

2018 Judges Philosophies

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

Jacob Abraham Florida State College at Jacksonville

Tim Anderson Elgin Community College

Joan Andrews Tyler Junior College I am primarily an interpretation judge. I am not dumb however! So make your arguments clear and link them clearly to your opponent's. I like debaters to be polite and considerate. I am open for almost anything, but remember I don't know technical stuff. No speed, no jargon and no technical elements of debate please! Just persuade me!

Krista Appelquist Moraine Valley I think that debates need to be a blend of logic and emotion. Delivery is just as important as content. Debates should be friendly. If it sounds like a canned speech, expect to lose. I do not appreciate speed or jargon. Debates should be for all audiences.

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.

Alexis Arredondo Pasadena City College When I judge a debate the most important elements are that the arguments are cohesive, easy to follow, and have strong delivery. I expect that the debaters are respectful towards each other and the judge. The debate should be civil and well-mannered. I typically go into a debate as if I have no prior knowledge on the topic. Whichever arguments flow through, are moral, and are appropriate for the type of debate that the opposing teams agree upon, is the debate that wins. I don't judge highly on technical elements, I only want the arguments to be organized and thoughtful.

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

Nichole Barta Irvine Valley College This judge has a communication background and looks for solid, well-explained arguments. Not a fan of speed or jargon.

Alicia Baticce Pasadena City College The two most important criteria I consider when evaluating a debate is evidence and impact analysis. Debate is an educational activity designed to foster discourse. That being said, keep it respectful. Let's have fun and learn together. I'm open to any arguments presented (Topicality, E.Specs, Adv, Disadv., CP, K). It's very important that you outline and impact out each argument. Make sure to tagline and signpost during the debate. I do not like speed. Faster than normal is fine, but I value quality over quantity.

Anne Marre Bautista College of the Canyons

Robert Becker Northwest College

Left to my own devices, I will evaluate procedurals (topicality)first, then look to disadvantages and then case. I'll evaluate kritiks wherever you tell me to place them in the order of things. If you don't tell me where to place a kritik, I will probably evaluate it among the disadvantages. As a critic, I believe my task is to weigh the issues presented in the round. I don't enjoy intervening, and try not to do so. To prevent my intervention, debaters need to use rebuttals to provide a clear explanation of the issues. Otherwise, if left on my own, I will pick the issues I think are important. All of that said, I am not an information processor. I am a human being and so are you. If you want me to consider an issue in the round, make sure you emphasize it and explain its importance. When weighing issues, I always look to jurisdictional issues first. I will give the affirmative some leeway on topicality, but if they can't explain why their case is topical, they will lose. I think there needs to be resolitional analysis to justify affirmative choices. Although some arguments are more easily defeated than others, I am willing to listen to most positions. Especially at Phi Rho Pi, we are debating people from different regions of the country, and have different styles, techniques, and positions with which we have familiarity. Don't assume that I know your case or DA because it's a position you use a lot. Make sure you explain things. You want to win because you were smarter, more strategic, and better debaters. You don't want to win because you were sneaky or duped the other team. Don't try to suck up to me. You can be friendly without being smarmy. Be professional. Don't act like you are the smartest person in the room, even if you are. That said, I'm here to have fun, and I hope you are, too. When it stops being fun, we need to think about the chess club.

In reality I probably have a somewhat high threshold for topicality, so if you want to win, you need to spend some time on it and not give the aff any way out of it. In-round abuse is not necessary, but if that argument

is made against you, then you need to explain why topicality is important (jurisdiction, aff always wins, etc.) I am fine with critical arguments, but you need to explain how they impact the round. I have found few students can explain how I should evaluate real-world impacts in a debate world, or how I should evaluate and compare real world and debate world impacts. I'm fine with critical affs, but you better have some good justification for it. "We don't like the resolution" doesn't cut it with me. If your critical arguments conflict with your disad, you better have some "contradictory arguments good" answers

I believe parliamentary debate, LD, and IPDA should develop different skills regarding research and delivery, but I do not believe that they should differ in their development of critical thinking. Parliamentary debate is still debate. It needs to have clash and argument. Goofing off for an hour or so is not a good use of my time, or of yours. You can use debate terminology in front of me. Inherency, stock issues, topicality, evidence, plans, etc., are all DEBATE terms, just like voting issues are not exclusively parliamentary debate terms or practices. Once again, impress me with your ability to explain the issues to me. 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 am primarily an I-E judge, but I do have some passing familiarity with debate. I see debate as a communications event; it is your task to persuade me why you should win. I am put off my competitors who speak too quickly. Make sure to explain every detail of your arguments, and do not rely on me to understand a given link. Please do not make overly technical T and K arguments. Do not insist that you should win because of a technicality; instead, explain your stance and persuade me to listen. Delivery, clear explanation of your analysis, and strong-but-friendly clash are going to be essential to winning my ballot.

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 like excessive tag-team arguing—so unless your partner is about to lose you the round, let him or her speak. Passing a note or asking your partner an occasional POI is fine. You can ask me questions if you like, but just be civil and have fun. I had my years of debating; it is now your turn. There are lots of things I believe about debate and the world in general, but I try not to bring them into the round. Absent instructions from you, my preconceptions are as follows: I believe there is a distinction between value and policy propositions (I would never run a fact case, but you can if you want to). If it is a policy resolution, I like to have harms somewhere in the case even if they are tagged something else. I think kritiks are 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.

Brianna Bitout Harper College The most important element of debate is clash. I want your arguments to hit each other. Don't give me two separate cases that don't even mention each other's impacted arguments. Which also means, it's pertinent you impact everything back to your weighing mechanism. Otherwise, I have no way to judge your argument.

I expect debaters to remain civil, and in IPDA, polite, when debating each other. I understand debates can get heated, but debaters should refrain from ad hominem arguments and being outright rude. I try to be as tabula rasa as possible. So, if you tell me the sky is red, and no one disputes you, then for the length of the round, the sky is red. I will be open-minded toward almost any line of argumentation as long as it is properly explained and impacted to the weighing mechanism. Although I am familiar with most jargon in Parli, debaters should refrain from using jargon during IPDA, and I would prefer minimal jargon outside of Parli in general. While I appreciate speed as a strategy, I don't flow speed well. So, if you decide to speed or spread, and I don't catch it on my flow, then it doesn't count in the debate. I don't mind procedurals and other technical elements when they are truly warranted.

Brianna Bitout Harper College Clash is my favorite thing about debate. One thorough, well-developed argument impacted back to the weighing mechanism is better than five tag lines that doesn't flesh out any actual arguments. In IPDA, I expect a high-level of decorum from the debaters. Otherwise, I expect civility and ask debaters refrain from ad hominem attacks. I attempt to remain as tabula rasa as possible. I appreciate different strategies, and I'm always willing to hear an argument when properly paired with warrant, claim, evidence, and link. While I appreciate speed as a strategy, I do not flow speed well and prefer competitors focus on the quality of their arguments. I understand most parli jargon and don't mind the use of jargon. I understand procedurals, and I do not mind the use of them when absolutely necessary, but you must still completely impact your argument.

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.

Krystal Blackmon Kansas City KS Community College Make the issues clear and explain why they deserve to be of utmost importance to you winning the debate round. Be nice to each other. Respect your opponents and the activity. I will listen to your arguments and do my best to evaluate them fairly. I would prefer you not go very fast. Technical jargon should be explained at least once if it is related to the topic and I may not be familiar with it. Never assume. Good luck!

David Bowers Kansas City KS Community College David Bowers KCKCCE Experience 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.

Janet Brehe Johnson Las Positas College I look for logical argumentation with solid background of the situation. I see debate as a persuasive public speaking event, so sway me with your logic and eloquence. I also like clear organization, a good amount of clash, and connected communication. Be respectful of each other. Have fun with this. DO NOT BE MEAN, but feel free to point out flaws in your competitor's arguments. Humor is a happy thing. Playfulness is good. You can even chide your opponent for a choice, but do NOT be rude and arrogant. Debates about definitions bore me. Aff, please set debatable, fair terms and let's have some fun with clash. If Aff's definitions are fair, and Neg makes big changes to them, I'll just get bothered. There's not much time in IPDA, so use it to have an intelligent debate. Also, Aff must support its case, and Neg must refute it. I give the round to the person who does this best. I don't have to agree with you. Use some specific examples and strong persuasive appeals and strategies. If it were up to me, the round would be interped! Lol. Okay, I can handle a bit of speed, but I much prefer you really connect with me and use your words so that they truly convey the message you intend. I'd love some courtroom style speaking, but I understand time can be tight. Avoid throwing debate-speak at me. I understand it, but I don't like it. I'd like less of the debate "game" and more of a true persuasive style.

Kelly Bressanelli North Central College (skip to second paragraph for my actual answer to the question)To expand upon my preferences, I have spent a great deal of time competing in, judging, and acting as assistant coach for parliamentary debate with a primary focus on LPDL but attention given to NPDA style as well. I have competed in IPDA style debate with far less frequency than parli and am unable to recall if I've yet to judge an IPDA round. I have no experience in NFA LD debate competing nor have I judged it at any tournament. Were I chosen as a Phi Rho Pi judge, I would prepare myself to judge Lincoln Douglas but I am not a good choice as an LD judge if others with more experience are available. I very greatly value respect within a debate. If one team or one member is being particularly rude, abusive, or disrespectful within a debate, I will find any reason I can to vote against them. This is thankfully a very rare occurrence. Aside from that, I very greatly value clash. Are debaters actually attacking one another's arguments or are they simply talking about their own cases barely gliding past what their opponents are saying? Clear definitions are also of utmost importance as rounds are often won on definitions alone. A good debate cannot happen if terms are very vaguely and not specifically defined. On a similar note, staying topical to the resolution is also important. Aside from that, I will generally try to care most about what debaters tell me to care most about within a round. I will decide based on the weighing mechanism chosen and the voting issues laid out before me. On that note, I do not make arguments for debaters. If one competitor said something that is technically wrong, I'll likely make a note of it on the ballot but this is not something that would lose them the round if their opponents did not call out their inaccuracy. Debaters must treat each other with respect and without condescension. I don't expect competitors to be paragons of politeness but I do expect them not to be overtly rude. I expect thank yous to begin the speech. I expect questions to be taken (with three being greatly preferred and two being the absolute minimum) and I expect them to be answered in a timely manner once another competitor raises to ask one. It depends on the round. What works in one round may be completely ineffective in another. As long as an argument is logical, well structured, and non-abusive I'm all for it. I care most about what is most impactful in any particular round. I have not yet actually judged a round in which an all in kritik (the entirety of a constructive speech is one or several kritiks) has been used but will almost certainly vote against one if it is used. If a K is necessary within a round, I will not vote against it and may even appreciate. However, I'll be very unhappy if a K is applied not because the other team is actually being bigoted in some way but "we've ran K's before and it worked for us" I will not be happy. I am also predisposed AGAINST splitting the negative. When one member of the negative or opposition team speaks about one aspect of the government/affirmative and the next member speaks about an something entirely different note. Even if this is legal it is very abusive and disrespects not only your competition but the nature of debate. I dislike speed and believe it detracts from the overall education of the round. I further believe that it unnecessarily disadvantages students with learning or auditory disabilities. I will not inherently vote

against debaters simply for speeding or spreading but if I am unable to get arguments onto the flow because of their rate of speaking, that is the fault of the debaters. Beyond not being able to capture arguments, the only penalty I may give for speeding is lower speaker points. Unless jargon varies greatly from one region to the next (to my knowledge, it does not) I am very familiar and comfortable with it. I do not care one way or the other if a competitor is using a lot of jargon or if they are using little or no jargon at all. This is presuming you mean debate jargon, of course. For technical elements: I care only about delivery to the extent that I am able to actually understand the message and do not vote based on delivery styles. I of course adjust speaker points to how well they deliver their message. I care very much about the structure and sub structure of the debate as it makes arguments easier to get onto the flow and to follow. In terms of resolution classification (fact/value/policy) I expect debaters to be able to correctly interpret the type of resolution they are debating and trust them to choose properly for resolutions which may be interpreted in multiple ways. I also expect them to formally state the type of resolution being debated as not doing so may muddle the round.

Kevin Briancesco Los Angeles Valley College

Brianna Broady Santa Monica College

Nate Brown Santa Monica College Clear and logical arguments is the most important criteria. Illogical arguments, or those that are delivered so poorly (fast talking is poor, and NPDA jargon is poor if competing in IDPA) is a very strong reason for my decision. I don't want to hear any NPDA jargon in IPDA. Professional and polite, of course. But also slow, normal rate of delivery. IPDA is public debate, not academic debate. Even NPDA needs to slow down. If I judge NPDA, I generally never want to hear K. I can hear T, but I hate when it is needed, and I often feel it was not needed. It wastes the time in the debate and I resent that. Aff better not make T necessary. And if Neg runs T, it better not be unnecessary. I want a debate on the topic, not on procedurals. Speed is bad. Jargon is bad. Speaking in outline format ("subpoint c", etc.) is bad. Clear argumentation and debate can be done in a style that any audience can understand and appreciate. That is obviously true for IPDA (required for IPDA), but should also be the case for NPDA.

Kathleen Bruce San Joaquin Delta College

Danny Cantrell Mt. SAC I assess how well students construct and refute arguments along with how persuasive you are as a speaker. My decision usually boils down to who makes the most sense from a logical point of view. I expect debaters to take the debate seriously. I strongly dislike partner communication during debates. I'm open to voting on anything although I rarely vote on kritiks. I do prefer debaters to talk about the topic. I do not think speed belongs in the debate - please speak at a conversational rate. You should define all jargon and fully explain any technical elements. Patrick Carberry College of Lake County

Daren Carpenter Tyler Junior College Clear concise arguments. I am primarily an interpretation coach. So make your arguments clear. Link your arguments clearly through organization. I expect debaters to be polite and considerate. I don't understand debate terms, so don't use them. But I am open to almost any type of argument. No speed, no jargon, no technical elements please!

Nathan Carter Northern Virginia Community College

Rick Connor Orange Coast College My most important criteria for evaluating a debate would be weighting 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 judge so some of the jargon or nuance (including speed) of debate may escape me. However, I can only judge on what I understand and believe the better debater is willing to adapt their language to meet the needs of their audience.

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 speed) of debate may escape me. However, I can only judge on what I understand and believe the better debater is willing to adapt their language to meet the needs of their audience.

