Chathi Anderson   Irvine Valley College   Evidence and how it links to the criteria defined in the round. You can throw at me what you like, but I have only voted on a K once-it was expertly explained to me how the aff's defense and arguments linked to either the DA or K. I prefer debates about the resolutions, but I love to see competitors have fun with it. I'm the judge that loves metaphor rounds-if that helps. With regard to arguments, I expect analysis and explanations in the debate round. I understand the jargon and rules of debate, but what I am not an expert on is the philosophies and evidence you bring into the round. Some I probably know a lot about, others I may not, so I expect everything to be explained in round. I do not mean you have to hold my hand through things, but I am not a fan of abbreviated/techie debate that relies on a judge to be a bank of knowledge. Eye-rolls, snarky attitudes, yelling, and straight up disrespect will not sit well with me. Save that for the van/bus ride home. I do, however, have a very dry sense of humor, so I do love some jabs here and there, but they must all be in good fun. If I feel someone is crossing a line, I have no problems saying so in round.

I hate extinction arguments/impacts. Other than that, I haven't come across anything that I won't consider. I do expect it to link to the criteria defined in the beginning. Follow the framework set up in the beginning, and all should be good.   I do not have a problem with speed or jargon as long as your speech is understandable. I have a mild hearing problem and a constant ringing in my ears that makes it difficult to separate words. If I am unable to hear what you're saying, I will simply ask you to clear. What I do not like, however, is spreading for the sake of overwhelming the opposition. Please do not drop half your arguments simply because the opposition hit them all. I also expect explanations and analysis on all the arguments, so be mindful of that when setting up your case.

Tim Anderson Elgin Community College   I am not a debate judge, so I view everything as a communication event. I do not often judge debate (if I do, it's IPDA) so I don't have a debate judging philosophy, and in conjunction with the philosophy of IPDA, I don't feel I need one   Don't act like a jerk (either verbally or non-verbally) to your competitor or the judge.   Again, I am not a debate judge, so I basically judge things as if I am evaluating two different persuasive speeches.   As I judge debate as a communication event, there should be no speeding, no jargon, and no hang-ups on breaking standard debate protocol/technical elements. I don't know standard protocol, but I am a college educated individual capable of evaluating arguments on my own. I do not appreciate being told what I should/should not do (i.e., "you HAVE TO/MUST vote for the _____") or arguing to win on a violation of a rule is falling on deaf ears. Oh, and I feel that the elongated "thank you's" before each speech sound disingenuous, sarcastic, and condescending. Just get to the substance.

Joan Andrews   Tyler Junior College   In IPDA, I am looking for logical argumentation, public speaking skills, source support and courtesy. This should be a "real world" discussion on an important issue. My background is as an Interp/Speaking coach. However, I have judged IPDA for over three years.   Courtesy is extremely important. Of course, students should point out flaws in their competitor's argument. However, the attitude should be "I think my way is better" not "you are wrong, stupid or deliberately misleading us." Also, I expect excellent public speaking skills. I will be looking for proper posture, fillers and eye contact. As the Phi Rho Pi IPDA rules state, "extemporaneous delivery is required." The Phi Rho Pi ballot also asks for judges to rate students on source support. So, I will be listening for sources (just like in Extemp).

I will listen to any logical argument. Do not waste time pointing out an infraction that would lead to a technical win in parliamentary debate. Instead, use your time refuting the logic your competitor's

argument. Please do not keep telling me that I should vote for you. Instead, use this valuable time to support your argument. Students will be keeping up with their own time. All parliamentary and LD debate jargon should be completely avoided. To be clear, if you use speed, I will simply put my pen down and those comments will be disregarded. Your speed should be the same as we were speaking in the elevator about the weather. Debate jargon and spreading comments will not benefit you and should be avoided. I will not be flowing the debate. Instead, I will be listening and evaluating your argument logically.

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.

Rafaela Baker Saddleback College The most important criteria I consider when evaluating a debate is if the competitor provides balance to their argumentation (each point they make should be balanced and well-structured). I also consider the criteria they choose for me to evaluate the debate (on balance, net benefits – as long as if fits with what they are arguing they are going do to well). Avoid dropping arguments and make sure you stay organized throughout (top of case, off-case, on case). Competitor must provide warrants for their claims; they cannot assume that I am going to "fill-in" what they mean if they don't explicitly state how their evidence connects to the claim(s) they are making. Debaters should be respectful to their opponent, and to the judge. Point of Order will be considered or not considered depending on the validity of the point they are making (they aren't granted just because they are called) and they should respect that the judge knows what they are doing when evaluating the POO. Language is a huge factor for me, and if debater is rude, disrespectful, and uses language that demonstrates a lack of civility toward competitor or judge chances are they will be dropped from the round. I am comfortable with procedurals run in NPDA, and am comfortable in understanding how they are executed. However, I am not a fan of procedurals in IPDA and they should only be run if one side is being abusive and not giving the opponent sufficient grounds for argumentation. Otherwise, nice clean argumentation and persuasive appeals are encouraged. I don't flow when a debater spreads (it is distracting and doesn't add value to the debate IMO). I am comfortable with jargon and technical elements as long as they are necessary and called for. If jargon and technical elements are used, debater must know how to articulate properly and make the opponent understand why they are using

jargon or technical elements. I won't just grant access to a debater for using technical jargon if they aren't utilizing it properly, or if they are not properly explaining why technical jargon is necessary.

Nichole Barta Irvine Valley College   Are you upholding your burdens and the criteria of the round? I expect debaters to be polite to each other opponents as well as team members. I expect debaters to use an appropriate tone with answer point of information questions and during cross-examination. I can only write as fast as I can write and only take into consideration what is on my flow. I expect debaters to be polite to each other opponents as well as team members. I expect debaters to use an appropriate tone with answer point of information questions and during cross-examination. The opposing team has the right to "clear" if they believe the team is spreading. Jargon is fine.   If you plan on running a "k" or "t" make sure you do it properly and explain it don't assume that I am going to draw the conclusion. DO NOT run these if you cannot run them. Please, do not waste our time and then kick them in your next constructive.   *IPDA should not have jargon

Alicia Batice   Pasadena City College   As a judge, I believe my role is to facilitate a respectful and educational space for students. I should adapt to the students rhetoric, students should not have to adapt to my preferences. I evaluate arguments in the debate that students emphasize. Example, if impact calculus is where you want my attention then that's where I'll put my focus.   I expect students to be polite towards one another. I understand being assertive about your arguments but do so in a civil manner. Do not personally attack your opponent by belittling their arguments, I consider this to be very petty, offensive and ineffective in the debate. In the world, you'll encounter more people with different viewpoints than people who agree with you; let's use this space to practice being professional and articulate about our stances.   Again, I believe as a judge, I should adapt to students. I am open to any argument a students wants to make, as long as, they are well structured, organized, and impacted out. I'm comfortable with the use of parli jargon, however, don't just use the word and expect me to do the rest of the work. For example, if aff wants to PERM a counterplan, don't just say "PERM. We can do both." Explain why we can do both or explain why this is a test of competition. I consider myself to be a flow judge. I like organization and structure. I don't like flipping through my flow to find where to put your argument. Let me know, where you are and where I'm supposed to put your information. Remember to emphasize the arguments that you've asked me to focus on. Example, if your criteria is utilitarianism- most good for the most people, emphasize this connection within your arguments. I like organization and structure during debates. Please, use taglines and internal signposts. I do not tolerate speed, at all, for any reason, in both IPDA and Parli. I understand the need to speed up in order to get all your arguments out, but I also believe that being more concise solves this problem. Do not sacrifice quality for quantity. I do not give verbal signs to slow down, I will simply put my pen down and stop flowing, so be sure to check in (eye contact) with me. Additionally, I do take in consideration the "clear" or "slow" from your opponents. If asked to slow down please comply.

Bob Becker   Northwest College   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. However, 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.   Don't try to suck up to me. You can be friendly without being smarmy. Be professional. 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.   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 resolutional analysis to justify affirmative choices. Although some arguments are more easily defeated than others, I am willing to listen to most positions. I 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. I believe policy debate, parliamentary debate, 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. IPDA is still debate. It needs to have clash and argument. Goofing off for half an 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, and don't belong to one format or another. Impress me with your ability to explain the issues to me.   I 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.

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.

Tyler Billman Southeastern Illinois College

Margaret Bilos Harper College I value good discussion and listening to each other. I expect the affirmative to create a reasonable set of definitions and resolution. If, to the common person, the link isn't evident or can't be reasonably explained, then they are setting up an impossible scenario. If it is reasonable, I expect the negative to listen to the arguments and respond reasonably to them. It's fine to present an off-case, but it is frustrating to have to evaluate 2 debates within the time frame of one debate. Listen and respond.   I expect debaters to treat each other with civility. I expect us to see each other as people and not opponents. I expect you to ask each other your names and use them in a conversational way. I expect you to look at each other while you are speaking, asking and answering questions. I expect you to treat each other like you are debating each other for the sake of enjoying an argument, not that you are demanding or directing the judge to vote a certain way. I am open to all strategies used within the framework of the event. However, if you are asking how many debate tricks I prefer you to use, I would imagine none. I prefer that you topicality is only used in egregious situations. If you are reasonably debating and listening and responding to each then really, this shouldn't be an

issue.   My preference is that you treat this as a communication event. As such, you shouldn't be speeding through rounds, you shouldn't be using jargon that a non-debate person would have a hard time understanding and you should be attentive to the communication skills that aid your ethos. I do expect that you use organization, but I do not want to hear outline elements spat at me. The people who listen, communicate, have thoughtful arguments and speak well will be successful.

