

Page 1

Antonio De La Garza	3
Northern Arizona University	3
Steven Graham	5
San Joaquin Delta College	5
Aaron Cannistraci:	6
Kasey Gardner	7
Delta College	7
Todd Graham	8
SIU	8
Gina Iberri-Shea	12
US Air Force Academy	12
Travis Risner	13
NAU/Hired	13
Chris Sloan	14
Hired (NAU)	14
Elly Garner	15
Point Loma Nazarene University	15
Meredith Northup	18
Hired /DVC	18
Nick Thompson	19
Diablo Valley College	19
Zach Freels	20
Hired	20
Thomas McCloskey	
Hired/Long Beach	21
AJ Moorehead	23
CSULA	23
Karen Nishie	24
Vanguard	
Sean Carmody	
Vanguard	25
Hajeer Pourkhalkhali	26
Hired	26
Christian Strohm	29
Hired	29
Leah D. Johnson	30
Hired	30
West, Tim	31
Hired	31
Neil Glines	32
Solano Community College	32
Frank Montano	33
Hired	33

Page 2

Raman Deol	34
Hired	
Rebecca Sietman	35
Wheaton College	
Dan Sietman	36
Wheaton College	
Alli Morris	37
Wheaton College	
Kimberlyn Dandy	38
Hired/DVC	
Megan Loden	39
CSULB	
Vince Alvarez	40
Hired	
Steve Farias	42
Pacific	
Joe Dudek	43
Pacific	
Adam Swaller	46
Pacific	
Andrew Grimalda	47
Concordia University, Irvine	
Alex Kramer	
De Anza College	48
Jeff Torosian	49
Fresno City College	
Robert Yamamoto	50
jared anderson - los rios community colleges	51
jeremy henderson - pacific lutheran university	52
kristine clancy - pepperdine university	55
hal sanford - santa rosa junior college	56
mark nelson - santa rosa junior college	57
Ian Samuel, Hired/Round Robin Speaker	60
Phil Sharp, Univ. Nevada, Reno	61
David Worth, Rice University	63
Christa Sloan, Pepperdine University	64
Tony Damico, Azusa Pacific	65
Cathy Glenn, St. Mary's of California	66
Jason Ames, Chabot College	67
Joey Mavity, Azusa Pacific	68
Tim Ernst, Pacific	70
Tim Karmeyer, Pacific	71
Stephanie Eisenberg, Hired	72
Josh House, Hired/Pepperdine	73
Kristina Whalen, CCSF	76
Duval Bodden, Long Beach	77

Northern Arizona University

1 year Parli random JCs

3 years Parli NAU

2nd year Coach NAU

As a critic I believe my first responsibility is to education. I do my best to make sure that the round is a safe learning environment. I also try to make sure that the debaters have as much space as they need to make their arguments. People who believe in objectivity or Tabula Rasa are fooling themselves, and teams that expect that of a judge are missing the point. **I will do my best not to intervene.** However, I am a critic of argument. If an argument is bad, unwarranted, or a lie don't expect me to vote on it.

Style

I am ok with speed as long as it is clear and organized. If I have trouble flowing you I will say clear. I like intensity in debaters but that does not mean you should be rude or condescending. I have and will continue to vote for debaters of all styles. Frankly what you have to say is much more important to me than how you say it.

Procedurals

I am not against procedurals as a competitor I used them and a coach my teams run them.

However, I am unlikely to vote on a procedural without proof of abuse. By proof of abuse I mean I need you to actually run the argument that the interpretation would keep you from running. I will still vote on procedurals without an abuse story but my threshold is very high and the better debater you are the less likely I am to believe that procedurals are your only chance to win. I am unlikely to vote a team down because of new theory (independent voters) in the member speeches as long as the MO covers everything. PMR turns are not golden, I think that that is a stupid way to judge, they are just arguments that I will evaluate if the PMR arguments are better than the MO's the PM wins those arguments if not then the PM loses those arguments. If it's at all close I tend to wash the arguments (this happens most often).

Framework

Without arguments to the contrary I will vote first on the Kritik level, second on the procedural level, last on the Net Benefit. As far as I am concerned framework arguments are completely debatable. For example if you make arguments as to why case should come before T and K and win those arguments I will vote on case first.

Trichotomy

I think that most fact and value debates are bad. Not because I am ideologically opposed to them, but because people debate them poorly (if you think you are the exception you are probably not). If you run a fact round and your opponents run a DA and Tricot bad don't link out of the DA. If you run a policy round and your opponents run Tricot good, answer their counter warrants and out impact them. When in doubt remember I want to see clash at a level beyond the procedural.

Kritique / Experiments / Projects

I love this type of debate and I respect teams that put work into doing something that is different and therefore risky. One caveat you must provide a way for your opponents to engage in the discussion you are having. Too many times projects go no deeper than "I am different so I win" I will not vote for that. In front of me it is worth your time to explain how I and your opponents should engage. I will vote on K's without alternatives as long as you justify how rejection is more than or better than status quo.

RFD

Page 4

Most rounds I end up voting for the team that does the best job of weighing impacts and discussing risk. A dropped argument is a conceded argument as long as it is an argument. I will not vote on unwarranted claims. I do not like poorly warranted DA or AD scenarios that lead to massive impacts. It will take a lot of work to convince me that universal healthcare will lead to global nuclear war. As a general rule the bigger the impact you go for the better the internal links and warrants need to be.

POI's and POO's

Points of Information can be anything, question, argument, joke. When you yield your time you yield your time. I don't flow them, but I do think that they are binding. Most Points of Order don't matter. Call them if you want but I do my best to protect. I prefer that if you think an argument is new just raise your hand and I will take it under consideration.

Steven Graham

San Joaquin Delta College

I am tabula rasa (as much as I can possibly be) and I am old, so I need to hear a roadmap and sign posts throughout the speech. I do not flow very fast, so if you are speaking really fast I might miss an important argument you are making. I am looking for the Government team to explain to me what I am voting on. This is done through the development of the case (claims, evidence...examples really help, and reasoning). The Government should clearly construct and rationalize their significance (including definitions), SQ harms, inherency, plan text, solvency, and advantages.

I am looking for the Opposition to either refute/turn the case or provide fully constructed disadvantages (uniqueness, link, internal link, and impacts) or a fully constructed counter-plan for me to consider as a viable alternative. I would appreciate you making my job easy by showing me where either plan/solvency/advantages out-weigh or the terminal impacts from the disads out-weigh. I'm not a big fan of Topicality (T), but it's your debate, so run whatever you want. I will consider a reverse voting issue (RVI) on T if the government argues and supports it.

Finally, please give me clear voters on the major positions you have won in the rebuttals; you don't need to rehash the entire debate because I'll have everything down on my flow (unless you talked too fast). In terms of Speaker Points, I'm looking for each individual's analysis, reasoning, evidence, organization, credibility, and delivery. I do enjoy wit and humor, for which you will be rewarded. However, personal attacks really turn me off. Also, I think delivery is almost a lost art form. I'm looking for a speaker to be fluent, persuasive, maintain some eye contact, and have a comfortable rate of delivery. This is a valuable educational activity, so there really are only winners in each round.

Aaron Cannistraci:

I don't like speed as a strategy, if you like spreading go do policy.

I'm a flow judge, so I like organization (roadmaps, signposts, taglines) and warranted impacts. I will listen to procedurals but only vote on them if I really feel the gov team is being abusive.

WARNING: I will drop for rudeness, I will not vote for you if you do not give me voters in the rebuttal speeches "voter #1: we are clearly winning on criteria..."

Kasey Gardner

Delta College

Experience : 7 Years, 6 Parli

Undergrad: Moorpark/Western KY

Grad Coaching: 2 Years Pacific

Feel free to use all positions and arguments that you wish in front of me and I will do my best to evaluate them fairly and honestly. I don't think it is the purpose of a judging philosophy to tell you what I will and not "like" in debate but rather how to discuss it. That being said I prefer not to see projects or unjustified generic criticisms. Critiques have a place in debate and I will listen to them. Personally I view them as an innovative tool to provide ground, use them carefully.

Speed is rarely an issue as long as you are clear and make sense. This argument applies equally if you are not fast but unclear as a whole. In order to enhance your clarity you should use examples, theory, or well warranted analysis.

The above being said I find myself not voting for a lot of performance but that doesn't mean I don't think it is legitimate, just poorly run often.

I appreciate being told how to evaluate arguments especially if they are on different planes (critical, case, theory, ect.) Standard tools of impact calculus are paramount as well; such as magnitude, timeframe, and probability.

You should call points of order in front of me, but save them for instances that matter. If the round is a slaughter, let them go, you will be fine. If the argument is not important then don't point of order it.

There are a few things I don't find persuasive, one of them is excessive prompting and tooling of your partner. Another is rudeness to the other team on a personal level, as opposed to the argumentative level.

Apparently I am not generous with speaker points. Most debate performances are about 27 or less, some are 28, a few are 29, and every once in awhile a 30. You will not find me giving 30's around. I often award points on merit of argumentation/examples, with some benefit to pleasant or effective delivery.

Finally, please get to my round on time. I will enforce the tournament's forfeit rule, being late is not acceptable. As for my own rule, it is 5 after prep is over if the tournament doesn't have one.

Todd Graham

SIU

2009-2010

I have a policy debate background. I like rounds that are policy debate rounds. Plans, advantages, disads, counterplans, etc...all make for better debates. Think of me as a policy maker. My role is to vote for or against the government plan. Generally, arguments filter through that role...with a few exceptions noted below.

Performances: While I have voted for hand puppets (sock puppets actually require socks), I wouldn't bank on any repeats soon. A performance is not more persuasive to me than any other single warranted argument. Usually it is less persuasive.

You must make arguments to win a debate. Those arguments should be clear enough to allow the other team a fair chance to respond. (Eg, critiques, metaphors, irony, narratives, personal advocacy, what your alt to your k is, etc...)

If the tournament in question has topic areas, I think it would be swell if you did your work, cut some files, and debated those topic areas. Running generics when we have topic areas should be avoided since it causes your credibility to be diminished.

