This means rounds should be educational and include an intellectually stimulating conversation. I also value competition, strategy, and research in debate and believe these things are necessary to achieve understanding and growth. I evaluate speed, jargon, and technical elements by how clear and strategic they are in debate rounds. I'm not the best with speed anymore, so I will most likely tell students to slow it down.

Lauren Lugo Mchenry County College

Clear and concise arguments and overall respect of the opposition at all times. I expect a respectful and calm demeanor from all debaters at all times. Clear, structured, and informed are the positions I am predisposed to listen to. I prefer that jargon and technical elements should be kept to a bare minimum, to keep the debate open and comprehensive.

Bryan Malinis San Diego Mesa College

I will always vote on presumption if the government team fails to provide a clear enough prima facie case for me to suspend presumption. I am looking for the team that provides the strongest, most logical arguments in the round. Be sure to stay organized! You must label all your arguments with taglines and signposts in order for me to flow the debate effectively. I have dropped teams in the past due to their lack of a CLEAR structure. Do not simply tell me that legalizing marijuana leads to dying children. Provide links, internal links, and impacts. Do not assume that I will make the argument/connection for you in my head. I only flow what is explicitly stated in the round. Most important, give me clear voters.

Debaters are expected to perform with professionalism and respect. I do not condone distasteful or disparaging remarks made against opponents, nor insulting nonverbal behavior. Such behavior tarnishes your own credibility as a persuasive speaker. Avoid ad hominem attacks. Excessive insults will result in me dropping your team. I am fine with partner-to-partner communication; however, I will only flow what the present speaker says. Please keep audible P2P communication to a minimum while an opponent is speaking: excessive talking hinders my ability to truly focus on the present speaker. Above all, make me happy to be in your presence. Have a good time and I will, too. I am stock issues all the way! I welcome topicality arguments as long as they are well-justified by the opposition.

Topicality arguments must be perfectly structured. You must cover all your bases with the topicality. I am not a fan of Kritiks, so tread carefully. I will not immediately drop you for using a K, but these arguments must be well-justified and clearly articulated. If it feels like your K is wasting our time, you've likely lost the round. Use common sense here. Your delivery skills are unequivocally tied to my perception of your credibility and competence as a speaker. I pay close attention to your speech rate (breathe like a human), volume, pitch, gestures, posture, eye contact, etc. Since nonverbal communication comprises up to 90% of what we communicate, you must be mindful of all the aforementioned elements during your speaking time. I have coached and judged collegiate debate for over five years and am comfortable with jargon and technical elements, though I am partial to a more straightforward, narrative debate style. For IPDA, treat me as a lay judge. I know nothing.

Christina Marquez El Paso Community College

Sound, logical arguments are most important. Collegiality and professionalism is a must. Arguments that make sense are what I'm predisposed. Conversational speed is preferred. Keep jargon and technical elements to a minimum.

Floyd McConnell San Jacinto College North

I like to hear a very well organized debate. Signposting and organization go a long way with me. Don't make your judge work too hard. When debate is done well, it is much easier to judge, and for your fellow competitors to have an educational experience. Debaters should always dress professionally. Also it is crucial for debaters to show proper sportsmanship. Please be polite to your opponents. Rudeness is never appreciated. There is a difference between confidence and arrogance. I like good organized, well labeled arguments. When it comes to policy, I am a stock issues judge. I am not a fan of Kritiks. Make strong arguments and refute arguments with sound logic. I see debate as a demonstration of effective communication. I really despise speed and spreading. I am fine with jargon, except in IPDA. I am open to well-constructed arguments. I do not like the open CX in Parli. I believe that only the speaker should answer questions. Minimal notes passed in round is ok.

Kristy McManus Western Wyoming Community College

Structure - I need to see that you can present a logical argument in an organized fashion, that you can follow and engage in an organized debate, and that you understand how to follow through with your argument in an organized way. I expect you to be professional, kind, and ethical. I try to be very open to all strategies, positions, and arguments. This is your debate. You are showing me what you do well. You are also showing me your understanding of strategy, position, and argumentation. If you are organized and well supported - I will listen. I am focused on the flow. I will not do work for you - you must explain and justify. I am fine with speed, jargon, and technical elements. Please explain to me what you are doing and why. I have no problem calling speed if you are going too fast for me. If you are using speed, jargon, or tech to be abusive - I will vote there. Please make sure your opponents understand what you are doing. We are all coming from different regions with different debate styles/structure. Please don't be abusive.

Sarah Metivier Schadt McHenry County College

I look for a friendly, interactive approach and appreciate a verbal style that includes clarity, organization, and wit. If a debater feels they are in a poor position as a result of topical interpretations, it's fair for them to point this out, but then they should move on. In other words, they should be good sports and find value in the challenges they face. I will judge what's on the table as long as it is realistic; this means that any weak arguments that go unchallenged will stand. Speed is fine, as long as there is also clarity. I prefer accessibility to jargon, and a sound argument to technical elements.

Lauren Morgan College of Dupage

The most important criteria for me is good argumentation/persuasion that employs a balance of ethos, logos, pathos appeals with reasoning. Often in debate, I find speakers do not provide sufficient reasoning to support their point. Be sure that you employ solid reasoning. In parli, use of the weighing mechanism is also paramount; if it is the criteria by which you are asking me to judge the debate, then I expect you to use it to show me why your position best fulfills the criteria by which you've asked me to judge the debate. I expect all debaters to be competent communicators and use decorum. There is no need to devolve into ad hominem attacks, especially when thinly veiled. Both verbal and nonverbal communication matter. I believe in trichotomy, so not every debate is a policy debate and sheer amount of evidence (cut cards) is not sufficient for me to vote for you. I am not opposed to T arguments, but if it appears you are running it as a matter or protocol or to turn the debate into the one you would like to have rather than the one you've been provided, that will not be in your favor. How you communicate is as important as what you say. I am not a fan of speed/spread nor overuse of technical elements. Create clash on the topic you've been provided, and debate it.

Douglas Mungin Solano Community College

Impact Analysis As this is a public speaking event I expect all competitors pay special attention to delivery basics and courtesy. I am open to all arguments but if you run Topicality you must stress in round abuse. I appreciate it as a strategy not as a crutch when you don't have enough oncase argumentation Go for it.