Francesca Bishop   El Camino College   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—why it matters in the debate. 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 love tag-team arguing—so unless your partner is about to lose you the round, let him or her speak. That said, you won't lose the round if you tag-team, but you or your partner could lose speaker points. 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 largely stupid 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.   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. IPDA: I default to the rules when it comes to delivery and content, but my interpretation is not that this form of debate is not entirely theory-free.

Brianna Bitout Harper Community College   For all debate, fully formed arguments impacted to the weighing mechanism are key. I need to know why your argument matters in the round. I also prefer when these arguments come from clash on the flow rather than over procedurals (unless they are truly warranted).   In IPDA, I expect you to call each other by name as well as refer to me by name (Bree or Brianna or Ms. Bitout is fine). This event requires a high level of decorum, so you should be nice to each

other and anyone else in the round. Do not interrupt each other. If I feel you have violated any of this, I will drop you. For Parli and LD, I'm a bit more lenient. I do not mind passionate arguments, but there should be absolutely no ad hominem attacks, and debaters should refrain from being rude. Do not talk to your partner. Passing notes or whispering to each other QUIETLY while the other team is speaking is acceptable unless it becomes excessive. If you start feeding your partner information while they are giving their speech, I will not flow what is being said. You have your chance to talk; let your partner think for their self.   I try and remain tabula rasa, so make sure you refute everything and drop nothing, especially in Parli and LD. Drops matter. Turns matter. Magnitude of impacts matters. I don't like slippery slopes and other logical fallacies. I don't like personal examples being used to make a case. Unless we're having a value debate, I'm not a huge fan of theory arguments. During rebuttals, the only thing I write are the voting issues you tell me, so make sure you're clear about what arguments solidify the win for your side.   In IPDA, don't speed. This event is about persuasion, so persuade me to vote for you; don't try and spread your opponent. There should be no jargon or any sort of procedurals. My philosophy when it comes to IPDA is that I shouldn't have to flow your speeches in order to understand what's being said or who I will want to vote for. In Parli and LD, I recognize speed as a tool that one can use. That being said, I do not flow speed well. So, you are certainly welcome to try and speed, but at the end of the round, my flow is the one that matters, so if it's not on my flow, it doesn't count. I'm familiar with most jargon and have no problem with it being used. As far as procedurals go, again, I recognize them as a tool in a debater's toolbox. This does not mean they should be abused. Use them only when absolutely necessary.

Justin Blacklock San Antonio College   The most important criteria that I look for in debate is clarity. Although many forms of debate have pushed a heavy focus on jargon and speed based strategy, I am of the believe that debate should be persuasive despite the audience members' knowledge of debate as it has become. This being said, I am willing to take any arguments that do not appear abusive to the other teams ability to clash.   Just as in any other forensics events, professionalism in dress, demeanor and treatment of all involved in the process is expected. As long as teams/individuals remain courteous and exemplify positive competition behaviors.   Logical flow is the most important to me. I am not a fan of performative debate strategies.   Jargon, I am fine with. Most technical elements are OK. However, speed should not be a factor in debate. If you make a habit of using speed to your advantage, make sure you make an effort to slow down and use signposts.

David Bowers Kansas City Kansas Community College 4 years coaching NFA-LD (Competed 4), 4 years coaching NPDA (Competed 5), 2 years coaching HS CX, Competed in 2 years of CEDA/NDT Overall -- I am not here to tell you what you should read in rounds or ignore arguments based on preference (with a few exceptions obviously, I won't listen to racism/sexism/ableism good type arguments), I will try and be as objective as possible in debates. What that means for you is that I need clear framing on the impact debate to help me understand what to do with you argument. Sans that I would default to a utilitarian framework. I have listened to/voted for/read just about every "type" of argument in debate, as a result I don't have a preference about how you go about debating. If there are questions about specific arguments I'm happy to answer them prior to the round, feel free to ask. I wish my philosophy was more useful. Please, feel free to approach me at the tournament and as question prior to prep. As long as

there is a justification for an argument I'd be more than happy to vote for it.

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.

Alex Brehm   Lower Columbia College Every round of debate is different and I consider many criteria when judging, but I find myself regularly making decisions based on topicality and the precise wording of a resolution. It is critically important that all debaters uphold their burdens and stay true to the ground given to them by the resolution. I will not vote in favor of any debater whose primary argumentation is extra-topical, non-topical, or ground belonging to the other side.   Good rounds of debate are energetic, spirited, and sometimes contentious. I don't necessarily want to see competitors trade passionate rebuttal for proper etiquette. That being said, it is of course essential that all members of our community feel respected and valued. To that end, please be kind and respectful while maintaining your competitive spirit.   STRATEGIES: I do not appreciate spreading. Stylistically, I am looking for argumentation and delivery that don't require an advanced degree in communication to understand. POSITIONS: I do my best to keep my personal ideology out of my evaluation, and make judging decisions based on what happens in the round. That being said, I have certain strong beliefs that I struggle to compromise. I am overwhelmingly in favor of strong public schools and closing the opportunity gap in education. I defend human rights and condemn violations to human dignity around the world. I believe that diversity (in all senses) is good and that we should celebrate what makes us unique. These (and other) core values that I hold closely would be challenging to vote against. ARGUMENTS: I find that the word "abuse" is used too lightly in the debate community. Allegations of abuse should be reserved for extreme circumstances so that we do not become desensitized to a very serious topic. Asserting that your opponent has done something abusive (including definitions, interpretation, etc.) is almost always overstating minor issues. Using unnecessarily strong terminology to make this type of claim is unlikely to earn my sympathies. The IPDA bylaws state that this format of debate strives "to provide contestants with a forum in which they can enhance their education through the laboratory of productive, "real-world" competitive debate experiences." I believe strongly in this mission to practice a form of debate that can be applied to other academic, professional, and personal settings and speak to a variety of public audiences. There is no "real world" application for spreading (with the possible exception of reading a disclaimer at the end of a radio advertisement). I appreciate competitors who deliver their speeches at a reasonable rate using vocabulary that could be understood by most public audiences. This does not mean that you should dumb down your analysis or argumentation.

Kelly Bressanelli.   Moraine Valley Community College

Shawn Briscoe   Maricopa Speech and Debate

Brianna Broady. Pasadena City College As a judge of primarily individual events, it is important that debaters are clear with their arguments. I am not opposed to any specific arguments as long as you provide clear evidence and warrants to justify your stances. Be respectful to each other and have fun in your round. Be sure to communicate with each other. Clearly respond to each other's arguments and engage in clash. I would say that I am open to any argument as long as it is well thought out and clearly structured. It is also crucial that arguments are fairly easy to follow along. I prefer speed to be at a conversational pace and for jargon and technical elements to remain at a minimum or clearly defined.

Nate Brown Santa Monica College Clarity, logical, and development of the arguments is most important. A close second is the quality of the speaking skills. Fast-talking, shouting, and poor delivery skills in general influent my decision. For IPDA, I don't want to hear any NPDA jargon. I want a very public/conversational style of delivery. Polite, professional, and conversational. No shouting or speed talking. For me, decorum implies a conversational, enjoyable style of speaking for the audience to listen to. I am not interested in framework/k arguments. I usually find Topicality a waste of time because I usually find the Aff to be reasonably topical. But if they aren't, then T is appropriate. Speed is strongly discouraged. I can't flow it and don't like it. Typical NPDA jargon in NPDA is fine, but you might want to explain it to me anyway, just in case. There should be zero NPDA jargon or speed in IPDA. In IPDA, I am just some person pulled off the street to hear a public debate. I will not like non-public style or strategy in IPDA.

Patrick Carberry College of Lake County

Daren Carpenter Tyler Junior College In IPDA, I am looking for logical argumentation, public speaking skills, source support and courtesy. This should be a "real world" discussion on an important issue. My background is as an Interp/Speaking coach. However, I have judged IPDA for over three years. Courtesy is extremely important. Of course, students should point out flaws in their competitor's argument. However, the attitude should be "I think my way is better" not "you are wrong, stupid or deliberately misleading us." Also, I expect excellent public speaking skills. I will be looking for proper posture, fillers and eye contact. As the Phi Rho Pi IPDA rules state, "extemporaneous delivery is required." The Phi Rho Pi ballot also asks for judges to rate students on source support. So, I will be listening for sources (just like in Extemp). I will listen to any logical argument. Do not waste time pointing out an infraction that would lead to a technical win in parliamentary debate. Instead, use your time refuting the logic your competitor's argument. Please do not keep telling me that I should vote for you. Instead, use this valuable time to support your argument. Students will be keeping up with their own time. All parliamentary and LD debate jargon should be completely avoided. To be clear, if you use speed, I will simply put my pen down and those comments will be disregarded. Your speed should be the same as we were speaking in the elevator about the weather. Debate jargon and spreading comments will not benefit you and should be avoided. I will not be flowing the debate. Instead, I will be listening and evaluating your argument logically.

