

51st USAFA Classic

NPDA Debate

Judge Philosophy Booklet

Contents

Dena Counts – Abilene Christina	4
Sarah Collins – Cameron University	5
Zach Fort – Cameron University	6
Josh House – Central Wyoming	7
Chris Leland – Colorado Christian	8
JD Smith – Colorado Christian	9
Matt Lenell – Colorado Christian	10
Danny Iberri-Shea – CSU - Pueblo	11
Kim Bryant – Howard Payne	12
Dayle Hardy-Short - NAU	13
Michael Dvorak - NAU	14
Caitlyn Burford - NAU	15
Tracy Valgento - NAU	17
Jeannie Hunt – Northwest College	18
Krista Stone – Northwest College	19
Fred Ebert – Northwest College	20
Duane Fish – Northwest College (TAB)	21
Billie Harvey – Ranger College	22
Nick Robinson – TTU (1/2 commitment)	23
Nick Larmer – TTU (1/2 commitment)	25
Rob Layne – TTU (1/2 commitment)	26
Julian Plaza – Colorado College	28
Sahan Jayasumana – Colorado College	31
Will Van Treuren – UC - BOULDER	36
Kevin Stone - Montana	37
David Airne - Montana	39
Kaitlin Bundock – Utah	41
Michael Middleton – Utah – (TAB)	43
Jason Jordan - Utah	44
Kasey Lowery – USAFA Volunteer	45
Ross Gresham – USAFA Volunteer	46

Michelle Reinstatler – USAFA Volunteer	47
Katie Plichta – USAFA Volunteer	48
Kristy McManus – Western Wyoming Community College.....	49
Zoey DeWolf - Hired.....	50
Michael Brooks – UTEP	51
Michael Martin – UTEP	52
Alyssa Sambor – TTU (1/2 commitment)	53
Caleb Rawson – Colorado Christian	54
Grant Langdon - Hired.....	54
Nick Mauer – Hired	54

Dena Counts – Abilene Christina

I am the DOF at ACU. I have been coaching Parli for the last 5 years. For those last 5 years, I have judged on average 65 rounds per year.

I vote with the better quality of argument. When I say better quality, I am looking for depth of arguments and warrants behind your claim. I attempt to remove my individual biases from the round and make debaters tell me where and why to vote. I understand that biases do seep into my judgments, but I do feel that I should make decisions based upon your argumentation – not my worldview. Probably, I'm more of a game player when it comes to a decision maker. Love new and unique strategies. I really think almost anything goes in this thing called debate. I say "anything" as I don't like cursing, nakedness, or slurs, but strategy wise, you can do what you need to do to win. Know that I'm very expressive in my nonverbals. If I am getting your argument, you'll know. If you've lost me, you should know from my nonverbals. I have only been coaching for five years, so there are times that super speed (not typically speed) can lose me. Again watch my nonverbals, and I'll let you know. I flow, judge on the flow, and don't do the work for you. Use your rebuttal to tell me why you win and where on the flow your arguments overwhelm the teams.

Section 2: Specific Inquiries

Please describe your approach to the following.

1. Speaker points (what is your typical speaker point range or average speaker points given)? 25 to 30
2. How do you approach critically framed arguments? Can affirmatives run critical arguments? Can critical arguments be "contradictory" with other negative positions? Kritiks are great from both Aff and Neg. Explain your framework, impacts and give me a realistic alternative. I do think you need an alternative and it shouldn't bite your story. No I don't think when you run other negative arguments they should be contradict other neg positions unless through the running of those positions you are trying to make a point.
3. Performance based arguments... Great. Just tell me how I should interpret them, how they function in the round.
4. Topicality. What do you require to vote on topicality? Is in-round abuse necessary? Do you require competing interpretations? I will vote on T but would rather vote elsewhere. To pull that trigger in -round abuse is typically necessary. Also, competing interp is necessary.
5. Counterplans -- PICs good or bad? Should opp identify the status of the counterplan? Perms -- textual competition ok? functional competition? CP's are fine. PICS are fine. That doesn't mean you shouldn't run argumentation of why PICS are bad though. Yes, ID the status of the CP. PERM the CP every which way you can. If you can think of a new way to PERM that would be super fun.
6. Is it acceptable for teams to share their flowed arguments with each other during the round (not just their plans) Yes that's fine.
7. In the absence of debaters' clearly won arguments to the contrary, what is the order of evaluation that you will use in coming to a decision (e.g. do procedural issues like topicality precede kritiks which in turn precede cost-benefit analysis of advantages/disadvantages, or do you use some other ordering)? Topicality is first. Then I look to Criteria or Framework to tell me where to go. Usually it is impacts or turns on case. I REALLY like rebuttals that tell me where to vote and WHY to vote.
8. How do you weight arguments when they are not explicitly weighed by the debaters or when weighting claims are diametrically opposed? How do you compare abstract impacts (i.e. "dehumanization") against concrete impacts (i.e. "one million deaths")? If you don't tell me WHY your impact outweighs their impacts on timeline, magnitude or probability, then you are in the right place (Reno, NV) as you are a gambling person. I would probably go with concrete impacts over abstract ones.

Sarah Collins – Cameron University

Background: Coach NPDA/LD debate since 2007. Competed in NPDA for 4 years.

Debaters have the freedom to frame the round how they desire. While, my personal preferences are listed below, I will vote on what is presented in the round. Don't assume that I will not vote for a kritik that doesn't have an alternative unless you make that argument in the round. In other words, I vote on the flow

Kritiks: Should have a clear link to opponent's advocacy or language, as well as a clear alternative. I don't prefer generic kritiks that don't link to the advocacy or language presented in the round.

Procedurals: Procedurals come before case, and should have: interpretation, violation, standards, and voters. If there is more than 1 procedural in the round, it is important to tell me how to evaluate procedurals and where to look first. I don't believe in the trichotomy, meaning that I don't believe certain words in the resolution dictate what framework the government should take (ie: fact, value, or policy), nor do I think that every resolution must be interpreted as policy. Offer and defend your interpretation of the resolution, and I'll listen to it. The government has the right to define; the opposition has the right to challenge those definitions. I will evaluate topicality in terms of articulated abuse and ground loss, unless I'm told to evaluate T based on competing interpretations.

On case: It is important for debaters to weigh the round. What position should I look at first? How does your advocacy outweigh other advocacies in the round (timeframe, magnitude, probability)? It is important to have offense on positions. I won't extend case for you, it is important that the MG extends case. Similarly, it is important the MO extends dropped arguments from the LOC. While I don't need a disadvantage (which has 4 parts: uniqueness, link, internal link, impac). to vote negative; minus procedurals, there must be offense (turns, solvency take-out's, etc.) to outweigh impacts of case. Minus procedurals, counterplans, disadvantages, and on-case offense, I will for a risk of solvency.

Decorum: Good arguments are ones that aren't blippy claims, but rather have warranted analysis. I don't have a problem with speed, unless you lose articulation. If I can't understand the argument you are making, it won't be on the flow, and since that's where I vote... it presents a problem. In other words, if your speech causes you to become inarticulate, slow down. Debate should be educational, if your opponent asks you to slow down, take the time to do so. If you don't Point of Order new arguments in the rebuttal, it is a strategic error on your part. Strong speaking skills are awarded with speaker points, but have no influence on my decision in the round. Don't be rude....to your partner, to your opponent, to me. Just don't do it.

If you have questions, please ask.

Zach Fort – Cameron University

Background: 4 years competition in NPDA; 2 years coaching NPDA

I would call myself a “flow judge”, meaning that I’m most interested in the arguments being made and whether or not they are adequately responded to. In other words, dropped arguments and under covered positions weigh heavily in my decision making. I’m not necessarily opposed to any type of argument, I will listen to anything. However, all arguments should have warrants and impacts. I will rely on you to weigh those impacts and tell me which position(s) should be evaluated first in the round and why. I will not intervene, so tell me where to vote!

Procedurals: I'm open to any procedural arguments. (Topicality, Kritiks, Vagueness, etc.) Procedurals should have a clear link to specific language or advocacy in the round and be impacted to demonstrate why the procedural argument matters and should win the ballot before looking at case. I do have a slight dislike for highly philosophical kritiks. Personally, I don't feel competitive debate is the best format for these discussions. This is not to say that I would never vote on a Kritik or vote against a team simply for running one. I will do my best to check my bias at the door, but I will inevitably view a kritik with a level of heightened scrutiny versus other arguments.

Interpretation of resolutions: I do not necessarily believe that any resolution has only way of being interpreted. I’m open for resolutions to be interpreted as fact, value or policy. However, teams need to provide justification for why they have interpreted the resolution the way they have interpreted it. If that interpretation is being challenged by the opposition, it is both teams responsibility to explain to me why one way of interpreting the resolution is superior to another in this context. The opposition must explain why the challenge of the government’s interpretation of the resolution (or counter interpretation) is a voting issue.

Questions and Points of Order: There is no set number of questions that anyone is required to answer in a round. However; I do feel it is polite to take at least two questions. When flowing rebuttals, if I believe an argument is new I will not factor that argument into my decision; however, I can’t promise I will catch every new argument so it is your responsibility to point of order them.

Speed: I am open to speed when necessary to cover all of the arguments; however, it is important that I am able to understand you. If I can’t understand what you are saying, I can’t flow it. If this happens, I'll say "clear".

If you have further questions, feel free to ask.

Josh House – Central Wyoming

I have tendencies but I'm not entirely robotic and my views are not perfectly static across time and space. If I change in a major way I'll let you know.

I tend to prioritize substance over style. That's not to say that I discount style entirely, and your delivery can certainly influence my understanding of what you have to say, but I'm not ever voting based on what you're wearing or just based on who sounded more polished.

I tend to prefer structure in your delivery, and I prefer it if you watch my nonverbal reactions and adjust accordingly when appropriate. That is to say, if I'm confused or lost I try not to keep that to myself, and I'd appreciate it if you make some attempt to un-confuse me sooner rather than later.