Sarah Contreras Del Mar College I expect a coherent argument presented in an organized manner which can be understood easily (not read so fast no one can understand or follow) Debaters should be respectful of each other and especially respectful of the judge. No competitor should "talk down" to the judge. At the very least, a coach with little debate experience should have an advanced degree and more education than the competitor and therefore deserves respect. I believe that IPDA and NPDA were created to be different than CEDA and NDT and therefore all of the debate jargon is meaningless. These events were created for "everyman" and lay judges...not only persons with backgrounds in debate.

Victoria Cruz University of Alabama at Birmingham sound argument with support calm demeanor and respect for their opponent logic, reason, probability of successful execution Does it still make sense or are they trying to run down the clock.

Paul Cummins Southeastern Illinois College

Jedi Curva East Los Angeles College

Meghan Cwiok Harper College/Eastern Michigan University I prefer good clash before anything else in the round. I love when the debate is about the topic presented and when each team brings up good arguments and counter arguments. I also really enjoy good examples to further or illustrate the point being made. Be kind to your fellow competitors. There is a difference between being really excited and in to the debate (which is fine, and I love it) and being mean. I will vote against teams that are blatantly rude or mean. I try to come in and vote what is on the flow regardless of political leanings of the debate. I do like to have off case or disadvantages on neg/opp. You are on an uphill battle up a mountain without it in my eyes. I do not like hyperspeed debate. Some speed is fine; I can follow it, but at a certain point it is too fast for it to be educational. Jargon is fine; I know all of it. T is fine as long as it is used appropriately, well fleshed out, and not as a time suck. Ks are not my favorite argument, but if it is really well fleshed out, simply explained, and relevant to the debate, I would consider it.

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.

Cynthia Dewar City College of San Francisco

Justin Dougherty Nassau Community College Organization and best overall argumentation. Preference for real-world examples and statistics. I expect clash. I expect a sense of cordiality and fair play. All strategies/positions/arguments are fair game to me. I despise any use of speed, overuse of debate jargon in IPDA, and overly complicated procedurals in debate.

Darren Elliott Kansas City KS Community College I competed in college at Emporia State. I was a Graduate Student coach at Wichita State in the late 90's when WSU returned to the NDT for the first time in a couple decades, and in my two years there we qualified 3 teams to the NDT. At KCKCC I've coached multiple elim participants at CEDA, NDT qualifiers, coached numerous CEDA CC and PRP National Title winners, NPTE qualifiers, NFA LD National Tournament Qualifiers, in 2015 we won the NPDA National Championship. A first for any CC, and also in 2015 became the first CC in the history of the NDT to qualify two teams in one year, and the first to qualify a team 4 years in a row. In 2016 we became the only CC to win the

NFA LD National Championship. I enjoy and support all formats of debate and think each one provides unique opportunities to students. I am convinced there are really only 2 things debaters want to know and 1 thing you SHOULD know. What you want to know: 1) Will I vote for you on your argument? Does not matter to me how fast or slow it is or what genre (performance, policy, project, theory, procedural) your arguments take. I have voted for and against everything imaginable. Probably the least interventionist judge you know. You need to frame the debate so I know "what happens" when I vote for/against you. Impact your arguments and undercut the impacts of the other team. Pretty simple. I have zero preference as to the type of arguments you run and enjoy a mix of arguments. Do what you do best. I think given that many of my teams recently have engaged in "personal politics debates" or "performance debates" that people assume that is what I want to hear. I will vote on T, framework, disads, cp's, k's, etc. I am certainly not a "pigeon hole" judge and quite frankly love coaching and hearing all kinds of debate arguments. It is why I choose to coach so many different formats. Good debate is good debate and that can take many forms. Bottom line is I will always give you and your arguments a fair shake and I hope we can both learn from each other. 2) What kind of points do you give? Probably tend to be on the high(er) side but I view the 1/10th scale like this—30 is a 100%. 29.9 is a 99%. Etc. I will award points based on a combination of percentages for the speeches you give, any question you answer and any question you ask—Do you control cx, is it strategic, is it worthwhile? Speeches—Do you do everything you need to do, put offense where it needs to be, have defense where it needs to be, engage the other teams arguments, close doors, make impact calculations when important, not drop important args, fulfill the duties of the speech you are giving? Think of it like a speech grade and if you are perfect I have no problem giving a 30. If you need a lot of revisions and suggestions for improvement and are below average for your Division, than a D or something in the 26's might be appropriate. It is a cold day in L.A. when I ever give anything in the 26's unless you are rude/offensive. What you need to know: One thing that will affect speaker points other than what addressed above is this—excessive rudeness and/or offensive language/cursing will not be rewarded and likely affect your points. Here's the deal—I cuss at times. I should do it less. I never did it in debate rounds. I think we need to appear more educated than that and we need to do a better job looking like a worthwhile activity to Administrators. I wonder how many debates I tape would cast that positive light on the schools in those debates and how they would be perceived by their Admins if posted publicly. I, and many others, also bring their kids to tournaments. I don't really want my 14 year old daughter hearing it. Her vocabulary is much more advanced than that and yours should be too. Maybe this makes me cranky. So be it. But I am right. (One caveat—if your argument/performance is such that using that language is called for because of artistic/educational purposes I will not hold that against you. It probably/maybe needs to have a grounding in the lit though and not just a cx response of "F your hegemony"!). I think civility and professionalism has seen a significant drop in the last few years. Be professional and respectful to each other in the debate, before the debate, and after the debate. This includes coaches who I see yelling at/cursing at undergrads from other schools. How would your Administrators react? I am certain you are not allowed to do that in your classes. Don't let competition blur the line between adult and undergrad. I love debate. You should too. Good luck, have fun, and I am always a fan of humor! Be kind to each other. Do not make things up. Sit, stand, fast, slow, does not matter to me. Just be clear and make good arguments. Any argument and any style is fine with the exception of arguments that exclude people from participating. Do not read "racism good", "sexism good", etc type arguments in front of me. Up to the debaters. But be cognizant of requests by opponents and other judges to make sure you include and do not exclude them from the debate. Good luck to everyone!

Scott Elliott Kansas City KS 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. See above and below

Aff. Win a topical plan, or defend the entire resolution. I will still vote negative on presumption. Prove your basic elements first. Inherency, (uniqueness for an advantage over the status quo) is still a voter. Solvency is still a voter. Win an advantage that outweighs the disadvantages by the end of the debate. Be prepared to defend your ontological, epistemological, ethical, and pedagogical assumptions. In other words, I will definitely vote for a “Kritik.” Impact framing is an issue for me. Feel free to use the critical portions to shift standard assumption about how I should weigh impacts. Example: if you win that individual species survival is more important than the lives of individuals within a specific species, I will have no problem voting for a team that saves the snail darter at the expense of a few billion humans starving to death or a regional nuclear war. It is up to the debaters to argue how impacts are evaluated...human util, deep ecology util, deontological, etc. are open to debate. Regarding Kritik alternatives—most of them are horribly vague, do not solve for anything, and are virtually worthless. But, people never argue against them. Read disads to their alt. Permutations are good ideas to test competition. The idea that you cannot perm methodologies is a joke---you know and I know it. Test whether the arguments are really mutually exclusive---i.e. a real reason to reject the affirmative. Point out double turns and performative contradictions...then impact them out. I prefer explanations how disads outweigh or turn case. If you can impact turn, that is fine with me. If you can internal link turn a position, that’s fine too. My personal tastes in debate. I am open to a lot of arguments my colleagues have already written off. I prefer to test almost all assumptions. Please deny warming occurs. Fine with me. Run Ice Age. Please run Malthus (I actually believe a lot of these arguments in my personal life). Please read Rights Malthus (I really am an unapologetic eco-fascist in my personal life). Please read nihilism. Please read human extinction good, wipeout, etc. Read E-prime, I do not care. Read veganism, I do not care. Please impact out advantages, disads or Kritiks by explaining how it will impact my dogs. I really, truly do not care for the majority of people in this activity nor do I care for the vast majority of humanity. But I do care about my dogs. Memorable examples of ways teams have unexpectedly picked up my ballot:1) Voted for Baylor one time because Emory misspelled their plan text;2) Voted for Emporia once because their plan wiped-out the universe, destroying all life (you had to be there);3) Voted numerous times on anthro kritiks, De-Dev, Cap K's, anarchy, malthus, space, aliens A-Life, etc.;4) voted for a counter-performance because it made me feel more emotional than the 1AC narrative;5) voted for porn good turns;6) voted for genocide reduces overpopulation turns;7) did not vote, but the team won, because they took my ballot filled it out, gave themselves the win and double 30's;8) voted once on a triple turn--link turned, impact turned, and turned back the impact turn (had to be there);9) voted on inherency;10) voted on foul language in a round--both ways--foul language bad and "yeah, we said F***, but that's good" turns;11) voted for veganism K while eating a cheeseburger. One last point: All of you need to flow the round. The speech document they flash over to you is not the debater's actual speech. Look. Listen. You may be surprised what the other team is actually saying. See above

Melissa Entzminger Bradley University I am a tabula rosa judge. The debate comes down to what the students say is important in the round. That being said, I do like weighing mechanisms and impacts. Tell me why your argument is better and why your peers' argument is not. I expect that the debaters are respectful in the debate round. While you may be arguing ideas, you still need to be civil. I am open to all ideas and arguments. I do not like speed. Jargon and technical elements are fine as long as they do not overshadow the actual argumentation. Thus, I am not a fan of the whole debate coming down to topicality there should be other arguments as well.

Joseph Evans El Camino College About me: I have been involved in forensics for 12 years. I debated HS LD for 2 years, and then 4 years of college parli debate at El Camino College and UCLA. I coached at CSULB while in graduate school, and I am now currently a full-time professor and coach at El Camino College. I view debate as a game of intellect, and therefore I believe that any method of debate is viable when used as a strategic ploy to win. I will try to list my views on the major themes within debate. The way I evaluate the round: I tend to fall back to evaluating the round through the eyes of a policy maker. Unless I am told otherwise, I tend to fall back on Net Benefits. This means that I will evaluate the arguments based on how clear the impacts are weighed for me (probability, timeframe, and magnitude). I will however evaluate the round

based on how you construct your framework. If (for example) you tell me to ignore the framework of Net Benefits for an ethics based framework... I will do so. On the flip side, I will also listen to arguments against framework from the Neg. You win the framework if you provide me clear warranted arguments for your position, and weigh out why your framework is best. Topicality: I have a medium threshold for T. I will evaluate the position the same as others. I will look at the T the way the debaters in the round tell me. I don't have any preference in regards reasonability vs. competing interps. You run T the way you see fit based on the round. If the neg decides to kick out of the position, I usually don't hold it against them (unless there is offense). I will vote on T if the Aff makes a strategic mistake (it is an easy place for me to vote). Kritical Arguments: I believe that any augmt that is present is a viable way to win. Kritical arguments fall into that category. I am well versed in many of the theories that most critical arguments are based in. Therefore if you run them i will listen to and vote on them as long as they are well justified. I will not vote on blips as kritical arguments. Framework: I will listen to any alt framework that is presented (narrative, performance, kritical Etc.) If you decide to run a different framework that falls outside the norm of debate... you MUST justify the framework. Evidence: Have it (warranted arguments for parli)! Speed: I am usually a fast debater and thus I believe that speed is a viable way of presenting as much evidence as possible within the time allotted. I can flow just about anything and I'm confident that you can not out flow me from the round. That being said, I value the use of speed combined with clarity. If you are just mumbling your way through your speech, I won't be able to flow you. While I won't drop you for the act of being unclear... I will not be able to get everything on the flow (which I am confident is probably just as bad). 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).

Joe Faina LAVC

Kelsey Figiel College of DuPage Organization and clarity of arguments. I need to be able to follow your speeches to be able to vote on it! Weighing mechanism is important, so please carry that through. Respect. This is educational above all else and you should learn something from each other. If you are rude to your competitors, that CAN lose you the debate. I will rarely base a vote on a topicality, unless it is well-developed and there is truly a loss of ground/an issue with accessibility to information Please do not speed. I would prefer to hear your well-developed arguments instead of listen to you speech through many arguments. Jargon and technical terms are fine if they are necessary to enhance your arguments.

Bonnie Gabel McHenry County College education through clash Spirited & witty
Open to many negatively

Gwendolyn Gay Tallahassee

I judge on the ability to structure and support an argument. I value clear speech, eye contact and the ability to fill time appropriately without rushing. I appreciate a passionate speaker that is also respectful of the competition. I do not tolerate patronizing speech or off-color humor. However, I welcome well-placed humor as it shows me the competitor is intelligent and observant.

I did not compete as a debater myself, but I was a recruiter for William Carey University and judged many high school and junior college debate rounds.

Tom Gay Tallahassee

I have approximately 10 years of experience with debate as a competitor (mostly parli) and as a judge (policy & parli) though no rounds on the circuit this year. All your ideas will be new and fresh to me! I aim to be as tabula rasa as possible in that I want to see the debaters take the round where they feel it needs to go as opposed to trying to fit a framework of what they think I want to see/hear. I'm open to nearly all arguments whether the round stays largely on-case or delves into more theory-centric/procedural territory (as long as it's applicable & adapted to the round). Be clear in how you want the round weighed, what you want voted on, and how you're winning/have won.

Speed is fine as long as I can understand you. Remember this is supposed to be a communication event, so quantity at the expense of clarity and engagement with the other side is not what we're going for. Also, you are allowed to have fun! Humor and sarcasm

are welcome, though rudeness and condescension are not. Speaker points are pretty straight forward, clear, creative, and convincing debaters will do well.