Critiques: Again, I prefer policy debate. However, when on the government, your plan advantages can be critical, just as a net benefit to a counterplan can be critical. Either way, you still had a policy. I have voted for many critiques, but I am not a hack. I think critiques should have realistic alternatives. Some critiques make little sense to me. Maybe this helps. When my team ran Baudrillard in policy debate on the aff and neg all year, here was my philosophy:

I would not vote for my own team this year,
But I hope you do.
I would not vote for our affirmative,
Whatever it is.
I would not vote for our negative arguments,
Because I don't really get them.
I do not understand why line-by-line is bad,
So I guess I am part of the problem.
My team has used an extra strike just for me,
Since they cannot risk me accidentally judging them.
Indeed, I say this with love in my heart,
But I would not vote for my own team this year.

Fiat for critiques:

Both teams can argue that their advocacy is a good thing. That essentially means the government defends their plan as U.S. government action (if USFG is in the res). Arguing a critique and saying that fiat is illusory doesn't change the fact that government teams should still get the chance to access their impacts.

Fiat for politics:

I think that fiat means the government gets their plan passed now. This "debate" about politics should begin after the passage of the plan. So politics links that argue about who voted for what and by what margin make little sense to me. Note: that also means that most "political capital" or "horse trading" links seem either out of place or incorrectly argued in many debates. EG., Why would the president spend political capital to pass a

Page 9

plan that he never liked in the first place? Why would it be seen as an olive branch? He NEVER would have done the plan (that's inherency). I think most opposition teams are asserting (actually fiat) these links, and they seem ridiculous to me. Fiat doesn't mean you get a link to politics automatically because legislation was passed. Make some arguments about the specific government plan and the political ramifications of it being passed. I think fiat means the plan was passed. The government gets to fiat it into existence. So debate the political process that happens AFTER the passage of the plan. That still leaves plenty of political process disads like: plan perceived as win or loss, plan popular or unpopular, plan angers x party or the base, plan is liberal/conservative which has "x" results, winners win/losers lose etc... I think these are all arguments that are included by my interpretation of fiat while not allowing unreasonable debates about supermajority, who voted for what, 9-0 s.c. counterplans, cheat-o-veto, as well as the examples above of capital or horse trading or olive branches. The easy test: does your interpretation of fiat give you a link (and sometimes uniqueness)? If so, then I disagree with your outlook on fiat.

Counterplans:

I think you should stick with mutual exclusivity and net beneficial as your standards. Venture into other standards at your own risk.

The consistency of advocacy and arguments is crucial for parliamentary debate. The counterplan should be consistent with the disads/case turns/kritiques you are running. For parliamentary debate, counterplans must be unconditional. I don't need you to tell me that when making them. Two quick reasons they must be unconditional: 1. There is no cross examination, and usually teams only get one question of the LOC. That means there is no time to develop the status of the cp, what that means, when/how the opp could kick it, how it relates to all the disads and critiques in the round, etc... These questions and their follow-ups are fundamental for the MG to select an approach that gives the gov the best chance to beat the opp strategy. Without those questions the MG is swinging in the dark. 2. Only one rebuttal per side. This makes it impossible for the gov team to win any debates where the opp team runs a conditional or dispositional counterplan. This is true since the opp strategy will be deployed in their "block" of last 2 speeches, when they decide to keep or kick the counterplan, disads that link to it, critiques that link to it, etc... Unfortunately, this makes the job of the PMR an uphill climb, since now they must address all the new ways in which they must extend arguments, modify the mg strategy, answer new extensions by the MO, find new offense uncovered when the MO kicked out of half of the inconsistent strategy, etc... The PMR must do this plus give a final rebuttal big picture story on all the positions and on the round as a whole. In policy debate the 1AR can just run fast and free, which leaves time for the 2AR to tell the story of the round. In parli, with one less rebuttal, the debate becomes ugly, and the gov team would rarely win.

The same is true with criticisms. Your advocacy is your alternative, and it needs to be unconditional and consistent with all other arguments you forward in your speeches.

In case you don't understand the meaning of "unconditional," let me explain. "Unconditional" is a very specific term that only refers to advocacy. That means your advocacy (plan, counterplan, alternative on the k) is unconditional. You will never advocate (as in plan/cp/k) something that is different/opposite. Unconditional does not mean that you cannot kick parts of your case. Unconditional does not mean that you cannot go for a procedural. Unconditional means your advocacy is unconditional, but there can still be other ways to win the debate (such as procedurals, critical arguments that you win/get turned—such as language critiques, etc...) You don't need to extend your plan or your counterplan to win. Unconditional simply means you cannot change your advocacy (which is only a plan or counterplan or critique alternative) by reversing it, or making it something else. Unconditional does not mean that you must win the debate by extending your original plan/counterplan/kritique alternative. It just means you cannot change it.

Perms are tests of competition. That's all they are. I don't require you to tell me that when making them.

Page 10

All debaters should take at least one poi (other than “could you repeat your plan/cp text”) in their speeches. Don’t take questions after your speech. That isn’t parli. Take them during your speech.

New arguments: Points of order are part of parliamentary debate. They allow both sides to explain why arguments are new or why they are legitimate extensions. Without these explanations that follow points of order, I cannot know for certain if an argument is new. Therefore, without a point of order, I will assume all arguments originated in a previous speech. If I end up voting on an argument that might be new in the rebuttal, it is not my fault for not noticing it, but the opposing team’s fault for not pointing it out. Don’t expect me to do the work for you. I judge this way when on panels also, so don’t quit making points of order just because you have several judges.

Plans should be topical. You should be topical. Seriously. And “competing interpretations” is a meaningless tag line from trendy coaches and debaters. Every argument in debate is a competing interpretation. Topicality has definitions and violations and standards. Those are arguments. Do that.

Spec debates are okay, but harder to win in parliamentary debate given the limited amount of prep time the government team has to write their plan. It would be nice if the plan specified whatever it can, and I do believe that some level of specificity is needed for the opp to have clear ground. However, opposition debaters need to show some actual abuse in order to win the argument, and burdens are higher for spec debates. On a similar note, I’d like to talk about funding spec, or troop spec, or other similar arguments. I am more persuaded by the opp running an argument that says what normal means is and then running a disad that links to normal means. (along with the spec) Then if the gov says that their funding or troops or whatever do not come from the normal means (but the plan never specified), then the opp has an easy debate on the spec and abuse and voting issue. But for me, the gov can defend normal means and the opp’s job is to run a disad to it.

Reverse Voting Issues are for people who cannot debate. And they are for judges who cannot think. RVIs include, but are not limited to anything that is a 10 second-type argument, even if there is no “reverse” to the vi. EG: “perms illegit, vote them down.” Good test: Does it take long to beat the abusive argument that you are putting your voting issue against, whatever it is? If not, then it doesn’t need an rvi (or vi). Another test: If it seems like a cheap shot, (underdeveloped, etc...) then I won’t give you much credibility on it. Other examples of rvi type args are: “They didn’t specify the status of their counterplan” or “They didn’t specify the status of their perm.” Since I think counterplans in parli should be unconditional, and all perms are tests of competition, I’m not taking any cheap shots on these type of arguments.

I try not to intervene in rounds. I’m also a critic of argument. Those two concepts conflict quite often. I wish I could tell you the bright line of which arguments are so terrible that they don’t really need much of an answer, and which arguments, while counterintuitive, still require solid counterarguments. My suggestions: First, try to make good arguments that have solid foundations. Then you won’t have to worry. Second, don’t count on me to debate for you. In most cases, I will not intervene. But I think parliamentary debate should not encourage judges to be 100% tabula rasa. I find debaters just make stuff up way too often, both about world events and about debate theory. So, while I try to give the debaters the benefit of the doubt, it is possible that I could intervene based on false facts or just bad arguments. Perhaps you will be able to tell by my nonverbal and verbal communication if your argument won’t be getting my ballot.

Kevin Stone- Lewis and Clark

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. I

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.

Gina Iberri-Shea

US Air Force Academy

I am open to all sorts of arguments and approaches. I have absolutely 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 don't mind speed, but if I'm not able to get your arguments down on my flow, that obviously hurts you. I like structure, and that becomes even more important in high speed rounds. Clearly tag and identify arguments that you want me to write down. I don't 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.

I enjoy well developed Kritiks but make sure the interaction with all arguments is understandable and that they are adapted to the particular round. Point out contradictions and tell me why that's bad- I won't vote against performative contradictions on face. I will easily vote on T- but don't just throw it out as an idea and not a developed argument. I won't vote against a plan because I perceive it to be not topical- you need to make the arguments. Please don't make any assumptions about what I might think is a really bad thing- tell me why your impacts matter. It is very important for both teams to tell me how to weigh the round- where you are winning and what you want me to vote on.

Finally, I don't mind partner interjections, but I don't flow them. I only recognize one speaker at a time and I think it's performatively bad when the speaker's partner completely takes control of the speech. Also, call points of order- especially if you think it's a new application or the round was messy. Have fun, I will probably reward anyone who contributes to a fun round.

Travis Risner

NAU/Hired

I am a flow critic meaning that I base my decisions based upon the flow. I am open to any argumentation as long as you justify it and explain why it is important and how I should vote for it. I have a high threshold for topicality. I would prefer that your topicality have critical implications. I feel that for me to actually vote on an RVI it must have some critical implication for me as well. I want to see articulated abuse in procedurals for me to buy them. I do not vote on defensive arguments, I need to see impacted offense on a position to vote for it. I will not accept new arguments in the rebuttle, however, teams should point of order new arguments if they see them in order to bring my attention to them. I want to see weighing of impacts and a cohesive story in rebuttles. By weighing I mean that I need a clear explanation of what impacts you are winning and why they are more important than the impacts you may be losing. If there are any other questions feel free to ask before the round.