David Nadolski Oakton Community College

Educational experience and clash is what I look for. I am NOT the judge to run a K on ever but rather I look for good road mapping, clash and persuasion. If a competitor brings up a technicality I want it explained... not because I don't know what it is but rather I want to see that the competitor does and why they feel that the rule is a voter. Politeness needed and NO SPEED. I'm pretty independent minded. Personally I politically lean left bit again... I look for a good argument and believe it is not my mind's role to enter the debate, but rather to track what each side argues and decide fairly No speed, no K, and explain your jargon as you use it.

Jin Nakama San Diego Mesa College

I take a humanistic view to debate, arguments and cases presented are best done so in a manner that connects with our experiences. The process of argumentation and evaluation does not happen in a vacuum, it happens within the context of experience. This does not mean that arguments must conform to my worldview, but rather, that arguments should be grounded in some kind of experience that is relatable to us as individuals. If you're going to paint a picture of a different world, that's fine too. In general, it should just make sense within the narrative you choose. Speaker points and ranks are determined based on style and conduct. I was taught to debate traditionally, and I proceed accordingly. I adhere to proper parliamentary procedure. When the round begins, address me directly and not the other team during -all- points of interaction. Please stand when you speak and rise on all points. Partner-to-partner communication is strongly discouraged, however you may pass notes. I place a great deal of weight on etiquette and am likely to punish any perceived hostility by deducting speaker points with liberty. #PolicyWhere the resolution stipulates a call to action, I adopt a stock issues paradigm and artificial presumption. Stock issues answer the questions needed to resolve questions regarding the adoption of the resolution—and so, the Affirmative team must affirm all five stock issues (Inherency, Significance/Harms, Solvency/Advantages) in order to secure the round. Failure to bring a prima facie case, will result in my defaulting to the Opposition team on presumption (unless the Opposition waives Presumption by assuming an Affirmative type advocacy). Because of the nature of parliamentary debate and its limited prep, my thresholds aren't as stringent as they are in traditional policy formats, but please know that the less time you spend laying out and defending each stock issue, the weaker they will be and the easier it will be for the Opposition team to negate them. You need only lose one to lose the round. Absent a specific call to action, I will look to Framework and then to line-by-line argumentation. The resolution should remain the focus of the debate, and any impacts on case should be both reasonable and probable outcomes. Extremism, terminal impacts or arguments that are morally bankrupt hold little sway over me, however, if you think you can argue these points with success, I will listen to what you have to say, albeit with a raised brow. Whether or not the Affirmative team has met their burden upholding the resolution will determine the outcome of the round.— On Counter-cases/plans: I will reject a topical counter-plan by default with prejudice (you lose presumption). If you do wish to run a plan-inclusive/topical cp, the proper theoretical justifications must be made. I hold firm to the belief that a straight-link to the resolution is the clear ground of the affirmative team absent any arguments on theoretical standing. #Fact/ValueIn F/V rounds, I look to the body and quality of arguments and weighing analysis. Arguments should go to the probative and have a clear link to the criterion and how that proves or disproves the resolution. Remember, facts and examples are not arguments, rather, they should be used in support of your arguments. Additionally, I view debate as an art and practice in persuasion. Parliamentary debate provides little justification to speak at nigh unintelligible speeds and frankly, I don't find the use of speed all that persuasive. On Procedurals, I look here first as these are a priori issues. Generally, these should be employed as a means of demonstrating in-round abuse, though if you think you have good enough reason to run it based on competing interpretations, by all means, go for it. I vote on issues of fairness before the impacts of case because fairness as a practice extends beyond the round while the impacts of case are limited to just that round. Jargon and various other technical elements are not likely to confuse me, but please, make an effort to speak plain English.

John Nash Moraine Valley

Bill Neesen Irvine Valley College

I am a flow judge. I look at what you said and try not to interject my self. So you should compare arguments for me. A lot less than most judges. I care about what you say not how you say it. Everything is ok since it does matter what I think. Flow

Eva Nielsen-Parks Tallahassee

I am looking for well-structured and supported cases that deliver clear argumentation through a logical flow. Topicality and technical points should be duly noted but preferably not the entire basis for rebuttal. I believe most debates can occur with minimal points of order as much of the time they can be better addressed within the speeches. Be polite. I value quality speaking. If your arguments cannot be understood because of speed or disorder, it is difficult to flow the debate effectively. Organize your speech. Name each point as you address it. Speak directly to the point and move on. Finally, wit and humor are appreciated! These can only be effective when debaters are enjoying themselves and respecting one another. I hope this is the atmosphere that characterizes all of your debates. IE coach. Explain everything.

Lucas Ochoa Saddleback College

Impact Analysis and Clash are the most important. No rudeness or ad hominem attacks. I'm pretty much open to anything as long as Critiques and Topicality isn't abused. I don't like speed or debate jargon. Just argue straight up.

Jennifer Page Irvine Valley College

What you say and not what I think. Don't expect me to fill in the blank. Be nice and professional. Do not care. I do not flow that fast (ie 520wpm is out)and tell you if it is too fast but understand the technical elements of debate.

Mike Para Orange Coast College

Stock issues and clash; supporting evidence for assertions. Argumentativeness is fine as it is a debate - insults and ad hominem attacks, to me, undermine the activity and I am extremely biased against them. Stock issues and criteria arguments. Theory beyond topicality needs support that is extremely well articulated for me to pick up in a round. If using speed in parliamentary or IPDA debate without clarity will hurt your speaker points. Jargon can be useful for signposts, but overused or misuse tends to also hurt speaker points.

Rolland Petrello Moorpark College

Once upon a time I said that I was a tabula rasa judge. Then as I got older I realized that for me this is an impossible standard. I am unwilling to abandon my knowledge or common sense in evaluating a debate – especially in today's world of alternative facts. I am a firm believer that the topic is what needs to be