I tend to want to vote in debates based on how the debaters tell me I should vote and to try to keep my personal feelings about a topic out of my decision. That is, I try to stick to the flow and I try not to intervene.

I tend to view voting on Topicality (and procedural issues more generally) in Parli as something that is in opposition with that last tendency. The Gov team gets about 20 minutes to figure out what a topic means and what they're going to say. As long as their interpretation of what the topic means makes sense I tend to think that the Opposition team should debate them on that interpretation. To be clear(er), I will vote on Topicality but I am very sympathetic to "we meet" arguments and I absolutely require articulated in round abuse (not potential abuse and not prep-time abuse). In LD or other activities where the topic stays the same over time I'm much more likely to vote on Topicality and to listen to reasons why I should choose the "best" interpretation of the topic. I would love to talk to you more about this if you're interested.

Oh yeah, I tend to want you to run a policy because I think it usually makes for better, more educational debate.

I tend to think that if the alternative on your K has to include the words "Vote Opp to..." it's a good sign that I don't really need to vote Opp to accomplish what you're after. If your Alt solvency rests on changing the minds/actions of people in the real world (not via fiat) then I expect an explanation of how it works starting with the people in the room and extending as far as our influence reaches. Otherwise don't tell me that my voting Opp will end capitalism or the patriarchy and expect me to fill in the gaps on how that happens.

I tend to forget to give time signals because I'm busy writing things down. I will usually at least have a timer, it's just that I forget to look at it as you go, so if you time yourselves or have somebody in the audience help out that's usually to your advantage.

I tend to want people to enjoy this activity, to seem like they're enjoying this activity, and to help others to enjoy this activity. I tend to react pretty negatively to behavior that is exclusionary, rude, or mean.

I would be happy to add clarification on items of interest on request.

Chris Leland – Colorado Christian

Debate has always been and always will be an academic lab for the articulation of good argumentation. I have competed, judged and coached programs at the university level in IE, CEDA, NDT and Parli. As such I am not a novice to debate, but I am relatively new to some forms of theoretical arguments and especially the more recent lingo that surrounds them. I have been out of coaching for 14 years, but have been putting into practice the debate skills in the public forum against philosophers, theologians, cultural critics, politicians, free thinkers, etc. So I have seen what debate does in the "real world." As such I am not yet convinced that some of the culture of debate doesn't force us into a box that is really pretty particular to our little world. I say that to say, I am not opposed to T or "Kritique" (which I guess is the hip postmodern spelling) or any other theoretical arguments but I can say I would much rather see clearly articulated and communicated arguments that are well constructed and well thought out. It is fair to say I have a much higher threshold for those types of arguments. Debate, I recognize, is also about strategy, but not at the expense of solid argumentation. Having coached CEDA and NDT and now Parli for the last couple of years, I can flow. Have to use my glasses to see what I wrote, which is different from the good ol' days, but ... I will say that the thing that has shocked me the most this year is the casual way in which language is thrown around. I fully don't expect it at this tournament, but there is no room in academic debate (even with the idea of free speech in mind) for foul language. It is unprofessional and rude. Might be considered cool for some, but it is not accepted in any of the professions for which we are training up this group to move onto in the future. Otherwise, I am excited to be back in the debate realm the last couple of years.

JD Smith – Colorado Christian

Colorado Christian University

Assistant Director of Debate

Judging Philosophy

The core of my judging paradigm functions around four basic principles; Courteous Competition, Sign-Posting, Time Allocation and Impact/Risk Calculus. I expect students to treat one another and judges with a level of respect that rivals the Dalai Lama. Do not sling insults among one another. Do not use profanity as an expression of your discontent or emotions at large. Instead treat one another as equals with dignity and pride, in the least, for the activity.

The flow is my life-source throughout the round. I will not ask you to complete it for me. This in mind, I expect your best effort to maintain the organizational of the flow stemming from the PMC (1AC). In the event that these expectations are not upheld I will likely reflect my frustration through quality points and speaker ranking. If you're uncertain as to my expectations, simply ask.

Time allocation is not my personal invitation to fill your time with "shenanigans." If you're finished, then you're finished. Sit down. There's no embarrassment tied to making a simplistic one shot argument in two minutes and parking it in the LOC. I'm going to trust that you're either that confident or just ill-prepared, only time will tell. Regarding more advanced expectations of time allocation, I consider overviews and underviews in the LOC and subsequent speeches to be absolutely necessary in a high flow round. Roadmaps should take thirty seconds MAX and will be held off time.

POI/PPP and PO's are welcome, encouraged and expected in the round. Remember to be courteous and appropriate. I will not rule in favor or against a PO in the rebuttal. I will defer my judgment until the flow no longer functions in the round (after my ballot is complete). This in mind, please refer to the specific contention/advantage etc. on the flow. PPP's will always receive a ruling.

The most concise way to ensure that your rebuttal will be properly evaluated by my ballot is to include risk/impact calculus in the LOR and PMR. Do not do this "as we go along" down the flow. Label your rebuttal underview as a Voter/IMP CALC, this will keep my flow clean and your critique sensible. I might also add that I encourage pulling across specific warrants to corroborate your Impact Calculus.

Regarding the more intricate details of the debate, such as CPs, K's, Procedurals and "speed," I have a few suggestions. CP's must include a framework explaining the evaluative paradigm of the argument and as such I would expect the negative to analyze this FW in conjunction with any permutations. Permutations at large should include solvency, or at least analysis that resembles such. Kritiks featuring an alternative text of "reject" will indeed get what they desire, rejection. Do the research and you'll be rewarded. Performance Kritiks involving racial or gender-based links will not be flowed. I've seen enough to believe they're value in competitive debate is debilitating as opposed to liberating. Should the opposing team offend you by the use of Gender or Racially exclusive language I will make the exception. All procedural argumentation must include proven, not potential abuse, in order to win my ballot. This means you should run a double-bind, prove the no link as indicative of the abuse and go for the procedural in the rebuttal. This does not mean you'll win the round. It means you did it right. I will not discredit a team for the use of "speed" in a debate round unless they're doing one of three things; 1) Double Clutching (speed is an art, practice) 2) Pausing for longer than 5 seconds between arguments (now you're just wasting my time) 3) Mumbling (I will call clear three times, after that I'm done flowing). If you don't know how to speak persuasively at a normative rate of delivery then I'll give you some tips before the round. This means that if you encounter a team that does not speed, adapt.

Matt Lenell – Colorado Christian

I'm a recent graduate serving as an assistant coach, with 5 years competition experience in high school and collegiate debate. As with anyone recently changing sides at a tournament, I understand the difficulty arising from the vast differences in judging paradigms. I'll listen to any reasonably sound arguments you want to make, but I do judge through the lens of logic.

Don't make up facts; I'll probably know...

I tend to be mostly flow based and tabula rasa when I can stifle my personal opinion. Sarcasm is acceptable, and persuasion is a must. I will vote on whatever criteria and voters you offer within reason. Whatever you do, don't run a procedural half-heartedly. Example: NEG offers T and claims education as a standard/ voter, NEG then proceeds to adapt DA's to apply to on case; BAD IDEA, you just delinked your own T. Debate lingo is fine. Spread debating is not. I'm looking for quality ideas. Adding metaphors to explain link stories is also a plus.

Any other paradigm Q's may be asked in round.

Danny Iberri-Shea – CSU - Pueblo

I will vote in the framework that is either consented to by both teams, or better argued by one team. I am pretty open to what debaters want to run and can appreciate the on-the-flow, mental chess stuff, "big picture" rhetorical masterpieces, or both. I find that all formats of debate offer unique benefits, and thus I appreciate different styles of argument, delivery, definition of purpose, etc. I do believe that the techniques and underlying philosophies/methodologies behind our rhetoric is important, and debaters should question the underpinnings of every advocacy, narrative, and/or plan, in addition to systematically dismantling each of an opponent's arguments. I am a fan of any debater who looks like they actually give a damn about what they are preaching. Control the agenda of the round! Have fun. Be brilliant!

I like clear criterion/weighing mechanisms/burdens/definitions, etc. Be clear about what your story is, why you are defending it, and *ultimately*, why you are presenting the superior advocacy in the round.

Kim Bryant – Howard Payne

I look for sound reasoning combined with presentation skills. I believe debate exists for education. I am a flow judge. I prefer NOT to intervene. Make it easy for me. Tell me how you won. Tell me why your argument is better. Don't debate about debate, I like debates about the topic. I will judge on your argumentation and reasoning abilities over your debate jargon.

Try not to speak at warp speed. I would rather find reasons to vote for you rather than vote the other team down. I love humor, so persuade me with your logic and wit.

Dayle Hardy-Short - NAU

Background:

I have been judging parliamentary debate recently, and I am doing my best to understand its nuances. My background is primarily in policy (NDT and CEDA).

On speaker points, I adhere to the old school model that speaker points include such things as analysis, reasoning, evidence, organization, refutation, and delivery (delivery being only 1 of 6 considerations I made for speaker points). Thus, I virtually never give low-point wins because if a team "wins", then it has done something better than the other team (i.e., has earned more points).

Generally, I am open to most positions and arguments. I expect the debaters to tell me what they think I should vote on, and why. I appreciate clash. I will not do the work for the team. I believe that the affirmative/government has the responsibility to affirm the resolution and the negative/opposition has the responsibility to oppose the resolution or the affirmative. Such affirmation and opposition can appear in different forms. I feel pretty comfortable in my understanding of whether or not something is a new argument in rebuttals, and I will not vote in favor of new arguments--just because someone extends an argument does not mean it's new, and just because someone uses a new term does not mean the argument is new (they may be reframing a previously-articulated argument based on additional responses from the other team).

I prefer debates in which debaters clearly explain why I should do what they think I should do. This includes explaining use of particular jargon and/or assumptions underlying it (for instance, if you say "condo bad", I may not necessarily understand in the heat of the debate that you're talking about conditionality versus something you live in; similarly I do not understand what "fism" is—you need to tell me). Do not assume that simply using a particular word means I will understand your argument (argument includes claim, explanation, and evidence of some kind). Please consider not only labeling the argument, but telling me what you mean by it.