Nathan Carter Northern Virginia Community College Your speaking style and organization Be nice and play the game fairly I dislike K, but I will listen to it I am a flow judge. I do not mind speed but give me a roadmap. I do not like Tag Team debate, please do not do it.

Chase Cashion Tallahassee The most important criteria that I consider is the judging criteria set by the debaters. I value substantive, logical arguments, and am looking for the team who defends judging criteria in the most complete way. I expect that the debaters will treat each other with respect. I won't be voting for teams that are rude to their competition. Pleasantries are fine, but please do them off time. In policy style debates, I'm going to be looking for the team that has the strongest impacts. It is important that each team explains the impacts for all of their advantages and disadvantages. I can only vote on what the debaters say, so don't ask me to fill in the blanks. I am happy to support/vote on any argument given by the debaters, as long as it is thoroughly explained, and it is connected back to the judging criteria. I prefer that the competitors not spread, as I want to be able to flow all of your arguments. I am okay with any other debate jargon (framework, critiques, etc), as long as the team gives a road map, and tags all of their arguments.

Vlada Casteel College of the Canyons

Ralph Castellanos Santiago Canyon College Substantive arguments that satisfy the judging criteria. I'll vote for any arguments that are well articulated and competitive in the round. Run whatever you'd like, just make sure it's well articulated. Do whatever you want, as long as both sides follow the same rules. I vote for anything. I have voted on T, K, etc. I am not against any type of argument. I'm fine with speed and jargon. Don't spread your opponent out of the round.

Sean Connor Orange Coast College 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. I expect the debaters to be cordial with one another, and have little tolerance for belittling comments, condescending remarks, or disrespectful nonverbal communication. I am open to most strategies including topicality and kritik so long as it makes logical sense. I am primarily an IE coach so some of the jargon or nuance (including speech) 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 Ability of competitor to make clear, rational arguments. Professional speaking style...NOT speed. Be polite to judge and competitors. I do not believe jargon belongs in IPDA. The arguments made should be understood by anyone. I do not appreciate speed. I do not like FIATs.

Marquesa Cook-Whearty Palomar College

Jenny Corum Billman Southeastern Illinois College I prefer debate that is clearly structured and impacted. I'm fine with any type of argument – critical, procedural, or otherwise. I will consider myself thanked so you don't have to. I prefer debate that is clearly structured and impacted. I'm fine

with any type of argument – critical, procedural, or otherwise. I will consider myself thanked so you don't have to.

Paul Cummins Southeastern Illinois College

Shaw Davari Orange Coast College   Clear Arguments.   Be respectful to one another.   I will listen to anything.   Just be clear and explain arguments thoroughly.   Don't speak fast and explain all terms.

Krishna Desai COLLEGE OF DUPAGE   Clear arguments that include strong support and clear structure. I really listen to the content of the argument and am not concerned with dropped arguments.   Be respectful, be kind, communicate competently.   One speaker should be speaking at a time.   None   If I can't hear, I don't know what you're saying.   If I don't understand you, I cannot process your arguments nor vote for you.   Therefore, you need to be sure I can hear and understand you.

Justin Dougherty   Nassau Community College   When judging IPDA, I ascribe to the principles of IPDA as prescribed by their constitution and/or by-laws. Hence, I expect a highly rhetorical and oratorical-based style/approach from both debaters. This means you lose my ballot if you insist on excessive speed, "spreading" or the act of stacking too many contentions, not being cordial, or the use of unnecessary meta-debate jargon and/or techniques. That being said, a basic knowledge and basic practice of debate theory is expected as well.   Stand during CX. Avoid looking at your opponent. Be cordial at all times.   A clear AFF structure is needed; even though I am open to various types of structure - it just needs to make sense. Regardless of chosen structure, please make sure taglines are clear, evidence is clearly sourced, and however you connect your warrants (examples, narratives, etc.) should be clear as well. And it goes without saying that each argument should have impacts. For NEG, direct clash is your friend, but you should link any off-case positions to whichever NEG philosophy you've espoused. Just be clear as to what your overall approach is.   Speed, kritiks, and over-reliance on procedurals and meta-debate is the quickest way to lose my ballot.

Kyle Duffy   College of the Canyons

Stephanie Eisenberg   Chabot College will update   will update   will update   will update

Darren Elliott Kansas City Kansas Community College   Director of Debate and Forensics Kansas City KS Community College Will listen to and fairly consider any argument presented. (Avoid obvious racist and sexist arguments and ad Homs). For an argument to be a round winner you need to win the impact the argument has in relation to the impacts your opponent might be winning and how all of those affect/are afffected by the ballot or decision (think framework for the debate). No predispositions against any strategy be it a Disad/CP/Case or K or T/Frameework on the Neg or a straight up policy or K Aff. Win what it is you do and win why that matters. Good luck. Have fun.

Scott Elliott   Kansas City Kansas Community College   What you need to know 10 minutes before your round starts: I will most definitely vote on topicality. Win the interpretation and violation, and I will vote

negative. You are either topical or you are not. If you are not, you lose. See below for more detail. That argument you always wanted to run, but were afraid to run it….this may be your day to throw the Hail Mary. I prefer impact turns and arguments that most judges dislike. Affirmatives still have to win basic stock issues. I prefer counterplans and disads. But I also believe that the affirmative has a burden to defend the ontological, epistemological, pedagogical and ethical assumptions of the affirmative arguments they have chosen. I have probably written, cut cards for and against, and coached teams about, the "cutting edge" argument you are thinking of running. I have also voted for it and against it depending upon how that argument is deployed in the round. I am not intimidated nor persuaded by team reputation, verbal abuse, physical assaults or threats. If you won, I am willing to take the heat and I do not care about the community's reaction. I have friends outside the debate community and I have my dogs. I don't need to be your buddy and I certainly do not care about my social standing within this so-called "community." Engage in overly abusive discourse in the round, threats, intimidation, or actual assaults of an opponent, another judge, or audience members and you will not only lose the round, but you can pretty much write off my ballot for the rest of your career. These organizations won't do much about it, but I will I do what I can to stop the downward spiral of this activity.

Bonnie Ellis   Mt. Hood CC/University of Nevada-Reno   I prefer policy for 'should' resolutions. Try to stick to the actual resolution (Ks are fun, but often we just do them for no other reason than because we can.) Things need to be organized enough that I can follow along the with train of thought- jumping around or dropping arguments just means I'm less likely to remember them, especially if you don't tell me to consider it at the end. Signposting will help. Clash is pretty significant, obviously. I need to see you cancelling out their arguments with your superior ones or I'll probably vote based on who is wearing the most purple or something. Anything you want me to consider when voting, please PLEASE give me a refresher in your last speech. Keep things fun, light, and amusing. Imagine everyone needs you to help them have a good day. If you do a bad job… well, you could lose.   Don't be jerks to each other. Just because you're not outright calling someone stupid, does not mean I won't pick up on your body language and intonation. I will be especially critical in cases where misogyny/sexism/racism/homophobia/transphobia or any other prejudices may be at play. I firmly stand that debate should be a place where the disenfranchised have a chance to speak and be heard, as well as a place for the privileged to learn how to check that behavior. I'm not too critical on speaks, nor attire. The contents of the arguments are what I care about. That being said, kindness and me understanding you (NO SPREADING) will be considered in speaker points.   Dehumanization is a big one. If you can show me how your position leads not just to the fewest people being hurt or killed, but them accessing most of their needs and rights, I will probably vote for you. Additionally, don't feel the need to tie it to nuclear war- I prefer outcomes that are realistic. Impacts that involve reducing poverty, disenfranchisement, oppression, the perpetuation of racism, sexism, xenophobia, homophobia, transphobia, etc. Argue more rights for people that typically don't have them, especially if it solidifies their own power to fight for themselves. Argue against normalizing violence against minorities. (In summation, I am an avid feminist, anti-racist, anti-classist, anti-capitalist).   Speed: not too fast. I have a difficult time following when competitors use spreading. I also find it excludes those with limitations such as hearing impairments, attention disorders, or language barriers from participating

fully in an event that should be made as accessible as possible to everyone. I won't exclude you just for spreading, but if I can't understand you, I can't vote for you. Jargon: I don't care about as much, I am familiar with most of it- but preferably, use lay terms when possible to keep it accessible. I won't take points away, but it will make it much easier to follow if jargon is limited to when it's necessary. I also do not consider terms like 'advantages' to be jargon. I did debate for two years, IPDA for 1 and NPDA for 1. I am a Comm Studies Major. So while I have a knowledgeable background, it has been a few years since I have debated, and I am somewhat rusty. Keep that in mind.

Mike Epley   City College of San Francisco   I view debate as an educational rhetoric game. I try not to intervene if the debate meets two vital *principles: 1. By default, I will do my best to enforce the published rules of any event I'm judging - based on my interpretation/understanding of them. I'm open to different interpretations, but less so to arguments that "rules are bad." If you volunteer to compete in an activity for a prize (the ballot), you've committed to follow the rules as the first qualification to receive the prize. As far as I can tell, that's the only way to keep any competitive activity fair. I'm unlikely to bend on my commitment to rule adherence as I see it as a gateway to competitive equity. 2. By default, I will do my best to perpetuate a culture of inclusivity and access in forensics.   I like it when debaters are considerate and bring good will and good humor. Ultimately, I'm down for whatever you want to do. If you have specific theory questions, ask me before the round. Bonus points for weird stuff that's not abusive or exclusive. I believe I'm familiar with most of the norms of college-level debate, but I have some weaknesses. I have some difficulty flowing top-speed arguments with high-level accuracy. If you're unsure what my threshold is, look for visual cues or ask. Speed at your own risk. I did about 5 years of Parli, so if you've been doing policy since fifth grade you probably know some jargon and theory that I don't. As Sean Thai puts it, "Don't try to understand my non-verbals, because I don't understand them." Linguistically, I'm more fluent in English than I am in Debate. The only "philosopher" I know decently well is Foucault.