Chris Sloan

Hired (NAU)

My name is Chirs Sloan I am a graduate of the University of Massachusetts Amherst. Though I had no competitive debate experience I am good friends with the anarchists at Northern Arizona University and have helped them develop some of their Kritical positions. Stylistically I prefer a debate that is conversational in pace, well organized and focuses on the big picture. I like intense debates and debaters with a sense of humor. I received my degree in Social thought and Political Economy. I am well read in materialism and dialects. CLR James is my favorite Communist. Just because I do not have a lot of debate experience does not mean that you should be afraid to run complex and nuanced positions. As far as procedural go I tend toward reasonability. If there is ground for both sides and the Gov is not obviously skewing the round it would be better for the Opp to just engage the case. I take notes but do not consider myslef a flow critic. The best way to get my ballot is to have a clear line of argument and do a good job of dealing with the impact calculus in the rebuttal.

Elly Garner

Point Loma Nazarene University

I competed in forensics for five years (two years Parli at PLNU, three years NFL Policy and NFL LD). That said, because I've been out of the scene for nearly three years, I will vote on where I'm told to vote. I will consider anything you link, impact and weigh out for me.

I try not to enter the round with preconceived notions about the resolution, allowing the debaters to control where the round goes. Justify your argumentation, show me why you win, but don't make me connect the dots for you.

Having competed in both Policy and Parli debate, I can keep up with the flow, but that doesn't mean I want to a massive load of unjustified claims. I need to hear you articulate links and impacts.

I enjoy well-defined burdens and resolutional analysis (including topicality, especially linked to offense). I need impacts to decide the round. Policy is usually the best way to go, but not always. The best strategy for the Neg is an offense; a well-linked DA... or 10 and a good counter plan just for good measure. Give me arguments that win the round, not just arguments that stop the bleeding.

Organization is critical, I like numbers, letters, etc. and I like rebuttals that tell me where to circle/highlight for RFD. Don't go line by line. While I can (and do) vote on dropped arguments, I need to know how they are impacting the round. Tell me why they are important to my decision.

Questions, just ask.

Angela Compton-Point Loma Nazarene University

Debate: 5 yrs. NPDA; about a year of LD experience

Other forensics events: mostly limited prep; a few years of platforms and some dabbling in interp.

Undergrad area of study: Political science and Philosophy and Religion

Grad school area of study: Religion

Judging Paradigm:

I try to let debaters debate their own round and influence the content as little as possible. I am, for the most part, a **flow critic**. However, the more disorganized you are the more likely I am to have to intervene because things are not as easy to sort out. **Speaker points are important**. I use them to evaluate your speaking style, adaptation, behavior and quality of argumentation in the round. If you are a decent speaker you can still get low speaker points for being rude, disorganized, or not adapting to me (your other critics, or a group of people).

I do have biases but I try to be as neutral as possible. However, since I am a product of a certain team, community, academic setting and certain areas of specialty there are some preferences that I can outline.

Speed

1. I have not yet seen a round that was too fast to flow as a judge/critic.
2. If you are going too fast for me I will drop my pen and stare at you until you slow down.
3. Since a debate implies actually having a transfer of ideas/arguments (etc.) between opponents you should slow down if your opponents request it of you. That being said **if both teams are up to speed I think it is fine**.
4. Your only bright-line for speed in round is me (and *any other audience members* you have) and your opponent so I will do my best to communicate with you, you should analyze and respond (or adjust) to your audience members, and as a participant in the debate you should communicate with one another if you have a problem. **If your opponent asks you to slow down because they cannot keep up, or if I indicate that you are too fast to follow and you choose to ignore it, you will not mean that you will lose, but you will not be happy with your speaker points.**

Types of Debates and arguments that I love

1. A great (read: clean and interesting) **K debate**. K, critical under views that are used strategically, on-case critical turns, etc.
2. Framework debates
3. Plan vs. CP debate
4. If done well I like a good T debate. Problem is that I have only ever seen one or two worth the time and effort.
5. Not Net Benefits (I do like NB but I like something else, assuming that it is good, even more).

NOTE: I am fine with you kicking positions that you do not want (unless the other team gives me great reasons why you shouldn't. That means that if you want to run T you can still have a good T and a good debate surrounding it and still get rid of it).

Types of Debates and Arguments I don't love

1. **Politics DAs**. You *can* run them. But I am sympathetic to arguments that eliminate them so it probably is not the best idea. Plus politics DAs tend to be run and answered horribly. General rule: If you couldn't (at least) turn it in for an Intro to Poli Sci paper its probably a lame idea to run it in front of me.
2. **Tricot debates** (unless you can give me different analysis than "Should implies a policy" or "___ word means value" or "___ implies a fact." These are overly simplistic ways to view language and syntax. They are really a waste of time and have very little philosophical grounding. If you want to make more interesting arguments about differing types of resolutions... By all means do so... I would appreciate and probably greatly enjoy those positions).
3. Messy debates suck!

Behavior in the Round

1. **Please be nice to one another**. I love the competition in debate but there is *no reason* to be rude *ever*. I hate watching rounds where people are acting contrary to the spirit of friendly competition.
2. **From the moment you enter the room your presentation matters**. That means the way that you behave before and after the round (In other words, while I am giving feedback) matters to me. All of it impacts your speaker points.

Page 17

3. I do not mind giving a good speaker low (20-25) speaker points for being rude or ignoring the communication [regarding speed etc.] of me, to some extent the audience, or the opponents).

Meredith Northup

Hired /DVC

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

Meredith prefers to be a policymaker in the round, but ultimately much prefers to see a good debate where the two teams are discussing the same issues and have them pretend as though she is not in the room at all. She thinks a debate about the rules of debate are just as good as a debate about other subjects.

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

Presentation/communication skills are important to Meredith in that they most often increase your credibility and persuasiveness. This is a communication based activity and in order for the debaters to truly become better orators, practice makes perfect. If you're a speedy debater you won't lose her but you better be sure she isn't going to vote on a single line item that you spent 2 seconds on in the rebuttal, if it is important enough for her to vote on it, you be sure to make it clear that is the case.

- Concerns about any particular argumentative approach/arguments which the critic rarely/never will vote for

There are no positions or arguments that Meredith will never go for, it really is independent on the round. Please be sure to explain statements if you think they hold a lot of weight, don't say phrases like "no inherency" or "no link" or "make them prove it" ... explain what you mean by it, although we know the terminology, we don't want to assume that the debaters mean one thing when it means something else to us. Explain what you are saying, how it functions in the round and the significance of it. Meredith is a huge fan of telling the big picture that includes all of the links, internal links, and impact analysis, as well as the essential line by lines. A lot of times debaters get very caught up in one argument and don't realize that it is trivial and that there is a missed argument that is far more important to the round or position.

Meredith can be a bit silly, and have a friendly face, at the end of the day debate is a passion of hers and she really enjoys seeing the students grow. She is a great critic for traditional debaters as well as alternative debaters, it is their activity and she is merely an observer to offer feedback from her years of viewing experience.

Nick Thompson

Diablo Valley College

I am a flow judge who prefers QUALITY of argumentation over quantity. At the end of a round, I look at which contentions are left standing and weigh the terminal impacts of each. In an especially competitive debate, I can usually point to one poignant statement that tips the balance to the side that ultimately receives my vote. Also, I try to be as *tabula rasa* as possible, but I think there's a limit to a judge's ability to discard a historical fact or generally accepted truth. Debaters should address a critic as a consumer of information, not as a sponge who will accept any premise without reservation.

I believe the purpose of speech and debate tournaments is essentially to prepare its participants for real world public speaking. For that reason, I prefer that debaters DO NOT SPREAD, because it's a worthless skill outside the bubble of Parli or Policy. However, my decision will not be affected unless the speech is so ridiculously fast that it cannot be flowed. I love a good topicality and hate a bad topicality; I would suggest sticking to case unless there is a compelling argument for loss of ground. I appreciate humor throughout the debate and creativity in definitions as long as those definitions give fair ground to the opposition.

Zach Freels

Hired

I debated for two years at Northern Arizona University and two years at Solano Community College.

I think everything in a debate round is up for debate. This means you must be prepared to defend even debate itself in front of me.

I will evaluate the round in whatever style or framework you can justify. I can flow pretty fast but if you go too fast I'll say clear. I'd prefer speed to be used to enhance the quality of arguments rather than the quantity.

If you want to win my ballot you must prioritize the issues in the round. Unless otherwise stated, I will default to a net/benefits paradigm. This means you must tell me when and how to vote on your procedurals or K.

In general, I feel debate theory to be substantially weaker than engaging the issues at hand. I will not vote for theory tag lines unless they are warranted. I do not believe debate will collapse because of a pic or untopical cases, so please pick stronger warrants.

K's: please have an alternative or tell me how "reject" does not revert to the status quo. These are my favorite positions in debate but I hate when they are done poorly.

T: I determine the winner of T based on the standards debate. I think critical arguments are stronger than ground or education but please tell me how it functions in comparison to ground/education. I need to know how exactly T is racist, capitalist, etc. before I will reject the argument.

Offense vs. Defense; I think good teams will combine both of these types of arguments. I tend to give at least some risk to positions that lack turns against them although I think defensive arguments can create effective mitigation that contrasts with offense from other positions.

I may look and talk like a hippy but I don't inject my political beliefs into a debate round. U.S. heg good, biz con, or pragmatism are just as likely to win my ballot as a deep ecology or critical race theory K. The only way to win those debates is to have well warranted arguments.

Any questions, just ask!

Hired/Long Beach

A) I am a good judge for you if: You like to weigh arguments in rebuttals, prefer policy (plan/counterplan/critical) debates, like to impact things thoroughly and explain positions, enjoy a faster pace and consider yourself a flow debater.
B) I am an ok judge for you if: You understand everything I wrote under A (adapting is fun!) and know the difference between offensive and defensive argumentation and fiat/pre/post-fiat.
C) You should probably strike me if: You don't understand anything I wrote under A or B, prefer value/fact debates to policy debates, prioritize rhetorical style to substantive arguments (not that they necessary conflict, I'm just saying) and don't flow that well.

Background: I did Parli for four years at Willamette University and graduated in May of 2005. I was the ADOF at Pacific University (not UoP, the one in Oregon for that year they did debate), now I'm a grad student at Long Beach meaning I'm thinking of ways to turn this philosophy into a K-framework right now.