debated (especially in a setting where you have a hand in choosing the topic you debate). That said, I believe that there are many types of claims and if you want to debate policy exclusively then strike the non-policy topics. As an adjudicator, I consider myself a critic of argument rather than a scorekeeper. Let's be honest; not all arguments are created equal and just because someone drops an argument doesn't mean that you win the round automatically. If you want me to vote on an argument, explain why your position is the most important one in the round vis a vis the other arguments. While debate is a contestation of ideas and it can get heated intellectually, that does not mean it should not be civil. If it becomes hostile or ad hominem in nature, then your speaker points will reflect my disdain for that style. This is not an arbitrary or negotiable choice. As a Director of Forensics I view one of my roles as safeguarding this activity for future generations. This means that our activity needs the support of administrators. If I would not feel comfortable showing a debate to an administrator for fear of their reaction, then it is a debate that is doing a long term dis-service to our community. I am open to most sound arguments. That said, there are arguments that I have concerns with and you should know what they are:1. Kritiks - I have voted on kritiks - some that I liked and some that I hated, but very few. The ones I prefer are very specifically linked to the argumentation in the round and the topic itself. Additionally, I find most K's to be very poorly explained. Never count on me to be as versed in the lit as you are when you've researched it specifically for the purpose of running it in a round. If I don't understand it, then you didn't explain it well enough.2. Identity Politics - This is a very risky proposition in front of me for a number of reasons. First, I find them to be more exclusionary than inclusive for other debaters in the round. Second, it requires me to evaluate your experience and usually the premise is that I am not in a position to do so because of my identity. Third, the validation of personal narrative is very difficult in the context of the limited time of a debate round. In terms of what I like - I did NDT and CEDA in the mid '80's. As a result I am an old school traditionalist. I think the stock issues are stock issues for a reason. Additionally, since I spent four years as a 1N, I love a good case debate and think it is not only the most practical application of critical thinking skills in a debate round, it is a lost art. I don't judge enough debate to flow like I once could, but I am also not a houseplant. If I can't keep up with you I will verbally indicate it and then it is up to you whether to respond to it or not. I do not look kindly on speed for speed's sake and will judge your speed based on how necessary I perceive it was. I look even less kindly on speed as solely a strategic tool against slower debaters. To me, that is avoiding the debate out of your own fear and ultimately misrepresents what debate should be to the outside observers that we need. Anything else, feel free to ask me pre-round.

Amanda Pettigrew Moraine Valley

Elsie Praeger-Goller Mt. Hood Community College

Communication, organization, and clear resolution analysis for clear debates are most important to me. Be polite to the judge and competitor. Use thoughtful language when talking about anyone in or outside of the round. Culturally responsive language is appropriated. I am predisposed to listening to arguments with logic, clear speaking style, arguments should have some background because it is IPDA and anyone should be able to understand arguments made in the round. Debate is a communicative event where competitors must be able to be understood. Speeding is not needed if you use concise word economy.

For jargon, basic words like topicality are fine, but make sure to use them correctly. Technical debate must be used wisely, I prefer not to hear it.

Emily Prochnicki Suffolk County Community College

Strong arguments that are supported by credible sources are most important. General politeness and kindness to one another is a must. I'm more interested in arguments than in the technical jargon or speed of talking.

Jeff Przybylo Harper College

I am primarily an I-E judge, but I do have a good familiarity with Parli and IPDA debate. I see debate as a communications event; it is your task to persuade me why you should win. I am put off my competitors who speak too quickly. Make sure to explain every detail of your arguments, and do not rely on me to understand a given link. Please do not make overly technical T and K arguments. Do not insist that you should win because of a technicality; instead, explain your stance and persuade me to listen. Delivery, clear explanation of your analysis, and strong-but-friendly clash are going to be essential to winning my ballot.

Rita Rafael Chapman University

Clarity is most important. If I can't follow a debater, then I can't evaluate their quality. It doesn't matter how creative or complex an argument is. If it sounds confusing during the debate, then I am unlikely to vote for it. I expect debaters to realize that this activity is an exercise, and not get personal. Address the merits of an argument, not the person making them. I am more likely to vote for reasonable impacts and conclusions. This may sound self-evident, but linking every action to the consequence of nuclear war is unconvincing. I believe that speed, jargon, and technical elements limits access to debate for me and others. The best debaters are able to explain complex ideas to general audiences.

Janice Ralya Jefferson State

Jolinda Ramsey San Antonio College

Clear arguments delivered are most important. Be Courteous to ALL. Clear and well supported arguments in the debate are how I decide the round. No speed. We need to understand each other.

Jess Rauchberg George Mason University

Respect and active listening for each competitor is most important. Critical theory is where I vote on accessibility. Feel free to use whatever, but you need to be able to make it understandable.

Jeff Rieck Moraine Valley

Steve Robertson Palomar College Default paradigms: I think that the round is for you to convince me why your side should win the debate. Thus, ultimately it is up to you to frame the debate in such a way as to persuade me. I try to be as non-interventionist and on-the-flow as possible (except in

circumstances when you, as a debater, force me to intervene). So I default to a paradigm of an argumentarian--I look to the quality of arguments that are made (believability, fidelity, warrants, application). However, there are certain guidelines which can make your adaptation to me easier. 1. Since evidence is inadmissible in parli and IPDA, counter-intuitive arguments become more difficult to win. That is not to say they are unwinnable--but the justification standard does increase. If you go for counter-intuitive strategies, be prepared to develop the argument(s) more thoroughly and in greater detail. The "reverse voting issue" on topicality, for example, is probably the most counter-intuitive argument you can make. You have to do A LOT of work to win this in front of me. 2. Debate starts at the highest point of conflict. Thus, I do listen to theory arguments, even to the point of whether the resolution is fact, value, policy, etc. Clarification of such points is necessary for the debate to proceed, and a case poorly framed within the resolution that does not justify the resolution can lose on just such a point. Don't assume that just because I have a policy background, I feel that policy is called for in every round. In addition, the aff/gov has the right to define the terms within the resolution--though not an absolute right. For a neg/opp to attack topicality, they must demonstrate two arguments--aff's definition/interpretation is bad, and neg's definition is good. I state this here explicitly because so many times I have voted for a non-topical case simply because of poor argumentation, and I'm sick of it! Just a personal thought. 3. The more specific the argument you can make, the better. Generic arguments, while useful and sometimes necessary, are not NEARLY as compelling as arguments that are specific to the case or counterplan. 4. Parli has the unique tool of the Point of Order. You should use this if applicable. Some debaters think that numerous PoO's anger judges. For me, only frivolous PoO's do this. I do not protect the OPP if the PMR is making new arguments. Make a PoO, rather than thinking, "well, the judge knows that's new...I needn't bother." If that's your decision, then you will probably lose, because it will get on my flow. However, this is not all-encompassing, and it does not give the PMR carte blanche for new arguments. PMR's who just make tons of new arguments (hoping one slips through) aggravate me tremendously, and the credibility of their arguments diminishes when this happens. Just avoid the new arguments, and all will be well. 5. For NFA-LD, you should be reading evidence. Evidence trumps assertion. This isn't parli -- assertions are only as credible as a college student is. Back up your claims with evidence. The more you assert, the less credible your argument. This should be a clue to the other side -- argue quality of argument, offer counter-arguments, and even better, offer counter-evidence. 6. For IPDA, realize that this isn't parli, it is a different type of debate. This is less about the flow or debate jargon and more about persuasive delivery. Think of this more like an interactive persuasion round. The good analogy is: think about debating for your grandmother. Be civil to one another. This is not Thunderdome, you are not Mad Max, and there are no weapons strapped to the walls! Hostility does not translate to better argument. This does not mean, however, that you have to be all sugary-sweet. Just realize that aggressiveness (especially unsolicited aggression) is not the point of this activity. Don't mutter under your breath, don't have attacks against the other person (that aren't warranted), etc. And also have fun. While this seems simplistic, many debaters forget that the activity should be fun. It's up to the debaters to establish why their arguments are important, and why I should consider one over another. Lacking this, I use my own opinions to weigh out arguments. So debaters should be sure to weigh out issues for me, because you never know how I'll evaluate things otherwise. I also have a hard time voting for arguments that don't make sense to me. If I look like I am confused during your speech, I might not be understanding what you're talking about. The less I can