Joseph Evans El Camino College   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.

        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 alloted. 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). 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 your 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 augment 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)!

Joe Faina   LAVC

Rick Falvo   El Paso Community College

Bonnie Gabel McHenry County College   Structure, logic, persuasive appeals   Civility Those that are not full of jargon and technical debate aspects Speaker will receive low points for this

Jimmy Gomez Orange Coast College   The most important criteria is the language of the arguments. I pay very close attention to how things are structured and worded.   I expect respect for all involved. But also enjoy the shady back and forth that can happen as long as it's respectful.   Anything anti-establishment. I hate it.

Ashley Graham El Camino College   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.

Joshua Green Prairie State

Ryan Guy   Modesto Junior College Video Recording: I always 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 YouTube links and only sharing them with you on my ballot (I'll leave a short URL that will work once I am done uploading... typically 4n6URL.com/XXXX). This way no one ever has to bug me about getting video files.Me:I debated NPDA at Humboldt StateI've coached Parli, NFA-LD, and a little bit of BP, IPDA, and CEDA since 2008.I teach argumentation, debate, public speaking, and a variety of other COMM studies coursesThe Basics:Post AFFs you have run on the case list or I get grumpy (https://nfald.paperlessdebate.com/)Use speechdrop.net to share files in LD and Policy Debate roundsNOTE: If you are paper only you should have a copy for me and your opponent. Otherwise you will need to debate at a slower conversational pace so I can flow all your edv. arguments. (i'm fine with faster evidence reading if I have a copy or you share it digitally)I'm fine with the a little bit of speed in NFA-LD and Parli but keep it reasonable or I might miss something.Procedurals / theory are fine but articulate the abuseI prefer policymaking but I am okay with Kritical positions. That said, run it well or I might be grumpy.I default to net-benefits unless you tell me otherwiseTell me why you win.   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.   NFA-LD SPECIFIC THINGS:Files: I would like debaters to use www.speechdrop.net for file exchange. It is faster and eats up less prep. If for some reason that is not possible, 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. I tend to feel paper only debate hurts education and fairness in the round. If you only use paper I would like a copy for the entire round so I may read along with you. If you can't provide this digitally or on paper, you will need to slow down and speak at a slow conversational pace so I can flow everything you say.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. Here is the case list as of 2018. Get your stuff on it: https://nfald.paperlessdebate.com/If your opponent is anti-case list you should run a wiki spec argument on them. I think that teams who chose to not disclose their affirmatives are abusive to teams who do.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 theory that articulates that.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 were 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. Kritiques: I tend to be more of a fan of policymaking rounds. That said I will vote on Kritical posistions. 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 overviews and 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. If someone asks you to slow down 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. I'll also listen and vote on theory in regards to speed, but I will NEVER stop a round for speed reasons in any form of debate. If you think the other team should lose for going fast you will have to make that argument.   Safety: I believe that debate is an important educational activity. I think it teaches folks to speak truth to power and trains folks to be good citizens and advocates for change. As a judge I never want to be a limiting factor on your speech. That said the classroom and state/federal laws put some requirements on us in terms of making sure that the educational space is safe. If I ever feel the physical well-being of the people in the round are being threatened, I am inclined to stop the round and bring it to the tournament director. 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 logical 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 procedural arguments, Kritiques, and other debate theory if it is run well. I'm also generally okay with a little 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.

Hannah Haghighat   Orange Coast College   Typically, impact calculus is what I value most. Stock issues are key and I want there to be clash in a debate, so make sure you are topical. I also value

speakers who engage with the audience and are immediate in their style of speaking.   I expect debaters to be respectful of one another. There is no reason to be rude to each other. With partner-to-partner communication, I prefer you pass notes to each other. If you need to speak to each other, make sure you are still being respectful of the person who is speaking. I am a Tabula Rasa judge. Make sure you connect the dots for me and make meaningful connection throughout the debate. Be clear, and tell me why I should vote for your team.   I do not like speed. Talk like a human. Delivery is part of being persuasive. I am okay with jargon as long as it is purposeful and isn't just being thrown around without reason. I understand the value of procedural arguments and believe they are a necessary part of debate. However, I am opposed to using procedurals just to use them, particularly when arguments don't make sense and don't apply to the round. At the end of the day, I want to see a debate that is fun, clean, and has clash.

David Hale   East Los Angeles College   I'll use the rubric for IPDA as my guide. I expect the debaters to understand the expectation of the tournament as it relates to boundry. Anything else... I guess I'll make a call when I see an issue?   (IPDA) Strategies that seem to align with a bit of sell rather than a hyper focused line by line. I'll expect students to adjust based on their needs. I have a high school level ability to process speed but probably won't be heavly flowing the case.

Doug Hall   Casper College   I am looking for a solid argument, clear logic, evidenced based messaging, and a room free from hostility. I will listen to procedural arguments but am not predisposed to vote for them. They MUST BE well placed and linked clearly. I need to hear VERY clear violation, standards, and voters to even consider voting for a procedural argument. If a Kritik, I need to hear a real link to the resolution or aff case. Also, if your Kritik smells at all like a project K or prewritten speech, I will drop you immediately. More than anything, I want you to enjoy the round, make impassioned logical arguments, and do what you do best.

Wade Hescht   Lone Star College - North Harris

Amy Hileman   Northern Virginia Community College   Good arguments well explained Be nice Fairly open but do not overuse debate jargon. Debate should be accessible and well explained to all. No speeding

M'Liss Hindman   Tyler Junior College   Clarity of arguments and how well they link to what has been said in the round. I also like overall organization to be clear.   Politeness to one another and good sportsmanship. I am rather open to most arguments but don't prefer "squirrel" cases.   I do not like excessive speed or jargon. I prefer good communication skills.

Dewi Hokett   Palomar College

Fallon Hopper   Competed for Lone Start College Kingwood/San Jacinto College   All debaters should be respectful and students and judges are involved in an educated debate. I like to see good clash and support in each argument. I will entertain topicality arguments as long as they are necessary and not used as a filler for negative arguments. I expect students to respect their opponents while having a knowledgeable debate. There is no need to speed through argumentation. I do not like spreading. The purpose of debate is to educate one another. I do not like critiques. I prefer that the argumentation has solid links to the case with impacts. Please provide a straight flow in which both the opponent and judge can follow.   I am perfectly fine with jargon and technical elements of debate. Debate is an educational/communication event. I have no interest in how many words you speak in a minute. I am focused on the education and arguments in the round.

Patricia Hughes Rio Hondo College   I prefer fun, topical rounds; with articulated, well warranted and impacted case arguments. While I understand the beast of competition, there is no need to be rude. I will vote down a team if they are rude or condescending. There is no need to belittle the other team; it does not prove your intelligence. Bullying is unacceptable and poor sportsmanlike.   When weighing a round, I look first at stock issues, then weigh the clash on the advantage vs disadvantage, using the judging criteria. I like clear analysis of the functionality of each position (plan/counter plan/advantage/disadvantage). Simply put, explain how your warrants lead to your impacts on the advantage/disadvantage. Also explain how your impacts happen, and what your impacts mean. Terminalize, but only use nuclear war or mass extinction if it is actually warranted. On plan/counter plan, explain each plank, how the plan functions (works), and how it is going to solve the issue at hand. Fiat is not clear analysis. Counter plans should have a clear explanation of mutual exclusivity. Permutations should have a new plan text with both plan and counter plan, with an explanation of how they work together. I also have a soft spot for clearly articulated significance arguments. Also, make sure to call out points of order.   I have a moderate tolerance for speed; however, I am not a fan of it. I like clear and articulate arguments. I believe speed is a useless tool that is irrelevant to everyday life. Do not spread or I will drop the first team to spread. I pay close attention to calls of slow/clear/speed. If any of the above are called, and the teams it is called against does not slow or improve articulation, they will be dropped. When it comes to theory arguments, use them sparingly. Procedurals are useful tools when stock issues are not met by Aff. Call topicality and trichotomies when the Aff is not upholding their prima facia burdens. Do not run procedural as a time skew tactic, or as an argument used in every round. I take the rules of debate seriously. Abusing these arguments will not end well for you. When running a procedural, I am looking for clear articulation of the violation, standards, and impacted voters; as well as counter definitions. I do consider RVI arguments; however, they should include counter standards and voters.

Jeannie Hunt Northwest College   I want to be able to judge the round with no 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 – policy making, critical, big picture, etc. That framework is what I will follow, so please don't set the round up as a stock round, and then ask me to look at the big picture 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.   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. 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.   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. 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. 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. 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 your hat off and tuck your shirt in. Having a bad attitude is as bad as having a bad argument. Speed is not a problem if it is clear.