I will listen as carefully as possible to what's going on in your debate (I will try to adapt to what YOU say and argue). Do your debate, make your arguments, and I will do my best to weigh them according to what happened in the debate. I am not arrogant enough to think that I get everything on the flow, nor am I arrogant enough to claim that I understand everything you say. But if you explain important arguments, most of the time I can understand them. At least I will try.

Topicality is a voting issue for me, and I listen to how teams set up the arguments. I have an extremely wide latitude in terms of what affirmative can claim as topical within the scope of any given resolution. I don't like T arguments that are ONLY about so-called abuse (indeed, I do not find them persuasive). I prefer that you focus on why the affirmative isn't topical. Thus, I prefer in the round you explain why something is not topical (standards, alternative definitions, etc.), but you do not need to articulate abuse (which I define as "they're taking ground from us; they've ruined debate; or similar arguments").

The team that proposes a counterplan must demonstrate it is non-topical and competitive. I am not a fan of conditional counterplans (they feel like quicksand to me), so if you must run one, explain why I should vote for it.

Abstract impacts should be clearly demonstrated and explained, and concrete impacts need to have similar weight.

A final note on speed and civility. I don't have particular problems with speed, but clarity is essential--clear speakers can speak very quickly and I will get the flow. I believe that debate is an important activity, both as an intellectual exercise and as a co-curricular activity in which we get to test classroom learning in a more pragmatic way (application and reductio ad absurdum), including communication skills and the extent to which arguments can go. The way we behave in rounds often becomes habit-forming. So show some respect for the activity, some respect for your opposition, and some respect for the judge. I'll try to keep up with you if you'll treat me like a human being. I will think through your arguments if you will give me arguments worth thinking through.

Michael Dvorak - NAU

I am fairly new to collegiate debate. I competed in both LD and Policy in high school but for the past four years I was primarily involved in individual events with a few parli rounds of competition during my career. I am currently a Graduate Coaching Assistant for NAU. During my (thus far) limited judging experience, I tend to vote with the more logical argument(s) that was presented. I will vote based on what is said in round unless competitors miss a crucial piece of evidence that trumps their argument that competitors should know about. I don't want to hear arguments that are outlandish (I won't vote because you say nuclear war happens if we raise taxes on cigarettes), but I will think outside the box so long as you provide me with sound reasoning to think that way. While I don't mind speed, make sure I can understand you through watching my feedback. I am looking for high quality, well thought out arguments to judge on. I don't want to hear arguments that you don't think or want to win simply because they are a "time-suck" on your opponents. If you have any other questions about my paradigm I will attempt to answer before round if you ask.

Caitlyn Burford - NAU

Background:

This is my third year judging and coaching NPDA and NPTE debate. Please feel free to ask me specific questions before the round.

Specific Inquiries

1. Speaker points

My speaker points usually range from a 26-29. Good strategic choices and clear, concise arguments are the best way to earn high points from me. If you are really going for a 30, throw in some unique, nuanced analysis and good framing of the debate.

2. General Overview

I think debate is a unique competitive forum to discuss issues within our rhetoric about the state, power, race, gender, etc. in a space that allows us to rethink and critically assess topics. This can come through a net benefit analysis of a proposed government plan, through a micro political action or statement, through a critique, or through some other newfangled performance you come up with. In that sense, I think debate is a rhetorical act that can be used creatively and effectively. Running a policy case about passing a piece of legislation has just as many critical implications about state power and authority as a critique of the state. The differences between the two types just have to do with what the debaters choose to discuss in each particular round. There are critical implications to every speech act. Affirmative cases, topicalities, procedurals, kritiks, and performances can all be critically analyzed if the teams take the debate there. Thus, framework is imperative. I'll get there shortly. You can run whatever you want as long as a) you have a theoretical justification for running the position, and b) you realize that it is still a competitive debate round so I need a reason to vote for something at some point. (a.k.a Give me a framework with your poetry!) I'll vote on Reject Alts.

3. Framework

This often ends up as the most important part of a lot of debates. If both teams are running with net benefits, great, but I still think there is area to weigh those arguments differently based on timeframe, magnitude, structural weight, etc. This kind of framework can make your rebuttal a breeze. In a debate that goes beyond a net benefits paradigm, your framework is key to how I interpret different impacts in the round. Choose your frameworks strategically and use them to your advantage. If the whole point of your framework is to ignore the case debate, then ignore the case debate. If the whole point of your framework is to leverage your case against the critique, then tell me what the rhetorical implications (different than fiat impacts) are to your case.

4. Theory

It's important to note that theory positions are impact debates, too. Procedural positions, topicalities, etc. are only important to the debate if you have impacts built into them. If a topicality is just about "fairness" or "abuse" without any articulation as to what that does, most of these debates become a "wash". So, view your theory as a mini-debate, with a framework, argument, and impacts built into it.

5. Counterplan Debate

This is your game. I don't think I have a concrete position as to how I feel about PICS, or intrinsicness, or textual/functional competition. That is for you to set up and decide in the debate. I have voted on PICS good, PICS bad, so on and so forth. That means that it all has to do with the context of the specific debate. Just make your arguments and warrant them well. Unless I am told otherwise, I will assume the CP is unconditional and my role as a judge is to vote for the best advocacy.

6. Round Evaluation

Again, framework is important. Procedurals, case debate, and critique debate should all have frameworks that prioritize what I look at in the round. In the rare case that neither team does any framing on any of the arguments, I will typically look at the critique, then topicality/procedurals, then the case. Because the critique usually has to do with some sort of education affecting everyone in the room, it will usually come before a procedural that affects the "fairness" of one team. (Again, this is only absent any sort of weighing mechanism for any of the arguments.) If there is a topicality/procedural run without any voters, I won't put them in for you and it will be weighed against the case. I will not weigh the case against the critique unless I am told how and why it can be weighed equally.

A concrete argument is always going to have a bit more weight than an abstract argument. A clear story with a calculated impact will probably outweigh an uncalculated potential impact. (i.e. "15,000 without food" vs. a "decrease in the quality of life"). But, if you calculate them out and do the work for me, awesome. If I have to weigh two vague abstract arguments against each other, i.e. loss of identity vs. loss of freedom, then I will probably revert to the more warranted link story if I must.

7. Speed, Answering Questions, and Other General Performance Things

I'm fine with speed. Don't use it as a tool to exclude your other competitors if they ask you to slow down, please. I don't really care about how many questions you answer if any, but if you don't then you are probably making yourself more vulnerable to arguments about shifts or the specificities of "normal means".

Tracy Valgento - NAU

Quick Tips in Prep Time:

Debate is a game and you should play it the best way you know how. This means DO WHATEVER you want argument wise and stylistically. Anything is up for debate, so long as you can win the reasons why your argument is best. Most importantly, stay organized. Clean debates are easily won debates.

The Specifics:

I debated for a total of seven years with four years of Parli and LD for Northern Arizona University.

Impact calculus: I am a material girl in a material world. I prefer material, real world impacts within the debate. Absent another framework I default to Net-Benefits first with probability and timeframe first. You should explain clear internal links that say specifically how you get from point A-Z.

Procedurals: I have a generally high threshold for procedurals, meaning you must prove abuse within the round. Or if you choose to use a competing interperaintions framework you need impacts to your interp and why it is best.

DA/CP debate: I really enjoy clear and specific disadvantages. I am open to hearing anything, but I want a convincing, specific uniqueness debate. For example on econ debates I want to hear about specific markets or situations rather than generally collapses and for politics I want to hear specific warrants about who votes what way and why over a generic backlash arguments.

For counter plans I enjoy good permutations debates. Perms need a text and articulated net benefits/solvency. I want to hear why the counter plan is not functionally, ideologically and/or textually mutually exclusive.

Kritics: Criticisms are fine in front of me on both the Aff and Neg-despite this being what I mostly ran do not assume that this a) all I want to hear or b) that I have read all K literature and will know what you are saying if you name drop critical theorists. You should know that I have very little Post-Modern literature. Critics should have clear frameworks that articulate impact prioritization and the roll of the ballot. If the MG does not answer an LOC framework I will defaults to the Neg's interpretation.

Conditionality: I feel that absent policy style backside or second rebuttals, the Neg should only run one counter-plan. In my experience, multiple, conditional advocacies tend to contradict themselves. Arguments made and things said in a debate round do NOT occur in a vacuum for example, your disadvantage should probably not link to your critic.

That being said, all things are debatable and if you have good, winnable reasons why you should get two or more counter plans, go for it.

Speaker points: Generally 26-30 points. A 26= egregiously offensive behavior. A 30= ingenious and articulate argumentation.

Jeannie Hunt – Northwest College

I want to be able to judge the round with no intervention on my part. That means a couple of things. You need to establish a framework that I can follow to evaluate the round. I don't care what that framework is, but I want one – policy making, critical, big picture, etc. That framework is what I will follow, so please don't set the round up as a stock round, and then ask me to look at the big picture at the end. More importantly, give me something to look at in the end. I would love to hear some impact analysis, some reasons to prefer, something tangible for me to vote on. Absent that, I have to intervene.

There are no specific arguments that I prefer over another. I will vote on pretty much anything, and I am game for pretty much anything. I do expect that you will not subject yourself to performative contradictions. If you run a k, you should be willing to live in the round with the same k standards you are asking us to think about. However, it is the job of the opposing team to point that out... This is true of any theory based argument you choose to run. I am old, which means that I think the 1AC is important. If you are not going to address it after the 1AC, let me know so I don't have to spend time flowing it.

Critical rounds invite the judge to be a part of the debate, and they bring with them a set of ethics and morals that are subjective. I love critical debate, but competitors need to be aware that the debate ceases to be completely objective when the judge is invited into the discussion with a K. Make sure the framework is very specific so I don't have to abandon objectivity all together.

Finally, 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 your hat off and tuck your shirt in. Having a bad attitude is as bad as having a bad argument. Speed is not a problem if it is clear.