Tyler Gillette Kansas City KS Community College

I debated for 3 years at KCKCC I read a lot of different types of arguments when I debated and am willing to listen to almost anything. Just what you do best and even you are clear on why that means you win I will vote for it. Theory- Just like any argument you need a clear link and impact in theory debates. With most theory args I believe it is usually a reason to reject the argument not the team. Condo: I am probably ok with conditionality, but, the more conditional arguments that are read the more sympathetic I am to the affirmative team. It will also be much easier to win if you can prove the conditional positions are contradictory to each other. CP theory: PICs are usually ok and the aff should have a defense on why whatever the negative PICs out of is important to the aff. PIC theory is way more winnable against ridiculous than it is against a PIC grounded in topic lit. . CPs- Are a very winnable strategy in front of me. Make sure the net benefit is clear. The only 2 types of CPs I think may be iffy are consult and ridiculous word PICs out words such as "should" and "the". If you have literature grounded in the topic on reason consult is good you can probably win the argument, I just find that is rarely the case. Some word PICs are ok, if you have reason the world they said is offensive or bad for what they are trying to achieve you have a shot, but i should be substantive not just a PIC out of "should" "and" or "the". That does not mean I won vote on those types of arguments, I just think PICs out of minor words are harder to win and probably more theoretically questionable. Topicality/Framework- There needs to be a clear impact to these types of arguments, just saying it isn't fair or is bad for education is not an impact if you don't have reasons why those are true of the affirmative you are debating against. I am more than willing to vote on these arguments if they are well warranted and impacted it just may be harder to get me to vote here than it is other people. On topicality, I believe reasonability is the best way to evaluate it, I can be persuaded otherwise, but, that is my general starting point. On framework, it is hard for me to believe we should exclude certain styles of debate, I tend to find the impact turns to framework far more believable than the impacts to framework. The most important thing to win if you want me to vote on framework is probably topical version of the aff. Disads-If you have them read them. I am totally ok with almost all disads, politics is one of my least favorite arguments in debate, the links and internal links on politics are usually questionable. Offense is always a preferable strategy, but, I am willing to say a disad has 0 risk if the aff can prove it. Case debate- I like to see good case debate and think the neg should in some way interact with the aff case. Just like disads offense is a better strat but if the neg can prove it I will vote on 0 risk of solvency. Kritikal affs- I am open to any type of aff you want to read as long as you can justify why what you do means you win. If your method is clear and you impact your arguments you should have no problem. When negating these affs it is usually better to engage the argument instead of just reading framework, it will be a hard sale to get me to believe we should exclude any style of debate. Kritiks- I read a fair amount of kritiks, but don't assume that means I know as much about the lit you are reading as you do. Kritiks are my favorite type of arguments and a usually a viable strategy, just be sure you are explainign how your argument interacts with the aff and means you win. I think that covers everything if you have any questions feel free to ask before round or email me tyler.gillette1@gmail.com

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 fourth that can happen as long as it's respectful. Anything anti-establishment. I hate it.

Angelica Grigsby Palomar College / Concordia University

Ryan Guy Modesto Junior College Please read my full judging philosophy on tabroom. I get grumpy when people don't.<https://tinyurl.com/RyanGuyJudge>
ORhttps://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=27190 I think mandating proper decorum is probably a link to the K. Good arguments. WikiSpec. They are part of the activity. Use them.

Hannah Hahight 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.

Doug Hall Casper College Logical and clear argumentation. I expect debaters to be respectful of one another. Treat each other with respect and courtesy. I try to not enter the round with any predispositions. I do not enjoy procedurals in Parli that have no link or place in the round. If you are applying a procedural argument, you need to be sure that the argument is well linked to the resolution/case. I do not tolerate procedural arguments in IPDA. I do not tolerate excessive speed or spreading, especially in IPDA. Jargon doesn't bother me in Parli, but Parli jargon has no place in IPDA. I am a fairly experienced debate judge and will listen to most arguments if they make logical sense and are well applied.

Wade Hescht Lone Star College-North Harris

M'Liss Hindman Tyler Junior College I will not be judging because I am the
Ombudman. Jeremy Hodgson Northern Virginia Community
College Dewi Hokett Palomar
College

Fallon Hopper None Evaluating your opponents case and making sure that you touch on and counter all of your opponents argumentation. Be professional and respectful to our opponents and keep a speed that both judge and debaters are able to flow. I do not like K arguments. I am perfectly fine with Topicality. I evaluate speed. If I cannot flow it I will drop it. Debate is educational and should be able to be understood by all that are involved in the round. I am fine with jargon and technical elements.

Jason Hough Hartnell College I am a flow judge and stock issues are key. If I drop my pen, you are going too fast. Speed has no real application (unless your goal is to become an auctioneer). Persuade me, which means you should bring ethos, logos and pathos in abundance. Affirmative has the burden of proof. If negative calls topicality, be prepared for a decision after the first neg. constructive. Speed=death, jargon= We are not debating about debate case structure= everything.

Brittany Hubble El Camino College I competed in debate for El Camino College for 2 years and this is my first year out. While I attended many CC tournaments, I also competed at several 4-year tournaments including NPDA and NPTE. My partner and I ran all types of arguments in debate (policy, critical affs, kritiks, etc.), but typically leaned towards policy debate. However, you are welcome to debate any way you like, but you should be prepared to justify your strategy if it is called into question. I tend to favor the strategy that is the smartest, most warranted and best for winning that round. Impacts: You should have them! I believe it is your job to tell me which impacts should carry the most weight in the round and why. I have no problem voting on a nuclear war or economic collapse scenario as long as you have a clear warranted story to explain how you get there. I am also not opposed to you asking me to prefer systemic impacts. It is really up to you, but I will usually default to net benefits and evaluate the impacts using timeframe, probability and magnitude unless I am told otherwise. I really really like impact calc and think it is a necessary component to winning a debate. Case Debate: I really enjoy the case debate and I really dislike debates where the aff is never discussed. You should engage with the aff no matter what you are running on the neg. Case turns and offense on case are awesome. I am not opposed to voting on 8 minutes of case out of the LO...in fact this is a great strategy for refuting both policy and critical affs when done well. Disadvantages: Love them. Case specific disads

with nuanced internal link stories are great. Please make sure they are not linear, as I will have a low threshold for voting on the aff outweighing on probability. Counterplans: Another excellent negative strategy. There should be a net benefit to the CP, competitiveness and it should solve the aff. Topical counterplans are fine. PICs are fine but I am also open to hearing why PICs or other types of counterplans are bad. Again, you just need to justify your strategy and win why it is a good idea. Conditionality: I am not a fan of multiple conditional advocacies but you can read them if you want. In general, I prefer unconditional advocacies and have no problem voting on condo bad. However, if you win the condo debate I will still vote for you and won't punish you for it. Kritiks: I think there are a lot of rounds where the K is the best and sometimes only good negative strategy. However, I prefer case/topic specific links and arguments other than "they used the state." I am not saying this can't be a link, but you should probably have more compelling ones. I also really like well-warranted solvency that is specific to your method/alternative. You should be well versed in the lit supporting your arguments. I don't like people blurting out tags and then having no idea how to explain them. I think you should call people out on this and use it as offense against them. You should also not assume that I have read the lit on your K and know all of the terms you are using. You are not doing yourself any good by confusing both your opponents and me. Most of this applies to the K on the aff as well. I prefer critical affs that defend the topic or use the topic as a springboard for discussion. I will vote on affs that do not depend the topic, but I will also entertain arguments that say you should. Identity Arguments: With the increase in identity arguments being proposed in debate, there is something you should know. While I understand their purpose and ability to be an avenue for individuals to promote advocacy, I find them difficult to evaluate and I am probably not the judge for you. Past experiences debating them have produced triggering memories and force me to include a bias when deciding rounds. I have been in a round where debate became an unsafe space and I would hate to have to adjudicate a round that would recreate that for another individual. Theory: I think theory is a great tool for both the aff and neg to secure ground in the debate and explain why certain arguments should be excluded from a debate. Your argument should have impacts! Don't just say it is bad for education or fairness then move on. You should also have counterinterps, reasons to prefer, offense, etc. against theory to win. Speed: Speed is fine but please be clear. I don't see how it is beneficial for making arguments that only your partner can hear and understand. I also believe the round should be accessible and you should respect a clear. There is nothing impressive about being a bully and spreading someone out of a round after they have repeatedly asked you to slow down. You should probably be able to win without it. Otherwise, I should have no problem flowing you and think speed should be used as a tool to make a lot of good arguments. Speaker Points: If you can do the above well, you will probably receive good speaker points from me. Being new to judging and understanding that speaker points can impact you in a tournament in ways other than speaker awards, I would say that I am currently on the more generous side of awarding speaker points. That is not to say I just hand out 30s or will not tank your points for being a jerk. I have a very low tolerance for offensive rhetoric or rudeness in rounds. Miscellaneous: Be organized and sign post. Don't assume you want me to apply arguments in specific places without being told to. I have pretty apparent nonverbals and you can usually tell if I think your argument is bad. You should probably use that to your advantage and move on. Read plan texts, advocacies, interpretations, counterinterps, role of the ballots, etc. twice and give a copy to your opponents if they want one. I prefer policy debate over value debate and think you can discuss the same arguments in a policy round more effectively. Overall, I think you should have fun with the debate and make it fun for everyone. I am open to answering questions to clarify anything or regarding specifics that may relate to your round.

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

if it is team). You can at least take off your hat. Having a bad attitude is as bad as having a bad argument. There are no specific arguments that I prefer over another. I will vote on pretty much anything and I am game for pretty much anything. I do expect that you will not subject yourself to performative contradictions or present narratives that you don't want attached to the currency of a ballot, which is what presenting the narrative in the round really comes down to. If you run a K you should be willing to live in the round with the same K standards you are asking us to think about. However, it is the job of the opposing team to point that out... This is true of any theory based argument you choose to run. I am old, which means that I think the 1AC is important. If you are not going to address it after the 1AC, let me know so I don't have to spend time flowing it. You should have some offense on the positions you are trying to win, so it doesn't hurt to have some offense on case as well. Critical rounds invite the judge to be a part of the debate, and they bring with them a set of ethics and morals that are subjective. I love critical debate, but competitors need to be aware that the debate ceases to be completely objective when the judge is invited into the discussion with a K. Make sure the framework is very specific so I don't have to abandon objectivity all together. Speed is not a problem if it is clear. Someone is going to be unhappy at the end of the round - that's how the game works. I will not argue with anyone about my decision. I am not opposed to answering questions about what could have been done differently, but asking how I evaluated one argument over another is really just you saying think you should have won on that argument. 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.

Cory Johnson Tallahassee

Coming from a background in "IE," most of the judging criteria that will be relied upon heavily during these debates will be areas of familiarity. For instance, making sure that your arguments flow well, and that your points are logical and clearly laid out. Specific points should be presented and executed with clarity so everyone in the room knows what you are talking about and when. If your current point in the argument becomes so tangential that your audience isn't sure if you have moved on to your next point or not, it will reflect on your ability to have a structured and definitive argument. Terminology, while important, plays a second fiddle to a logical point with a well maintained flow of thoughts and ideas.

There are an abundance of speaking tools that are used and misused. Speed and inflection are important ones. Speak, not slow, but slowly enough to where your argument can be followed by all parties involved. Volume is not the only way to show intensity or emphasis. If you slow your dialogue on specific words or phrases, combined with the use of proper inflection, you may find that your ideas and points better infiltrate the minds of your your audience. Your outward confidence in your argument, while important, should not be traded at the sacrifice of feeling you need to raise your voice in order to get your point across.

Use of metaphorical analysis is highly encouraged so long as the metaphor in use doesn't distract your audience. If they are spending mental energy attempting to figure out how your metaphor remotely ties to your argument, then you have lost their attention.

Humor will help you, hypocrisy will not. Use of humor, especially if it brings your point across, will award brownie points. If you expect your opponent to give you your time to speak, then they should be treated with the same respect.

Sasan Kasravi Diablo Valley College

Kelsey Kinnebrew Tallahassee

My judging philosophy is strongly based on the characteristics of Individual Events because those are the events I am most familiar with. I will always value strong, well-organized arguments that are based on logic. Since debate was never my specialty, I look for debaters who use rhetoric that the audience can easily understand. I put performance and articulation at the forefront. I want to be entertained so I always

encourage passion and humor, however I will not tolerate any hurtful words directed toward any person present or not present. I expect competitors to treat each other, the audience, and the judges with respect and kindness. My decisions will be based on who I thought defended their position with the most solid evidence and had the most well-rounded argument.

Augustus La Due San Joaquin Delta Depends on the framework given in round. If none given I usually assume net benefits like most policies rounds are. But I apperiacte when debaters explain and tell me what my framework is. I see my self as a referee not a person who intervenes in the debate. I expect debaters to be respectful of one another. Act professional as if they were doing this in the real world. I believe in our community we all tend to become influenctional people in the real world. Might as well start being professional now First off I will listen to any arguement in the round based on the framework given. Now when it comes down to it I put theory before case. Because I believe a debate about the round in is self is a more engaging debate. But once that is solved I go with stock issues on case. Not a fan of K's but will listen and vote on them if they are won properly. Like I said before be professionals. Like you would not hear in the real world people spreading in business discussion. We should all look to keep everyone involved as best as we can and win on arguements not speed. And I get the jargon been around it enough now to understand.

Augustus LaDue San Joaquin Delta College Criteria for the debate and who best meets it. Impact calculus is important in the rebuttals Be professional in the debate and respectful of the other competitor. Partner to partner communication is okay, if kept at minimum. I like topicality as a check back if there is proven abuse. Willing to hear Ks, but am partial to on topic debates. Want to hear the resolution discussed. Good with speed as long as you don't spread out opponent. Would rather hear a good debate than an unfairly matched debate. Jargon is all good.

Blake Longfellow OCC / Bradley / Western Kentucky Speed, if I can't understand you and don't have time to evaluate your arguments then I can't possibly be expected to vote for you. I am more interested in this activity preparing you for a real-world setting, where delivery and presentation skills will be highly valued. Treat the activity with respect, present yourself with credibility. Suit and tie are not required, but a hoodie and sneakers is disrespectful to the value of my time, which is donated so you are able to participate in this activity. I would prefer someone make 2-3 clear and well-supported arguments.I have a background in business, and am predisposed towards economics arguments. I stay up to date on the news (Economist, Vice News Tonight, CNBC are my primary media outlets). Don't run a critique. Don't run topicality just because. Topicality needs to be abusively clear for me to buy it. I'll vote for whoever has the best evidence for tangible arguments.