Sasan Kasravi DVC   1. At the end of the day, all I'm really concerned with when making a decision is what the largest impact in the round is, then I'll consider whether I buy that the team who made the argument accesses that impact, and if I buy that your impact is the most important and that it happens, I'll vote for you. With that said, I try to intervene as little as possible, so it would be best if this analysis is given by you directly, rather than me having to decide on my own what the most important impact in the round is.   . I am not particularly traditionalist about decorum. My primary concerns are first that the debaters are all comfortable, and second that they're in a position to put forward their best work. Maybe for you that means being somewhat formal and standing and all that, and that's totally cool. But if you think the quality of your debate is going to be better by you wearing a hoodie and sitting down while you speak, then I will not hold that against you — certainly not in my decision about the round.

3. I think this is a weird question. I will tell you what arguments I'm predisposed AGAINST, and the only real heads up that I feel I should give is that I am not particularly a fan of Kritiks. I've voted for them before, and I'll probably have to vote for them again in the future — I'm just not a big fan. To explain, for me, it comes down to two things. A kritik argues that something in the debate I'm judging has real world impacts beyond the hypothetical implications we're talking about and that those should come first. That presents two issues for me. The first is that if I really believe that my vote in this debate is going to create significant impacts in the real world, then I think it's reasonable for me to intervene in how I vote slightly more than I would otherwise, because it's kind of unfair to tell me that my vote is life or death for real people in the real world, but not give me any autonomy in whether I believe you or not. Second, I find that most kritiks have very weak solvency arguments. More often than not, I don't believe that my vote in a community college debate round is actually going to serve a significant role in ending capitalism (for instance).   4. I'm comfortable with these things. My concern is first and foremost INCLUSIVITY in the debate. In other words, I will be able to keep up with your speed or jargon, but I don't enjoy judging rounds where I feel that one side lost simply because they weren't fast enough or exposed to enough technical debate. I prefer the winner of the debate to have stronger substance in their argumentation. So please do me a favor and be inclusive of all of your opponents and the other judges that may be on your panel. But with that said, at the end of the day I am tabula rasa and will make my decision based on my flow.

Natalie Kellner Contra Costa College

Tyler Kline Saddleback College   My two biggest criteria in round are clash and impact calculus. While I understand the need for procedural arguments I prefer they be limited to the necessity. The debate should be on the chosen resolution rather than unnecessary abuse arguments. All claims should be impacted out to the highest logical degree, express the importance of who, what, and where has been impacted and to what degree.   The round should be conducted fairly and with civility on both sides. For parliamentary rounds I am accepting of partner to partner communication but it should be short and not distracting. I will only flow the information given by the assigned speaker but I do not appreciate a ventriloquist act. Competitors are expected to act respectfully to each other as well as the judge. Procedural arguments should only be run when absolutely necessary. If there is a legitimate breach of procedure or an abuse of the rules then the corresponding argument is warranted. Any competitor spreading will be dropped. Speed will be met with an immediate drop. I see the necessity for jargon but do not just hurl terms at me with no link or explanation.

Jared Kubicka-Miller Santiago Canyon College   Best arguments win.   Don't speak over each other. Partner communication affects speaker points, but not the win/loss.   Topicality is about ground. Impacts are everything. I do my best to see what speed is within everyone's ability. I have never found myself voting for the number of arguments. Speed isn't a replacement for critical thinking.

Chris Langone Oakton CC

 Alexis Litzky City College of San Francisco

Blake Longfellow   DVC

Daniel Lopez Hartnell I mostly look to impact of arguments/advocacy. Whoever can show the clearest impact typically gets my ballot. However, I have no problem evaluating each round and applying an appropriate ruling based on procedure, decorum, or any other issue presented as significant.   I expect debate students to be civil with each other. I dislike yelling and name calling (in all its variations). We are all here to share ideas. I do have an inclination to social justice, but will not rule solely on those arguments. I dislike ridiculous end-world scenarios; everything does not lead to nuclear war or 4 more years of a sitting president. I prefer more realistic arguments.   I prefer debate to be as accessible as possible. Arguments should not be hidden behind a veil of debate tactics. Do not spread in my round, and always clarify if someone does not know the terminology. Procedural arguments are a double-edged sword in my room. I will intervene when unfair tactics are employed, but I strongly dislike running a procedural simply for the sake of running a procedural.

Chris Lowry Palomar College

Bill Lucio   Highland Community College

Beth MacDonald   Del Mar College Which side upholds the value better or best establishes & upholds the criteria.   Assertive, but courteous interactions. FACE THE AUDIENCE/JUDGE, not

opponent. Signpost/Roadmap throughout debate. Extend arguments to end. Voters great. Don't like FIAT I can handle any speed. CLASH and extend arguments through to end of round.

Lisa McNeil El Paso Community College

Floyd McConnell San Jacinto College North

Jasmine McLeod Mt. San Antonio College

Sarah Metivier Schadt McHenry County College Structure and Logic, persuasive appeals, no jargon Civility but don't overdo it I don't have a paradigm for IPDA They will receive low speaker points

Erik Miller N/A Clarity and logic. I judge based on momentum. What and who's issues are we talking about at the end of the round and have any significant points been swept under the rug by the opposition. Absolute politieness and sincere cordiality. No hushed arguing with your partner while the opposition is speaking, no eye rolling or mocking facial expressions. No yelling. I like impacts, but in general none. I want the speakers to forget "the flow" and crystalize the debate into voters at the end. Speed isn't a problem for me, but you'd better be intelligible. I like theory and definition arguments, but I am mainly looking for clash and the Aff/Gov to meet a burden of proof. I'm extremely pragmatic.

Scarlett Miller Casper College Argumentation and logic. I expect that all debaters will treat each other with civility. I listen for sound, logical argumentation. I'm not predisposed to consider any specific arguments I do not like speed, but understand it's place in the activity. I have extensive experience in debate, so jargon and technical elements, including procedural arguments, don't bother me.

Jacob Montez Las Positas College

Joshua Montez las positas weight of logical points The highest none depends on how well it was delivered

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.

Nidsa Mouritsen   University of Nevada, Reno   Substantive argumentation is the most important criteria for me. It's important to me that you understand and can articulate your points well, particularly if you are arguing something unusual.   For decorum the only thing that really matters to me is that you are courteous to your partner and opponents. I don't have a predisposition for or against any particular arguments.   I enjoy fast technical debate, but substance is more important than being gamesy. So while I think fast debate is fun and challenging, a good, substantive slow debate is just as valuable to me.

Stephanie Mu Pasadena City College   My background has mostly been in IE's but I am open to any argument you want to have as long as everything is clear, logical, and respectful. Organization and structure are important as I default to using my flow as basis of judging. I don't mind being blunt and direct but be considerate. You can be assertive without being aggressive. Be respectful of each other and mindful of your rhetoric.   I am open to any strategy/position/argument that you find important as long as arguments are clearly articulated and organized. Don't have an issue with it but I prefer word choice over speed. Be mindful of speed with fellow debaters and adjust accordingly so that it is accessible for everyone in the room. Jargon and technical elements are fine so long as you articulate the effect/weight it has in round. P.S. have fun!

Douglas Mungin   Solano Community College

David Nadolski Oakton Community College   Solid arguments as well as organization of clash, and speaking at a sane speed. I'm not a huge fan of inappropriate topicality arguments. IN other words, run T all day... but ONLY if its not whining and is very justified. Otherwise just get to the debate   Politeness and that there be no table talk. This whole "its not my turn but Ill feed my partner word for word what to say" is terrible. You can pass a note but no ventriloquism. and no Ks.   I am a left leaning centrist politically but logic will sway me regardless I say I despise speed because I can't think of a stronger word. Maybe abhor. Don't do it. I am ok with jargon and technical terms as long as they come with a quick definition in case IDK what it is.

John Nash   Moraine Valley I do not have a judging philosophy. What this means is that I typically only judge IPDA. You should treat the round as if you are two people chatting around the dinner table discussing different sides of the same issue. Please never tell me "this is why you should vote for me" or "this is why I win this point." Please keep all debate lingo out of the round. Please make sure that the debate you are running is not one you have done prior or one that you have a premade case for. Canned cases will always get you the loss. Have fun and be nice. Be nice and play fair. Do not do silly things like thank the peanut gallery.   Ethos Pathos Logos   Never do it!

William Neesen Irvine Valley College   In most instances what you tell me to look at. Set up what you think it should be and defend it. If left to my own accord I will be a policy maker. What you need to know is that I have done/judged debate my whole life and I have seem many different styles of debate. IPDA is a different beast and do not treat it like NPDA   Be nice to each other, there is no reason to be a jerk. I

also am not sure we are in court so we can be a little less formal.   I hate aff projects that ignore the topic. I dislike RVIs Speed as a weapon sucks, so go only as fast as other team. Technical debate is fun. IPDA should not have speed or jargon.

Junior Ocasio Illinois Central College Don't know   Don't know   Don't know   Don't know

Dave Odasso   San Diego Mesa College Ethical Clash.   Do not demean the other team or competitor.   Anything not on-case (Topicality, K, etc...) discussed, you will need to persuade me to believe you, which is not easy. I'm not a novice. However speed is not educational, jargon needs to be explained briefly, and I discussed "technical elements" previously. Please know that debate is a form of professional communication and should be performed as such.