understand your argument, the less likely I am to vote on it. For NFA LD, jargon is fine, but part of the structure is no speed. You should shoot for slightly faster than conversational. If you're going too fast, I will let you know with an audible "slower." If you go back up in speed, I will drop you for it. It is part of the event, so don't abuse this. You wouldn't spread in a persuasive round, right? For IPDA, focus should be more on delivery than technical, on-the-flow debate. See my statements above about IPDA.

Tomeka Robinson Hofstra University

Stock issues are most important. Respect for the event. Stock issues and well impacted arguments I am okay with speed, jargon, and technical arguments as long as the students can argue why these things matter and for speed do not go under time because of their speed

Sage Russo Chabot College

I look for strong arguments backed up by warranted analysis as well as a confident delivery style. I prefer arguments that have real world examples, good use of logic and take a holistic perspective. I am looking for overall framing as opposed to technical skills in debate. I expect debaters to focus on their presentation and treat everyone in the round with respect. I will listen to any argument so long as it is well explained and well warranted. I will not tolerate any racism/sexism/transphobia/etc. I am not a speed critic. I expect you to focus as much on the delivery aspects of debate as you do on the argumentation. You will not win a round over using jargon, going too fast, or using too much techne in your speeches.

Hal Sanford Santa Rosa Junior College

Short Version: I'm a stock issues judge. I'm not fond of Ks, although a summer at debate camp has made me receptive to them if run well. Thank you, Joe Allen. Be nice to each other. Long Version: Some debaters may want more. Here's more. Remember, being electronic, it's length does not link to damaging environmental impacts - no trees were killed in the creation of the philosophy.

What is the most important criteria you consider when evaluating a debate? I look to stock issues, as argued on my flow.

AFFIRMATIVE: Make sure you are topical. Reasonable definitions are accepted; they do not have to be the "best." Affirmative, be sure your interpretation of the resolution gives reasonable ground to the negative; otherwise, affirmative, you will lose.

In policy rounds, show me that a post-plan world is better than one defended by the negative. Weigh impacts. Show your solution is workable and links to a better outcome than the negative option(s).

In value rounds, show me how your value criteria are supported and illustrated through your examples. Provide reasons to prefer your values or criteria to those offered by the negative, if they dispute them.

NEGATIVE: In policy, raise topicality only if it is a genuine issue. Too often negatives think they are being clever with "time suck" topicality arguments that fizzle in rebuttals and the negative loses because they did not devote 15 seconds more to weighing impacts or developing a disadvantage. Also, give me reasons why disadvantages actually make the plan net-detrimental; show me how your counterplan

alone is better than plan or the plan plus C/P. Explain how plan does not solve the problem or is not workable.

In value rounds, if you present counter values, explain how your criteria are superior to the affirmative's when in relation to the actual resolution. Weigh how the impacts to society (or part of it) are greater when supporting your arguments and value(s). Finally, if the resolution places one value over another, tell me equal status means a negative ballot: the affirmative must prove primacy of one over the other.

What are your expectations for proper decorum from the debaters? Be nice. Don't belittle your opponents by calling them, or their arguments, stupid, lame, or dumb. Remember, there is always somebody smarter and meaner than you. Do you want to generate the karma that comes with being a jerk? Really?!

What strategies/positions/arguments are you predisposed to listen to and consider when you vote?
Stock Issues:

In policy debate, these are key for me. Affirmative has to win all four to win; negative can win one to win. Remember, stock issues answer the questions needed overcome the uncertainty and the risk of change to justify adopting the resolution. Affirmative must win all four to win round. Stock issues are:

1. Motive/Harm, 2. Blame/Inherency, 3. Plan, and 4. Solvency/Advantage(s). Proving all is a precondition to receiving an affirmative/government ballot.

Topicality: Be sure interpretations or counter-interpretations are reasonably defined, metaphors are accurately applied, and mere time-suck topicality arguments aren't argued by negatives. You've got better things to do. Still, affirmatives, me buying a reverse voting issue on topicality is very unlikely. Even with a opp. drop on this issue, I'll really resist. Kill shot reciprocity for affirmative and negative on topicality does not make sense to me. Case must be topical for aff. to win; other reasons exist to vote neg. even if case is topical. Affirmative: Hurray, you are topical; you should win on a topicality RVI despite a disadvantage that links your plan to everybody on earth dying? Really?

Counterplans: It should be non-topical; otherwise, there are two affirmatives in the round and I'll just sign the ballot for the one actually listed as affirmative. They also should be competitive, meaning there is a genuine forced choice between the plan and counterplan. Show competition with mutual exclusivity or a reason that doing both is bad.

Critiques: With me, given equal teams, the critique most likely will lose. I have voted for critiques, but that is when a weaker team does not adequately deal with the critique. Debate camp and Joe Allen have made me wiser in the ways of the K, but I dislike generic critiques that don't relate to the resolution, the opponent's arguments, or reality. Good luck selling me that K whose central premise is that "we should all hurry up and die because life's greatest gift is death." Really? I vote on the flow, but I won't turn off my brain. Still, if your names are Robert or Sterling, I might buy it. They're eloquentus-maximus.

Weighing: Explain why you win. Weigh impacts. Apply your examples to concepts like magnitude, probability, timeframe and show how the opponent loses, how opposing arguments are less compelling.