Topicality: I assume the gov interpretation of the resolution is valid unless argued otherwise. To win on T, I think opp needs to win at least one part of all four sections of T (so, of course, their interpretation, and at least one violation, standard and voter). I view a T argument as links in a chain in that if opp loses one component entirely, I probably won't vote opp on T, assuming gov explains why the sub-point in question is key to a T-shell. Also, I don't think that APriori/ Prima Facia is an evaluative voter/impact on T in that I just think it means I look to T first, but I assume that anyway since it is a procedural. That said, I have voted on T in the past (and, for that matter, on RVI's to T), but I just want teams to do the work on the position if they want to win on it. That goes for every argument, too.

Critiques/Kritiques: K's are awesome! I think that the components of a K are like links in a chain, too. If one section (framework, link, impact and alternative) is gone, I probably won't vote on it for the team that originally ran it, again, assuming an argument is made in the round about why that specific sub-point is a key part to a K. With that in mind, however, I still believe that fiat is ultimately illusory and in the vein, that a good K is pre/post-fiat, and I will vote accordingly. I've had this running discussion recently that the thesis of all good K's should be able to be summarized in one sentence--critical arguments should be clear, too.

Counter-plans: I love CP debates! I think topical counter-plans and negative fiat are very legitimate. Arguments I don't like: Poorly-run vagueness. I hear a lot of vagueness positions that sound more like complaining than an argument that manages to generate an evaluative impact. Similarly, I tend to think that burdens arguments are lazy/sloppy T. If there is a resolution of fact/value, I would really appreciate a plan to test the resolution and I would not be receptive to an argument challenging the validity of such an approach to topics like that.

How to get my ballot/miscellaneous paradigm stuff: I will take the easiest way out I possibly can. Usually that means that I wait until someone in the round makes a mistake and vote on it (most of the time this is a dropped argument that is impacted and weighed well). Aside from that, I really really really like weighing in rebuttals and give the LOR and PMR more freedom than most to do just that. Also, I can flow speed and I kind of like it

because usually it gives me an easy way out in the round when someone drops something. However, I should caution teams that I like speed, as long as it doesn't come at the expense of thorough analysis and warrants.

AJ Moorehead

CSULA

"My primary philosophy in all areas is summed up by the phrase "It's your debate." Whatever is agreed to in the round defines the lens or paradigm I will use for that particular round. Of course this enables freedom, but it also pretty much obligates flow coverage, especially pertaining to framework, especially if it's something you don't agree with. I am not deeply in love with speed but there is certainly a time and a place - and my background is such that I can handle whatever pace the round selects. That said, if there is a disagreement on which rate of speed should be used, I am sympathetic to the liberal grouping of arguments and systematic dismissal of ideas that weren't reasonably clear. Don't blip. Don't forge ev. Be original."

I am referred to as an "old school" parli debate coach. I prefer stock issues and debate that sticks to the resolution. I am not the judge to run a performance debate or a non topical plan in front of. I think that procedurals are necessary to protect ground in debate and offer checks against abuse, however, I also believe that many teams prefer the "gaminess" that procedurals offer them and prefer procedurals to the topic -- I'm not a big fan of the "gaminess". If a topicality, resolutionality, vagueness (for example) argument is necessary then run it and run it well -- if it isn't necessary, then don't run it in front of me. Kicking out of T in the members speech usually seems a bit unfair to me -- but if it no longer fits -- then take your chances. Kritiks seem to be a bit out of fashion this year which to me is just fine...if you feel you must run a Kritik -- make sure you understand it well enough to explain it, in detail, to me so that I can vote on it where you want me to. Don't leave Kritik analysis to me -- explain it -- otherwise I'm likely to not vote where you want me to.

Things I prefer in parli: cogent arguments delivered in a conversational/professional manner; organization; stock issues; advantages that link to plan; upholding the NPDA standard that government has the burden to uphold the resolution,; I also believe that opposition walks into the round with "presumption" (a seemingly "old school" belief). I am not a big fan of pouring burdens onto either team that are not inherently theirs (ie saying that opposition has any burden other than the burden of rejoinder in front of me won't be appreciated). I like wit, even sarcasm, I despise rudeness and foul language. Talking about your sex life, or other very personal issues won't go over well in front of me.

Rebuttals do not need to review the entire debate -- just what still matters after all the constructives are finished. Tell me where you are winning and why. On constructives, there are some teams that cry when the Member of Opposition brings in new arguments -- it's a constructive speech that requires new analysis and sometimes new arguments to beat government.... remember, the only place new arguments are not allowed is in the rebuttal -- but if you are MoO, make new arguments unbeatable because government does have the last word.

Have fun, be organized, be smart and I'm likely to pick you. Be arrogant, mean, disorganized or non topical (gov) and you won't enjoy reading what I have to say about your round.

Sean Carmody -- 2 years parli; 2 years peer coach.

Vanguard

Question 1 : Please enter a complete judging philosophy for all of your NPDA critics

I enjoy a well thought out, well delivered debate. Clash is important to me. Explain your argument and why you are winning your argument and I will "buy" what you sell. Organization is very important -- tell me where you are on the flow. I like stock issues. I do NOT like performance debate and while I understand Kritiks would prefer not to listen to them. Just debate the resolution given, stay away from being too gamey and we'll get along fine. I like "out of the box" thinking -- but tell me why we are out of the box and justify it for the win.

Sarcasm is good; justification for arguments is good; procedurals are fine if 1) justified, and 2) run properly; I don't know how to judge a "performance debate" so if you choose to dance or meditate in front of me rather than give verbal arguments that I can put on my flow you will lose. Government, uphold the resolution/ opposition offer clash and both teams tell me how and where you win. I put on the flow what you tell me is important -- sell your arguments.

Hajeer Pourkhalkhali

Competed: Parli, 3 Years

School: UC Berkeley

Hired

DECISION

Without another criterion, I default to NB analysis. Triggers are important to me, tell me where to pull the trigger first and why. This becomes important in theory v K debates, I need to get analysis on which issue I evaluate first.

ASSESSING ARGUMENTS

How important are the following to you as a judge (not important, slightly important, modestly important, very important)?

--Line by line argument

Absolutely critical.

--Big picture/main issues argumentation

Explain to me the hierarchy of the arguments in the round. Tell me why I am voting on your arguments first.

--Style/Persuasive communication

Not a factor.

PRESENTATIONAL ASPECTS

How do you feel about the following in parliamentary debates?

--Faster delivery in parliamentary debates

Perfectly fine. In fast debates, I just like to hear numbers ("the little 1 here is... etc"), it helps keep my flow and your flow aligned.

--Use of gender-culture-orientation neutral or promotion language

Its only an issue if it gets brought up by the other team, and even then I'll evaluate it like I would any other argument.

--Weak/bad arguments that are not responded to

I see dropped arguments as true. If there are multiple competing dropped arguments, I will give greater weight to drops with more strength of warrant.

--Any other presentational aspects you'd like to comment on?

Give me a roadmap and be clear as to where you are on the flow.

STRONG VIEWPOINTS

Do you feel very strongly about any issues that would make it difficult for you to vote for an argument? (e.g. abortion, drug legalization, war on Iraq, malthus, etc.)

I won't vote Win-Win or Loss-Loss. If you win a WW or LL argument, I will listen, but just end up flipping a coin. Other than that, none.

ARGUMENTS ON TYPICAL POSITIONS

--Government cases (*consider key issues that should be presented; policy versus fact versus value versus metaphor topics/cases*)

I will always prefer a policy debate to a fact or value debate. If you do, for whatever reason, decide to run a fact or value debate, make it very clear to me what your thesis/advocacy in the round is, and how I should evaluate it.

--Topicality/link arguments (*consider when topicality arguments are justified; do you need standards; can the government lose on a technically incorrect definition/interpretation; how do you weigh competing definitions; must the government present definitions in the first speech*)

I don't need definitions from the 1A. I enjoy good theory debates.

RVI's need to be well developed or cold conceded.

--"Generic" Disadvantages (*consider how well linked the disadvantage is to the proposal; consider how many links before a disadvantage is too tenuous to seriously consider*)

I'll weigh them like any other D/A.

--Counterplans (*consider topicality, competitiveness, and conditionality*)

I only have one preconception on CP theory: if P = CP, I vote P on presumption. Just make sure you explain your CP theory and how I evaluate the round.

--Critiques/Kritiks (*consider specificity of links, how they weigh versus other positions*)

I'm fine with Kritiks. It is important for me that you have an alternative on the K and explain how it garners some solvency for your K. How the Kritik weighs against other positions **must** be explained at some point in the round. I will be unhappy in a theory + K debate if neither side gives me a good hierarchy for the arguments in the round, or if both sides drop each others analysis on the hierarchy.

Page 28

--Counterwarrants--arguments against the resolution that aren't necessarily against the case (*consider what a good counterwarrant is; when they are warranted; how do counterwarrants weigh against a government case*)

No.

--Value/criteria (*consider how important this is to your decision; are arguments unrelated to the value criteria irrelevant to your decision?; must value/criteria be presented in a team's first speech?*)

If no value/criteria is specified, I will assume net-benefits is the criteria for the round.

Christian Strohm

Hired

BACKGROUND: Graduated UC:Berkeley with a BA in German. 3 years' competitive policy in high school. New to judging

SPEED: We used to spread people out of the round, so it's fair game in my opinion. However, when it comes to important theory or procedural debate, it's critical to slow down where you want me to understand. Consistent transition phrases between arguments and/or numbering is great.

DECIDING THE BALLOT: I will vote on anything you tell me to, so long as I know why. I am more personally interested in theory or kritik debate than I am about stock policy, unless the stock issues are unique and interesting. Do your impact analysis during the rebuttals so I know where to vote and why. Furthermore, helping me understand why voting for the other team is a "bad idea" is very useful in deciding. If both sides pile up impacts and I'm left to decide for myself, it's probably not going to be what you want.

OFF CASE: I think topicality, framework, and procedural debates are great if you make them interesting. Running something like five very similar T args is more annoying than effective in my opinion, but it's part of the strategy of the round. I have no idea what potential abuse is or why it matters. I view these debates as competing interpretations, and both side is entitled to his or hers. If you create a clear interpretation, articulate why it's better, give me reasons why to ignore the other interpretation, and how that is meaningful to this round, you can pick up the ballot on anything.