Alix Lopez East Los Angeles College

Chris Lowry Palomar College

Robert Loy Santa Monica College

William Lucio Highland Community College

Bryan Malinis San Diego Mesa College I will vote on presumption if the government team fails to provide a clear prima facie case for me to suspend presumption. I am looking for the team that provides the strongest, most logical arguments in the round, which include clear claims, data, and impacts. Be sure to stay organized! You must label all your arguments with taglines and signposts in order for me to flow the debate effectively. I have dropped teams in the past due to their lack of a CLEAR structure. Do not simply tell me that legalizing marijuana leads to dying children. Provide links, internal links, and impacts. Do not assume that I will make the argument/connection for you in my head. I only flow what is explicitly stated in the round. Most important, give me clear voters. Debaters are expected to perform with professionalism and respect. I do not condone distasteful or disparaging remarks made against opponents, nor insulting nonverbal behavior. Such behavior tarnishes your own credibility as a persuasive speaker. Avoid ad hominem attacks. Insults will result in me dropping your team. I am fine with partner-to-partner communication; however, I will only flow what the present speaker says. Please keep audible P2P communication to a minimum while an opponent is speaking: excessive talking hinders my ability to truly focus on the present speaker. Above all, make me happy to be in your presence. Have a good time and I will, too. I am stock issues all the way! I welcome topicality

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

Jennifer Mazur College of Central Florida

Dawne McClure Saddleback college As long as the argument is clear I will follow. I expect debaters to be respectful at all times. I prefer well structured arguments. Competitors should understand that a claim should be supported with evidence. I do not like speed/jargon at all.

Floyd McConnell San Jacinto College North

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

Kristy McManus Western Wyoming Community College Strategy. I want to see that you understand the resolution, the structure needed for that resolution and that you are critically engaged with the content. I want to see how you build and maintain an argument. Be civil. Always. Acknowledge and understand regional differences as well as levels of experience. I try to stay as open as possible to all (TAB) strategies/positions/arguments. If you need to run a K, run a K. If you need to run a T, run a T. Please do not run strategies/positions/arguments that are abusive. I would expect that you will have well planned and justified arguments. This is YOUR debate. You need to run what you feel is important for this round. You need to tell me where to look - what is important - and why to vote for you. I am fine with speed. However, if you are using speed as a tactic, I will stop flowing. If the other team can't handle speed - it is your responsibility to slow down so that we can have a good round. Jargon and technical elements have their place. If structure calls for them, use them. In IPDA - I expect a debate that is not focused on jargon - I will be looking for your ability to build arguments that don't rely on jargon and technical elements but on organization and layman's terms.

Sarah Metivier Schadt McHenry County College Clear, smart, and accessible. Be courteous and if you mansplain, you instantly lose. Any that are soundly supported with evidence and rhetoric. Do not want.

Jamie Morgan LAVC

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/speed nor overuse of technical elements. Create clash on the topic you've been provided, and debate it.

Michelle Moyer Moraine Valley CC If I feel that you are running a canned case, you should expect to lose. All of your cases and arguments should be developed during your prep time. Evidence should be common knowledge. I enjoy debate that is fun and friendly. I vote on what makes logical sense. Topicality should only be used when it is overly obvious. Absolutely no speed or jargon is appreciated by me. This event is about communication and you should always consider your audience first.

Douglas Mungin Solano Community College I risk sounding hella basic by stating that I am only interested in "good" arguments but I am. For me, debate is the engagement with world making. We all realize our words at 9am in the morning on an empty college campus does not really change national and international discourse, but in this particular round and room it does. We take these conversations with us in how we engage in the world. So debate comes down to these stories we tell and argue. So all speeches need to focus on the impact and larger stories of the round. I am cool with Topicality but you need to tell me how this really impacts the round, the same for Ks and other theoretical arguments. If you are the gov/aff your case needs to be tight. You have prep time, do not make me do the the work for you. For both teams: Don't drop anything, treat each with respect, roadmap, be nice to your partner, time yourself, drink water, smile and have fun. We are all nerds talking really fast in an empty classroom on a Saturday and Sunday. Chill out. Debaters should stand and be polite I'm fair game for most arguments Speed is okay but be clear

William Murphy Miami Dade College Content is most important. I will consider the strategic relationship between arguments. I expect civil behavior from all competitors. Laughter is acceptable. Rude behavior is not. I rarely intervene in my decision, but rudeness is one justification I am ok with intervening on. I will entertain any arguments. I prefer weighing advantages and disadvantages. I am not a fan of generic kritical arguments and tend to have high standards for the alternative and the link story. I expect voters to be clearly articulated in rebuttals. I do not enjoy speed. If I miss an argument, it is your fault. Do not expect me to yell clear. Talk in an audience-centered fashion. I am perfectly ok with jargon and technical debate. I am fine with theory-based arguments. I am a knowledgeable debate, flow-based judge, who also happens to think communication skills are important.

David Nadolski Oakton Community College I absolutely hate critiques and speed talk.
Collegiality and being well spoken. No speed I'm not a fan

John Nash Moraine Valley I think that debates need to be a blend of logic and emotion. Delivery is just as important as content. Debates should be friendly. If it sounds like a canned speech, expect to lose. I do not appreciate speed or jargon. Debates should be for all audiences.

Gabriela Naylor Tallahassee

My background is almost completely in the individual events. I am looking for well-structured arguments. I'd like the speeches to be well organized with a pace that is easy to follow. Minimal points will be appreciated as long as they are valid and within the theme. Define your points to build your case. Passionate debates are always entertaining, but stay professional and polite. Speak directly to the point and move on. Speed will be an issue if you're speaking too quickly for me to follow. I'd rather a slower, more relaxed debate with flowing transitions. Give full attention to your opponent's points, be respectful, and have fun with it. Humor and wit are appreciated, but are not valued more than an organized speech.

Bill Neesen Irvine Valley College Parli Debates judged this year: 20+Non-Parli Debates judged this year: Policy 1+Years Judging Debate: 17 (both highschool +college)Years Competed in Debate: 7What

School Competed at: Millard South/ OCC/CSU- Fullerton Making Decisions: 'My decision is based solely (as much as that is possible) on how the debaters argue I should decide; I avoid using my own decision-making philosophy as much as possible. It is your round. choose how you want it to happen and then defend it. I should also note that just because I coach crazy people it is not the only style of debate I like. Decision-making Approach: It is up to you and you can do whatever you want. I decide who wins based on what you say in the round. So it is up to you pick a style and defend it. 'Assessing Arguments: 'I am addicted to my flow but drops only become important if you tell me they were dropped and why that makes them important.' Presentational Aspects: 'Speed is ok I would be amazed if you went faster than I can flow but if your not clear that might happen. I hate offensive rhetoric and if it gets bad so will your speaks. That is the one place I get to input what I think and no matter what I will retain control of it, this means that a 30 speaker point arg is silly. Strong Viewpoints: 'No I see debate as a game. I have defended some pretty scary shit. So I would not punish you for doing it but you better be able to defend it.' Cases, DAs, CPs, Ks, T, etc.: 'I like all of what is listed. My advice is to make some arguments and then defend them. I really don't care what they are.' Other Items to Note: 'I might have a higher threshold on T and similar args. I have also been told that I am a K hack even though I never ran them and was a CP debater. '

Heidi Ochoa Saddleback College Logic and clarity. Polite. I'm comfortable with lingo, but I do believe for the purposes of regional differences, you should always clarify your use of lingo. I'm fine with it, but you have to be clear and logical and have strong organizational and presentational skills before you drop jargon in a round.

Alex Paez San Joaquin Delta College

Jennifer Page Cypress College

Kelsey Paiz Chabot College I am always going to prefer straight-up argumentation. In a net-benefits round, I am going to vote for the team that does the most good/least harm. Make sure to really weigh out your impacts in the round and be persuasive when you tell me the story of what the world looks like from your side. As a side-note, I don't tend to buy end-of-world/nuclear-war impacts, as MAD almost always checks back. I don't mind if you communicate with your partner during a round, but the current speaker must say the argument in order for it to end up on my flow. The current speaker should be the one doing most of the speaking during their turn. I definitely prefer to hear straight-up debates that discuss the topic at hand (including disads and counterplans) over a critical case, but will vote on any argument (T's, K's, etc.) that is reasoned out, impacted, and persuasive. Especially if you run a critical argument, as this was not my forte, make sure you clearly explain everything about it and why it is more important for us to accept your kritik and reject discussion of the resolution. It is up to you as the debater to impact everything out for me and tell me why I should be voting for you over the other team. I'm not a huge fan of speed in either LD or parli. While you don't have to speak at a "conversational" pace, if I can't keep up with you, your arguments won't end up on my flow. I want to be able to hear and process your arguments so that I can determine a winner. Tags and impact calculus are going to be the most important things to hit, and you can speed up a bit during evidence.

Justin Parks Kansas City KS Community College I have roughly 2 years debate experience competing for KCKCC in CEDA, Parli, and LD and roughly 3 years debate coaching/judging experience. Generally speaking you should not have to worry about adapting your style to suit me. You know where you excel in debate and I would much rather see a good debate on arguments you prefer than a bad debate on arguments I prefer. If you were trying to adapt to me the style of debate I prefer most would be kritikal or performance type debates. I may not always know the specific literature you may be referencing but I have experience with most kritikal arguments in some capacity. However I do also enjoy a good conditionality and theory debate as well and think these arguments have an important place in debate. I will vote on framework in both directions, offensive reasons to reject framework arguments are reasons to vote for a team and offensive reasons to reject an argument are reasons to vote for a team. With all that being said I do foremost believe in argumentative responsibility. Your words have meanings and consequences and should be treated as they do. Do not expect to be able to read any morally reprehensible arguments in front of me and still win.

Elizabeth Patterson Merced I am an open-minded educator and welcome all arguments competitors present (including but not limited to critical theory arguments, procedurals of any kind, etc.) I will flow and weigh arguments through the lenses in which the debaters provide (criteria/paradigm). Arguments: Unless some competitor code of conduct/law is violated, I will not intervene unless the debaters implore me otherwise through their advocacy. I debated 4 years (NPDA) and vote where debaters tell me to on the flow. Rate of Delivery: Any rate of delivery debaters engage will be flowed and evaluated based on the discursive criteria the competitors advocate. While a quick rate of delivery may be strategic and advantageous at times it should not interfere with clarity and basic structure and sign posting. If you feel excluded from the debate because of another competitor's rate of delivery, please make those arguments and tell me how I should weigh them.

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

Amanda Pettigrew Moraine Valley I think that debates need to be a blend of logic and emotion. Delivery is just as important as content. Debates should be friendly. If it sounds like a canned speech, expect to lose. I do not appreciate speed or jargon. Debates should be for all audiences.

Hillary Phillips College of the Canyons

Tyler Pierce Casper College

Scott Plambek San Diego Mesa College I have a limited debate background, so I will be focusing on general persuasive techniques. I dislike overt arrogance and contempt. I believe that debaters should

rest on the quality of their argument and persuasive skills, rather than trying to gain ground by mistreating competitors. I may not have extensive knowledge of debate theory, but I am well aware of fallacious arguments, including ad hominem attacks. Avoid strategies that rely on technical elements or procedural issues because I will not have a frame of reference for what should be happening. Instead, just use simple persuasion with logical arguments. Avoid speed, jargon, and debate-specific argumentation practices or techniques. I am not overly familiar with these approaches. Thus, in a persuasive context, just focus on speaking clearly and passionately so as to establish and maintain your ethos.

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. Disadvantages. If you are running a Value debate then 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 then make sure that you have sufficient and substantial arguments to prove your side true. 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 then 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 speaking. 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 is 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 to fast then I am less likely to catch everything on my flow. If my flow is missing arguments then I may miss the crucial argument that would lead me 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 absolutely lose speaker points and could potentially 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.

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

Janice Ralya Jefferson State Community College I look at the arguments presented by both sides in order to determine who presents the best argument supported by evidence. Debaters should be courteous and respectful. NA I believe anyone who engages in critical thinking should be able to follow a debate. I value a conversational style with limited debate jargon.

Salim Razawi Las Positas College It's most important that I understand what you are talking about. Even though it is a debate, remember this is still a public speaking event. Be courteous and respectful to other competitors. Nothing in particular. Throw in some pop culture and theatre art references, and you'll have my ear more. Only use speed if you have clear articulation. I don't care for jargon. Use layman terms as much as possible.

Kevin Reim University of Central Florida One thing that is most important to me is ensuring that all of the cases are developed during prep time. If I feel you are running a canned case, prepare to lose. All the evidence should be common knowledge. Fun and Friendly is my style. I vote on what makes sense. I follow logic when it comes to debate, and topicality should only be used when it is obvious. I don't appreciate jargon or speed. I feel as a competitor they should be considering their audience in order to effectively communicate their message.

Jeff Rieck Moraine Valley I think that debates need to be a blend of logic and emotion. Delivery is just as important as content. Debates should be friendly. If it sounds like a canned speech, expect to lose. I do not appreciate speed or jargon. Debates should be for all audiences.

Susan Rimel Tallahassee

I am looking for well-structured and supported cases that deliver clear argumentation through a logical flow. Topicality and technical points should be duly noted but preferably not the entire basis for rebuttal. I believe most debates can occur with minimal points of order as much of the time they can be better addressed within the speeches.

I value quality speaking. If your arguments cannot be understood because of speed or disorder, it is difficult to flow the debate effectively. Organize your speech. Name each point as you address it. Speak directly to the point and move on.

Finally, wit and humor are appreciated! These can only be effective when debaters are enjoying themselves and respecting one another. I hope this is the atmosphere that characterizes all of your debates.

David Roznovjak Harper College I value clash above all else. That being said I accept all arguments on the flow. I want to hear warrants, claims, and impacts. I value good logic and clear structure. I expect both teams to be cordial to one another. No ad hominem attacks. I accept all strategies. I vote on Kritiques, Topicality, Counter Plans, and any strategy employed to win and have a good debate. I am good with jargon and technical elements. Speed should not be used as a strategy to win the debate or flood the opposing team. Higher speaking rate is expected in debate, but keep it reasonable and clear. Annie Sauter Harper College I think it's wondrous when a debater knows how to exercise the use of their weighing mechanism throughout the course of the debate. This is how I'm supposed to judge the whole thing, so it's helpful for me if you refer back to it and connect the dots. I love to witness debaters clash with class. Be respectful, have a great time, and learn from one another. I also really appreciate when a team takes questions. Some of these questions/answers can become so crucial to the debate, so I'd love to see you honor as many as you see fit. Perhaps some judges are cool with aggressive, condescending, or belittling communication throughout the course of a debate. But not I. Not I, said the cat. I'm predisposed to consider organization (please tell me where your argument goes on the ballot), as well as an argument that stresses impacts. This activity is all about communication, and talking fast at me prohibits my ability to comprehend your argument, however good it may be. If you fast talk at me, I will put my pen down. I think it's important to communicate in a manner that is inclusive and relatively easy for all to understand, so I just don't prefer jargon.