How do you evaluate speed, jargon, and technical elements? SPEED:

NFA-LD: This is not supposed to be an audition for a speed-freak auctioneer. Rules state speed debate is antithetical to the event. That said, I heard about 30 rounds last year, including some top 4-year debaters. Only one has been "too fast" for the event, but an eloquently argued and rightly applied speed challenge by an opponent might find me a receptive audience. After all, "speed is antithetical to the event", right? If I, or the opponent, call "clear," heed that request.

PARLI: Be sure you really have quality arguments that necessitate speed to get them all in during the allotted time. Be clear, organized, and persuasive. I'll stop you if you're going too fast and I'll be receptive to an opposing team demanding you slow down also.

JARGON: Don't just sling jargon around and assume I'll do all the analysis and explanation to fully impact the concept. For example, if an affirmative thinks he or she can simply say "perm" and destroy the counterplan as a reason to vote negative, he or she is mistaken. Say something like: "Perm. Do both the plan and the counterplan. A counterplan must be a reason to reject the affirmative plan. If there is a permutation where both the plan and the counterplan exist, that counterplan is not a reason to reject the plan. Vote affirmative unless the counterplan alone is net beneficial to both the affirmative plan alone or the plan and counterplan."

TECHNICAL ELEMENTS: Please be organized. I won't time roadmaps, but they are appreciated. I do permit some conversation between partners during the round, but issues must be vocalized by the recognized speaker to count. I will not consider arguments made after time elapses. If you really need to sit while speaking, I'm fine with that.

Daniel Santillana Tallahassee

For good educational debate the most important criteria I look for is the ability to craft a well thought out and sound argument in a composed and respectful manner. Terminology is less important to me than logic. I expect for debaters to hold themselves to a composed and respectful decorum on and off the speaking podium. Speakers should be expected to treat their opponents as fair as they expect to be treated. I keep an open mind as far as how arguments may be crafted and am open to creative ways of crafting arguments. I enjoy humor as a mode of conveying points and making sound connections as long as it is respectful and appropriate. One of the goals of this activity is to have fun after all. I am looking for a steady pace carried on throughout. I'm predisposed to favor argumentation that flows fluidly throughout the round. Although fallacies and terminology are welcomed, in the end I will value the soundness of the argument by logic first. If I cannot understand you due to speed or volume, I will have a harder time judging your argument.

Annie Sauter Harper College

As speakers, we must pride ourselves on being effective communicators. That being said, I'm not used to speed. I don't favor it one bit, and I find it extremely hard to follow. Anyone can talk fast. What I care about is how well you are communicating your ideas and your argument. I appreciate the avoidance of logical fallacies. I also think the weighing mechanism is something I pay close attention to. When you set up a clear weighing mechanism and suggest it as criteria for how I should evaluate the rest debate, it's always a good thing if you can stick to it throughout the course of the entire debate. I really value organization, and I don't mind if you tell me exactly where your argument should go on the ballot. I appreciate cordial debaters who are able to read their judge/fellow competitors and adjust their speaking style. I do not favor teams who are condescending, aggressive, or tell me what to do. I don't like being told as a judge that I should or shouldn't do something. If I run into this, it is likely that I will tune out and stop listening. I think I'm most likely to listen to and consider the argument that presents the most impacts. However, I should mention that I find really unrealistic disads a bit silly (ex. We shouldn't convince companies to invest in wind energy because eventually turbines will take over the entire earth). Real world consequences are most likely going to make me listen and consider your argument. When it comes to speed, I want to be sure I can comprehend what you're saying. I don't favor speed. As for jargon, I think it's important for me to be convinced by your entire argument. If you throw out jargon, back it up. Jargon itself is not enough. Take the time to explain the lingo and elaborate a bit on why it applies.

Kari Schimmel Illinois Central College

John Schultz Tallahassee

I value logical, concrete arguments. Define your terms, build your case and then ensure that your case solves the need you have established. If you use strong logic, you will have a strong case. If you are the negative, you simply have to explain why the affirmative case doesn't solve the problem. I believe that the affirmative team gets to set the parameters of what is discussed so the primary job of the negative team is to show at least one significant flaw in the affirmative case. Be polite and have fun. I also value quality speaking. I realize there is a lot of information to cover in a short amount of time, but if your arguments cannot be understood because of speed or disorder, it is difficult to flow the debate effectively. Organize your speech. Name each point as you address it. Speak directly to the point and move on. Oh yeah, and that thing called the judging criteria! Explain it.

Tim Sheehan Ivy Tech Community College

Effective Argumentation is most important. (Effective Claims, Evidence, Reasoning factor into that) Be respectful to one another and to the judge. It factors into my deliberation. If I can't get your argument because of the way it is said, then it lessens the effectiveness of the argument.

Taure Shimp Modesto Junior College

I evaluate the round by looking at Topicality and Specs, CPs and K Alts, then Advantages and Disadvantages. While each round plays out differently, I tend to consider who has best upheld the criteria; who has most access to solvency and impacts; who has the most ink on the flow (e.g. are

arguments being sufficiently answered or are critical arguments dropped). I enjoy rounds with good humor where everyone treats one another with respect. This does not mean you need to begin every speech with flowery thank yous, but it does mean you should avoid rude nonverbals (scoffing, making faces, etc.). Basic guideline...if you would not speak to family members, co-workers, teachers, and friends in a certain way then don't speak that way to competitors. I do not particularly care if debaters stand or sit. Debate should foster civil discourse and honor the educational integrity of the event. I see it as my responsibility to listen to the arguments you choose to make and evaluate them as fairly as possible. However, I do have some personal preferences. The rounds I enjoy the most have a lot of clash, fewer but higher quality arguments, and impact analysis that emphasizes probability over magnitude. That being said, I will listen to the arguments the debaters choose to make. Procedurals and Kritiks can make for good debate...but I find AFF Ks are often gratuitous and I tend to resent when they are run as a strategy to win rather than out of ethical necessity. If you choose to run a Kritik (on either side), it is very important that you explain the theory clearly and accurately; have a strong link; and identify a realistic alternative. If you are unable to articulate—in a concrete way—how we can engage the alternative, you should not make the argument. I enjoy critical theory, but find it almost offensive when it is handled poorly or intentionally distorted. In NFA-LD: Speed and jargon is fine as long as your tags are slow and clear. In Parli: Faster-than-conversation and jargon is fine, but I do not like spreading in this event. For me, it decreases the quality of analysis and becomes counterproductive to the in-round education. I will not ask you to slow down during the round or say “clear.” In IPDA: A conversational pace is best suited for this style of debate. I still want to hear clear arguments with cited evidence. I personally am fine with jargon in this event and believe it is possible to discuss definitions and question the underlying assumptions/ideologies of certain arguments. My perspective is that this event should model accessible but high level thinking and argumentation (similar in style to the Intelligence Squared debate podcast by NPR).