Andy Orr   College of Southern Idaho   My primary criteria revolves around the burdens in debate. Two sides join the round already resolved on the issue. The affirmative has the burden of proof, and must provide an advocacy. The negative has the burden of rejoinder, and must argue against the affirmative's position. To meet this burden, the negative can either defend the status quo, having both presumption, or may advocate for a different change (as the affirmative has para-metricized the resolution). My primary role is to listen to the arguments presented and determine if I am persuaded to support or reject the resolution. Thus, after burdens, I will look to the on-case stock issues. The only stock issue that is a default voter is inherency. If the status quo is already addressing the problem, then there is no reason to prefer the plan. Disproving harms and significance are at best mitigations. If you win those arguments, there still is no reason not to vote for the plan. Solvency and advantages must be turned to become voters. You'll need to prove the plan causes the opposite effect. However if you mitigate either of these, you'll need to pair it with a disadvantage or counter plan to give me a reason not to try the plan. Next I look to off-case positions, including topicality and critiques. These must have good structure and be complete in it's construction (I won't fill in the blanks for you regarding warrants and jurisdiction). Additionally any off case argument needs a clear under-view when it is presented (not just in the rebuttals) indicating how it fits into the round, and how I should consider it in my vote. I prefer rebuttals based on debate theory to be the first counter/refutation against an argument. In essence, they are a reverse voting issue (you should reject this argument on face based on this theory), and do not easily fit into a line-by-line. Take a few moments and tell me the theory story, then (just in case I don't buy it) get into actually refuting the argument.   As a communication instructor, I believe the purpose of this activity is to prepare students to critically think and engage others in a meaningful way. Ergo, students should deliver arguments clearly and with at a rate that emphasizes communication. I am convinced that a fewer, well-developed arguments can prove to be more persuasive than a larger quantity of thinly-constructed arguments. Furthermore, students should address argument parts individually rather than grouping during the constructive speeches. The final rebuttals are the appropriate place to provide summary voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.   I have no preference in terms of philosophical, theoretical, or empirical arguments as long as they contain the three parts to make them an argument. Be sure that each part is present: claim, warrant, conclusion (impact). Use this strategy: a. I say...... b. because...... c. and this means... On Policy & Fact Debate: For organization, sign post your tag lines, and give your

citation again at the end of the card. That way we know you have finished quoting material. Avoid oral prompting as much as possible. I consider it to be rude and disrespectful toward your partner. Additionally, part of this activity is learning to work as a team and depending on another person for your success. This is an essential skill in life and you would never use verbal prompting in a business meeting, sales pitch, or political speech. Ergo, it really has no place in an activity designed to create in students those skills. On Value Debate: Value debate is by definition, a meta analysis of a topic. The first level of that debate is the overarching value. Students should present and defend a value that has been carefully chosen to have a non-absurd and debatable counter value e.g. capitalism vs. socialism and not freedom vs slavery (forces the opponent to be morally repugnant). Wonderful debates can occur on by debating value level, but they rarely will win the debate because people (smarter than us) have discussed these for generations and we still have no certain truths. Criteria are the next level of the meta debate. Again we could have a wonderful discussion on the merits of act utilitarianism vs. the categorical imperative, but it would not settle the issue, nor would it persuade the judge on either side of the resolution (although you can win a round by default if your opponent is not able to effectively articulate their value or criterion). Criterions are most useful if treated separately as a test of your contentions rather than a policy-type mechanism for testing (achieving) the value. Your contentions are the real heart of the debate and should be the main focus. Claim, warrant, and conclusion are essential to every argument and can be contested on each or every one of those tenants. The key in value debate is to provide context after giving your argument as to how it affects the criterion and proves your case & value. I would find it difficult to vote for a kritik in general, and it would be extremely unlikely in a value round. First, there is already so much to cover in a limited amount of time; I don't think one can do the kritik justice (in other words, I am not often convinced of their educational/rhetorical value because we simply do not have enough time to reach that goal). That being said, if there is an in-round instance prompting a performative kritik, I think there can be a direct link made to education and the ballot being used as a tool. Second, these arguments by their nature avoid the proposed topic. Thus, they skew preparation time when run by the affirmative and are seemingly a method of last resort when put forward by the negative. Moreover, in a value debate, a kritik provides no ground (or morally reprehensible ground) on which to make a counter case. Thus, the only way to rebuttal is to argue against the philosophical grounding (which leads to a muddled debate at best) or the alternatives which makes it a de-facto policy debate (and is contrary to the purpose of value debate).   My role is to select the best debater(s) in the round, not the most cleaver, fastest talker(s). Thus, "dropping" an argument is not an independent voting issue for me. If the opposition has been non-responsive, you must argue the point and explain the relevance to the round. I will not punish a team simply because they were "spread" out of the round; don't be afraid to actually debate the issues!

Jen Page   Cypress College

Kelsey Paiz Chabot College

Justin Perkins Cypress

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 these arguments 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 that notice 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 I do not have a judging philosophy. What this means is that I typically only judge IPDA. You should treat the round as if you are two people chatting around the dinner table discussing different sides of the same issue. Please never tell me "this is why you should vote for me" or "this is why I win this point." Please keep all debate lingo out of the round. Please make sure that the debate you are running is not one you have done prior or one that you have a premade case for. Canned cases will always get you the loss. Have fun and be nice. Be nice and play fair. Ethos Pathos Logos Do not use it!

Thuy Pham   Mt. San Antonio College

Hillary Phillips College of the Canyons

Tyler Pierce   Casper College While I have enough debate experience to be totally ok with jargon, procedural, and theory based arguments, I mostly value effective communication and solid argumentation. I don't look for anything in particular, I just want solid clash and compelling delivery and argumentation. Basically I want to see you do whatever it is that you do best."

Scott Plambek San Diego Mesa College When evaluating debate, I value clear, enthusiastic delivery that is well-tailored to the audience. Additionally, I value a balanced approach to persuasion, that embodies Ethos, Pathos and Logos (rather than the purely logic-driven approaches to debate). I expect debaters to treat their team members and competitors with respect. In my opinion, there is no justification for treating a competitor poorly during a round.   I am not familiar with advanced debate strategies and tactics. So, many of these would be ineffective while I am judging, unless they are explained clearly within the round.   I am not familiar with advanced debate jargon. So, overly technical approaches to debate/persuasion are unlikely to benefit competitors.

Sherana Polk   Orange Coast College   I am looking to see which team upheld their burdens the best. Therefore, I think that each team should be clear in the beginning of their presentation about what they need to do in order to win the debate. Afterwards, I look to see if their arguments did the best job at upholding their burdens and pointing out flaws and inconsistencies with the other team. I also am a fan of stock issues. Therefore, if you are running policy then I am looking to see a discussion of advantages vs. disadvantage. If you are running a value debate than I actually want both teams to discuss a value and do the job of connecting the value to every single argument. If you are running a fact debate than make sure that you have sufficient and substantial arguments to prove your side accurate.

     Debaters should be respectful and cordial with one another. If students are rude that will definitely cost them speaker points and possibly even the round. This activity should highlight the best of ourselves. So be assertive, be considerate, and have fun. Partner-to-partner communication is fine. Make sure that it is not too excessive. If you keep interrupting your partner than I feel that you don't trust your partner and therefore I don't know if I should trust your partner. Also, I only flow the person who has the floor is saying. Therefore, if it needs to be on my flow make sure the person whose time to speak is actually the one making the argument. I like clash. I want both teams to engage in the debate and really analyze the arguments that were made by their opponents. In each argument that is presented I want clear and accurate evidence that supports the positions that you are making and I want you to impact your arguments out. What do I or the community at large get if I vote for your side? Really walk me through the results of your idea. Ultimately, I am willing to listen to any position as long as it is clearly and thoroughly explained, that it explicitly links to the resolution, that it is impacted out, and that it simply makes sense. For IPDA I abhor speed, jargon, and technical elements. IPDA is not Parli and it should not be treated like Parli. Therefore, speak in a normal conversational tone, present evidence, and have thoughtful arguments that are well explained and connect back to your side of the topic. a competitor who treats an IPDA round as just single person parli will be less likely to win my ballots. For Parli and NFA-LD, I am not a fan of speed either. I need to be able to understand you and if you are going too fast then I am less likely to catch everything on my flow. If my flow is missing arguments than I may miss the crucial argument that would lead to vote for your side. I will clear competitors who are going too fast. If I clear you and you still have decided not to adjust your speed

then you will lose the round. Competitors can also clear each other if you think that others are going too fast as well. If competitors don't adjust their speaking style then run an argument on it. As far as jargon and tech goes I am open to listen to any argument with any labeling that the competitor wants to provide. Just clearly explain and link each argument back to the resolution. I am not a huge fan of K's simply because the vast majority of them are not explained well, does not link at all to what is happening in the round, and is just a cheap ploy to get out of discussing the issue. So if you run a K make sure that it really connects to what is happening in the round and make sure that it is explained well. For T debates I am down to listen to them. I don't think that T's must have articulated abuse in order for the T to function. If Gov team mis-defined the round, even if it still gives debatable ground to the opp, I will still vote in favor of the T. However, if the T is ran just to use up time I become very unsympathetic to the opp and it may be more challenging to win my ballot. I like CP's but make sure that they are non-topical.