Shanna Schultz San Jacinto College 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. 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!

Zack Segretto College of the Canyons

Taure Shimp Modesto Junior College Please read my judging philosophy on
 tabroom.comhttps://tinyurl.com/TaureShimpORhttps://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?
 search_first=Taure&search_last=Shimp https://tinyurl.com/TaureShimp
 https://tinyurl.com/TaureShimp https://tinyurl.com/TaureShimp

Nathan Steele City College of San Francisco I aim to subdue my bias and objectively adjudicate rounds, voting for the team that presents the most logical, well-reasoned, organized, creative, clever and dynamic arguments. Debaters should provide/contest criteria for evaluating the round. Highlight key voting issues during your final speech. Be respectful of your opponents at all times. You can be a little snarky but do not make it personal. Attack the arguments and behaviors in the round rather than the people. Avoid obnoxious nonverbal-behaviors. Partner communication is acceptable, but don't parrot or puppet your partner. Heckling is acceptable but everyone (partner and opponents) should minimize interruptions to the debate and the flow of the speaker. I will listen to you throughout the round, and I hope you will continue to listen to each other. Don't lie. Convince me of how I should evaluate the debate and what the affirmative or negative team must do to win my ballot. I'm capable of believing any well-reasoned and supported claim, but I favor cogent, criteria-based arguments that are ultimately weighed against other issues in the round. When well warranted, I can vote on well-structured and clearly explained topicality arguments and kritiks. Debaters should be specific in their argumentation and provide clear voting issues in rebuttal speeches. The debate should be accessible to your opponents and judge(s). Delivery can be accelerated beyond a conversational rate, but I value clear articulation, emphasis, inflections, pauses, and vocal variety. Delivery style may affect speaker points but will not factor into a decision. Points of order can be called when rules are broken; I will stop time and hear briefly from the opposing side before ruling.

Neal Stewart Moorpark
 College

Kiefer Storrer Glendale Community College Clash, real world/community impacts, or warranted abuse stories. Being inclusive of the other debaters, that's about it. Whatever is warranted, I don't want to exclude anyone from the activity. See above.

Josh Sunderbruch Harper College I look for impacted, articulated arguments. I do not appreciate underdeveloped arguments or arguments that require that I intervene. I expect to see logically sound positions clearly outlined. Debate is still a communications activity, and I greatly dislike rudeness, overly aggressive behavior, and condescension. I expect to see members participating in a civil, intellectual exercise with members of a shared community. I will listen to what I am given. I prefer arguments that are focused on the intellectual exchange of ideas, but I accept where the debate goes. As for specifics, I have probably only seen five well-run counterplans ever, and I expect counterplans to be both competitive and counter-resolutional. I will vote on Ks and Ts when warranted, but I will also vote on RVIs that are well-articulated and appropriate. I do not believe that only policy makes for good debate, and I do not believe in a magic rulebook that says all debate must always have particular elements. Debate theory is fine, but unless you know what you are doing with it, it's not going to help you. I will not flow arguments that move too quickly, I will accept jargon as a shorthand, I still want everything to be impacted. While I can appreciate a highly technical debate, I never want the sense that I am listening to a stock case that someone else prepared, or that I am witnessing someone running technical arguments that they do not understand.

Derod Taylor East Los Angeles College

Burke Thomson San Joaquin Delta College Evaluate theory, framing of the round, and impact calculus. Be civil to one another. I am predisposed to straight up debate. Ks have an uphill battle on my flow. Do not spread opponents out of the round. I will listen to a speed critique. I am comfortable with jargon.

Burke Thomson San Joaquin Delta College Depends on the framework given in the round, if none is given I default to net benefits. However I am open to weigh the round by how the debaters dictate it should go. I see myself more as an observer rather than someone who tells the competitors what to do. I expect the debaters to act professionally, seeing as many of them claim to be using this as a starting point for being future policy makers then they should act as such. This includes being professional in their speech, and not personally attacking their fellow debaters. I firstly listen to what I'm told to in the round by the competitors seeing as they set the framework for what I'm supposed to vote for through their arguments. This being said if no framework is given then I fall to stock issues seeing if they solve for the harms/impacts that they have presented, and if they can either put weight/avoid whatever the opposition has presented. As long as it's inclusive for all members participating then I see them as tools to be used. That being said if they are used as an abusive tool in round, ie spreading or using jargon to exclude someone from the round, against a fellow debater then it may be a problem. However this means that's it's up to the members in round to point out, or to say slow/ask for clarification.

Jeff Toney San Joaquin Delta College

Grant Tovmasian Rio Hondo College In Parli: 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. In NFA-LD: Solvency vs. Stock Issues, DA, CP In IPDA: the spirit of this event persuasiveness. I expect all debaters to remain cordial and professional throughout the round. The decorum is important so as not to isolate or offend any students. Be respectful towards one another. I want to hear and for you to have fun, constructive and polite debates. Although debate is an adversarial activity, it does not need to become a rude activity. This is a space where we welcome individuals and nothing is less welcoming than rudeness. So Be POLITE!!!! I always prefer cordial and educational rounds with elements of quick wit and persuasive argumentation over Nuclear Holocaust, which I really do not care for, especially when it results because of US not buying used car parts from Uruguay. In Policy. DA vs Advantages. CP is a viable strategy to use, but in it of itself I see it just one of the tools Neg has at its disposal. If perm can happened in the real world it can happened in a debate round. If you are running a CP please make sure to explain its status, especially if you are stating dispositionality (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. Meeting stock issues. In Value and or Fact Debates. Simply give me a clear weighing mechanism. In Metaphor Debates. Metaphoric integrity is important Example: "This house would come in as a wrecking ball" does not equal Grandma will bake a pie since Government has the right to define (I don't care how good of a pie Grandma makes, this metaphor is not about pies) I prefer good on case argumentation. Do not simply run useless procedural in order to avoid on case thorough analysis. If you need to run one make it clear why and how Aff crossed a line. As such I am a believer that presentation and sound argumentation take importance over unsubstantiated arguments. 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's are to be run only when one or the other side believes that it is more important then whatever else is happening on case 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.

Tom Tracy Harper College I am primarily an I-E judge, but I do have some passing familiarity with debate. I see debate as a communications event; it is your task to persuade me why you should win. I am put off my competitors who speak too quickly. Make sure to explain every detail of your arguments, and do not

rely on me to understand a given link. Please do not make overly technical T and K arguments. Do not insist that you should win because of a technicality; instead, explain your stance and persuade me to listen. Delivery, clear explanation of your analysis, and strong-but-friendly clash are going to be essential to winning my ballot.

Dana Trunnell Prairie State College Students should adequately address and uphold their case, while attacking the other side. Clash is good. Supporting argumentation with logical reasoning and evidence is key to winning the debate I'm judging. I think debaters should be courteous to each other and debate without interrupting or being rude. I am not a fan of creating impossible to debate criteria. Avoid abusive argumentation. Debaters should speak at a conversational rate. In IPDA, jargon and technicalities should be explained as might be expected by the nature of the debate. I am more okay with jargon in Parli and LD.

Roxanne Tuscany Grossmont Most of the comments below relate only to Parli debate. For IPDA I am still looking for clear, well thought out arguments. But less jargon. For Parli debates: 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, old style, which means on a single piece of paper. Which also means I am not "wasting" paper. I want to hear arguments that have claims, with reasoning/evidence. 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. During rebuttals I am looking for very clear voters, to tell me why your team won the debate. 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 expect POI's to be called and for the individual to stand. I only want to hear from the speaker, not from their partner. You may pass a note, but make sure it is discreet. Of course, I expect to occasionally hear a topicality argument, when warranted. I do not want to hear critiques. I also believe in stock issues rather than comparative advantage debates. A plan in policy, should not just be the resolution. However, I am aware, that most of the students are not familiar with this form, so I will adapt to your style. I believe there is no place for spreading/speed in Parli. Everyone who continues to encourage or allow spreading is encouraging poor communication skills, defeating the purpose of Parli debate. It isn't about "my" ability to flow, it is about your ability to communicate logical, argumentation to an audience. Having said all this, I love judging Parli debates. I am excited to hear your well structured, lively, debates.

Arthur Valenzuela LAVC

Jeani Vermillion Ranger College Library I need to persuaded. I also look at how the speeches are set up and what information is presented. Civil disagreements. Address the topic not the other person. Whoever's argument I can follow and who persuaded me the most. I approach the debate with an open mind and wait to see who proves their argument to me. I need road maps. If the speakers start going to fast I will put my pen down and stop flowing. If it gets too technical, you will lose me.

Greg Volle Illinois Central College

Trent Webb Nassau Community College Parliamentary: I'm a "parli purist". This means I expect a series of clear warrants to complete arguments. I expect a plethora of real world examples to illustrate impacts. Organization/clash is key to winning my ballot. IPDA: Your use of oratorical persuasive elements is key to me. Construction of original argumentation should include sources, and paraphrasing of those sources. Again, organization/clash are most important to me. Regardless of format: I expect cordiality, a sense of fair play and non-abusive procedurals. Stand for C/X. Time yourself. I almost never vote of topicality unless it's really really clear and abusive. I'm much more likely to vote for the debater(s) who best exemplifies the real-world impact of their arguments. I almost never buy kritiks. I absolutely despise any form of

speed/spreading in any form of debate. This IS a communication activity; and I will not support any movement and/or use of technical elements to takes us away from that.

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 proceduarals 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 arguments 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 not 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. Speed 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

Janene Whitesell Solano Community College I have been teaching argumentation and debate for 25 years. I am not a debate coach, but have judged debate rounds for as long as I've been teaching debate. Here's what you need to know coming into the debate: First, I believe that all forensics events are public speaking events. I expect speakers to stand and deliver. As long as lawyers, politicians, and preachers stand, then our community should as well. Second, I feel strongly AGAINST prompting your partner. Again, in the real world a speaker has to stand on their own. Many times debaters interrupt their partner and the partner loses their train of thought. The more egregious the prompting, the more likely it will be that I drop a team. Third, I'm not a fan of topicality arguments. I would rather the the opposition/negative clash with the government/affirmative team. If you want to run topicality, make sure that it is warranted and that you have nothing to say against the affirmative. Fourth, I usually don't vote on K arguments (in a similar fashion as T arguments). Finally, your university/college/coaches have invested time and money into this endeavor. Treat it with respect.

Jamie Whittington-Studer Moorpark College

Brit Williams Highland Community College

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

Brandon Wood College of DuPage 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. 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 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

2017 Judging Philosophies

Kacy Abeln College of Dupage

I will listen to every argument a debater presents. However, as much as I try, I do find it difficult to divorce myself from my knowledge of fallacious argumentation. Thus, I tend to focus on logical links and how they tie back to the weighing mechanism of the round. If there are the links to nuclear war are easily broken, I am unlikely to vote on impacts to nuclear war. IPDA should be dramatically different than parli. When a debater turns an IPDA round into a parli round, I am likely to vote for the OTHER debater in the round. Delivery, organizational, and ethos matter significantly more in IPDA than in parli. I highly value courteous and respectful debate. I believe strongly in the idea that one of the major distinctions between debate argumentation and "verbal fighting" is the high degree of respect debaters show each other in and out of rounds. Ethos has its place in debate and respect to others does impact ethos. I strongly believe in the distinction between fact, value, and policy resolutions. The burdens for each are vastly different and require teams to focus the debate in drastically different ways. I hold true to the idea that setting up a case using the correct 'resolutional' type is a burden of the government team. In voting, I equally weigh prima facia issues and the weighing mechanism of the round. I expect debaters to impact their arguments directly to the weighing mechanism established in the round. IMPACT, IMPACT, IMPACT Speed sometimes occurs, but should not be relied upon. I will make it

clear when the speed becomes so quick that I can no longer flow the debate by simply putting my pen down. It should be a clear nonverbal indicator to every debater that I am no longer flowing the debate because of speed, and therefore will not vote on the arguments that are not on my flow. I also believe that speed impacts credibility. While debate relied heavily upon logos, ethos and pathos should not be ignored. Beyond speed, I also highly encourage debaters to use strong organization including, taglines, roman numerals, capital letters, etc. Labeling and numbering arguments is one of the easiest ways to ensure that both teams and the judge(s) are on the same page. Jargon alone does not make an argument; a debater's explanation of the jargon makes an argument. Jargon alone will never be voted on by me. I expect debaters to explain why the jargon is significant to the round and how it should impact my voting. Technicalities can matter but only if the debater(s) impact out why the technical elements have a bearing on the round itself. Procedural arguments are a part of debate for a reason but should not be relied upon solely to win rounds. If procedurals are present, debaters should feel free to run them, but not force them to work.

Tim Anderson Elgin Community College

Joan Andrews Tyler Junior College

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

Joel Anguiano El Paso Community College

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

Krista Appelquist Moraine Valley

Meredith Aquila Northern Virginia Community College

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

Jay Arntson Pasadena City College

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

Roxan Arntson Mt. San Antonio College

The merit of your arguments is the foremost deciding factor for me. The debater(s) who has the strongest arguments should win. As a personal preference, I like well structured debates. If I can easily flow what you're saying and where you're refuting your opponent, it makes it much easier for me to make a fair decision without

interjecting into your round. Try not to be a douchebag. There is really no reason to be rude or condescending; these are strategies of aggression that are usually employed by debaters who lack more refined skills of actual argumentation. You should address me, the judge, not each other. You can communicate with your teammate, but it should not be excessive or distracting... and I will only flow what actually comes out of the speaker's mouth. (Additionally, it always appears like there's not great partner trust when one person tries to dominate his/her partner... and I start to doubt your credibility.) I recommend that you stand when you speak and employ good public speaking traits: articulation, limit non-verbal distractions, fluid delivery with few verbal fillers, eye contact, expressiveness, etc. I am willing to listen to anything you'd like to discuss. However, it is your responsibility to explain clearly why I should prefer your argument to another. This applies to the use of procedurals; running a procedural isn't a guarantee of a win. Your responsibility as a debater is to explain exactly what the violation is and how it impacts the round or to explain clearly why the violation did not occur or how it is irrelevant to the round. Similarly, I will listen to a K, but you have to convince me that this is more significant than the resolution... or why it isn't. Do your job to flush out arguments and rebuttals so I don't have to!