KRITIK: The link must be strong to the aff or the resolution. Discourse kritiks are all good so long as the link is strong. I must know what my ballot is doing if you're running a kritik to win the round. I don't want a kritik to sound like a disad; for example, a kritik with a pre-fiat link and post-fiat impacts is pretty unconvincing. One thing worth noting is that I believe when you move the debate round into a philosophical forum, you invite my personal beliefs into the decision making process. If you are requesting my ballot as an expression or rejection of something, you should know that you're asking ME as an individual rather than a faceless tabula rasa.

COUNTERPLANS: CPs are cool from a policy or theory perspective. I believe they should be advocated unconditionally, and will assume so unless it's mentioned otherwise. Debates about ground are fine as long as there's empirical or demonstrated loss.

SPEAKER POINTS: 26 is average. Less for rudeness or unclarity. More for clarity and humor.

Leah D. Johnson

Hired

I am in both the policy and parli part of debate. I am currently competing on the policy side.

I am a fair judge and typically follow the rules of debate. I like a lot of clash (so structure is a definite plus). I give speaker based on delivery and persuasion. I don't tolerate rudeness. Sportsnmanship is something we all have to have in our everyday lives. During the debate I like to know where the debater is so I can flow the arguments there. This will make it easy for me to vote. During the rebuttals, always give voters. Tell me specifically, "This is a voter" so I will look there when I am making my decision. Ask me questions before the round starts and come see me after the round to get feedback on what I saw in the round and possibly give advice that may help later.

Anything else, just ask.

West, Tim

Hired

-General Information

My default decision making calculus is net-benefits unless told otherwise. I will also vote strictly from the flow unless in-round argumentation tells me to do otherwise. I believe that debate is the most educational when a critic removes her/his personal biases from debate so I will do my best to do that. Debaters should feel comfortable arguing any kind of position, strategy, etc... in front of me.

-Speaker points

I believe that speaker points are arbitrary constructs that often result in competitors being unjustly excluded from out rounds. At tournaments that do not force me to vary speaker points, I will give all competitors 30s. At tournaments that threaten to punish me or my team for my decision, I will give 30, 29.5, 29, 28.5 in a completely random order.

-Ks/Performance

Critically framed arguments are cool. I will approach Ks, as I approach any other kind of argument; I will vote on a K if it wins my flow. In my opinion, good Ks usually include competitive frameworks with alternatives that are clear and solve. I also believe that if a K can exist in one speech, they should be accessible by all speeches, which means Affs can definitely run Ks. I like performance too and am on board with participating in evolutionary debate.

-Topicality/Procedurals

I do not require any specific thing in order to vote on any position if a given team can win that their lack of certain normalized arguments do not need to exist. With that being said, I usually vote on topicality/procedural arguments that have violations and impacts (which should be explained in your standards and voters). I do not believe that a judge should specify that abuse must be proven or that competing interpretations must exist, because those strategic decisions should be left to the debaters. I have and will vote on any style of topicality/procedural argument.

-Counterplans

I do not have a set opinion on PICs or the status of counterplans. Like the rest of my philosophy states, I am willing to vote on anything-including PICs bad and status args. I think that competition is/can be proven on both a textual and functional level. I am open to people challenging this with permutations and if the perm debate is won, I will vote that textual competition or functional competition is bad.

Neil Glines

Solano Community College

Years Judging: 12

My View of Parliamentary Debate: I enjoy a good mix of both worlds. The way in which you present your arguments is equally important as the types of arguments you present. I am open to any and all types of arguments. Speed is not an issue for me. Please be clear and try to avoid foaming at the mouth. Humor is underutilized in debate these days. A team that can have a good time while advancing their arguments will stand out in my ballot.

GOV: I need a criteria or weighing mechanism in order to evaluate the round. When you provide one, unless I hear otherwise, all arguments should be weighed through it. Res analysis is an easy way to avoid muddy debates and lots of T, so use it. When you make claims support them with examples or some other type of backing. Cases that advance Tag lines with little analysis are problematic. **MG:** please answer opp arguments and extend your partners. It is hard to win when you get dragged off case and do little to advance the original case. **PMR:** When answering OPP'S arguments don't forget to go big picture when providing your own voting issues. Please remember to flow arguments through your weighing mechanism.

OPP: T, CP, K, DA, and any other type of argument you feel is appropriate are fine with me. Make sure you spend the proper time justifying them. **MO** if you run a new argument you might want to have a unique reason why. I want you to defend yourself from case shifts or teams that are moving targets. However running new arguments in the **MO** other than the above-mentioned reasons leave you open for turns by the **PM** in the rebuttals. **LOR:** Try to avoid going for the whole enchilada. Issue selection is key.

Final Comments: Speaker points will be awarded to smart, witty, reasoned, and affable speaker. Points will be deducted from rude, oppressive, and offensive speakers. Above all else have a good time.

Frank Montano

Hired

I am currently coaching the policy debate team at Columbia University in New York City and am in California for a few months for other things. Although there are differences in Parli and Policy, I am ultimately an evaluator of argumentation. This means that I will evaluate any argument in the round and if you are winning the argument and more importantly, explain why winning your argument/s wins you the round, you will be in good shape in front of me.

Some specifics:

Topicality: My default evaluation is competing interpretations absent any other way to evaluate T. I think a lot of folks could spend a lot more time on the standard portion of this debate, but most of the time it comes down to the impact level and often times this debate is very shallow. I am open to justified RVIs, K of topicality or any other creative ways to argue this position. Just justify it and do some impact analysis and it will be evaluated loike any other arguments.

Theory: Not my favorite, but if you decide to go for theory, please go beyond the frontline blocks and explain why their is abuse, loss of education etc. in this SPECIFIC instance and give me EXAMPLES and I am more likely to pull the trigger on this question.

C/P: I like them. I think that a CP should be nontopical, but if you can justify otherwise, I will listen. PICs are fine as well as consult CP.

DA: I like them. I like when they are a net benefit to the CP. I like when they have a vey good specific link and not a general state link.

Kritik: I like them. I often evaluate these like a DA. If you don't have an alt, please make sure you tell me why (squo-do nothing is better ec.). These debates need to be less technical and more big picture in front of me. Don't get bogged down in the line by line here, but talk more about your thesis/big picture and why the K is a better option.

Performance/Projects: These are fine. Be prepared for the framework debate and impact your args like any other strategy for debate and why you outweigh or are more important.

Rebuttals: I like teams that have a cohesive story especially in the 2nr and 2ar. Although I will evaluate dropped arguments with a little more weight, do not assume that since it wasn't argues right next to the arg, that the overall thesis of your opponents arguments do not answer it.; I tend to flow more in paragraphs with these speeches and use the line by line mostly to piece together the previous speeches leading up to the last rebuttals. Do impact analysis and a lot of comparative argumentation. I love "even if" statements.

Speed: I can keep up with most CLEAR debaters. IF you become blippy (this happens a lot in theory debate) please slow down on your tag lines and also please explain in rebuttals and don't just extend your blippy answers.

If you have any other questions, please ask and have fun more than anything.

Raman Deol

Hired/Pacific

I debated for Pacific for 3+ years. I coached at Delta Community College for a year and now just occasionally help out at Pacific and Delta when needed.

I think that the round is for you to convince me of why your side should win the debate. Thus, ultimately it is up to you to frame the debate in such a way as to persuade me to vote for you. At the end of the day, everything is debatable, including the rules of debate. I will consider any argument so long as it is well supported and developed fully.

Rebecca Sietman, Wheaton College

I am a former policy debater, and this is my 7th year coaching parli. I genuinely enjoy debate; if I didn't, I would be a miserable person considering how much of my life and work revolves around it. I am used to seeing all different styles of debate within the parli community, and I consider myself to be tolerant and respectful of the wide diversity. This probably gets me into trouble, at times, because I don't make anyone happy. But I can't apologize for that because I approach debate in the way that I strive to approach life—balance. I try to keep an open mind, even when someone approaches life, or debate, very differently than I do. I think there's a lot we can all learn from each other, and I certainly don't have it all figured out, in the realm of debate or otherwise. With that said, run the arguments you want to run. I consider myself to be a flow judge, although that doesn't mean I want to hear blippy debate. I like warrants for claims and clear links/internal links. Please use your rebuttals to prioritize your arguments for me—tell me where you're winning and why I should vote there. In general, I am not a fan of performance debate; but that's probably because I've never seen it done well. I am open to critical styles of debating as long as 1) it is clear how my ballot functions in the round (I don't want to intervene, so I need you to tell me how to weigh the round/arguments) and 2) the other team is not excluded from the round (they need to have ground to engage you).

Dan Sietman, Wheaton College

Background:

I have never debated competitively nor have I had any formal training in debate per se, although I did my undergraduate work in Political Comm, and therefore have training in argumentation, persuasion, etc. I am currently working on my Master of Divinity at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. I began judging Parli just over six years ago. As many of you can attest, my judging philosophy has changed considerably over the years.

Approach:

As an overview: I will listen to nearly anything as long as it is warranted and as long as I understand how my ballot is functioning in the round. What follows are personal preferences you may use to help you win my ballot.

I believe that Tabula-Rasa is a wonderful ideal, so I will try not to intervene in the round; however as a human being I believe that it is an unattainable ideal, thus all I can do is promise to try my best to vote only on that which is said in round. Having said that, please recognize that I am not an idiot; just because something is said in round does not mean that I am bound to accept it, regardless of whether the other side responds to it. I believe in the legitimacy of fact, value, and policy debate, but feel free to run Tricot-Bad positions; if your opponents are not capable of defending Tricot they don't deserve to win. I believe that in most cases "normal means" covers stock issues adequately, and in general I am willing to grant risk of solvency.

Presentation:

I believe that debate is a rhetorical exercise regarding the clash of warranted arguments. It is important that you present your arguments clearly such that a total stranger could walk into the room and render a decision. Good delivery enhances your ethos. I have a few pet peeves. (1) Don't spray the room with your saliva; breathe regularly from your diaphragm and keep your lips moist. (2) I can flow quickly, but if I don't like your speed, I will stop flowing your speech, and I will adjudicate based on persuasion alone. I find that most people can say more utilizing a good economy of speech rather than trying to imitate those few who can actually speed well. (3) Do not yell at me from three feet away; adjust your volume appropriately for the size and acoustics of the room.