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.

Krista Stone – Northwest College

Framework is the most important part of the round for me - I don't want to have to do work for you, so establish where you want me to vote and then stick to that framework. I also need some sort of analysis in the end. You need to weigh the round for me, not expect me to wade through every detail of the round in the end.

Line by line and impact analysis is also important. Please warrant your arguments and have clear links between claims. I understand debate jargon but I have a moderate threshold for speed. If you are speaking too fast, I will not flow it. If I don't have it on the flow I will not be evaluating that argument. I also have a moderate threshold for critical arguments. Make sure your thesis is clear. I am open to most arguments and don't have any real predispositions.

Please be respectful of everyone in the round. Being rude will affect your speaker points at the very least.

Fred Ebert – Northwest College

Most Important Criteria: 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.

Expectations of Decorum: I expect people to be respectful of each other. Having some good fun is fine but being mean to each other isn't. 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.

Predispositions: As I said earlier, 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. In the event that you want to run a K, don't do it unless you really understand what's behind it

Speech/Jargon/Technical: 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. I understand what you are talking about but if it doesn't add to the debate, I'm left un-impressed.

Duane Fish – Northwest College (TAB)

Parliamentary Debate is one in which the analysis and the argumentation are the critical elements. As a consequence, I evaluate two competing sets of arguments. My decision is based upon which team best persuades me to their position. I focus on the big picture at the end of the debate. I very seldom go into the minutia. The team that tells me the best story at the end of the round will win my ballot. I know that makes me a buffalo of sorts, but that is the way it is. That means elements such as organization, structure, and clash are critical. While delivery is important, it does not outweigh argumentation. I want the debaters to be professional and have fun. I try not intervene unless there is some violation at this level. My preference is to make a decision based upon the voting issues and not the flowery oratory. I treat topicality as another argument to be weighed in the context of the round. I want to see some abuse before I would vote on topicality. I must admit that topicality must be compelling for me to vote in this area. In policy round, I will listen to all types of competing plans and counterplans. I prefer net benefits as a paradigm for evaluation. I have voted on kritics, but would say that they are not my favorite argumentative strategy. In value rounds, I want a comparison of the values in competition as well. It is not enough to say we value "X" and say that is good enough to win the rounds. I really want a debate that is cordial and fun for everyone. Be nice to each other and enjoy what you are doing. If you have fun, so will I. I do not particularly like points of order. I think it is used to annoy rather than to make legitimate objections. I generally know new arguments and will not vote on them. They seldom make a difference in the big picture anyway. I certainly don't like them if you are looking to find out how I am feeling on an issue. I will most often tell you I will take it under advisement.

Billie Harvey – Ranger College

I will make this short and sweet, because I am. I am open to any arguments, but I tend to lean towards Policy Making. As far as spreading goes, please just make sure you can be understood. If not, I will shout "CLEAR!" just once, so please adjust. I want clash. I don't usually vote for theory or critiques that aren't sufficiently linked to the Aff. Don't waste my time or your opponents. Overall, just debate. I want good argumentation. One thing that I will not tolerate in a round is bad attitude. Be nice. This is suppose to be fun and educational. Once you cross the line into being a jerk, I put my pen down.

Nick Robinson – TTU (1/2 commitment)

Background/General

I debated at Willamette for four years and then coached at Whitman for two. I tend to be pretty expressive while I'm judging, I can't help it. I try to keep my speaker point average around 27.5, which means I give as many 26's as I do 29's. I will listen to anything, but I am definitely happiest watching a disad/counterplan debate. Try not to lie.

Presentation

The way in which you present your arguments will not have any influence over the outcome of the round as long as I can understand you. I will say "clear" at least a couple of times if I cannot. Being really mean to your opponents will cost you speaks. Rolling over/giving up against a really good team will also cost you speaks. Either give me a copy of your advocacy text or read it twice, slowly.

Case/Disads

Most of this is obvious, so here are a handful of aphorisms: Organization is your friend. You should terminalize your impacts. Just saying "and you know, it's like rivets on a plane" does not count. You should warrant your link arguments. You should warrant all your other arguments too, ideally. Read your plan text twice or give me a copy.

Procedurals

I would much rather watch substantive debate than half an hour of theory. In virtually all circumstances, I determine that fairness comes first. I think that, in general, you win the procedural if you win that a) the other side violates your interpretation and b) you win that their interpretation is inferior to yours.

The aff should be topical. To beat T, you need at least one good reason why the other side's interpretation is bad plus a credible counter-interpretation. RVI's are dumb and I won't vote on one unless it's really compelling, well-warranted, and completely conceded.

Spec arguments are terrible. You should read your disad and explain why it links through normal means. In most cases, you should be able to generate links to your disads by making credible arguments about normal means. I will not vote on spec unless the other side is flagrantly abusive and there is really no alternative.

Kritiks

Last year everybody kept voting for one of my teams to "disrupt the velocity of the government war machine," and I think that's kind of hilarious.

I am skeptical that a critical framework makes the PMC disappear. If you want the K to outweigh or turn case, that's great, but pointing out that plan won't actually happen does not compel me to ignore the logic of the other side's arguments. The best K's do not rely on framework to win, but rather persuade me that the logic of the affirmative is fundamentally faulty. They also have specific, well-developed link arguments that go far beyond "you use the USFG so you are statist." You should be able to demonstrate exactly how the logic/rhetoric intrinsic to the affirmative links. I have serious trouble believing that a K alt can change the world, whether by sparking a movement or rewiring my brain.

Counterplans

In terms of theory, counterplans are best evaluated on a case-by-case basis. On some topics, for example, PICs are fine. On others, they are probably abusive. I much prefer to evaluate CP theory as a question of whether neg gets to advocate the CP rather than as a voter. I generally think that conditionality is good, even with multiple conditional advocacies. Of course, I would never judge a debate as though my opinion on a theory question is the word of God.

Permutations do not need a text beyond "Perm: do both," unless you're doing something tricky like permuting only a part of the text. Asking for a text on "Perm: do both" makes you look dumb. The perm is a test of competition, not an advocacy. You should articulate a net benefit to your permutation because pointing out that plan and CP can coexist is not really relevant to my decision.

Rebuttals

Three things good rebuttals have in common: they give thorough overviews that explain the interaction of all the arguments in the round, they make choices about what is important and what isn't, and they weigh both the strength of warrants and the strength of impacts. You do not need to call a point of order in front of me, but you can if you want to. Cross-applications are not new arguments. The LOR does not need to explicitly extend each MO argument he/she would like me to consider in my decision. You do not get to split the block.

Nick Larmer – TTU (1/2 commitment)

I debated Parli for five years at the University of Wyoming. I am currently at Texas Tech University. I really do not have a set philosophy in which I judge; but rather will vote how I am told to. I am fine with any form/style of argument as long as it is justified and impacted. Any type of argument is also acceptable to me. I tend to believe that the arguments presented rather than the presentation/communication skills should hold more weight in the debate and will ultimately determine my decision. On case arguments affect my decision equally as off case arguments as long as they are impacted and explained how they interact within the debate. I have a relatively low threshold for procedurals (except specs) and often enjoy good technical procedural debate. I like CP/DA debate as well as critical debate. Essentially, explain how your impacts win the round and I will vote that way on any position that you feel comfortable running. I will protect teams from new arguments in the rebuttals but I understand the importance of calling points of order. I would prefer you use them with caution. Debate is an activity for the competitors. Good Luck

Rob Layne – TTU (1/2 commitment)

Compare warrants between contrasting arguments.

Compare impacts using words like “irreversibility,” “magnitude,” “timeframe,” “probability.”

Use warrants in all of your arguments.

Make sure your permutations contain a text and an explanation as to what I do with the permutation.

Use internal and external structure like Subpoint A 1. a. i. instead of saying “next” or stringing arguments together without breaks.

Be cordial to one another. There’s no need to be mean or spikey.

I take a careful flow...if you’re unclear or not giving me enough pen time don’t be upset when I ask you to clear up or slow down a touch.

Allow me to choose a winner at the end of the round.

Have voters and standards attached to procedural arguments if you want me to take them seriously. I like “we meets” on interpretations.

I will protect you from new arguments in the rebuttals. There’s little need to call superfluous Points of Order.

Have an alternative attached to your criticism or at least explain why you don’t need one.

Be on time to the round. Already have used to the restroom, gotten your water, found your room, etc.

Prep Time and Round Arrival:

I will subtract 5 speaker points if you are more than a minute later to the round than I am or after prep time has elapsed (which ever is later). After 3 minutes, I will begin the proposition team’s speaking time.

Please don't come to the round and then go to the bathroom, please relieve yourself before prep begins or during prep. This addendum is obviously reflecting my judging by myself and will not be inclusive of a paneled round.

Compare standards if there are competing interpretations present.

Connect the dots between different arguments to illustrate how those arguments interact.

Kick arguments in the opp block to go deeper on selected arguments.

Know the difference between offensive and defensive arguments. I still think arguments can be terminally defensive as long as it’s explained.

Avoid extending answers through ink. Answer opposing arguments before making key extensions.

Extend arguments/case via the member speeches to have access to them in the rebuttals.

Not everything can be a turn. Please avoid making everything a turn.

Enjoy the debate round. I’m not going to force fun on you, but not everything has to be so serious.

Speaker points

I typically give speaker points from 25-30. My average is a 27. 30’s from me are rare, but they are occasionally given. You likely won’t see more than one 30 from me at an invitational tournament. At NPTE, I’ve typically given out 3-4 30’s. I expect that most debaters at the NPTE will likely be in the 27-29 range.

Critical Arguments

I tend to enjoy critical arguments as long as they're well explained. Framework your argument and provide an alternative. Affirmatives can run critical arguments. If you're running arguments that are incongruent with other arguments, you should likely have an explained justification for doing so.

Performance based arguments

Please don't ask me to sit in a circle...have a discussion...rip up my ballot...get naked...or do anything that most folks would find mildly inappropriate. I think that debate is a performance. Some performances are better than others. Some performances are justified better than others. If you prefer a framework of a certain type of performance, make sure your framework is well articulated and warranted.