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

Bryan Asbury Illinois Central College

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

Araceli Bachner Northern Virginia Community College

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

Nichole Barta Irvine Valley College

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

Robert Becker Northwest College

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

but if they can't explain why their case is topical, they will lose. I think there needs to be resolitional analysis to justify affirmative choices. Although some arguments are more easily defeated than others, I am willing to listen to most positions. Especially at Phi Rho Pi, we are debating people from different regions of the country, and have different styles, techniques, and positions with which we have familiarity. Don't assume that I know your case or DA because it's a position you use a lot. Make sure you explain things. You want to win because you were smarter, more strategic, and better debaters. You don't want to win because you were sneaky or duped the other team. Don't try to suck up to me. You can be friendly without being smarmy. Be professional. Don't act like you are the smartest person in the room, even if you are. That said, I'm here to have fun, and I hope you are, too. When it stops being fun, we need to think about the chess club. In reality I probably have a somewhat high threshold for topicality, so if you want to win, you need to spend some time on it and not give the aff any way out of it. In-round abuse is not necessary, but if that argument is made against you, then you need to explain why topicality is important (jurisdiction, aff always wins, etc.) I am fine with critical arguments, but you need to explain how they impact the round. I have found few students can explain how I should evaluate real-world impacts in a debate world, or how I should evaluate and compare real world and debate world impacts. I'm fine with critical affs, but you better have some good justification for it. "We don't like the resolution" doesn't cut it with me. If your critical arguments conflict with your disad, you better have some "contradictory arguments good" answers. I believe parliamentary debate, LD, and IPDA should develop different skills regarding research and delivery, but I do not believe that they should differ in their development of critical thinking. Parliamentary debate is still debate. It needs to have clash and argument. Goofing off for an hour or so is not a good use of my time, or of yours. You can use debate terminology in front of me. Inherency, stock issues, topicality, evidence, plans, etc., are all DEBATE terms, just like voting issues are not exclusively parliamentary debate terms or practices. Once again, impress me with your ability to explain the issues to me 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.

Matthew Beifuss College of DuPage

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

August Benassi Moorpark College

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

Saleha Bholat Northern Virginia Community College

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

Tyler Billman Southeastern Illinois College

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

Margaret Bilos Harper College

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

Francesca Bishop El Camino

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

Brianna Bitout Harper Community College

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

Justin Blacklock San Antonio College

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

Thomas Bovino Suffolk County Community College

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

Allison Bowman Moorpark College

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

Kevin Briancesco Los Angeles Valley College

Brianna Broady Santa Monica College

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

Nate Brown Santa Monica College

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

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

Cody Campbell Glendale Community College

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

Daniel Cantrell Mt. San Antonio College

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

Patrick Carberry College of Lake County

Daren Carpenter Tyler Junior College

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

Sean Connor Orange Coast College

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

Sarah Contreras Del Mar College

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

Victor Cornejo Pasadena City College

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

Christine Courteau Stephen F. Austin State University

Melissa Courteau Stephen F. Austin State University

Christopher Cox Moraine Valley Community College

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

Steven Cruz Tallahassee

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

Paul Cummins Southeastern Illinois College

Toni Dach Northern Virginia Community College/Ohio University

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

Toni Dach Northern Virginia Community College

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

Kevin Daily Ranger College

Shahin Davari Orange Coast College

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

James Delahoussaye Saddleback College

Cynthia Dewar City College of San Francisco

Jim Dobson Las Positas College

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

Kevin Doss Lamar State College - Orange

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

Justin Dougherty Nassau Community College

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

Fred Ebert Northwest College

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

Stephanie Eisenberg Todd Chabot College

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

Darren Elliott Kansas City KS Community College

Scott Elliott Kansas City Kansas Community College Special Note for Novice and Junior Varsity Debaters: After years of consideration, I have made the decision to make TOPICALITY an absolute voting issue in novice and junior varsity debate. By this I mean that if the affirmative's 1AC is not topical, they will lose the debate. Extra-topical advantages or extra-topical or non-germane critical aspects of the affirmative 1AC will not be considered in my reason for decision. That being said, what constitutes a "topical" affirmative case is still open to debate. Especially given this year's college topic wording, the traditional framing of the agent of action, or whether really is an agent of action is very much open to debate. Competing interpretations should be debated out. In other words, addressing why one interpretation is better for debate, education or better for students is still open to debate. You can use whatever types of warrants and data to support the claim (the resolutional statement). This means that if you want to "perform" your 1AC (all 1AC speeches are performances anyway), that is fine. If you want to use forms of poetics or aesthetics to support your defense of the resolution, I am willing to listen to it. Topicality is a gateway issue and will be decided before anything else in my decision except for instances of some egregious behavior from debate participants that violates standards and norms of the activity (e.g. ethics challenge, certain language choices, intimidation or physical confrontation). Topicality is a minimum affirmative burden of proof. It is not a reverse voter. I do not want any more persons telling stories thirty years from now about the time they won a debate round on an RVI. In case you are confused, let me give you some examples of 1AC's that would not be topical, and would thus LOSE the debate, if the negative team made and properly defended a topicality argument all the way through the debate: 1) Debaters need to eat healthier; 2) not enough ramps on campus for disabled debaters; 3) debate participants have been somehow abused or neglected by the debate community, other debaters, or coaches prior to the reading of the 1AC; 4) the

general shittiness of your ontological or epistemological existence; 5) the refusal to affirm the resolution because you object to one or more of its terms; 6) you feel like academic policy debate unfairly constrains your freedom; 7) the world, or the debate activity, is generally racist, homophobic, abelist, sexist, capitalist and any other form of oppression that is not tied directly to affirmation of the 2014-2015 Cross Examination Debate Association resolution for policy debate for CEDA/NDT tournaments or the assigned resolution in a parliamentary debate tournament. If you do not like this portion of my judging philosophy, I suggest that you either do not pref me or debate in open division. For persons in open/varsity debate and other issues related to debate: I prefer a standard topical plan with advantages affirmative case versus counterplans and disads from the negative team. That being said, I listen to, and vote for, critical affirmatives and I have voted for many kritiks. See below! Common Issues: Topicality and Framework. I will vote on topicality. I think a lot of negative teams allow themselves to be run over by critical affirmatives' framework arguments. There are good reasons why topicality should be a voting issue. Develop them. I think the smartest argument I have heard on the T/framework debate is, "it's not the ground we lose, it's the ground you gain." That pretty much encapsulates why T should be a voter. That being said, I often vote for critical and non-topical affirmatives because the negative team fails to make good arguments, or kicks T/framework in the 2NR. Disadvantages. Run them if you have them. There should be plenty on this topic this year. I am usually not a fan of politics debates. However, on this topic, I think there are actually real links to political capital and elections disads. I think link turns are really good offense because, at worst, they function to take out the link to a disad, or make it a wash. Affirmatives should note, impact turns are fine with me. Counterplans. Please do. There should be plenty of counterplan ground on this topic. Agent counterplans seem pretty legit (Ex-O, Congress, maybe courts or States) until proven otherwise on theory or based on the topic literature. Consult--maybe, but you are going to have to read some topic specific evidence to justify it. As long as it is grounded in the topic literature, I am probably going to accept the legitimacy of a counterplan. PIC's... I think people read blocks that are nonsensical on both sides. Kritiks: I will vote for them. I find a lot of them to be nonsense. But, many affirmatives do not know how to respond to nonsense. Debate it out. Affirmatives probably need to discuss the transition to the end-state envisioned by the K authors. Things I tend to do in rounds: 1) I try to be fair to the teams. That means I will listen to any argument and try to figure out to the best of my ability what the speaker is trying to say; 2) I protect the 2NR. I don't give much weight to new 2AR arguments. The 1AR better extend and explain an argument if you want the 2AR to go for it; 3) I evaluate what went on in the round, not what I think your (K or solvency) author really thinks; 4) I usually look at evidence only when the last two speakers ask me to make an evaluation or comparison. I will rarely call for every card read in the round and reconstruct it as I see fit. 5) I like the last two speakers to tell me, "we win this debate for the following reasons" and "even if they win this argument(s), we still win because." On the other hand, I tend to dislike five minute overviews. Be responsive to the other team's arguments. Do not make me do all the work. Allowing me to connect the dots will often lead to an outcome that you did not anticipate and you will not like; 6) If I think I missed something in your speech, I will ask during the round what the argument was. If I say clear, and you don't change your rate or style, be prepared to not have those arguments evaluated in the round. I don't read your speech documents as you speak. But I will ask for it after the round as a matter of team policy; so I can post cites and argument outlines to the debate caselist. Memorable examples of ways teams have unexpectedly picked up my ballot: 1) Voted for Baylor one time because Emory misspelled their plan text; 2) Voted for Emporia once because their plan wiped-out the universe, destroying all life (you had to be there); 3) Voted numerous times on anthro kritiks, De-Dev, Cap K's, anarchy, malthus, space, aliens A-Life, etc.; 4) voted for a counter-performance because it made me feel more emotional than the 1AC narrative; 5) voted for porn good turns; 6) voted for genocide reduces overpopulation turns; 7) did not vote, but the team won, because they took my ballot filled it out, gave themselves the win and double 30's; 8) voted once on a triple turn--link turned, impact turned, and turned back the impact turn (had to be there); 9) voted on inherency; 10) voted on foul language in a round--both ways--foul language bad and "yeah, we said F***, but that's good" turns; 11) voted for veganism K while eating a cheeseburger. One last point: All of you need to flow the round. The speech document they flash over to you is not the debater's actual speech. Look. Listen. You may be surprised what the other team is actually saying.

Melissa Entzminger Highland Community College

I am a tabula rasa judge. Impact your arguments. Tell me why your argument is important in the round and how it impacts your opponent's case. Telling me why your position and arguments are better than your opponents is

key to winning the round. I expect students to be polite. Being polite in the debate round is very important to me. The ability to argue without losing your temper is a sign of a mature debater. No predispositions. I do not like speed. This form of debate is one in which anyone can judge meaning there should not be a lot of technical jargon and elements. I prefer arguments about the issues rather than just a topicality argument.

Joseph Evans El Camino

I have been involved in forensics for 10 years. I debated HS LD for 2 years, and then 4 years of college parli debate at El Camino College and UCLA. I coached at CSULB while in graduate school, and I am now currently a full-time professor and coach at El Camino College. I view debate as a game of intellect, and therefore I believe that any method of debate is viable when used as a strategic ploy to win. I will try to list my views on the major themes within debate. The way I evaluate the round: I tend to fall back to evaluating the round through the eyes of a policy maker. Unless I am told otherwise, I tend to fall back on Net Benefits. This means that I will evaluate the arguments based on how clear the impacts are weighed for me (probability, timeframe, and magnitude). I will however evaluate the round based on how you construct your framework. If (for example) you tell me to ignore the framework of Net Benefits for an ethics based framework... I will do so. On the flip side, I will also listen to arguments against framework from the Neg. You win the framework if you provide me clear warranted arguments for your position, and weigh out why your framework is best. Counter Plans: I will listen to any CP that is presented as long as it is warranted. In terms of CP theory arguments... I understand most theory and have been known to vote on it. All I ask is for the theory argument to be justified and warranted out (this also goes for perm theory on the aff). Topicality: I have a medium threshold for T. I will evaluate the position the same as others. I will look at the T the way the debaters in the round tell me. I don't have any preference in regards reasonability vs. competing interps. You run T the way you see fit based on the round. If the neg decides to kick out of the position, I usually don't hold it against them (unless there is offense). I will vote on T if the Aff makes a strategic mistake (it is an easy place for me to vote). Kritical Arguments: I believe that any argument that is present is a viable way to win. Kritical arguments fall into that category. I am well versed in many of the theories that most critical arguments are based in. Therefore if you run them i will listen to and vote on them as long as they are well justified. I will not vote on blips as kritical arguments. Framework: I will listen to any alt framework that is presented (narrative, performance, kritical Etc.) If you decide to run a different framework that falls outside the norm of debate... you MUST justify the framework. Evidence: Have it (warranted arguments for parli)! Speed: I am usually a fast debater and thus I believe that speed is a viable way of presenting as much evidence as possible within the time allotted. I can flow just about anything and I'm confident that you can not out flow me from the round. That being said, I value the use of speed combined with clarity. If you are just mumbling your way through your speech, I won't be able to flow you. While I won't drop you for the act of being unclear... I will not be able to get everything on the flow (which I am confident is probably just as bad).

Joe Faina Los Angeles Valley College

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

Kelsey Figiel College of DuPage

Organization is key! Finally, respect each other! Enjoy yourself and learn something from your competitors! When you present a weighing mechanism, please bring it throughout the entire debate. For me, that continues the

organization of the debate from start to finish. Please do not speed, as that does not show me your critical thinking or argumentation skills.

Bonnie Gabel McHenry County College

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

Rachel Garnett

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

Tyler Gilette Kansas City KS Community College

Jimmy Gomez Orange Coast College

Christine Goss Jefferson State

Ashley Graham El Camino

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

Shonette Grant Northern Virginia Community College

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

Joshua Green Prairie State

Angelica Grigsby Palomar College

Ryan Guy Modesto Junior College

My full JP is attached here. Scroll down if you want answers to the PRP specific questions. General Approach to Judging: I really enjoy good clash in the round. I want you to directly tear into each other's arguments (with politeness and respect). From there you need to make your case to me. What arguments stand and what am I really voting on. If at the end of the round I'm looking at a mess of untouched abandoned arguments you all have epic failed. Organization is very important to me. Please road map and tell me where you are going. I can deal with you bouncing around—if necessary—but please let me know where we are headed and where we are at. Clever tag-lines help too. As a rule I do not time road maps. I like to see humor and wit in rounds. This does not mean you can/should be nasty or mean to each other. Avoid personal attacks unless there is clearly a spirit of

joking goodwill surrounding them. If someone gets nasty with you, stay classy and trust me to punish them for it. If the tournament prefers that we not give oral critiques before the ballot has been turned in I won't. If that is not the case I will as long as we are running on schedule. I'm always happy to discuss the round at some other time during the tournament.

Video Recording: I usually have a webcam with me. If you would like me to record your round and send it to you ask me. I'll only do it if both teams want it, and default to uploading files as unlisted and only sharing them with you.

Specifics: Speaker Points: Other than a couple off the wall occurrences my range tends to fall in the 26-30 range. If you do the things in my "General Approach to Judging" section, your speaks will be higher.