On/Off Case:

Case is as important as the debaters make it. I give Gov wide latitude under the right to define, but run T as necessary. K, including Gov Res-K is fine; make sure that I know how my ballot is functioning in the round. Feel free to put an RVI on any *a-priori* position. Remember that if you under-cover or fail to cover case, and if I don't buy your off-case, then you lose. I value offense. Simple mitigation on case won't win you the round, but *turn* isn't a magic word; warrant your turns.

Special Concerns:

Performance: Debate is about the clash of warranted arguments, and *nothing* warrants offensive speech or behavior in the round. There is a wonderful venue for performance in IE's. I don't want to see your performance, and you don't want me judging it.

Politics: Debate is about the clash of warranted arguments. My first reaction to Politics was, "My, what an exquisitely crafted slippery-slope fallacy." The problem is that they rarely have solid link stories. While I'll listen to them, as a favor to me, please run something else.

Time Sucks: Debate is about the clash of warranted arguments, not about who can spout 20 positions, kick 18, and complain that 2 were dropped.

Alli Morris, Wheaton College

I debated for Wheaton College for four years and two years in high school so I'm comfortable with whatever strategy you bring into the round. There is no position that I will not vote for as long as it is well warranted with the impacts articulated and adequately weighed. One impact that is adequately explained will outweigh 3 blips in my mind. I don't like being yelled at, spit on, or gesticulated wildly at so try to watch your volume, speed and actions and use them in moderation. If you yell at the other team or swear excessively in round, I'll be somewhat disenchanted with you so don't do that. I tend to be more sympathetic on Topicality and Spec if you prove abuse.

Kimberlyn Dandy's Judging Philosophy

Hired/DVC

Background of the critic:

I debated Parliamentary from 2003/2004 under the tutelage of Marline Bates at Diablo Valley College, 2004/2005 at Chico State under Kristina Schriver-Whalen. I have a Bachelors degree in organizational communication from Sacramento State, where I experimented with CEDA debate but was confirmed in my love for NPDA. From this experience I learned to value both forms of debate, but do believe they belong in their own categories. I have been judging NCFA tournaments on an occasional basis since 2006.

Approach of the Critic to Decision Making:

My ideal aim in decision-making is to vote through the criteria where the debaters tell me to vote. I will vote for Kritiques and Topicality. The Kritique must be well formed and I prefer multiple links to case. Topicality should be valid, beware I am known to vote for RVIs as simple as time-suck or non-educational.

Importance of Presentational Skills:

Parliamentary debate is an exercise in persuasion (my favorite IE). You persuade me with your logic, and quality of arguments, but also with your own confidence. I **despise** rudeness or mocking. You can say an argument is faulty without saying the other debater is an idiot.

Importance of on-case argumentation and concerns about particular approaches:

My favorite approach to a case is a quasi value/policy. I think it makes a more conducive debate if the Government has an advocacy, however in a round where evidence is not allowed it is pointless to argue specifics of a plan, if you want to do this then go visit my friends in CEDA where you can argue such things at several hundred words a minute. I believe parliamentary debate is the perfect forum for discussing the theory behind said plan. That said I do love a bit of empirical evidence for examples, but place more importance on your warrants and links.

CSULB

Experience

I was a TOC LD debater in high school for four years and was a Parli debater at West Texas A&M University for four years in college. While debating in college, I attended the NPDA. I currently coach IEs at CSULB, but frequently help coach the debate team as well.

General Paradigm

My limited parli success during my undergraduate career (and my now long-term relationship with Tim West) has left me eagerly, albeit gradually, learning all of the intricacies of parliamentary debate. That being said, I do appreciate when teams explain complex theory arguments. I am open to whatever kind of position you would like to run, but clarity and weighing is essential in flushing-out arguments and my decision-making process. On that note, please don't let my learning curve discourage you from running arguments that are applicable in a given debate round. Since I am from Long Beach, I obviously grasp and enjoy K debate...but, I also appreciate the technical side of debate. As long as you justify the argument or strategy, I will follow you.

Speed/Delivery

I think speed has a place in debate, and I can follow/flow teams at any delivery rate they choose. If I am having trouble, I will certainly tell you. However, keep in mind that I am a Comm. MA student, public speaking instructor, and IE coach, so I think persuasiveness, narratives, and vocal emphasis are always welcome elements. Oh, and you obviously don't need to stand-up (or sit-down/handstand) and look a certain way just because I have the word "IE" in my paradigm; I love comfort about as much as I love forensics-be comfortable.

Points of Order

I am a good, solid flow judge. I have had lots of practice, and if you said it, chances are it is on my flow...usually in the right place. With that in mind, I will protect you from new arguments in the rebuttals. However, I also acknowledge that sometimes POOs are strategic, and especially, if the argument is in a "gray area," I encourage you to POO to your hearts' content.

Bottom Line

If there is one thing you need to know about my philosophy it is: I am simply the adjudicator in the round and do not expect you to do anything extra special because the "girl from the small school in Texas" is in the back of the room; I am intelligent, have a fond love for debate, believe parli *should* be accessible to intelligent people, and always enjoy a good round.

Vince Alvarez

Hired

Asst. Debate Coach, San Francisco State University

My academic background/interest is in rhetorical criticism, critical/cultural studies with specific interest in postcolonial studies and gender/queer theory.

Topicality - While I would rather not listen to a topicality debate if I don't have to, I do understand and appreciate its importance. I can be persuaded by reasonability arguments. I can also be persuaded that some things are more important than T, especially if there is a substantive debate going on. I think that T is a question of competing interpretations.

Theory - I would really appreciate not having to adjudicate the debate on a theoretical questions. So often these debates are difficult to flow, hardly progress past the surface objections, and are almost always boring. That being said, there is a place for everything in debate, including theory -- and it is often the only way you can win a debate. So be it. The team advancing the theoretical objections has the larger burden, which means that I would tend to lean negative on counterplan theory etc.

Comparing the impacts of specific standards would serve you well, as would reading evidence. The thing about theory for me is that teams only need to win marginal defense to convince me. "Vote against the arg, not the team" is persuasive.

Counterplans - CPs are ok with me, I would prefer a case specific counterplan, than something generic. A net benefit that turns the case is a must. I like CPs to be strategic in value, I am growing fond of these "dirty word" counterplans, and think that they serve a good purpose in debate, somewhere between the process/agent CP and the K. I like it when the counterplan is part of a big picture strategy and not a generic reflex.

Critiques - I like K's. I often ran them as a debater. I like specific K's more than generic. I will vote for the K, and have. I like in depth kritik debate, as opposed to a brief undeveloped K. I think that the K is most vulnerable at the permutation/alternative level. I appreciate alternatives that are nuanced and interact with the affirmative in strategic/innovative ways. If you have a good link/alt explain it in cross-ex instead of evading questions. If you are evasive I am more likely to think that your link/alt is not good.

Performance - This is cool with me. I just ask that you have an argument when doing your performance business. I also think that deferring strategies will have to overcome a high threshold against abuse

claims. I am familiar with much of the generic critique literature, but not everything so please do explain. I think that examples and nuance are critical in these debates. There is always a DA to the perm, find it and weigh it against the net-benefit to the alt.

Framework - I like to know what the framework of the debate is, how I should evaluate impacts (and what types of impacts I should evaluate or privilege). If "you gotta have a plan" is all you got, its all you got. I'd prefer that you engage the aff on its own terms or with a competing world view, but if you have to run FW run it with a few caveats: If you can engage the affirmative, do it! Its OK to engage the affirmative AND read FW. I don't think that engaging the affirmative means you have good ground, it means you covering you bases. Always contextualize your generic FW arguments to the affirmative that you are debating. If you have taken the time to talk the affirmative before the debate in order to understand what they do, and then rewrite your FW to be as specific and strategic as possible, it will show. Nothing is more off putting for someone with critical proclivities than a generic FW block.

If I didn't answer your questions, ask me. Every judge has preference. I prefer innovative arguments over generic. I prefer laughing and watching lighthearted debates. It's no hard to make me laugh, at least try. It is my belief that you work too hard as debaters for me to not work just as hard judging you. I could care less about the content of the arguments that you are reading, but I would want the debaters to be civil toward each other, toward me and anyone else observing. As long as you have a claim and a warrant, then you have an argument and it ostensibly has a place in debate in until someone says otherwise.

Steve Farias

Pacific

In General: Go ahead and run whatever you like. A great critical debate is a debate I love to listen to; however, I also love listening to heg debates. Indeed, I love freedom. Other things I like are great impact stories that have multiple scenarios and I also like good standards debates on procedurals. I think that the two biggest problems I have in judging debates is that there are often many unwarranted claims that end up becoming key issues in a debate round and there seems to be a lack of comparison sometimes at the impact level. Please explain to me 1) why your argument is true and 2) why YOUR impact is more important than THEIR impact. That prevents me from having to do any work.

On T: I tend to see topicality in terms of abuse. I honestly believe there must be proven abuse in round if you are going to argue about ground and fairness, however I will vote on unanswered ground standards. I also believe that it is a game of competing interpretations in so far as I believe that both teams must defend an interpretation in order for T to become a wash. Again, actual ground loss or a comparison of the standards will be necessary after that for me to vote on topicality. As for FX: I tend to think FX is easily answered but too often dropped. Answer it and it shouldn't matter. On Extra: Ditto here. Answer it and it shouldn't matter. Final note to the Opp: In no way am I saying I do not think you should run topicality or other procedurals, I just tend to see that I do not often vote on it. I see it as a great strategic tool and a position that can be gone for if necessary.

On CP: CP's are the best strategy, IMHO, for any neg team (or at least some alternative advocacy). It is the best way to force an affirmative to defend their case. PICs, Delay, Consult, Micro, Macro, etc. whatever you want to run I am okay with. I do not think that We Bite Less is a compelling argument, just do not link to your own disad. Finally, the perm is not an advocacy UNLESS YOU SAY you advocate it and then explain why that is legitimate.