Procedurals

I require an interpretation, a violation, and a voter. You should probably have standards for why your interpretation is better than other interpretations. I don't require competing interpretations, but it can be a useful tool. I don't require in-round abuse, though it will help to prove why your interpretation is preferable. I have a low threshold on procedurals. Folks do wanky stuff...explain why your version of debate is preferable and why that means I should vote for you.

Counterplans

I think folks should define what a PIC is for me (make that just about any interpretation of a counterplan). I might have a very different conception of a PIC than you do. I think opp's should identify a CP's status to avoid procedural args. Permutations should be explained. I want to know how you think they function in the round. My default status for a won permutation is that I just stop looking at the CP. If you have a different interpretation as to what I should do with a permutation, you should articulate my options.

Julian Plaza – Colorado College

Question 1 : Background of the critic (including formats coached/competed in, # of rounds judged, etc)

General: Debate is a game of competing advocacies and frameworks. One wins this game, in my book, if one gives clearly articulated reasons and examples as to why their framework is good/legitimate, and why voting in that framework necessitates a vote for the advocacy itself. This game is won primarily through the record of arguments extended and made, the flow. I only take into consideration arguments extended throughout the round. For example, if a team drops uniqueness and the other team argues against it and does not extend their argument throughout the round, I will consider it a non-issue. Similarly, I don't give grace periods at the end of speeches, once the clock stops my pen drops. Speech times in parliamentary debate seem to be the only concrete rules for debate, and I treat them as such.

Specifics:

1- Speaker points: I regret to admit that I don't know any clear criterion by which allocate speaker points. That aside, I typically give speaker points above 26, unless something offends me. Don't be racist, don't be sexist, etc. I give higher speaker points to debaters who make quality arguments (ex: a concise and clear claim with well warranted and analyzed empirics to back it up). Arguments that simply make a claim and assert its connection to a well known historical event will NOT win a debater high speaker points.

2- The K: As a philosophy major, I tend to enjoy critical debate, despite how often it bankrupts the ideas of geniuses. However, a successful kritik will have several key components. First, it will have an explanation of how the kritik views the world and the kritik itself. Second, the kritik must obviously link to the advocacy of the opposite team (ex: I will not listen to a Heidegger critique of technology on the internet). Third, it will have an efficacious alternative. I strongly oppose kritiks that don't have a prayer of solving the problems they isolate. I am strongly persuaded by oppositional arguments which take the format of procedural violations. I will vote for kritiks, but think that the format of parliamentary debate does not lend itself to quality critical positions.

3- Performance: I'll be honest, I understand performance debate very little. If a team is to attempt to win my ballot with a performance argument, they will need to explain it well.

4- Topicality: I believe that topicality is a game of competing interpretations. I think abuse is an impact of bad interpretations, which means simply claiming that another team unfair will NOT win my ballot. To vote on topicality I require a simple calculus:

1) Tell me why your interpretation is good for the debate round bby using your standards as a measure; 2) Explain the warrants of your standards and why they are the best criterion to measure the aptitude of a given interpretation; 3) Explain why the interpretation and standards prove your interpretation is best, and why this justifies a vote for you position.

5- Counter Plans: As far as counter plan debate goes, I welcome any and every kind of counter plan. If a specific type of counter plan is abusive, it is up to the other team to establish what it is that is unfair and why it warrants removing that argument from the round. I typically like the condition of the counter plan to be read following the text. Again, if a condition is not immediately established, it is up to the other team to conjure up arguments why it's not cool to be remiss about the conditon of the counter plan. If I am to vote on a permutation, it must be competitive (textual competition is debateable), it must have a text, it must solve, and it must have unique reasons as to why it outweighs the case. I think that running perms "as a test" is generally a waste of time considering one can make arguments as to why a given counter plan is perhaps artificial in character.

6- Flow sharing: Obviously, don't start hijacking flows in-round, but I am a fan of teamwork. If you want to share flows, do it (within reason).

7- Argument scaling: In the absence of clearly won arguments, I evaluate based on the position of the argument along the trajectory of fiat. So, generally, kritiks and topicality/ procedural arguments will come first, because they claim pre-fiat status. These arguments are gates into the substance of the debate, and must be overcome in order for me to vote anywhere else on the flow. After, I will evaluate the plan vs. counter plan and disad debate. In this realm, I default to net-benefits in judging the terminal impacts of each position. I cannot stress the importance of scenarios. If there is not a specific scenario for your impact to occur in your imagination, then it's highly unlikely that your impact will hold up against a well warranted specific example/ narrative.

8- Impact Analysis: First, I can't stand dehumanization impacts. If something really is "dehumanizing," there are probably examples of it. Things like structural inequity create real problems, and I would rather hear about that. I have sat through too many rounds where some one simply asserts dehumanization and continues to repeat it, as if each time they do the image of famine babies becomes more real in my mind (it doesn't, it just makes the debater look more like a parakeet). Thus, absent a scenario, it is extremely unlikely that I will vote up a dehumanization impact. I will be honest that the lead up to the impact is as important as the impact itself to me. I like warrants and I like them specific. By the time a debater is done with the internal links, everyone in

the room should have a good idea of what the impact is going to be. In the end, I will vote how the teams tell me to and will do as little work as possible to come to conclusions about the round.

Sahan Jayasumana – Colorado College

Parli Judging Philosophy:

Summary: I debated in Highschool and College doing both parli and policy. . I wouldn't call myself a tab judge because some arguments like 'rape good' will never work in front of me however I do understand the necessity of being an impartial arbitrator and will do my best to evaluate each flow. I try to stay up to date with current events and prefer a fast, technical debate.

I understand the differences between parli and policy however since I focused on policy in college I tend to view rounds and resolutions in that context. If you are going to go for a fiat/policy making criterion I suggest you read my policy judging philosophy (attached to end of doc). The rest of this paradigm will focus on parli specifics.

Background: I did CX debate in Highschool and College (For Georgia StatexGT). I was a founding member of the student run and student funded GT debate team. I have also coached and judged HS policy debate in Georgia, Colorado and the national circuit for 5 years. I learned parli debate from my HS debate coach who was a member of the Colorado State Debate Team before I went to college. In college I competed in both APDA style parli debate and NPDA style debate. I prefer NPDA style argumentation.

Trichot: I haven't seen many interesting fact debates. I enjoy value debates that contextualize the resolution, criterion and role of the ballot. Metaphorical interpretations of resolutions is fine but you should see the section on T/Theory.

Speed: I'll let you know if you are going to fast by saying "slow," if you are unclear I will say clear. I generally don't have a problem with speed in parli.

T/Theory: the sky is blue vote for me will not win me your ballot, however most cheap shots like T = RVI, topical CP's illegit etc are persuasive if impacted especially if the other team drops it and you go for it competently.

I don't like T and Theory debates but I often find myself voting for well extend T and theory positions including Specs, Severence and Prefcons. I will weigh theory like a DA, with the impacts of education fairness or whatever else the team is arguing, therefore its important that you make comparative claims when going for theory. I have been told I vote on theory quite easily.

Number of arguments in a round: I enjoy 1 off debates or case debates with a lot of turns because it results in good debates where each side is analyzing the others evidence. Presenting 12-20 arguments in the 1NC is acceptable provided the debate collapses down by the rebuttals. I also have a low tolerance of preformative contradictions. The first team to make a concession gets to keep it, for instance if the negative runs D-dev and an econ DA and the aff says "concede the econ impact" they can use it against Ddev, the negative cant say "negation theory pretend like we didn't read econ growth good".

How do i decide which part of the debate to evaluate first?

The neg's job is to refute the aff, I start at the 2NR and make sure their reasons for me to reject the aff are solid (were made in the constructive and extended correctly though the debate), then I look to the aff to see if there are holes in the negative's strategy.

For T theory CP K Stock and DA debates: see attached policy paradigm

For Value debates: I look first at the round framing, generally I vote for the team that frames the resolution in such a way that there is a ethical reason for me to endorse that side. This requires teams to compare and weigh criterions, values and the role of the ballot.

For Fact debates: I find the easiest 'out' on the flow and vote for it. Normally that means the conceded preponderance of evidence argument followed by counting the number of cards extended in each rebuttal.

I ran the following arguments often in parli:

libertarian based Kritiks

Globe-local based Kritiks

Exclude CPs

Political Process CPs

Advantage CPs with politics or Case NB

Capitalism good/bad

Conditionality good * yes I did run condo good in parli, I don't recommend that you do unless you have very compelling answers to timeskew

Policy Judging philosophy:

Summary:

Kritiks give me a warm fuzzy feeling inside, but I would rather see a bad policy round than a bad kritik round – if you don't understand your kritik enough to explain it to me in round don't do it.

PICs w/ a DA and Solvency turns is probably the easiest way to win a round in front of me

T/Theory – I don't like t/theory rounds but obviously if you are winning hands down go for it, if it is dropped go for it just make sure you impact your arguments, I have been told that I pull the trigger too easy on theory so don't undercover it.

STOCKS – Unless you win there is ABSOLUTELY no reason to do the plan I will not vote in a stock issue paradigm, however if you win there is a compelling reason not to do the plan I will vote for you.

I learned to debate in Colorado, then I moved to Georgia and saw the national style of debate. I prefer the national style of debate that is fast, detailed and research oriented. I wouldn't call myself a tab judge because some arguments like 'rape good' will never work in front of me however I do understand the necessity of being an impartial arbitrator and will do my best to evaluate each flow.

Details

1. Important: an argument consists of a claim, warrant and implication – in the last speech you need to explain the significance of your arguments otherwise I will decide how significant they are and it will probably be 'not that important.' Even if statements will save you here, to quote Roy L. (who I try to emulate as a judge) "While you obviously always think your opponents arguments suck, I don't necessarily always agree. Why don't you tell me about how even if they win xyz crappy argument you should still win because of abc"

2. Experience: I debated 8 policy resolutions and numerous parli resolutions but I am unfamiliar with space policy therefore define your acronyms and list any synonyms. I have also coached HS debate for the last 3 years, two at the marist school which traveled the national circuit and one at Banaker which was a local GA team. This means I know more about cases that have been run on previous resolutions than the 'case of the week' that you might put out.