Topicality: Hey Aff...be topical. T and other procedural debates are awesome if you can break free of the boring generic T debates we seem to hear in every round. I'm cool with the "test of the aff" approach but please be smart. I'll vote on T, just make sure you have all the components. I prefer articulated abuse, but will vote on potential abuse if you don't answer it well. I'm unlikely to vote on an RVI. In general I enjoy a good procedural debate but also love rounds where we get to talk about the issues. That said if you are going for a procedural argument...you should probably really go for it in the end or move on to your other arguments.

Kritiques: I tend to be more of a fan of policy rounds. That said I do enjoy critical theory and will vote on the K. Please keep in mind that I have not read every author out there and you should not assume anyone in the round has. Make sure you thoroughly explain your argument. Educate us as you debate. Make sure your alternative solves for the impacts of K. I'm not a fan of this memorizing evidence / cards trend in parli. If you don't understand a critical / philosophical standpoint enough to explain it in your own words, then you might not want to run it in front of me.

Weighing: Please tell me why you are winning. Point to the impact level of the debate. Tell me where to look on my flow. I like clear voters in the rebuttals. The ink on my flow (or pixels if I'm in a laptop mood) is your evidence. Why did you debate better in this round? Do some impact calc and show me why you won.

Speed: I think going a little bit faster than normal conversation can be good for debate. That being said; make sure you are clear, organized and are still making good persuasive arguments. If you can't do that and go fast, slow down. If someone calls clear...please do so. Badly done speed can lead to me missing something on the flow. I'm pretty good if I'm on my laptop, but it is your bad if i miss it because you were going faster than you were effectively able to.

Side Note on NFA-LD: I get that there is the speed is "antithetical" to nfa-ld debate line in the bylaws. I also know that almost everyone ignores it. If you are speaking at a rate a trained debater and judge can comprehend I think you meet the spirit of the rule. If speed becomes a problem in the round just call "clear" or "slow." That said if you use "clear" or "slow" to be abusive and then go fast and unclear I might punish you in speaks.

NFA-LD SPECIFIC THINGS:

Files: I would like to be on the email chain: ryanguy@gmail.com. If there is not an email chain I would like the speech docs on a flashdrive before the speech. Preptime stops when you hit send on the email or pull the flash drive.

Disclosure: I'm a fan of the case list I think it makes for good debate. If you are not breaking a brand new aff it better be up there. If it is not I am more likely to vote on "accessibility" and "predictably" standards in T. I am very persuaded by wikispec arguments for teams that do not disclose. Here is the case list as of 2017. Get your stuff on it: <https://nfald.paperlessdebate.com/LD> with no cards: It might not be a rule, but I think it is abusive and bad for LD debate. I might even vote on a procedural that articulates that.

IPDA: I'm a NPDA and NFA-LD judge for the most part. Even in IPDA I prefer that you signpost your arguments and follow the typical structure for advantages, disadvantages, contentions, etc. You get 30 minutes prep, you should cite sources and provide me with evidence. Arguments supported with cited evidence and empirics are more likely to get my ballot. In general I am okay with anything in IPDA that I am okay with in LD and NPDA. Meaning I will vote on procedurals, Kritiques, and other debate theory if it is run well. I'm also generally okay with a little bit of speed under the guidelines I provided above. In general I follow arguments on my flow. Make sure to respond to each other because a debate without clash is boring.

Q1: What is the most important criteria you consider when evaluating a debate?: Good argumentation, cited warrants, clash.

Q2: What are your expectations for proper decorum from the debaters? Hotels are awkward. Do what makes you comfortable. Sit, stand, it is all the same to me. I care what you have to say, not how you plan to say it. I am fine with partner communication, but it is probably a good idea (generally) to not puppet your partner. Help them if needed, but let them be awesome too.

Q3: What strategies/positions/arguments are you predisposed to listen to and consider when you vote? I prefer policy debate. I'll still listen and vote on critical arguments, but tend to enjoy rounds that follow a more traditional inherency/Plan/advantages kind of setup. In recent years I have found myself less fond of value and fact resolutions. I think policy resolutions let us have better debates about the issues. If you want to run F and V resolutions as a policy, I will probably be okay with that...but you should be ready to justify why policy resolutions are better if they TRICOT you (because our judge likes it is a bad counter standard). In LD I will

vote on WikiSpec if your stuff is not on the case list. <https://nfald.paperlessdebate.com/Q4:How do you evaluate speed, jargon, and technical elements?> See above for my thoughts on speed (a little is good). Jargon and technical elements are part of the event. Use them.

Hannah HAGHIGHAT Saddleback College

David Hale East Los Angeles College

Doug Hall Casper College

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

Robert Hawkins Diablo Valley College

Tim Heisler Las Positas College

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

Adrian Herrera Tallahassee

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

Wade Hescht The Honors College @ LSC

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

Beth Hewes College of Southern Idaho

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

Jeremy Hodgson George Mason University

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

Christopher Holfester Suffolk County Community College

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

Lucy Holsonbake Northern Virginia Community College

Ian Hopkins Northern Virginia CC

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

Ian Hopkins George Mason University

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

Jason Hough Hartnell College

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

Jeannie Hunt Northwest College

I want to be able to judge the round with the least amount of intervention on my part. That means a couple of things. You need to establish a framework that I can follow to evaluate the round. I don't care what that framework is, but I want one. If there is debate about that criterion, make sure that the theory is clear and there are specific reasons why one framework is preferable to the other. That framework is what I will follow, so please don't set the round up as a discourse round and then ask me to look at only net benefits at the end. More importantly, give me something to look at in the end. I would love to hear some impact analysis, some reasons to prefer, something tangible for me to vote on. Absent that, I have to intervene. You should make your own arguments. If you are speaking for, or allowing your partner to speak for you, I am not flowing it. It should be your argument, not a regurgitation of what your partner said three seconds ago. Prompting someone with a statement like, "go to the DA" is fine. Making an argument that is then repeated is not. Delivery styles are much less important to me than the quality of the argument, but that doesn't mean you should have no style. You should be clear, structured and polite to everyone in the round (including your partner if it is team). You can at least take off your hat. Having a bad attitude is as bad as having a bad argument. Speed is not a problem if it is clear. Someone is going to be unhappy at the end of the round - that's how the game works. I will not argue with anyone about my decision. By the time I am disclosing I have already signed the ballot. I am not opposed to answering questions about what could have been done differently, but asking how I evaluated one argument over another is really just you saying think you should have won on that argument. There are no specific arguments that I prefer over another. I will vote on pretty much anything and I am game for pretty much anything. I do expect that you will not subject yourself to performative contradictions or present narratives that you don't want attached to the currency of a ballot, which is what presenting the narrative in the round really comes down to. If you run a k you should be willing to live in the round with the same k standards you are asking us to think about. However, it is the job of the opposing team to point that out... This is true of any theory based argument you choose to run. I am old, which means that I think the 1AC is important. If you are not going to address it

after the 1AC, let me know so I don't have to spend time flowing it. You should have some offense on the positions you are trying to win, so it doesn't hurt to have some offense on case as well. Critical rounds invite the judge to be a part of the debate, and they bring with them a set of ethics and morals that are subjective. I love critical debate, but competitors need to be aware that the debate ceases to be completely objective when the judge is invited into the discussion with a K. Make sure the framework is very specific so I don't have to abandon objectivity all together. Because I don't want to intervene, I don't appreciate points of order. You are asking me to evaluate the worth of an argument, which skews the round in at least a small way. Additionally, I think I flow pretty well, and I know I shouldn't vote on new arguments. I won't. If you feel particularly abused in the round, and need to make a point of some sort, you can, but as a strategy to annoy the other team, or me, it is ill advised. I have been coaching parli since 2005. I coached policy before that for seven years and competed in CEDA in college.

Kush Jenkins Northern Virginia Community College

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

Jordan Johnson Casper College

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Are you cool with speed?" In short: yes. But smart and slow always beats fast and dumb. I have absolutely no preference on rate of delivery, though I will say it might be smart to slow down a bit on really long tags, advocacy texts, or on overviews that have really nuanced descriptions of the round. My belief is that speed is

typically good for debate but please remember that spreading's true measure is contingent on the amount of arguments that are required to be answered by the other team.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Framework appeals effectively consist of a normative claim of how debate ought to function. The interpretation should be prescriptive; if you are not comfortable with what the world of debate would look like if your interpretation were universally applied, then you have a bad interpretation. The impact to your argument ought to be derived from your interpretation (yes, I've given RFDs where this needed to be said). Furthermore, Topical

Version of the Affirmative must specifically explain how the impacts of the 1AC can be achieved, it might be in your best interest to provide a text or point to a few cases that achieve that end. This is especially true if you want to go for external impacts that the 1AC can't access – but all of this is contingent on a cogent explanation as to why order precedes/is the internal link to justice.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I like conditionality probably more so than other judges. As a young'n I got away with a lot of, probably, abusive Negative strategies that relied on conditionality to the maximum (think “multiple worlds and presumption in the 2NR”) mostly because many teams were never particularly good at explaining why this was a problem. If you're able to do so, great – just don't expect me to do much of that work for you. I don't find it particularly difficult for a 2AR to make an objection about how that is bad for debate, thus be warned 2NRs - it's a downhill effort for a 2AR.

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

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

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

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

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

KRITIKAL DEBATE

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

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

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

THOUGHTS ON COMPETITION

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

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

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

Sasan Kasravi Diablo Valley College

Natalie Kellner Ohlone College

Clarity of content and the ability to support logical arguments with evidence. Hold my hand through the whole process. Be clear and set up structure that allows me to follow with ease. For me, this activity really boils down to the basics of public speaking, that it is an audience centered. If you loose me then you lost your vote. Don't assume your audience knows exactly what your talking about, you should be so clear with your arguments the audience can't help but understand what you are saying. Be respectful and witty, the intention is not to insult each other, I want to see you challenge each other. What is a K (I am unsure of the answer to this question.... so let's not...)? Take your time, clarity is key, if you can speak faster than I can think... we are going to have a problem. I am NOT a debate coach. My IE background frames my perception of the event. I want to see a clear extemporaneous delivery and a concise speech tone that sounds like you are having an informed conversation. This tactic will grab my ear and my interest. Show me some personality and have fun!

Kathryn Kelly Blinn College

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

Jared Kubicka-Miller Santiago Canyon College

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

Tara Kubicka-Miller Santiago Canyon College

Katie Lai George Mason University

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

Chris Langone Oakton Community College

It will depend on the event. I will judge IPDA according to the public-oriented spirit of the event. I will judge pari based on the quality of the arguments and the flow. I will judge LD based strictly on the flow. I have no pre-conceived notions of what LD debate should be and let the debaters define (and debate) the judging criteria. Have fun. Be smart. Don't pander. I will go to procedurals first. I like counterplan=disad combinations. If you run a K you better understand your argument. I don't like arguments based solely on the identity of the debaters. Speed is fine in LD. Not in IPDA or Parli. I am cool with all jargon, like I know what it means.

K C Larson

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

Kyle Larson Harper College

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

Viet Le City College of San Francisco

Blake Longfellow Diablo Valley College

Daniel Lopez Hartnell College

Chris Lowry Palomar College

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

Robert Loy Santa Monica College

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

Lauren Lugo Mchenry County College

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

Bryan Malinis San Diego Mesa College

I will always vote on presumption if the government team fails to provide a clear enough prima facie case for me to suspend presumption. I am looking for the team that provides the strongest, most logical arguments in the round. Be sure to stay organized! You must label all your arguments with taglines and signposts in order for me to flow the debate effectively. I have dropped teams in the past due to their lack of a CLEAR structure. Do not simply tell me that legalizing marijuana leads to dying children. Provide links, internal links, and impacts. Do not assume that I will make the argument/connection for you in my head. I only flow what is explicitly stated in the round. Most important, give me clear voters. Debaters are expected to perform with professionalism and respect. I do not condone distasteful or disparaging remarks made against opponents, nor insulting nonverbal behavior. Such behavior tarnishes your own credibility as a persuasive speaker. Avoid ad hominem attacks. Excessive insults will result in me dropping your team. I am fine with partner-to-partner communication; however, I will only flow what the present speaker says. Please keep audible P2P communication to a minimum while an opponent is speaking: excessive talking hinders my ability to truly focus on the present speaker. Above all, make me happy to be in your presence. Have a good time and I will, too. I am stock issues all the way! I welcome topicality arguments as long as they are well-justified by the opposition. Topicality arguments must be perfectly structured. You must cover all your bases with the topicality. I am not a fan of Kritiks, so tread carefully. I will not immediately drop you for using a K, but these arguments must be well-justified and clearly articulated. If it feels like your K is wasting our time, you've likely lost the round. Use common sense here. Your delivery skills are unequivocally tied to my perception of your credibility and competence as a speaker. I pay close attention to your speech rate (breathe like a human), volume, pitch, gestures, posture, eye contact, etc. Since nonverbal communication comprises up to 90% of what we communicate, you must be mindful of all the aforementioned elements during your speaking time. I have coached and judged collegiate debate for over five years and am comfortable with jargon and technical elements, though I am partial to a more straightforward, narrative debate style. For IPDA, treat me as a lay judge. I know nothing.

Christina Marquez El Paso Community College

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

Floyd McConnell San Jacinto College North

I like to hear a very well organized debate. Signposting and organization go a long way with me. Don't make your judge work too hard. When debate is done well, it is much easier to judge, and for your fellow competitors to have an educational experience. Debaters should always dress professionally. Also it is crucial for debaters to show proper sportsmanship. Please be polite to your opponents. Rudeness is never appreciated. There is a difference between confidence and arrogance. I like good organized, well labeled arguments. When it comes to policy, I am a stock issues judge. I am not a fan of Kritiks. Make strong arguments and refute arguments with sound logic. I see debate as a demonstration of effective communication. I really despise speed and

spreading. I am fine with jargon, except in IPDA. I am open to well-constructed arguments. I do not like the open CX in Parli. I believe that only the speaker should answer questions. Minimal notes passed in round is ok.

Kristy McManus Western Wyoming Community College

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

Sarah Metivier Schadt McHenry County College

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

Lauren Morgan College of Dupage

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

Douglas Mungin Solano Community College

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

David Nadolski Oakton Community College

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

Jin Nakama San Diego Mesa College

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

John Nash Moraine Valley

Bill Neesen Irvine Valley College

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

Eva Nielsen-Parks Tallahassee

I am looking for well-structured and supported cases that deliver clear argumentation through a logical flow. Topicality and technical points should be duly noted but preferably not the entire basis for rebuttal. I believe most debates can occur with minimal points of order as much of the time they can be better addressed within the speeches. Be polite. I value quality speaking. If your arguments cannot be understood because of speed or disorder, it is difficult to flow the debate effectively. Organize your speech. Name each point as you address it.