On K: I think that K's without alternatives are just non-unique disads. I think that reject and embrace are not alternatives in and of themselves, I must reject or embrace something and then you must explain how that solves. In my opinion, procedurals in the MG make the debate really hard to adjudicate but if a team does it well I will still vote on them.

On RVIs: Just answer it and we will be fine. If a team really wants to go for an RVI, I will need multiple warranted reasons to vote there.

If you have any questions about this or anything I did not mention, feel free to ask me any time. Thanks.

Joe Dudek

Pacific

First of all, I want to greet the community. Having transferred coasts to work for Pacific, I have been thrown into the Parli judging pool, so it only seems fair that y'all have some idea what I'm thinking

Background

I debated for four years at Lafayette College under the tutelage of one John Boyer, someone I admire greatly. As a member of the LD community, I ran stable, predictable positions (often read slowly and with full citations) because I believed them to be competitively advantageous in that format. That said, I have approached debate in an extremely academic manner and believe that I have a very firm grasp of most theory issues, etc. I am also familiar and comfortable with running, responding to, and hearing critical debate.

Pet projects at Lafayette:

K - Deep Eco and Terror Talk.

AFF - PEPFAR, Somaliland, and Hemp.

LD Rules Theory, but that's neither here nor there...

I'll be referring to the "AFF" and "NEG" for most of this. Feel free to insert "GOV" and "OPP" if it makes you feel cooler.

General Paradigm

Unless otherwise prompted, I have the following idea about what ought to happen in a round:

The affirmative's job is to provide us with a policy action that will somehow benefit the world. The negative's job is to prove that the world is worse if the judge adopts the affirmative plan. Exactly which "world" we're talking about changes from T to DA to K, but it all comes back to the same mantra.

That said, tell me a story! Don't just extend your previously blipped ground standard in the face of clear, articulated counter-standards. Tell me why you're winning! Tell me how the world has changed or will change as a result of the affirmative's performance or advocacy.

Speed

I have adopted the same framework for speed that I was taught by most of the community I learned debate in. LD and Parli are communicative events. So long as your opponents and I can hear and comprehend you, we're all cool. If I or your opponents cannot understand you, we have the right to ask that you speak slower or more clearly. Failure to respond to that request opens you up to procedural offense.

That said, I watch policy videos in my spare time and *sometimes* fall behind during the text of a card ready by the least clear speaker in the round, often because of poor sound quality. I doubt you will lose me in parli.

Theory / Topicality

I will be more responsive to defense responses if you are running "whiny" offense. Blipping out seven jargoned reasons for Negative Fiat Bad on the counterplan is probably not going to gain a lot of traction. Giving three well-warranted arguments as to how the conditional counterplan has kept you from effectively answering the disad might be more worthwhile.

I also tend to have a lower threshold on most procedural offense. I say this only because I found myself voting on it a lot in Northern California. It might just have been that I wasn't seeing good AFF responses.

Kritikal Debate

If you've gotten all the way to this section and haven't caught on yet, then you're not paying attention. I welcome any argument that illustrates how the world could be improved. I don't care what world and I don't care in what way. I will say that I tend to be compelled by arguments that indicate we should be able to weigh PMC impacts against the K so that the entire PMC doesn't get muted in what is already [too short an activity](#).

Counterplans

I believe firmly that a moving target is a real problem. Stable advocacy creates a foundation for informative, educational, clashing debate. Our format is not timed in such a way that we can fully evaluate the nature of counterplans, so I am likely to fill in that gap by erring for stable advocacy. That said, if the AFF doesn't call you out you win and if the debate I have alluded to about the appropriate nature of counterplans takes place, I'll be more than willing to listen to it.

I am also open to interpretations of parametrics that do not donate leftover ground to the NEG. Counter-warrants are actually a non sequitur from parametrics, but y'all can debate that out.

On the whole 'offense on PERMs' thing... If the AFF even breathes the phrase, "test of competition," then most of your offense disappears. Sorry, [Kyle](#).

Impact Calculus

Anyone who thinks that impact calculus is a purely logical exercise is kidding themselves. This is the epicenter of persuasion in advocacy. I also believe that an extremely quick and efficient speech can develop most of this through its intensity and succinctness. You need to convince me that your view of

Page 45

the way the impacts interact is the most sensible or most preferable. PMR's that do this effectively are often referred to as the Jedi mind trick, but that only happens if the LOR is leaving the door open. That said, this narrative about how to evaluate impacts should not begin in the rebuttals, or you are way behind.

Adam Swaller

Pacific

I've been around NPDA debate for going on 6 years now. 4 of which were as a competitor, 2 of which were judging. I also have informal experience with NDT, both in terms of judging and competition [for roughly a year and a half].

As a general sentiment, I'm not a unique snowflake when it comes to my perspectives on debate. As such, this may be largely uninteresting. I will almost always look for the easiest out in any given round. This means a few things for you - should there be a lack of a criteria, I will default to net benefits and hope you're doing the work you need to do in order to win under that framework. You will also need to be extending arguments clearly throughout the speech. It is not enough to just go up there and bark out "extend the pmc!", give me a thumbs up and then peace out of the round. Tell me which arguments ought to be extended and why they matter in the context of the round. This implies that you should be doing some sort of impact calc along the traditional lines.

Speaker Points -

26 - if you're average
27 - if you're above average
28 - if you're pretty good
29/30 - if you're great

Speaker points are typically given for the strategy and efficacy you demonstrate in the round, not for sounding really pretty. I interpret strategy as meaning effective issue selection [implying that kicking arguments to access a deeper breadth of argumentation is acceptable], clever use of cross applications and effective usage of extensions. I encourage you to call points of order.

Kritiks -

I would typically run K's my last year of debate, so I really appreciate a good K debate. This does not mean that I preference them higher than "traditional" arguments though. I am fine with K's on the aff. I believe that alternatives are somewhat necessary, though I am fine hearing a K that doesn't have an alternative in so much as you are explaining what access to the ballot grants you.

T/Specs -

I will vote on potential abuse, provided you are winning access to those arguments. This means you ought to be describing to me what your interpretation of potential abuse is instead of just 'spergin out the the phrase potential abuse in the LOC.

CPs -

I'm open to whatever sort of theory you're partial to running when it comes to counterplans. You just need to explain and warrant why this theory matters. CPs don't have to be nontopical, and I assume they're dispositional unless specified otherwise. Perms ought to have some sort of a text. I think you need to prove why the CP is a better option than whatever plan/perms are floating around in order to get me to vote for it. Aside from that, I don't really have any strong feelings regarding CPs.

andrew grimalda —
concordia university, irvine

Question 1 : Please enter a complete judging philosophy for all of your NPDA critics

Judging Philosophy for Andrew Grimalda

Affiliated with Concordia University

Experience: Director of Debate at the United States Military Academy at West Point. Program competed in both CEDA and Parliamentary Debate.

8 years of NDT debate in high school and college.

Overall: I enjoy a round in which the issues are well analyzed. Speed is fine, but I prefer few, well articulated arguments than a multitude of non-case specific, poorly analyzed arguments. I will generally decide the round on the policy-making issues and not on who is the better speaker. My decision in Value rounds will be based on whoever is the most convincing, which often means whoever is the most enjoyable to listen to.

Topicality: I will base a decision solely on topicality, however; I will offer the Government some leeway in how they interpret the terms of the resolution.

Plan Permutations: I don't like to hear the plan change unless the Opposition has offered a plan-plus counter-plan, then I may consider the permutation.

Counter-plans: I like good counter-plans that are not plan-plus and not topical. The Opposition needs to demonstrate the net added benefit of selecting their CP. I find conditional counter plans less effective. Any DA's offered should be unique to the Government's plan and should not impact the counter-plan.

Fiat and Funding: I accept the notion that adoption of the plan by fiat is acceptable because it “should” be adopted. However, I’m not a fan of claiming funding by normal means. How money is raised in a policy round is a serious consideration that is unfortunately too often overlooked. If the Government defines funding by normal means, I will allow the Opposition to define what that means even if the Government subsequently objects.

DA’s: I want to see good links and real harms. If they don’t exist, the Government will have an easy time of convincing me to disregard the arguments.

KRITIC: Generally I am not a big fan because they are seldom well presented. If presented, the analysis should be specific to the Government’s case. Do not present a generic Kritic brief with no explanation of its impact. If you do, you are wasting precious time.

alex kramer - de anza college

I guess at this point in the evolution of Parli I'd be considered old school by many folks, but I still see the value in having an academic debate format that values clear, eloquent argumentation that is coherent not just to the debate community, but also to a broader public audience. Having said that, I've been around debate long enough to know most of the ins and outs of debate theory, and I do value complexity and depth of argumentation. Just don't sacrifice quality arguments for convoluted tactics, and persuasive delivery for hysttrionic verbal speed. Although some perceive debate as just another game or competition, I believe that what we ought to be trying to do through this event is touch on something more significant, in terms of learning, skill development, and intellectual growth.

jeff torosian - [fresno city college](#)

It is my third year judging debate (trained in Policy, judged Parli for two years). I don't really have very many requests as a judge; I like almost all types of arguments. With that said, I believe that debate is first and foremost academic. As for specific positions I enjoy almost all types of arguments as long as you win the argument and show its relevance in the decision making process. I enjoy creativity within the round as long as it is within the means of being ethical. The primary goal of the round in my opinion is to further our education. I have virtually little expression during the round so do not think you are winning or losing an argument based on my expression. A few suggestions:

- 1) If you are going to perform, explain why and be sure to support your arguments.
- 2) Be sure that you are clear. Speed is ok (limited in Parli) but sometimes when you are not really clear it is difficult to get all of your arguments. I prefer clarity over speed. If I don't have it on my flow, I can't use it in my decision. Sign posting is always a good thing, especially when it comes to procedurals.
- 3) Have fun! Or try to have fun?

If you have any questions or want more information feel free to find me or ask before the round.

I think debate is a game and an event to help demonstrate intellect and personality.

“Do I think I am a policy maker or my ballet can make change in the world”...