Evelio Silvera Tallahassee

Clear and persuasive communication supported by valid sources. Debaters should be respectful of each other and argue the logic and validity of points and not make personal comments about other competitors. Debaters should also practice good, clear communication skills and refrain from “spreading” or “speeding” through an argument in the hopes of getting something by a competitor. I consider the overall logical explanation and support of an argument. Simply stating something is not topical or that a reference does not apply is not enough. I expect points to be grounded in the structure of the round and based on fact and not an unfounded opinion. There is a structure to debate and elements that must be present, but “spreading,” non-stop debate jargon and critiques are not grounds for winning a round if there are no persuasive arguments and clear communication to those elements.

Jonathan Stansbury The Honors College @ LSC

I have judged and coached LD, IPDA, and Parli for the past 8 years. I will be flowing every round. I am a very open judge in debate in terms of types of arguments. I am a big fan of evidence in LD and IPDA. In Parli I am more interested in your logic and argumentation. Delivery should match the event. I think

IPDA should have way less jargon than other forms of debate. I do not like seeing speed at the phi rho pi tournament in debate events.

Cherie Stepheson Western Wyoming Community College

Background: I earned my masters degree in Educational Psychology from Capella University in 2012. I am ABD Doctorate of Educational Psychology with an anticipated graduation of 2017 from Capella University. Judging Philosophy: I do not like rude debaters, nor do I appreciate "spreading" or when debaters talk fast. I also do not like when debaters go off topic, we have a finite amount of time to discuss the resolution...try to avoid extra-topical arguments on the AFF side. However I can acknowledge I have my biases and I try my hard to check them at the door. I do not like K's, they have their place but I do not think you guys have enough time to explain the full K. Make sure to explain your arguments holistically. I will not do work for you. I think debate is an event that allows you to both make great argumentation as well as speak efficiently, effectively, and with respect. Debate is a competition. And a educational learning experience. Let's have some fun!

Neal Stewart Moorpark College

I evaluate IPDA, like any other event, on a combination of content and delivery. Debaters should treat opponents, judges, and audience members with respect. Feel free to make any argument you feel can be persuasively explained to a lay audience. Speed, jargon, and technical elements should be appropriate to a lay audience.

Kiefer Storrer Glendale Community College

Josh Sunderbruch Harper College

Parli Philosophy I am a former debater (most styles) who dislikes the lack of impact and analysis in policy debate. I like parliamentary debate because it encourages analysis and communication skills as well as debate strategy. Please keep this in mind. Like most debate judges, I look for clash and dislike teams that try to win on technicalities (T, K, RVI, etc). Still, I will vote for topicality if there is abuse, not just if there is insufficient ground (I will also vote for a well argued RVI on T, though). Ultimately, I see Parli as an event about flexibility and adaptability. As a former debater tired of lay judges, my biggest pet peeve is misrepresentation of the flow—don't tell me that the rival team said something they didn't (or vice versa); it's the easiest way to lose my ballot (I see it as retribution for all of the teams that sneak out cheap wins by lying). Debate the issues, demonstrate the links in the arguments, etc. Have fun up there. Savor parli for what it is—don't turn it into something else.

NFA-LD Philosophy I am a former debater (most styles) who prefers debate styles involving analysis and communication skills as well as debate strategy. Research is less impressive to me than the mind behind it. Please keep this in mind. The more traditional/philosophical approaches are the most likely to influence me. As a former debater tired of lay judges, my biggest pet peeve is misrepresentation of the flow—don't tell me that the rival debater said something they didn't (or vice versa); it's the easiest way to lose my ballot (I see it as retribution for all of the debaters that sneak out cheap wins by lying). Finally, know that I will enforce the pleasant delivery standard of NFA L-D.

Eddie Tiongson Irvine Valley College

Chris Tittle Tallahassee

If there are any IE "points of reference" that I might use to judge a debate, they would be what I learned in Extemp (researching and sharing sources on current events) and public address events (organization and delivery through Informative, Persuasion and ADS). Be polite and have fun. Decorum: Polite, compliant with timing rules and requests from opponents, conviction in perspective and celebrating the spirit of competition Strategies/Positions/Arguments: Structure, transition, responding to opposing views and raising new points Delivery: Relaxed body, articulate, paced, eye contact I don't appreciate debates where the speakers put a philosophical "spin" on what should be plain discourse that anyone should be able to follow without too much effort. If you're going to debate the Southcom role, don't bring up the "gender dynamics" of international relations (what is that?). Bottom line: My mother should be able to sit down in a round and understand the topic, points of view and arguments from start to finish. Explain everything.

Jeff Toney San Joaquin Delta College

Grant Tovmasian Rio Hondo College

The most important criteria for me is impartiality. I will avoid interceding on any one's behalf up to a point. Please remember that although I approach the round as impartial as I can, that does not negate the truth, I still am aware which country I live in and who is the president and killing puppies is wrong (also kicking them, and just violence in general, I frown upon) I expect all debaters to remain cordial and professional throughout the round. The decorum is important so as not to isolate or offend any student. Debate albeit adversarial in nature should be based on arguments and not a personal attack and as such, each student should perceive this as a safe place to express ideas and arguments. I prefer good on case argumentation over near useless procedural that are simply run in order to avoid on case thorough analysis. As such I am a believer that presentation and sound argumentation is critical towards establishing one's position. DA vs Advantages. CP vs Plan are all sound strategies and I hope students will use them. I firmly believe that speed kills, as such the first team that uses it as an offensive or defensive tactic will get a loss in that round. Critics, i.e. K are to be run only when one or the other side believes that it is more important than whatever else is happening and is directly connected to either the actions of the other team or resolution in it of itself. As such, they should be willing to commit to it wholeheartedly and most important at the top of everything. For example, if you truly believe that the other team is promoting cultural genocide, seriously do not speak to me about agricultural benefits or disadvantages of the plan first, because then I think you cheapen both the critique and your whole line of argumentation. If permutation can happen in the real world it can happen in a debate round. If you are running a CP please make sure to explain its status, especially if you are to claim dispositional (EXPLAIN) Please call Points of Order and 95% of the time I will respond with (point well taken, point not well taken) That aside, I am open to any line of argumentation as long as it is complete. Example: I will not do your work for you, no link no argument, no impact no argument, no warrant NO ARGUMENT PERIOD. I want to hear fun, constructive and polite debates. Have fun and let the best team win. (I

always prefer cordial and educational rounds with elements of quick wit and persuasive argumentation over Nuclear Holocaust, which I really do not care for, especially when it results because of US not buying used car parts from Uruguay.)