Speak directly to the point and move on. Finally, wit and humor are appreciated! These can only be effective when debaters are enjoying themselves and respecting one another. I hope this is the atmosphere that characterizes all of your debates. IE coach. Explain everything.

Lucas Ochoa Saddleback College

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

Jennifer Page Irvine Valley College

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

Mike Para Orange Coast College

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

Rolland Petrello Moorpark College

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

kindly on speed as solely a strategic tool against slower debaters. To me, that is avoiding the debate out of your own fear and ultimately misrepresents what debate should be to the outside observers that we need. Anything else, feel free to ask me pre-round.

Amanda Pettigrew Moraine Valley

Elsie Praeger-Goller Mt. Hood Community College

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

Emily Prochnicki Suffolk County Community College

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

Jeff Przybylo Harper College

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

Rita Rafael Chapman University

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

Janice Ralya Jefferson State

Jolinda Ramsey San Antonio College

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

Jess Rauchberg George Mason University

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

Jeff Rieck Moraine Valley

Steve Robertson Palomar College Default paradigms: I think that the round is for you to convince me why your side should win the debate. Thus, ultimately it is up to you to frame the debate in such a way as to

persuade me. I try to be as non-interventionist and on-the-flow as possible (except in circumstances when you, as a debater, force me to intervene). So I default to a paradigm of an argumentarian--I look to the quality of arguments that are made (believability, fidelity, warrants, application). However, there are certain guidelines which can make your adaptation to me easier. 1. Since evidence is inadmissible in parli and IPDA, counter-intuitive arguments become more difficult to win. That is not to say they are unwinnable--but the justification standard does increase. If you go for counter-intuitive strategies, be prepared to develop the argument(s) more thoroughly and in greater detail. The "reverse voting issue" on topicality, for example, is probably the most counter-intuitive argument you can make. You have to do A LOT of work to win this in front of me. 2. Debate starts at the highest point of conflict. Thus, I do listen to theory arguments, even to the point of whether the resolution is fact, value, policy, etc. Clarification of such points is necessary for the debate to proceed, and a case poorly framed within the resolution that does not justify the resolution can lose on just such a point. Don't assume that just because I have a policy background, I feel that policy is called for in every round. In addition, the aff/gov has the right to define the terms within the resolution--though not an absolute right. For a neg/opp to attack topicality, they must demonstrate two arguments--aff's definition/interpretation is bad, and neg's definition is good. I state this here explicitly because so many times I have voted for a non-topical case simply because of poor argumentation, and I'm sick of it! Just a personal thought. 3. The more specific the argument you can make, the better. Generic arguments, while useful and sometimes necessary, are not NEARLY as compelling as arguments that are specific to the case or counterplan. 4. Parli has the unique tool of the Point of Order. You should use this if applicable. Some debaters think that numerous PoO's anger judges. For me, only frivolous PoO's do this. I do not protect the OPP if the PMR is making new arguments. Make a PoO, rather than thinking, "well, the judge knows that's new...I needn't bother." If that's your decision, then you will probably lose, because it will get on my flow. However, this is not all-encompassing, and it does not give the PMR carte blanche for new arguments. PMR's who just make tons of new arguments (hoping one slips through) aggravate me tremendously, and the credibility of their arguments diminishes when this happens. Just avoid the new arguments, and all will be well. 5. For NFA-LD, you should be reading evidence. Evidence trumps assertion. This isn't parli - assertions are only as credible as a college student is. Back up your claims with evidence. The more you assert, the less credible your argument. This should be a clue to the other side - argue quality of argument, offer counter-arguments, and even better, offer counter-evidence. 6. For IPDA, realize that this isn't parli, it is a different type of debate. This is less about the flow or debate jargon and more about persuasive delivery. Think of this more like an interactive persuasion round. The good analogy is: think about debating for your grandmother. Be civil to one another. This is not Thunderdome, you are not Mad Max, and there are no weapons strapped to the walls! Hostility does not translate to better argument. This does not mean, however, that you have to be all sugary-sweet. Just realize that aggressiveness (especially unsolicited aggression) is not the point of this activity. Don't mutter under your breath, don't have attacks against the other person (that aren't warranted), etc. And also have fun. While this seems simplistic, many debaters forget that the activity should be fun.

It's up to the debaters to establish why their arguments are important, and why I should consider one over another. Lacking this, I use my own opinions to weigh out arguments. So debaters should be sure to weigh out issues for me, because you never know how I'll evaluate things otherwise. I also have a hard time voting for arguments that don't make sense to me. If I look like I am confused during your speech, I might not be understanding what you're talking about. The less I can understand your argument, the less likely I am to vote on it.

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

Tomeka Robinson Hofstra University

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

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

Sage Russo Chabot College

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

Hal Sanford Santa Rosa Junior College

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Topicality: Be sure interpretations or counter-interpretations are reasonably defined, metaphors are accurately applied, and mere time-suck topicality arguments aren't argued by negatives. You've got better things to do. Still, affirmatives, me buying a reverse voting issue on topicality is very unlikely. Even with a opp. drop on this issue, I'll really resist. Kill shot reciprocity for affirmative and negative on topicality does not make sense to me. Case

must be topical for aff. to win; other reasons exist to vote neg. even if case is topical. Affirmative: Hurray, you are topical; you should win on a topicality RVI despite a disadvantage that links your plan to everybody on earth dying? Really?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Daniel Santillana Tallahassee

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

Annie Sauter Harper College

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

Kari Schimmel Illinois Central College

John Schultz Tallahassee

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

Tim Sheehan Ivy Tech Community College

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

Taure Shimp Modesto Junior College

I evaluate the round by looking at Topicality and Specs, CPs and K Alts, then Advantages and Disadvantages. While each round plays out differently, I tend to consider who has best upheld the criteria; who has most access to solvency and impacts; who has the most ink on the flow (e.g. are arguments being sufficiently answered or are critical arguments dropped). I enjoy rounds with good humor where everyone treats one another with respect. This does not mean you need to begin every speech with flowery thank yous, but it does mean you should avoid rude nonverbals (scoffing, making faces, etc.). Basic guideline...if you would not speak to family members, co-workers, teachers, and friends in a certain way then don't speak that way to competitors. I do not particularly care if debaters stand or sit. Debate should foster civil discourse and honor the educational integrity of the event. I see it as my responsibility to listen to the arguments you choose to make and evaluate them as fairly as possible. However, I do have some personal preferences. The rounds I enjoy the most have a lot of clash, fewer but higher quality arguments, and impact analysis that emphasizes probability over magnitude. That being said, I will listen to the arguments the debaters choose to make. Procedurals and Kritiks can make for good debate...but I find AFF Ks are often gratuitous and I tend to resent when they are run as a strategy to win rather than out of ethical necessity. If you choose to run a Kritik (on either side), it is very important that you explain the theory clearly

and accurately; have a strong link; and identify a realistic alternative. If you are unable to articulate—in a concrete way—how we can engage the alternative, you should not make the argument. I enjoy critical theory, but find it almost offensive when it is handled poorly or intentionally distorted. In NFA-LD: Speed and jargon is fine as long as your tags are slow and clear. In Parli: Faster-than-conversation and jargon is fine, but I do not like spreading in this event. For me, it decreases the quality of analysis and becomes counterproductive to the in-round education. I will not ask you to slow down during the round or say “clear.” In IPDA: A conversational pace is best suited for this style of debate. I still want to hear clear arguments with cited evidence. I personally am fine with jargon in this event and believe it is possible to discuss definitions and question the underlying assumptions/ideologies of certain arguments. My perspective is that this event should model accessible but high level thinking and argumentation (similar in style to the Intelligence Squared debate podcast by NPR).

Evelio Silvera Tallahassee

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

Jonathan Stansbury The Honors College @ LSC

I have judged and coached LD, IPDA, and Parli for the past 8 years. I will be flowing every round. I am a very open judge in debate in terms of types of arguments. I am a big fan of evidence in LD and IPDA. In Parli I am more interested in your logic and argumentation. Delivery should match the event. I think IPDA should have way less jargon than other forms of debate. I do not like seeing speed at the phi rho pi tournament in debate events.

Cherie Stepheson Western Wyoming Community College

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

Neal Stewart Moorpark College

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

Kiefer Storrer Glendale Community College

Josh Sunderbruch Harper College

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

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

Eddie Tionson Irvine Valley College

Chris Tittle Tallahassee

If there are any IE "points of reference" that I might use to judge a debate, they would be what I learned in Extemp (researching and sharing sources on current events) and public address events (organization and delivery through Informative, Persuasion and ADS). Be polite and have fun. Decorum: Polite, compliant with timing rules and requests from opponents, conviction in perspective and celebrating the spirit of competition

Strategies/Positions/Arguments: Structure, transition, responding to opposing views and raising new points

Delivery: Relaxed body, articulate, paced, eye contact

I don't appreciate debates where the speakers put a philosophical "spin" on what should be plain discourse that anyone should be able to follow without too much effort. If you're going to debate the Southcom role, don't bring up the "gender dynamics" of international relations (what is that?). Bottom line: My mother should be able to sit down in a round and understand the topic, points of view and arguments from start to finish. Explain everything.

Jeff Toney San Joaquin Delta College

Grant Tovmasian Rio Hondo College

The most important criteria for me is impartiality. I will avoid interceding on any one's behalf up to a point. Please remember that although I approach the round as impartial as I can, that does not negate the truth, I still am aware which country I live in and who is the president and killing puppies is wrong (also kicking them, and just violence in general, I frown upon) I expect all debaters to remain cordial and professional throughout the round. The decorum is important so as not to isolate or offend any student. Debate albeit adversarial in nature should be based on arguments and not a personal attack and as such, each student should perceive this as a safe place to express ideas and arguments. I prefer good on case argumentation over near useless procedural that are simply run in order to avoid on case thorough analysis. As such I am a believer that presentation and sound argumentation is critical towards establishing one's position. DA vs Advantages. CP vs Plan are all sound strategies and I hope students will use them. I firmly believe that speed kills, as such the first team that uses it as an offensive or defensive tactic will get a loss in that round. Critics, i.e. K are to be run only when one or the other side believes that it is more important than whatever else is happening and is directly connected to either the actions of the other team or resolution in it of itself. As such, they should be willing to commit to it wholeheartedly and most important at the top of everything. For example, if you truly believe that the other team is promoting cultural genocide, seriously do not speak to me about agricultural benefits or disadvantages of the plan first, because then I think you cheapen both the critique and your whole line of argumentation. If permutation can happen in the real world it can happen in a debate round. If you are running a CP please make sure to explain its status, especially if you are to claim dispositional (EXPLAIN) Please call Points of Order and 95% of the time I will respond with (point well taken, point not well taken) That aside, I am open to any line of

argumentation as long as it is complete. Example: I will not do your work for you, no link no argument, no impact no argument, no warrant NO ARGUMENT PERIOD. I want to hear fun, constructive and polite debates. Have fun and let the best team win. (I always prefer cordial and educational rounds with elements of quick wit and persuasive argumentation over Nuclear Holocaust, which I really do not care for, especially when it results because of US not buying used car parts from Uruguay.)

Keith Townsend El Paso Community College

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

Tom Tracy Harper College

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

Dana Trunnell Prairie State

Roxanne Tuscany Grossmont

The debaters in the round, should be telling me, "what the most important criteria is in the debate". I am listening and analyzing your debate according to what you, "the debaters", tell me is important. Therefore, your criteria for the debate should be very clear, and you should be reminding me throughout the debate what my criteria should be, to vote for your team. Parliamentary debate is and has been a "communication" event. We are at a speech/debate tournament. I expect communication skills to be used as effectively as possible, and that we are following our disciplines' research that supports first impressions and good communication to be effective persuasive methods. Therefore, stand when speaking. When your partner is speaking, only discretely pass a note to them. Never, speak for them. I would also like to have you stand for Points of Information, and politely call out, Point of Information. If you raise your hand, the speaker many times cannot see you. It is not "rude" to interrupt the speaker, for points of information or points of order. It is part of parliamentary debate guidelines. It is rude to speak for your own partner. I would like to say that I am open to all positions/arguments and strategies. I teach argumentation, and I know that there ARE 3 types of resolutions: FACT, VALUE, AND POLICY. If you pick a resolution that is a fact resolution, it should be run that way, etc. There are fact and value resolutions. They may be more challenging, but they exist. Of course, you can argue that the team has incorrectly identified what type of resolution it is, and run topicality. That is part of the debate. Also, there will be metaphors in these debates, and they could be in the form of a fact/value or policy. You need to identify this in your debate. In a policy round, I do prefer stock issues format, rather than the current trend of comparative advantage. I also expect a complete plan. For the opposition, I expect you to listen to the affirmative case, and argue against their positions as directly as possible, rather than come in with your own case, that has nothing to do with what the government case is arguing. Speed has no place in parliamentary debate. For me, it has nothing to do with your judge being able to "flow" the debate. It has to do with you being a competent communicator, in the real world. If you can talk eloquently, with good enunciation skills, then I'm fine with you talking relatively fast, without it being a problem. I don't believe a judge should have to yell out: "clear". An audience should not have to tell the speaker, that we can't understand you. Jargon should be used sparingly. We are at a national tournament, where not every region uses the same jargon. Therefore, don't assume we know your jargon. Quickly, briefly explain your terms. I would like you to know that I love parliamentary debate, and have been judging for as long as it has existed in the western states. I love to hear real world issues debated directly in front of me. I hope you are up to this incredible experience and challenge of arguing real issues. Enjoy!

Arthur Valenzuela Los Angeles Valley College

Dana Jean Van Winkle Saddleback College

John Vitullo Mt. San Antonio College

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

Trent Webb Nassau Community College

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

Brandan Whearty Palomar College

Gretchen Wheeler Casper College

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

Janene Whitesell Solano Community College

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

teach argumentation, so I'm familiar with terminology. Keeping it conversational so that the "average person on the street" could understand it should always be the goal.

Roger Willis-Raymondo Mt. San Antonio College

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

Brandon Wood College of Dupage

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

Jim Wyman Moorpark College

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

Eric Yahn Glendale Community College

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