3. Rate of delivery: I prefer fast debate, I will let you know if you are too fast or unclear. If I have to let you know more than 3 times a round then I will dock speaker points, I have judged TOC quality teams and competed in college policy debate so it is unlikely that you will be too fast for me, it is more likely that you will be unclear.

4. Number of arguments in a round: I enjoy 1 off debates or case debates with a lot of turns because it results in good debates where each side is analyzing the others evidence. Presenting 12-20 arguments in the 1NC is acceptable provided the debate collapses down by the rebuttals. I also have a low tolerance of preformative contradictions. The first team to make a concession gets to keep it, for instance if the negative runs D-dev and an econ DA and the aff says "concede the econ impact" they can use it against Ddev, the negative cant say "negation theory pretend like we didn't read econ growth good".

5. Preference Order Assuming all positions are well prepared and executed correctly: Topic Specific K > specific CP w/ DA > specific PIC with internal net benefit > Impact turns or Generic K > Generic CP > Politics DA > Case > T/Theory...that said "I think you should read what you want. Being good on an argument I dislike is better than being bad on an argument I like. Both sides should focus on the role of

the ballot, how the impacts interact with one another and why the world of the aff is better/worse than the world of the neg.

6. Cheap shots the sky is blue vote for me will not win me your ballot, however most cheap shots like T = RVI, topical CP's illegit etc are persuasive if impacted especially if the other team drops it and you go for it competently.

7. Kritiks arguments that change the question of debate from do/don't do policy to more theoretical terms are fine, the most persuasive type of kritiks are those that act like an oldschool value DA with a 'CP/alt text' that doesn't involve governmental action. Arguments like "reject all instances" are substantially less persuasive. I love listening to a good Kritik round either critical aff or a kritik neg however nothing is worse than a team going for a K they don't understand or know how to run against a team that also doesn't know what is going on. I would rather listen to a good K round than a good policy round but I would rather listen to a bad policy round than a bad kritik round. I think floating PICS are lame and probably not competitive.

8. CPs I think any CP grounded in literature is fine, theory arguments are generally unpersuasive if the negative has cards comparing the CP to the AFF plan text. For more generic CP's theory arguments are somewhat more convincing especially when neg lacks solvency advocate.

9. Acceptability while I try to run a fun, laid back round there are certain bounds of acceptability: No physical violence, No overt Rape analogies or Racist language directed at your opponents. I understand that there are some kritiks, cases and situations that require analysis of language or that beg the question of what to do when confronted with physical language but that doesn't mean you can resort to that in round, if you are running a case about racism in the US it is fine to use 'the language of the card' as long as it is not directed at your opponents or me and is used for some rhetorical purpose. Saying "we raped that ____ DA" will lose you speaker points.

10. Evidence Quality is important. If I am unsure of the warrant behind a claim I will ask for the card, if the card doesn't support the claim then the claim is an assertion rather than an argument. Analytics are quite persuasive even against mediocre cards, however if a card is conclusive I will favor it over analytics. I will not read every card in a debate, ideally I would read none, to quote Roy

"Teams do not invest sufficient time into beating up people's evidence. Where is it from? Who wrote it? Is that person qualified? When is it from? Does it have a warrant? Does It even say what its tagged? I am convinced a 2ar could beat up most politics disads by just indicting the evidence, mocking it for quality, and extending the aff. I will not do the work here for you. I will not read another team's evidence and say because it was bad I won't vote on it unless YOU TELL ME TO DO THIS. "

11. Education or Fairness while fairness is important the reason I have a coaching job is because schools throughout the nation believe that the education provided by debate is important. If you cannot justify the educational value of your positions then, regardless of how fair they are, you will not win my theory/T flow.

12. Jargon if you don't see a debate term used in this judge philosophy its probably best to define it, see experience for more. Topic and case specific terms should be defined, im repeating myself so I'll move on

Q&A

How much of my decision do I prepare before the debate is over?

A lot, there are some things I think a team needs to answer, if the team fails to answer that thing and the other team goes for that argument it is easy for me to make a decision. Think of this as a check list "1. Answer theory 2. Extend the perm 3. Explain why the perm doesn't link to the DA etc."

How do you decide which part of the debate to evaluate first?

The neg's job is to refute the aff, I start at the 2NR and make sure their reasons for me to reject the aff

are solid (were made in the constructive and extended correctly though the debate), then I look to the aff to see if there are holes in the negative's strategy.

For Case vs turns/DA's I look to what impacts the neg extended and the aff mitigation of those impacts and then what impacts the aff extended and the negs mitigation.

For CPs I start with evaluate what impacts the CP and AFF can solve, then I try to figure out which is most netbeneficial relying on the debaters impact calc as much as possible.

For K's I start with the ability of the kritik to turn the affirmative, if the k outweighs the aff then I look at theory to find out if the k is legitimate, finally I look to the alt to see if it is better than the affirmative with the k's impacts turns.

For T/theory I look at which interpretation provides the best education.

Under what conditions will you call for a card?

Bill Batterman nailed it on the head:

This also depends on the issue but for the most part I will ask for evidence under three circumstances:

1. A piece of evidence is contested either explicitly ("their evidence is bad") or implicitly ("prefer our evidence").
2. A piece of evidence is uncontested but relevant to a broader question. Most frequently, this occurs when one team concedes an argument and I must determine the relative weight of that concession compared with another argument. I do this less now than I used to because I tend to find that most evidence is implicitly contested even when "dropped". If I decide that the evidence really isn't contested, then I typically do not bother reading it except to provide commentary (see #3).
3. A piece of evidence is contested or uncontested that I want to explain or discuss with one or both teams. This is usually a situation where a card could have been used differently or where one or both teams did not understand something about the issue it was discussing. This circumstance does not influence my decision, only my post-round commentary.

What will you do with those cards besides read them?

I will evaluate if the card lends truth to your claims. To quote bill again

In most cases, I have a specific question in mind when I am reading a given piece of evidence. As I review it, other questions are often raised and I subsequently resolve those as well. In some percentage of debates (probably 33% or less), I resolve an important issue by reading the evidence on both sides and scrutinizing it piece-by-piece; this usually occurs in very good debates that are close and focused on an in-depth issue.

Do you generally decide who you will vote for at the very end or do you decide earlier and then spend the rest of your time making your decision comprehensive/preparing for questions from the losing team? There is a feeling of who is winning the debate that develops as the debate develops, in most cases that feeling ends up being right. In the best rounds that feelings changes after each speech – see the checklist comment above.

Most of my time is spent deciding the round in question, I will spend a few minutes confirming that decision by double checking those flows important in the decision.

Are you mostly an information gatherer or do you argue with yourself back and forth in your head? And how do you conduct those arguments?

I like to think that my flows are detailed enough that when I look for information after round it is for specifics of cards or to confirm that the evidence is legit. Sometimes I play devils advocate to figure out if something is irrelevant – this is frequently done when teams fail to use even if statements or the impact calculus is poor.

What conditions have to be satisfied for you to have confidence that your decision is sufficient?

Bill nailed this on the head again

This is something that I have attempted to formalize: I require three conditions to be met before turning in my ballot. (1) Have I given both teams a fair hearing by considering their overall narrative as well as the evidence they have advanced to support it? (2) Would I be comfortable with my decision as a universal norm? If my students were on the receiving end of this decision from another judge, would I be

satisfied with that judge's decision? This is a feel thing—if I am satisfied that I have met the "fair hearing" standard, I am almost always comfortable with imagining my decision as a universal norm. Occasionally, however, this standard forces me to revisit the decision and more thoroughly consider whether I am being faithful to the narrative that developed in the round. (3) Am I prepared to defend my decision and provide educationally enriching commentary to the students on both teams?

What positions did you run in debate?

K – a weird mix of kappler/nayar and security was my debate staple though highschool, I wish I had used it more in college

CP – Exclude CP's were my bread and butter, on the college visa topic I regularly ran an exclude livestock industry with an anthro/water/warming NB's

Case – im a fan of impact turns, Critical HTS, policy/critical blacksites, Nuclear Feminism, EB Nanotech visas

Will Van Treuren – UC - BOULDER

I debated for four years in high school policy and four years in college parli. I have coached CU for two years and a high school team for one. I enjoy the activity of debate immensely and see my role as a judge to keep my biases out of the round and let you play the game how you see fit. I will happily listen to traditional debate, the K, theory, performances, anything you want to do, and try to evaluate the arguments objectively and within the context of the debate. Here are my current preferences/biases formed over my time in debate. They are guidelines; you can convince me any of them are wrong (i.e. you still have to win that multiple conditional advocacies are bad, there are good reasons for them):

Multiple conditional advocacies – I tend to believe multiple conditional advocacies are abusive to the affirmative.

Frameworks that procedurally exclude offense – (like ‘aff can’t weigh their case because fiat is illusory’) are not particularly persuasive to me. If a framework question is unresolved I will default to thinking of myself as a policy maker and of the teams as advocates for the policies they are defending. Alternate frameworks often lack a way to compare impacts (e.g. what is a methodology or ontology DA?) and I will compare the world of the alternative to the world of the plan in terms of articulated consequences (impacts) without filter unless you provide a clear decision criteria for what impacts to include or exclude.

Case debate – I think the state of case construction and the level of case debate in parli is bad. Most cases I have seen in the last two years of judging have had internal contradictions/tension that were not exploited by the LOC. I reward clever case argumentation, and wish it would be a larger portion of LOC strategies. In particular smart defense in conjunction with a case specific disad or turn will often be more demonstrative of intelligence and clever strategic thinking (to me) than reading several counterplans and resolving aff offense with conditionality (same goes for smart defense coupled with a few clear pieces of offense against a CP, K, DA or whatever).