Keith Townsend El Paso Community College

Logic/Reasoning of argumentation Professionalism Ones that make sense Speed kills. Keep jargon/technical elements to a minimum

Tom Tracy Harper College

I am primarily an I-E judge, but I do have a solid familiarity with debate. I see debate as a communications event; it is your task to persuade me why you should win. I am put off my competitors who speak too quickly. Make sure to explain every detail of your arguments, and do not rely on me to understand a given link. Please do not make overly technical T and K arguments. Do not insist that you should win because of a technicality; instead, explain your stance and persuade me to listen. Delivery, clear explanation of your analysis, and strong-but-friendly clash are going to be essential to winning my ballot.

Dana Trunnell Prairie State

Roxanne Tuscany Grossmont

The debaters in the round, should be telling me, "what the most important criteria is in the debate". I am listening and analyzing your debate according to what you, "the debaters", tell me is important. Therefore, your criteria for the debate should be very clear, and you should be reminding me throughout the debate what my criteria should be, to vote for your team. Parliamentary debate is and has been a "communication" event. We are at a speech/debate tournament. I expect communication skills to be used as effectively as possible, and that we are following our disciplines' research that supports first impressions and good communication to be effective persuasive methods. Therefore, stand when speaking. When your partner is speaking, only discretely pass a note to them. Never, speak for them. I would also like to have you stand for Points of Information, and politely call out, Point of Information. If you raise your hand, the speaker many times cannot see you. It is not "rude" to interrupt the speaker, for points of information or points of order. It is part of parliamentary debate guidelines. It is rude to speak for your own partner. I would like to say that I am open to all positions/arguments and strategies. I teach argumentation, and I know that there ARE 3 types of resolutions: FACT, VALUE, AND POLICY. If you pick a resolution that is a fact resolution, it should be run that way, etc. There are fact and value resolutions. They may be more challenging, but they exist. Of course, you can argue that the team has incorrectly identified what type of resolution it is, and run topicality. That is part of the debate. Also, there will be metaphors in these debates, and they could be in the form of a fact/value or policy. You need to identify this in your debate. In a policy round, I do prefer stock issues format, rather than the current trend of comparative advantage. I also expect a complete plan. For the opposition, I expect you to listen to the affirmative case, and argue against their positions as directly as possible, rather than come in with your own case, that has nothing to do with what the government case is

arguing. Speed has no place in parliamentary debate. For me, it has nothing to do with your judge being able to "flow" the debate. It has to do with you being a competent communicator, in the real world. If you can talk eloquently, with good enunciation skills, then I'm fine with you talking relatively fast, without it being a problem. I don't believe a judge should have to yell out: "clear". An audience should not have to tell the speaker, that we can't understand you. Jargon should be used sparingly. We are at a national tournament, where not every region uses the same jargon. Therefore, don't assume we know your jargon. Quickly, briefly explain your terms. I would like you to know that I love parliamentary debate, and have been judging for as long as it has existed in the western states. I love to hear real world issues debated directly in front of me. I hope you are up to this incredible experience and challenge of arguing real issues. Enjoy!

Arthur Valenzuela Los Angeles Valley College

Dana Jean Van Winkle Saddleback College

John Vitullo Mt. San Antonio College

Clean and distinct argumentation is the most important criteria. Whoever has the best arguments and tell the best story will win my ballot. Debaters should be polite and professional. I vote on any argument as long as it is cogent. As long as you are articulate, I can listen.

Trent Webb Nassau Community College

For me, the most important thing is the quality of your arguments, never the quantity. Even though this activity exists in competitive/academic vacuum, it is important to me that debaters make arguments with real-world impacts, legitimate and logical support, and representative examples. It is also important that debaters respect the activity of debate by abiding by the rules and respecting your opponent. I expect debaters to debate with a friendly and cordial attitude. I expect debaters to refrain from anything sexist, racist, transphobic or anything discriminatory. You should stand for C/X if you're able. You should be on time and keep your own time during the round. I expect you to respect the general rules of debate and the rules of Phi Rho Pi. For IPDA - I am predisposed to debaters who engage in "pure advocacy". This is the spirit with which IPDA was created. Therefore, specific cases do not go over well with me unless they are "common knowledge". Also, running any type of critique, trichotomy argument or topicality violation in IPDA is a big no-no. Stick to the resolution! I'm not a fan of meta-debate. For NPDA - I'm more forgiving when it comes to plans that are case specific as I know this is the trend in NPDA. Understand that I haven't judged NPDA in quite some time but I did coach it for the better part of 10 years when it first started. That being said, I still don't enjoy meta-debate in NPDA either. In either format, I am more likely to vote for the debater(s) who best exemplify the criteria, utilize the evidence, and provide real-world impactful voters. Feel free to ask me to clarify any of this before the round starts. I HATE SPEED! If I put down my pen, I've stopped flowing because you've lost me. I still believe this is a communication activity, so communicate in an effective way. IPDA should rely upon rhetoric, persuasion and public advocacy, therefore any "debate jargon" should be kept to a minimum. In NPDA, I understand that jargon and CEDA-like elements have become trends. I have a big

problem with this; so if you've going to use anything that would fall under that umbrella, understand that I'm quite resistant to it unless it is thoroughly explained and applied well.

Brandan Whearty Palomar College

Gretchen Wheeler Casper College

Debates should be well structured and developed on real world information and examples. Goal of the debate should be to communicate on a level that would make sense to anyone who is listening to the debate. Debaters should remember that first and foremost this event is about effective communication and persuasion. I expect debaters to be professional and civil in the round. In IPDA, I look at definitions and how each team uses them to clarify the round. Weighing mechanism should be clearly stated and defined and not ignored until the very end. Clear explanations of harms, advantages and disadvantages. Decades in the activity have made me appreciate debates that do NOT get dragged down into debate theory arguments. Forget speed, my hearing is ruined from so many years of listening to "spread" debate. If I can't hear or understand it because of speed, it doesn't go on the flow. Jargon needs to be defined and kept to a minimum, since there are multiple interpretations, even in the debate world about what terms mean. Finally, debates about technical elements can end up in a dead heat which can leave the judge sometimes in the position of needing to intervene. Yikes!