Miguel Porfirio Del Mar College Is there clash? Or do they just run topicality arguments. I was taught that there is always something to debate.   Keep things nice and civil.   Who's plan has the most solvency Speed is ok as long as you slow down your taglines and articulate your words. If I can't hear what you're saying, then what you're telling me is that you don't care about your argument and neither should I.

Erika Portillo El Paso Community College

Jeff Przybylo Harper Clear argumentation. Eloquence matters to me in all forms of debate.   Treat each other with respect.   Well reasoned and supported arguments.   For the most part, I am an IE judge and coach. I judge about ten parli round a year and 10 IPDA rounds. I understand the rules and jargon for the most part. If you want to debate "debate" you are going to lose me. If you MUST make technical arguments about the debate-- make them, be clear and move on.

Reed Ramsey DVC   1. The short of it is I am a policy maker who evaluates impacts first and foremost, but I still expect the debate to have good warrants/evidence for justification of arguments. If you compare impacts through a nuanced calculus your odds are much higher for picking up my ballot. I tend to vote for the team who makes me do less work   2. My only expectation for proper decorum is that you treat each other with respect. 3. I am predisposed to listen to things such as: Disadvantages, counter plans, Topicality/theory arguments, and criticisms.   4. For the technical side of the debate I anticipate you being able to identify arguments, but I Do not want you to make jargon and crutch. The thing I evaluate more than anything are practical breakdowns of arguments and applying them as specific as possible. Speed is okay for me, but I am a firm believer that you can make just as many concise arguments at a slower rate.

Salim Razawi Las Positas College

Zach Rosen Saddleback College   Persuasiveness of argumentation. Any competitor can speak at a high rate or invoke a theoretical argument. Very few debaters qualify their choices, however, and fewer still actively attempt to persuade the judge to agree with their position as opposed to simply stating that their opponent is wrong.   To be cordial and professional. There is no room or need to act

in any other manner.   I am predisposed to vote against arguments like topicality or kritiks when not adequately justified by the debater invoking it. When it comes to structural arguments I do not believe in tabla rasa. There is no evidence in either cognitive or cognitive neuroscience that such a state exists, even at birth, in human beings (contrary to Rousseau's writings) If the technical argument is justified and you can PERSUADE me of such, I'll vote on them. There is no consistent definition amongst coaches in terms of the lexical definition of most of the terms that are grouped under jargon. Unless you want me to impose my particular definition of a term, define it and define it well. Or better yet, don't use it as a crutch. I will strike any arguments from my flow that are given at a rate of higher than 150 WPM (If I think you're speeding, I will actively time you to discern if this is the case at the expense of documenting your arguments).

David Rosnovjak   Harper College

Jessica Samorano   Las Positas College

Jessica Ashley Samorano   Las Positas College LPC N/A   N/A   N/A   N/A

Hal Sanford   Santa Rosa Junior College   For me, stock issues are the most important criteria. Affirmative's failure to present a prima facia case is problematic, as is not demonstrating by a preponderance of persuasion the motive (harm), blame (inherency), plan, and solvency/advantage. Viable counter plans should present a non-topical, forced choice, not being perm-able. Be polite. Do not belittle or insult. Partner communication is fine, but I only flow words from the recognized speaker. Again, be nice! Remember, there is always somebody meaner and smarter than you who would love to avenge their friend who was humiliated by a rude competitor. Do you want that karma, seriously?! Just be nice. Relevant and well-structured arguments with real world examples are always nice. Weighing of opposing positions through the lenses of probability, timeframe, and magnitude is also a winning choice. Finally, a word of caution to those who plan on running critiques: Make critiques relevant to the resolution, the opponents' case, or both. Be smart about this. In debate, there is a resolution. It is the focus of the debate, not a debater's personal agenda, which can be beautifully expressed in any number of individual events.   IPDA should be at a conversational rate. NFA-LD rules say speed is antithetical to the event, but everybody seems to ignore the rules. Hmmm. Parli is often fast. Bottom line: if either I or an opponent says "clear" (meaning you are not enunciating well) or speed (meaning you are talking too fast), I strongly suggest you heed their request, or mine. As far as jargon goes, explain it to me so I know you know what you're doing. Explain the "perm," telling me that both the counterplan and plan can be run without necessitating a forced choice, a requirement of a viable counter plan. Technical elements are most important in parli and in NFA-LD. Please structure arguments and provide warranted arguments. If you are running a topicality challenge, I want the word(s) being challenged, your interpretation of what that word or phrase should be, the opponent's violating interpretation, standards that support your interpretation, and voters (a priori, fairness, education, etc.)

Annie Sauter Harper College I'm primarily an I.E. judge, but here's my debate spiel. 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 relaying your ideas and your argument. I pay close attention to your also weighing mechanism. When you set up a clear weighing mechanism and suggest it as criteria for how I should evaluate the rest debate, that's what I'm most likely to do. Debate the thing you're actually supposed to be debating about. Clash is fun. Clash is key. 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, kind 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. If you're presenting a sound argument, you shouldn't feel compelled to boss me around. If I experience this, or witness ANY lack of respect towards your fellow competitor, expect an unfavorable ballot. 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 (e.g. We shouldn't convince companies to invest in wind energy because eventually turbines will become robots and take over the ENTIRE EARTH! Bleep-Blorp). But really, Real world consequences are most likely going to make me listen and consider your argument.   I don't like jargon, but 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. Lastly, this is supposed to be fun. Relax! You are awesome. If you're having fun, so am I.

William Schubert   Las Positas College   N/A   N/A   N/A   N/A

John Schultz   Tallahassee   The most important facet of the round is the judging criteria. All of your arguments should connect back to that. Arguing about other philosophical elements of the opposing team is misdirected energy. Also, don't simply summarize in your rebuttal. If you want to win the round, the rebuttal should be bullet items to support that.   Have fun and be respectful of each other.   I judge in a holistic manner. As I said above, pay attention to the JC. I expect direct clash on pertinent issues in the round. Give me a road map of where you intend to go in each of your speeches. I'm also a fan of highlighting fallacies of argumentation in your opponent's case. Not a fan of speed. Communicators who are persuasive, clean, and organized usually win my rounds. Speed kills. More is not always better. If you spread and the other teams drops points, it has little bearing for me. Jargon and technical elements are fine, but make sure you explain it all. Ask me if you have any other questions.

Shanna Shultz   Sound argumentation is the starting point for any good debate; depth of analysis is rewarded over "quantity" of clever attempted argument. In other words, depth over breadth is preferred. I enjoy hearing new types of arguments and case studies applied throughout the debate, evaluating various applications of policy or philosophy to diverse settings.   The ancient art of civility is the foundation of discourse. I expect for debaters to be firm and resolute but respectful as well as gracious listeners.   I tend to prefer "real world" mpx calcs over technical mpx but I weigh them both. I do not entertain arguments that are well known and developed (e.g. eco-fem ks or politics da) that become just lingo on the flow without the actual work of extending and refutation. If you don't have the time to run a complex argument (even it's well known in the community), then don't run it [[looking at Ks in NFALD]].   I can keep up with speed and jargon, but believe that public debate should be accessible to all audiences. It's the speaker's responsibility to make sure I am catching all their arguments - I do my best to keep up with everything, but I default to the speakers to tell me what I

should know. I have no explicit bias against or for technical elements as I recognize that all organizations develop standards of competition. I'm here for it all!

Erin Shadrick Casper College Be fair, be logical, use evidence to support your claims. I'm fine with any kind of arguments.

Taureanna Shimp Modesto Junior College

Kacy Stevens 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 links to nuclear war or other hyperbolic scenarios that are easily broken, I am unlikely to vote on such unrealistic impacts, especially if they have been delinked. 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, organization, and ethos matter significantly more in IPDA than in parli. I highly value courteous and respectful debate in both parli and IPDA. 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. 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. However, I will pick back up my pen and continue flowing when the speaking rate becomes reasonable enough to flow. I also believe that speed impacts credibility. While debate relies heavily upon logos, ethos and pathos should not be ignored. Beyond speed, I also highly encourage debaters to use strong organization including, tag lines, 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 and IMPACT them, but not force them to work.

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.

Tyler Stewart Lower Columbia College, University of Nevada - Reno I don't want to see maximized magnitude with no attention to propensity for the bad effects to happen. High magnitude with no

probability to happen will not see my vote. I'm fine with critiques but prefer policy debate. I loathe topicality arguments but if there is a legitimate concern about trying to worm your way out of trying to debate the opposing team on good terms I will side with the team arguing for topicality violation.

Don't be snarky, degrading of opponents or school/major. Don't talk over your partner. If your opponents need clarification on an argument, please give it to them.   I'm biased in favor of left wing ideas but honestly I would not bank on that bias saving a poorly thought out argument. I only disclose this bias because it would be unrealistic to believe that my biases have no effect on my voting. I do not as a rule disregard any argument someone wishes to make on the basis of personal disagreement with the plan or critique. Give me one or two (max three) well thought out arguments that have support for high probability of impacts. For critiques I don't really care how strictly one sticks with particular literature. It would be best if you can take a complicated and in depth value analysis and make it digestible for as many people as possible. Having good definitions set up will help with that. don't make blanket statements about groups or ideologies. I want specific arguments against data analysis, values and policy impacts not "X group is bad" or "they're emulating Y group which is bad".   Never speed! I used to do it but have since realize how completely useless of skill it is. It circumvents having to actually debate well thought out points by drowning opponents in a sea of argumentation and it actively pushes out people with hearing disabilities or speech impairments. As for jargon, since I've been out of debate for a couple years now I may not be familiar with new terminology and it's my personal belief that if an argument can be made more accessible and easily understood by people unfamiliar with debate, then it's going to be more persuasive overall. Off the top of my head the only technique I can't stand is a topicality time suck. If you believe your opponent has misinterpreted the resolution and that has made the debate unfair, that is the only argument I'm going to listen to. At that point I don't care about any other arguments and dropping a topicality is an instant loss. Saying your opponent is being unfair and needs to be punished with a loss will have to be your only argument your team makes.