Impact calculus – I assess internally consistent arguments that clearly articulate incentive structures (check out Stephen Moncrieffs excellent philosophy for more) for various actors as far more probable impacts/links/uniquenesses. If your scenario is not internally consistent in some clear way, I will treat it with inherently lower probability. As an example, an aff with a really well constructed single advantage can often outweigh poorly warranted LOC disads (even if they are otherwise uncovered) by virtue of how important being able to construct the causal chain and incentive landscape for the actors is post your link for me.

I will vote on RVIs if they are entirely unanswered, but my threshold here is very high – I think RVIs are stupid.

I hold no bias for or against specification arguments.

I default to competing interpretations but think that the aff can easily win reasons why they are bad and/or their interp is good enough. In round abuse is not necessary.

I think that PIC’s encourage strategic and in depth debate. It will be hard to convince me that they are bad without a more nuanced argument about functional and textual competition. I am a fan of most counterplans that are not veto-cheato style, but can more easily be convinced that plan contingent counterplans are abusive.

My default ordering for argument evaluation is procedural then all other arguments equally unless arguments about the sequencing are made (i.e, impact filters, ontology precedes something, etc.). You can change my default.

I think death is probably worse than dehumanization and that body counts are a more effective way to get my ballot than nebulous claims about dehum. However, I think that teams can seriously improve on impact calculus and more complex weighing of dehum versus death or probability vs. magnitude could be fertile ground to win an otherwise unwinnable debate.

Style and speaker points:

The only stylistic thing that I think merits inclusion is that I dislike arrogant or mean debaters. Intensity is encouraged but very easy to do that without being rude. I like to reward clever decision-making and technical prowess more than eloquence or being funny (but those things will help you as well).

Critical/performance arguments:

I am happy to listen to critical or performance arguments by either side. I think that a clear framework for my role as a judge needs to be established and that the alternative have explanation. I have backfile knowledge of many criticisms but am not deep on the literature so your arguments will have to be explained. I think that affirmatives under utilize ethics or critical style advantages and enjoy the strategic options they introduce into the debate. Being ‘contradictory’ with other negative positions doesn’t seem like a problem in a world of conditionality. Contrary to my reputation as an anti-K hack I frequently vote for criticisms but I have never voted for Baudrillard and Nietzsche (not to say that I won’t, just a word of caution).

Kevin Stone - Montana

Making Decisions: My goal is to base my decision solely upon how the debaters argue I should decide; I avoid using my own decision-making philosophy as much as possible. I like to be placed in a paradigm by the debaters. This would be done by explaining what my evaluation process should look like and defending why that particular process would be preferable. When this doesn't happen I will revert to what I see to be the most appropriate mechanism for making a fair decision (frequently a policymaker framework). I look primarily to the rebuttals in making my decisions (meaning you can't split the block in that way) though I do trace arguments made in the rebuttal backward through the debate.

Assessing Arguments: Dropped arguments still need to be placed within the context of the round and it is the responsibility of the debaters to explain what sort of impact the argument ought to have on my decision. I think it is necessary to supplement line-by-line argumentation with "contextualization." I feel that it is important to bridge the gap between arguments and the framework. I have strong viewpoints but I evaluate arguments based on the comparison of impacts made by the debaters. There are some arguments I probably would never endorse but I can't imagine a debater ever making them ("rape is good" would be an example).

Presentation Issues: This is your debate round rather than mine, as long as you are speaking intelligibly, there shouldn't be a problem.

Cases, DAs, CPs, Ks, T, etc.:

CPs- I subscribe to generally accepted counterplan theory.

Topicality- I think T is probably where I am most likely to deviate from what has been said

above. I focus on the standards debate on topicality. The definition and voters are important of course but it is my opinion that they are more like hurdles that must be jumped for topicality to be a viable position whereas the standards are where topicality is won or lost. Offense coming out of the standards and critical offense in particular seem to be underutilized methods of making topicality a winning position.

Kritiks- I am fan of critical positions but I feel that many criticisms are little more than non-unique disads. This is not to say that a criticism can't be effective if its primary function is as a case turn, I just feel that to fully exercise the potential of the line of argumentation the debaters must articulate a sophisticated framework that explicates the roll of the position as well as its relationship to the critic and the ballot.

I think one personally held theory belief that may distinguish me from the community at large is a rejection of the pre-fiat/post-fiat dichotomy. Debate is a game and an impact is an impact.

Again, I can be placed, with successful argumentation in just about any judging framework, and if a team is winning that that should be the case. This puts some added pressure on the debaters though, and requires a fully thought-out "system." I am not one to ignore arguments, I am open to whatever you have to say as long as it fits into the framework you are having me use for the round (or that which I have reverted to in the absence of direction from the debaters. My primary goal as a critic is to provide fair judication of the debate round, and I believe this can best be done by being open to what the students want say, and is best maximized when debaters articulate a specific voting mechanism to me. This makes the rebuttals quite important. If you have questions prior to the start of the tournament please email me at kevin.cascadia@gmail.com, otherwise, feel free to ask me in person.

David Airne - Montana

Debated NDT 3 years and 1 year LD in college

Coached NDT/CEDA, LD, and Parli for +10 years

The quick overview to my judging is really simple. I judge things on what happens in the context of the round and it is up to those in the round to write that ballot for me. If you do not write it for me then you leave it up to me and I do not really want to intervene in the round, so write the ballot for me. So use the rebuttals to write my ballot. Asking me what arguments I like is silly, run what you want and if you are winning it then I vote on it. If you run things I happen to not like that just means you might have a higher threshold needed to win it, but if you are winning it then I vote for it. I typically default into a policy maker, but I am happy to vote wherever the round takes me. Finally, I will openly admit I do not give the highest of speaker points (25-28 is pretty typical) but good debate warrants higher speaks when it occurs. Any specific issues you want to know about continue reading or just ask me since I am happy to tell you.

T: I have voted on it. I do see it as a voter, but explain why it is a voter.

SPECS: Never been a fan, but they can be useful in specific instances

Critical Stuff: Never have had any problem with it other than I do not like them run poorly and I am not a fan of running them in the INC with other contradictory positions so that you can pick which arguments are your winners. It does need to be well developed and explained, especially since there is no evidence that I get to read after the round. Otherwise, feel free to run whatever critical arguments you want but be sure you explain how it compares to the AFF or NEG so I see how it operates in the world then critical arguments are always great to hear.

CP: I have no issue with them at all. When it comes to PICs I tend to prefer agent CPs since there is usually a better solvency debate that can occur and it is much more interesting to me than other PICs. They should be either net ben or mutually exclusive but do not need to both.

Perms: I make this separate from the Critical and CPs since they impact both of them, but in different ways. On CPs I have no issue of perms and I see them as tests of competition not an actual advocacy. However, "Perm do both" is not really a perm since it is only 3 words with no explanation. Perms on Critical arguments are a different thing since I am not sure how they can really interact to the critical alternative. I only say this because when people make prefiat claims and are critical of the discourse used, then I am not sure how a Perm can actually function since the language has occurred in the round. If it is prefiat then I am not sure I understand how a policy action, which bound by fiat, can exist in the prefiat world. None of this means I would not listen to perms, but it just is something that has me thinking about the relationship with Critical arguments.

DA: Go for it but give me some way to evaluate the impact and show me how it relates to the case and the CP if you have one.

Case Arguments: Minimization is a fine way to go if you are running a CP and/or a DA. However, only telling me the harms of case are not as bad just tells me there is still a harm that the case solves which means they are still better than the status quo, not as good as they were in the first speech but still better. So do not expect to win on the so-called "terminal defense."

Framework: If you have a framework be sure you explain how it functions for me in the round. Remember, I default to policy maker so without a clear explanation of it I will use that lens in the framework. So you have to tell me how the AFF/NEG views compete with each other.

Points of order: You can call them but they are all under consideration.

Kaitlin Bundock – Utah

Question 1 : Background of the critic (including formats coached/competed in, # of rounds judged, etc)

I competed for four years in college parl debate for Northern Arizona University; I have judged 20+ rounds this year.

Question 2 : Approach of the critic to decision-making (for example, adherence to the trichotomy, stock-issues, policymaker, tabula rasa, etc.)

I vote on the flow, keeping in mind that dropped arguments that are not impacted out or made to have an important role in the round will likely not be a factor in my decision making. In other words, I will not just see which team had less dropped arguments on a position and vote there. I will evaluate the quality of the arguments being made.

I will usually only vote on procedural arguments if there is in round proven abuse that excludes one of the teams from being able to access offensive arguments. You have a better chance of me voting on a procedural if you are able to make it critical in some way. When evaluating rounds I will look first at the procedural debate to determine if there was significant abuse, then to the K debate (if there is one) then to the impacts, then to theory (unless theory arguments are being made as to why I should reject a position or a team). The rebuttals should tell me how to prioritize the arguments of the round, where to look first, why to look there first, and why the argument matters. I will flow the rebuttals and would prefer teams to call points of order, but not when the new argument is trivial.

I prefer policy debates and dislike procedural debates. I do not like fact or value debates because I think that they often are not argued well, and tend to go in circles. If you are in a fact or value debate in front of me, you should make well warranted arguments that have impacts, and provide me with a clear way to evaluate the round.

You need to have well warranted link stories on case advantages and disadvantages. If you have a weak link and/or internal link story on a disad that leads to massive impacts, I will likely not be persuaded by your disad and will be more apt to vote on turns to your internal link/link story by the gov. I do not have any particular preferences about the CP debate, but prefer the CP to be mutually exclusive and net-beneficial. To beat a CP in front of me you must put offence on it.

I will generally vote for any argument as long as it is argued well and justified. I default to the net-benefits paradigm unless you specify another criterion.

Question 3 : Relative importance of presentation/communication skills to the critic in decision-making

I am ok with speed as long as it is not used to purposefully exclude a team from the round. If speed is used to exclude you from a round you need to make an argument about it and demonstrate proven abuse and why it is significant to you and the round. I can keep up with speed fairly well, but the faster teams can out-flow me. I will let you know if you are going too fast.