Janene Whitesell Solano Community College

I prefer that negative uphold its primary burden to clash and uphold the status quo. Debaters should stand when speaking. As stated above, i prefer an animated, natural speaking style. High speed rarely affords more information. It just becomes a distraction to listen to. Debaters should not prompt their partner while speaking. You have to trust your partner and, if they fail, you have to save your argument. I don't prefer T arguments unless they are absolutely warranted and I usually don't vote on K arguments. I don't prefer speed, but i can flow it. I teach argumentation, so I'm familiar with terminology. Keeping it conversational so that the "average person on the street" could understand it should always be the goal.

Roger Willis-Raymondo Mt. San Antonio College

I look for clash. It is also important to me that you remember there is a resolution, and that it is there for a reason. Don't be afraid to have some fun, but I will be voting for the most persuasive arguments AND delivery in the round. I expect a high level of collegiality. Don't be rude. Be considerate. Remember that this is a speaking activity, and that it is not just your job to spit out as many arguments as you can in the time provided. Connect with your audience even if the audience is just your judge and your opponent. I will listen to any arguments as long as they make sense in the confines of the round. I have yet to vote for K, but I have not heard one that has been persuasive enough. Everything else (topicality, counter plans, etc... are good to go). There is no real-world application for speaking fast. And it just sounds desperate and ridiculous. Please talk like a person. I really like judging debate (with the exception of LD). please allow me to continue to enjoy debate events. Be smart. Be kind. Give me a reason to vote for you.

Brandon Wood College of Dupage

Did you persuade me with complete arguments? Did you make this seem like a general audience could follow and enjoy? Did you treat your opponent with respect? Did you speak passionately and compellingly? Did you not talk about the value of education? If you answer yes to all of these then you have mastered my criteria. Opponents will greet each other by first or last names and I will only mark refutation on my flow if a specific name is attached to it during the constructive. I don't want to be told what I have to do. I'm not being shown a stack of cut research that makes me have to vote for someone. Whether it's parli or IPDA you should avoid words like, "you must", "you should strike this", "you have to vote for our side because we did this/they didn't do this", or "here is why we won". Every time I deduct 3 speaker points and I put you on mental time out for 30 seconds where I will flow nothing. Don't meet competitor hostility with hostility unless you want to assure a hostile ballot. Arguing that something is or is not "educational" is ultimately a weird form of whining that has infected debate. Experiencing something that is unfair, like circular arguments or bad definitions, is educational. It's going to teach you something. If abuse is occurring please respond in a way that doesn't involve the hyperbole that the entire activity of debate is endangered because of some team's narrow definition. I attempt to be tabula rasa except when it comes to trichotomy. If that resolution is policy then I expect the gov/aff and opp/neg to meet whatever intrinsic burdens therein. If you don't have a claim, evidence, and warrant/link I don't count it on my flow for the purposes of determining a round. If you start an argument I expect you to finish it. Claims with neither will result in speaker point deductions. Speed = me not flowing. Jargon = assumed enthymemes and sloppy debate (usually). Technical element = will accept them as needed.

Jim Wyman Moorpark College

The arguments by the adversaries (I try as hard as I can not to intervene). I look for the most real world arguments that make sense. I expect respect for each other and for the judge. I don't have a low threshold for foul language; but I would prefer not to hear it. I believe debating to be a public speaking event and, therefore, I have the same expectations I would have for debate as for other events. In team debate I want partner intervention kept to a minimum. I have now taken the position that until the words are spoken by the speaker, it is not flowed or heard. I am what I would call a traditional debate judge. I believe topicality is a valid argument and a voter. Conversely, I do not like artificial arguments. I consider Kritiks (or however it is spelled) to be such an artificial argument. I have never voted on a Kritik because the ones I have heard are based upon false premises (or unwarranted premises), false links (or unwarranted links), or false conclusions (or unwarranted conclusions). I use a judicial paradigm and do not find a niche for these arguments in my philosophy. I do not like speed debating (I think it takes away from the integrity of the arguments). Some jargon is okay if it is part of the current debate setting. I am not sure what technical elements really means. I, mainly, rely on traditional debate theory.

Eric Yahn Glendale Community College

I am a tabula rasa judge. I will vote where you tell me to, as long as it is well articulated and warranted. I'm open to trichotomy and topicality arguments, they serve a purpose so use them if you have to. I am not a fan of Kritiks, and here's why, I've found that most people don't use them properly. If they are poorly drawn and out of context then I cannot vote on them, theory arguments are impressive yes, but if you don't understand the words coming out of your mouth then your opponent won't either and if I have to piece together a theory for you then you've already lost. Don't try it if you can't handle it, it's better to debate at face value than over extend your reach. I am a champion of decorum. I like thank yous and human decency. Be nice to one another and we'll get along fine. I want clean well articulated arguments, as such I tend to favor Toulmin's model of argumentation. i.e. This happens because of that for these reasons. Sign post everything always, tell me where you are on the flow, what arguments you are responding to, what your response is and why your response is better. Time that I have to spend flipping through pages is time that I am not flowing you. Both on and off case argumentation are key to winning my ballot. I will vote on dropped arguments if you tell me to, but I will not do any leg work for you. If you don't say it, I can't flow it. I will not flow speed, if it's too fast and I miss it, that's your fault. Note: I can't flow policy speakers and the "double pump" is one of the most irritating noises ever. Brownie points* for making me laugh though. • Preferences on procedural arguments, counterplans, and Kritiks I am not opposed to a topicality argument but it needs to be properly structured. Counterplans are fine, but should also be clearly structured. I do not like Kritiks. • Preferences on calling Points of Order Points of order should be used to call out new argumentation in rebuttals, if you don't tell me they're new arguments, they're on my flow to be calculated when voting. Points of order will be ruled on if possible, in rounds with a panel of judges, they'll be taken into consideration. IPDAI view IPDA as a cross between dueling extempers and persuasion. Tell me your story, give me your facts, and defend your findings. NFA-LA I never competed in LD, however I have the base knowledge to coach and judge the event. I will flow what you tell me but I will call for cards if that's where you and the opposition draw the lines. Keep it neat, keep it clean, be persuasive.*Brownie points are not redeemable for credit, speaker points or actual brownies.