Josh Sunderbruch   Harper I look for consistency in argumentation. I expect logical connections to be made with eloquence and without requiring intervention on my part. I expect debaters to remember that they are engaged in an educational activity that has its basis in the oratorical tradition. Debaters should be courteous, thoughtful, and committed to the event as an educational space. I will consider almost any argument if it is well-constructed. For example, I will vote on well-argued procedurals, but I will also vote against them as a reverse-voting issue when warranted and when urged to appropriately. I will vote for complex philosophical arguments that are applied well, but I will not intervene on behalf of some convention because a debate theorist said I should in a journal. I expect counterplans to be both counter-resolutional and competitive, and I see maybe one well-run counterplan a year. In general, I resist the idea that there is a single proper form of debate and that unwritten rules do the work for the debaters--instead, I expect the necessary argumentation to take place in the round.   How do you evaluate speed, jargon, and technical elements? I will not flow speed and will simply drop my pen to indicate as much. I am okay with jargon when it is accurately used, but it is not a replacement for impact analysis. Technical elements, likewise, have their place. I love well-run technical meta-debates. However, I have little tolerance for competitors running aspects of debate that they do not understand, or expecting that one form of debate (i.e. IPDA) will conform to the rules or conventions of another form of debate (i.e. CEDA) just because.

Sean Thai   University of Nevada, Reno   The most important thing I look for in debate is strong access to the impacts via the standards debate. The better the links the better your chances to win are. Of course, this has to be contexualized via the facts that the your links should be resolving your uniqueness claims, and that your links have some explanatory power for how they resolve impacts, especially specific impact scenarios.   I have little expectations of decorum from debaters. The bare minimum that I require is simply that we be courteous and accepting to all people, and take into account all their needs and accessibiltiy requests.   I have little predisposition for strategies. I evaluate everything largely on the flow. I excel at technical debate. I evaluate technical debate, speed, and jargon with no bias or predisposition.

Kyra Tillmans Las Positas College   Logic Be classy   International POV   If you can deliver a technical argument with limited to no jargon, you're doing a good job. If you're going too fast and I can't understand you, you're missing the point.

Grant Tovmasian   Rio Hondo College   The most important criteria for me is logical consistency. I will avoid interceding on anyone'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. 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 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.

Shannan Troxel-Andreas   Butte College

Dana Trunnell Prairie State

Roxanne Tuscany Grossmont College . I want to hear clear, well structured, arguments. I want the speaker to label their points/sign posting throughout. I need a road map, throughout the speech, not just at the top of the speech. I am "flowing" the debate, on legal pads, which means on one or two pieces of paper. Which also means I am not "wasting" paper.  I want to hear arguments that have claims, with reasoning/evidence. I believe that this is an educational activity that teaches some very important skills from the areas of argumentation and public speaking. I believe that the developers of Parli put in some very sound parameters for how the event should be run. Therefore, I expect the speaker to stand. I only want to hear from the speaker, not from their partner. You may pass notes, but make sure it is discreet. At a state or national tournament, I know that there are different terms/jargon that have developed from individual regions. Therefore, don't assume that everyone should know the same terms. If you use a term, quickly explain it, the first time you use it. I welcome an opposing team to ask the other team for explanations of their terms. I do not expect that team to respond with something like, "everyone should know this term". If that is true, give us the definition. I see far too many debaters misusing and miscommunication about jargon. I believe there is no place for spreading/speed in Parli or IPDA. Everyone who continues to encourage or allow spreading is encouraging poor communication skills, defeating the purpose of Parli/IPDA debate. It isn't about "my" ability to flow, it is about your ability to communicate logical, argumentation to any audience.

Arthur Valenzuela LAVC

Jeani Vermillion Ranger College Whose argument makes the most sense and is the most persuasive. Debating is not personal and should not be taken as personal. Arguments should stay civil. I always try to start with a clean slate and allow each speaker to persuade me. I cannot evaluate speed, I tend to put my pen down until I can understand the speaker again. I'm not up to date on jargon or technical elements and do the best I can with them.

Rajiv Vijayakumar Las Positas College Clarity, don't use technical jargon, debate the topic at hand. Be respectful, debate the topic at hand. Stay on topic, try not to run topicality cases unless absolutely necessary, absolutely no time space continuum or other garbage like that, and talk to an audience member who is able to accept competent and reasonable logic. Be clear, make sure I understand what you are saying. If I don't hear and/or comprehend what you say you won't get credited.

Trent Webb Nassau Community College A clear AFF structure is needed; even though I am open to various types of structure - it just needs to make sense. Regardless of chosen structure, please make sure tag lines are clear, evidence is clearly sourced, and however you connect your warrants (examples, narratives, etc.) should be clear as well. And it goes without saying that each argument should have impacts. For NEG, direct clash is your friend, but you should link any off-case positions to whichever NEG philosophy you've espoused. Just be clear as to what your overall approach is. Stand during CX. Avoid looking at your opponent. Be cordial at all times. When judging IPDA, I ascribe to the principles of IPDA as prescribed by their constitution and/or by-laws. Hence, I expect a highly rhetorical and oratorical-based style/approach from both debaters. This means you lose my ballot if you insist on

excessive speed, "spreading" or the act of stacking too many contentions, not being cordial, or the use of unnecessary meta-debate jargon and/or techniques. That being said, a basic knowledge and basic practice of debate theory is expected as well. Any use of speed and/or meta-debate tactics is an automatic loss of my ballot.

Nate Wensko Orange Coast College I believe that IPDA is IPDA and Parliamentary debate is Parliamentary debate. Both events should continue to be separate events. I use the point system in IPDA as a guide to who is winning the round. I feel that all arguments and procedurals are accessible to the debaters as long as they are described in a manner that a lay judge could understand. My position on evaluating a round of parliamentary debate is how well does the argumnets presented either solve or link to the impacts presented by each team. For me link, solvency and impacts are strongest when they are detailed out rather than a pile of statements that assume connections to the evidence or examples presented. I also think refutation that addresses the arguments directly and not just dismissive in nature weigh very well in the round. Decorum, I feel, now more than ever is important for teams in opposition. Being thoughtful and respectful to each during the round is a lesson that never loses value. Being responsible with rhetoric at this point in time is something we all need to continue to practice in and out of the round. Debaters should be exemplars of the aforementioned as best as they feel they can be. I will consider all positions made in a round as I do now want to limit the access of arguments allowed in a round. One note on K, I feel that this position needs to be taken if and only if the round truly calls for such an argument. Speech should be controlled in a way that both teams have access to the round and the positions being presented. Please respect the other team if they call for a slowdown in presentation. I am fine with jargon or technical elements in Parliamentary debate just be sure to not assume the jargon or technical element speaks for itself because I understand it, a little ground should be covered when such positions are presented. On partner communication: I feel the most fair ground here is that I only flow the person that is speaking at that moment and not the person sitting. I think in this way a partner is using a point of information to speak to their partner. I really enjoy listening to final rebuttals and can be a strong deciding factor in the round, so at this point there are no more points of information and only notes should be passed to each other.

Brandan Whearty Palomar College I default to how the debaters tell me to judge the round. If the debaters disagree then whoever wins that argument. Clear structure and nice treatment of one another are appreciated. Open to any set of arguments or style of arguments. I believe this is the debaters responsibility to tell me the level of importance. I am slightly hard of hearing and have damaged hands. Debate as you normally would and I will adjust you if necessary. I have difficulty with more than about 5-7 pages of argument for each side. Critics of my judging say that I place too much weight on cleverness and style of presentation.

Janene Whitesell Solano Community College

Brit Williams Highland Community College

Roger Willis Mt. San Antonio College

Melinda Womack Santiago Canyon College

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.   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.

Jacqueline Yu MT. SAC & UC BERKELEY   I am open to all forms of argumentation, so long as I can understand the speaker and flow your argument. But try your best to keep the debate about the topic at hand. It's never fun watching a debate where the opposing team gets screwed over with their prep because of topic manipulation. Also HAVE FUN and BE NICE TO ONE ANOTHER! It is a competition, but if you are rude to your opponent or partner, judges see right through it.   Dress to impress and be professional. The role of each debater is to convince the judge that they are the more right debater in the round. Prove your points, make your arguments, but do so following basic ethical guidelines (0 tolerance for racist/sexist/homophobic language).   1) Was the debate topic answered 2) Did you refute the opposing team's points 3) Were your points backed up with reason and fact - Make me able to look over the flow of the debate and think "from start to finish, this debate proved its point and

convinced me you were the better debater."   Do not spread - if I cannot make out the words you're saying, how can I understand your argument? Make the debate enjoyable for everyone, meaning we (even an inexperienced audience) can follow and flow your debate and learn from the round.