Question 4 : Relative importance of on-case argumentation to the critic in decision-making

I prefer there to be a good amount of on case argumentation, but am fine with the debate occurring more on another position. If the debate is occurring mostly on off-case positions, the gov needs to make good, well warranted, and offensive arguments on those positions in order to win the round. Additionally, the opp needs to demonstrate that the reason they are not addressing case more is because their impacts outweigh the case impacts.

Question 5 : Other information:

Overall, I enjoy seeing competitors having fun with this activity and talking about issues that are important to them.

Michael Middleton – Utah – (TAB)

A Quotation:

“The present situation is highly discouraging” –Gilles Deleuze & Felix Guattari

A Haiku:

Debate is Awesome

Judging Makes Me Cry Softly

Do I weep in vain?

Some things to consider (when debating in front of me):

10. I DO NOT support speed as a tool of exclusion
9. I DO NOT like deciding for myself what is the most important thing in the round or how to evaluate the competing arguments; You should do this for me. You will like it less if you don't. On the other hand, I will like it more.
8. I DO like well-structured debates. I also like interesting structures.
7. I DO like creative interpretations; I DO NOT like when you don't explain/provide a rationale for why I your interpretation makes for a productive/rewarding/interesting/good debate.
6. I DO NOT like nor understand potential abuse arguments; I DO like and reward teams that demonstrate compellingly that the quality of the debate has been compromised by an interpretive choice made by the other team.
5. I DO NOT vote for any given argument or against any given type of argument. Run whatever strategy you like; Be clear about your strategy.
4. I am a participant in the round also. While I make my best effort to vote on who is winning and losing the debate based on the arguments, I use speaker points to evaluate and highlight both excellent and poor behaviors, i.e. if you create a hostile environment, you get massively low speaker points.
3. Jargon does not equal argument. Nor does it equal a good time.
2. Cross-application does not equal new argument. It doesn't really equal anything.
1. Debate is not life. Losing a ballot will not steal your humanity. I tend to prefer rounds that demonstrate everyone in the room knows this.
0. Have Fun

Jason Jordan - Utah

I am comfortable voting for just about any winning argument within any framework you want to explicitly place me within. I have very few, if any, normative beliefs about what debate should look like and/or 'be'. Absent debate to the contrary, I default to voting for the advocacy with the most net beneficial post fiat impacts. Unless I am told to do otherwise, on all portions of the debate I tend to use the heuristics of offense/defense, timeframe/probability/magnitude, and uniqueness/link/impact to evaluate and compare arguments. I don't evaluate speaking skills as part of my decision, nor do I have any value judgment attached to a proper "method" of speaking in debate rounds. Unless I am told to do otherwise I attempt to flow everything I possibly can. I think people should be nice, in round, out of round, etc. So, please try to be nice, in so far as you consider my value to life important.

Kasey Lowery – USAFA Volunteer

As a new judge, I do not have any preconceived ideas of how you should argue. However, I will be looking for clarity and ask that you do not go too fast. If you are too loosely structured or go too fast, it is possible that I will miss your point or your supporting evidence. Be sure that you are explicitly stating why your point is important or more important than that of your opponent. I would like a copy of your plan/CP/alt text to ensure that I am capturing all of your argument.

I appreciate an appropriate sense of humor and want to see that you are enjoying yourselves. I will probably reward teams that are especially entertaining as long as it does not distract from the main argument.

Ross Gresham – USAFA Volunteer

I like British Parliamentary debate, which involve a certain amount of give and take (use appropriate interruptions). They aren't about trying to fill the flow chart so that your opponent is fighting the clock to respond. Speed doesn't help in most cases. If you do go fast, make your structure icy clear.

Parliamentary debates also aren't about unrealistic technicalities. Any type of argument is fine, but make it real. I won't be pulled in as a referee. Make your case and I'll adjudicate.

Michelle Reinstatler – USAFA Volunteer

I am open to all sorts of arguments and approaches. I have absolutely no objections to a particular strategy. You can talk about whatever you want and I will attempt to evaluate your arguments fairly. I have a hearing disorder and hearing loss so if you are going to talk quickly it must be loudly and clearly. Clearly tag and identify arguments that you want me to write down. I do not know how to flow streams of consciousness. Make sure I get plan/CP/alt text, don't just blip it out and pass it to the other team- I want the exact wording on my flow too.

Katie Plichta – USAFA Volunteer

I am open to all sorts of arguments and approaches. I have no pre set objections to a particular strategy. You can talk about whatever you want and I will attempt to evaluate your arguments fairly. I prefer a slower pace.

Kristy McManus – Western Wyoming Community College

Most Important Criteria

Flow.

Expectations of Decorum

I expect professionalism and kindness.

Predispositions

I try to remain tab at all times.

Speed/Jargon/Technical

Speed is fine (except NFA-LD - it is a speaking event). If I can't understand you, I won't flow it. Jargon and technical elements are necessary and will be focused on.

Additional Information

I will not protect either side - you must do the work and tell me where you are what and why I am voting.

Zoey DeWolf - Hired

First and foremost, **rudeness in general will result in low speaker points and will not be tolerated.** Debate is supposed to be fun and I expect all debaters to be cordial.

Rounds follow the will of the debater. I'm open to all arguments as long as they are sound. Also, I would like a copy of all plan, counter-plan, perm texts. Thank you much.

I'm open to all K's run by either side as long as teams can **elucidate links and the solvency of their alternative.** With that said, I have evolved into the belief that Ks make for lazy debates and I have a harder time voting for them the older and crankier I get.

Performance debate, as long as it is clear, is fine with me.

On topicality and other spec positions. In-round abuse is necessary for me. Prove to me the ground you actually lost.

Clear rebuttals are also super important. I will default to net benefits unless told otherwise. **You must compare impacts in the rebuttal to secure my ballot.**

Michael Brooks – UTEP

I believe debate can most effectively be thought of as a communication event; as such, ideas and arguments in a debate round become most accessible and finally, most persuasive, if stated clearly, utilizing a comprehensible rate of speed and without undue dependence on jargon. Clear signposting and effective organization throughout the debate enhances the clarity of argument. Consistent signposting creates a clean flow, with major arguments prominent in the mind of your judges. I tend to vote on the flow. I'm open to any strategy as long as it is explained well, organized clearly and makes sense. I use a tabula rasa approach as a judge, so don't worry about what I may or may not believe in *re* whatever proposition is being debated, or what rhetorical strategies and/or debate conventions you choose to utilize. I enjoy a well-crafted and intellectually satisfying argument on any topic, from any viewpoint. Clash is the heart of debate, so keep on point. Please remember the value of transitions reinforcing the organization you've established throughout the round, and don't forget to spend appropriate time on summary, most specifically in rebuttals. A strong rebuttal traces the evolution of the most important arguments used in the debate, showing how and why your version of the proposition should prevail. I do caution you against the use of offensive language or actual rudeness toward your opponents. NPDA debate should be an exercise not only in communication, but in the practice of good ethics in this formalized and rather ritualistic exchange of ideas. Wit and humor are appreciated, if you have the occasion to use such strategies.

Michael Martin – UTEP

My judging philosophy is very motivated by good communication skills. I am impressed by individuals who speak clearly and eloquently in-round. Individuals with high skill levels in spreading tend to lose me. I also feel that speech should be as jargon free as possible but, if jargon is necessary, provide a quick explanation. I think that the K should be used appropriately. To elaborate, I feel using the K as the entire neg argument decreases education on the topic at hand and, consequently, allows for less research and general knowledge on the topic. The K can be very effective when used in conjunction with the counterplan or alternative, but I feel it tends to be a weak argument on its own. I consider myself a tabula rasa as far as the issues go. I do my best to ensure that my own politics do not cloud my judgment, as I feel the debate should go to the team with the best argumentation.

Alyssa Sambor – TTU (1/2 commitment)

Short Version: Do what you want as long as you can justify it. I am open to almost all kinds of arguments and debate positions, but will not tolerate sexism, racism, homophobia, or other forms of exclusionary language. Other than that, I don't mind speed and am not interested in forcing you to conform to what I think debate should be about.

Long Version/Specifics:

Case: Cases can be policy oriented or critical or policy oriented with critical impacts/advantages or any combination of the above/new ways of affirming. I do not hold affirmatives to being topical if they can win that they don't have to be.

T/Theory: I have no strong predispositions against theory. Your interpretation should be specific and contextualized to the round. Counter interps are always a good idea, and you should provide reasons to prefer your counter interp. Standards should interact with the violation and interp you're using. Your voters should clearly articulate why your piece of theory comes first. I am open to critical responses to questions of theory.

CPs: I have no strong dispositions on most kinds of counterplan theory, including conditionality (though I am somewhat persuaded that multiple conditional counterplans are probably not awesome for debate) and would prefer that these questions be settled in round. I really enjoy smart PICs.

DA's: I prefer specific disads to generics. If you're running an econ disad, make sure you explain your warrants and don't just throw a bunch of acronyms at me. I'm not a major fan of most politics da's in terms of personal preferences, but would certainly vote on one.

Kritiks: These are my favorite kind of arguments and the ones I am most familiar with. Most of my background in critical literature focused on intersections of race and gender, though I have also read a wide variety of other kinds of critical literature. I am fine with performance and narrative debates. I would probably be a good judge to try something creative or new in front of. Make sure you clearly explain how you are framing the round and the impacts being discussed.

Other: I am fine with speed unless it's used as a deliberate tool of exclusion (when it's used unnecessarily against novices, people with issues hearing, etc). The more warrants you have for your arguments, the happier you are likely to be with the outcome of the round. Impact prioritization of all kinds (whether specified in the framework or developed in the rebuttals) is very important to me. When not instructed to weigh things otherwise, I probably prioritize probability over magnitude. Offense wins debates, but true, terminal defense is underrated. If you have any specific questions, feel free to ask before the round.

Caleb Rawson – Colorado Christian

No Philosophy Available.

Grant Langdon - Hired

No Philosophy Available.

Nick Mauer – Hired

No Philosophy Available