“No”....BUT... if you tell me I should in the round and win that argument I will. I

am open to any argument as long as it is defended and won. I prefer that debaters

use CX (l/d) as a tool for gathering information rather attempting to gain

superiority. Note: I have not judged this year so my ears and mind will be a bit

rusty. I am not knowledgeable of the years' topic and its jargon (l/d).

jared anderson - los rios community colleges

The basics – My general philosophy is that this is your debate to do what you like. Explain whatever craziness you want, make sense, do it well, and you can win my ballot. I actually really enjoy rounds that push the boundaries of what debate is “supposed” to be. That doesn’t mean however, that if the other team can clearly point out how your particular approach is bad, I won’t vote against you.

Essentially, you don’t really need to adjust your strat for me. Background – I debated for Los Rios (where I now coach) and then Cal Poly. My experience is primarily with CEDA/NDT Debate. I qualified for NDT and broke at CEDA nats. I am familiar and have coached NPDA, but my preference is for Policy debate.

Speed -

Ok. Go fast. It's fine. I can flow you. If you are unclear I will yell at you.

T/Procedurals/Theory – If you ask people who know me, or even my students, they may tell you I’m a T hack. I’m fine with that. Yes, I am one of the few remaining judges who will still vote on Topicality. I tend to view T as competing interps, but I can vote on other approaches as well. You don’t have to run it to win my ballot. If you are going to go theory, do it well. Warrant your claims. Impact your arguments. Weigh those impacts in the round. Do your work on the flow. Disad/CP – These are fine. Do them. K’s/Performance Also fine by me. I’m probably more familiar with the lit then you are, so make sure you are not lying about your shit. I don’t particularly like whiny args that claim you should win just because you did your funky thing, without ever explaining what your actual argument is. I’m also not a big fan of whiny args that claim the other team should lose because they argue in a different manner...move past this stuff, explain your arguments either way and you should be fine. Make sure you clearly explain your framework for evaluation.

Points of Order -

You need to call them. This activity gives you the burden of pointing out new args in rebuttals, I won't do it if you don't. Any questions? Just ask me.

jeremy henderson - [pacific lutheran university](#)

Question 1 : Please enter a complete judging philosophy for all of your NPDA critics

Jeremy Henderson

Debate Experience:

3 Years of NPDA/NPTE experience at Texas Tech/Oregon State University.

Overview:

I generally approach judging debate as if the actual event were a game, with not only the content and style of the debate up for contest, but the actual rules themselves (within limits, I'm pretty sure you're not going to be able to convince me or the tournament director that the time limits should be jettisoned). From that point on, the team who can best justify whatever they're arguing for is going to be the winner. I'd like to say that I am completely tab and that it is the debaters who sign my ballot, but I'm pretty sure that nobody is perfect, but I will try my best to keep any biases I may have out of the round.

Procedurals/Theory

Topicality:

Absent any argumentation about how I should view topicality, I automatically default to competing interpretations as the way for evaluating topicality arguments. This doesn't necessarily mean that I won't consider other way of evaluating topicality if they are justified, just that in a messy T debate, that is where I will look first. At this point, I think whoever is winning the standards debate is going to be winning the topicality. For government teams trying to beat back topicality, I think the strongest way to make it a non issue is to not only have a clear counter interpretation, but offense you the opp's standards. With all that said, I'm not going to automatically vote on topicality just because it is run, you need to be winning reasons why T is a voter (and saying topicality is a priori is NOT a reason to vote first...you need a warrant there).

Oh, and I don't necessarily have to see in round abuse to vote on T, but that's up for debate.

Spec Arguments:

I absolutely LOVE spec arguments, and I ran them whenever I could when I debated. I think that an increased level of specification allows for a better and clearer debate. I view spec debates in a similar way that I view topicality debates, that if you win your interpretation of what level of specification is necessary (through the standards debate) and that this is a reason to vote, I will vote for it. Some spec debates may be harder to win than others (I tend to think forcing specification is funding is a little bit harder because it tends to link into an extra topicality debate that doesn't really do anyone any good), you should feel free to

run these in front of me.

Theory Arguments:

I tend to have a bit higher threshold for theoretical arguments that aren't the two that are listed above. As Counter Plans go, I tend view pretty much every CP as legitimate until the government team points out why they're not. I think conditional counterplans are a little hard for gov teams to pin down, and therefore I would probably be less inclined to vote for them versus other types of counterplans, but it's all up for debate.

Other Random Procedural Issues:

I don't have a problem with a team running multiple procedurals and kicking them, as I think it helps increase the strategic thinking involved with the debate, but it isn't impossible to win that this sort of debate might be abusive and therefore I could be persuaded to vote against that strategy, but it would probably take a pretty significant amount of time.

If RVI's are well warranted and justified, I'll vote for them. Unfortunately, that hardly ever happens, so employ them at your own risk.

Resolutions/PMC's

Fact/Value/Policy: I tend to prefer policy debate to debates of facts or values, especially given that implicit in every policy are facts that are used to justify arguments and values that are used as weighing mechanisms. If you want to have a fact debate, I will most likely just count the number of facts you say and award the win to whoever has the higher number, because honestly, there is no good way to judge a fact debate.

Criteria: Absent a criteria presented in the debate, I will default to net benefits as my weighing mechanism. That being said, DON'T FORGET A CRITERIA. It's a really simple thing to do, and takes 5 seconds.

Plan:

Gov teams should always read their plan twice to ensure everyone knows what is going on in the debate. Also, if possibly the government teams should take a question or two after the reading of the plan to give clarification to opp teams. None of this is mandatory, just a good idea for clearer debates.

Disadvantages:

I love a good disad/counterplan debate, as long as it has the requisite parts(Uniqueness, Link, Internal Link and Impact). If any part of those is missing, your going to have serious problems trying to win that position. Without offense against a disad, your not going to be able to win the position, as all the defense in the world still leaves "a risk of a disad".

Kritiks:

General: Although I ran these nonstop during my tenure at Texas Tech, that doesn't mean that I'm predisposed to vote for a team just because they ran a kritik. I may actually have a higher threshold for critical debate because I've been so involved in critical debate/theories. Other than having all the necessary parts of a K (framework, link, impact, alternative) I think that the most important part of any kritik is the alternative solvency. Without alternative solvency, you have no way of solving/avoiding the harms that you outlined on the impact section of the K.

Performance Debate: It's awesome if done well, so run it if you want.

Presentation/Other Aspects

Speed: I'm a fan of speed, and can keep up with most levels of speed. It is probably a good idea to slow down a little bit for the reading of the plan just to make sure I get all the relevant parts. If your speed is inhibiting your ability to speak, then I may yell "clear" in order to let you know what I'm hearing.

Dress:

What you wear doesn't change your argumentation, so dress comfortably if you want to.

Standing versus Sitting:

I don't care, debate in whatever manner makes you most comfortable.

I'm pretty sure I've forgotten quite a bit or undercovered important parts, so if you have any questions find me before the round or ask me anything you want to know before the debate starts. Debate is an amazing activity that has given me some of my best friends, so be sure to enjoy yourself.

kristine clancy - pepperdine university

Question 1 : Please enter a complete judging philosophy for all of your NPDA critics

I competed for Long Beach for two years in policy debate and two years in parliamentary debate, thus my views are heavily influenced by both types of debate.

Essentially my philosophy is more work for you and less work for me. I expect that issues have impacts (bad, horrible and all the other cool adjectives that you can think of are not impacts – I don't know what they mean) and that at the end of the debate you tell me how things weigh out compare both magnitude and risk. Write my ballot for me, and be honest in your assessment, you are not winning every argument in the debate round so weigh things accordingly.

If the debate does not involve a policy discussion then this task is much harder and you must have a clear criterion to evaluate all the different arguments in the round. I don't know what is more important rights or security, so you had better have a way for me to figure it out, or in the end I can promise you will not like the way that I work it out.

Other than that I am open to all sorts of arguments from topicality to counterplans to kritiks. However, a word of caution these arguments are all grounded in theory and if you don't know it or understand it then don't use them (don't say perm and expect me to fill in the rest, if you are unaware of how a perm functions in a debate round don't use it). I won't vote on topicality unless there is articulated in-round abuse with one exception, I will vote on a critical reason to prefer.

I am fine with critical arguments made by either team in the debate. I think your arguments generally need to be consistent with each other and critical arguments are no different. If your arguments are inconsistent it means you are missing the big picture in the debate and how the arguments relate to one another. You need to tell me why my vote is important and "the ballot as a tool" is getting old and I don't generally like to reject things. Finally, if you are making a critical argument you need to make sure your link and impact operate on the same level. I am tired of hearing pre-fiat links and post-fiat impacts on critical positions. If fiat is illusory then you don't get access to impacts outside of the debate round...and if you do then so does the other team.

hal sanford - santa rosa junior college

Judging philosophy:

Judging Philosophy Hal Sanford, Santa Rosa Junior College Here's how to win my ballot: The winner will have provided me with the best explanation for why their arguments compelled me to adopt or reject the resolution. Please do not expect me to be the other debater on your team who explains impacts and extends your arguments. My job is to evaluate which team did the better job of explaining, extending, and impacting arguments. Please do not throw out conclusions without supporting analysis. If an affirmative/government debater claims solvency, explain how topical mandates cause the problem to be solved. Similarly, if a negative/opposition debater claims the plan lacks solvency, show how the plan fails to address or eliminate the underlying causes that created the harm. I reward explanations of how arguments impact the opposing positions. From the affirmative/government, I expect a topical case with all stock issues won by a "preponderance of persuasion." I purposefully do not use the word evidence because analysis may trump evidence. The aff/gov. may be polished speakers, display a dozen clever turns, and make me want to kidnap them for service on my team, but if you lose a stock issue, you've lost the round. I am receptive to creative resolution interpretations, but please don't run such an odd-ball case that a strong topicality argument ends the round before everybody gets to speak. Finally, make me believe that truth, fundamental fairness, societal well-being, or some other worthy end is best served by adopting the resolution. If disadvantages are presented, turn them, minimize them, or show them to be outweighed by affirmative/government advantages. From the negative/opposition, I expect sound judgment to be displayed in running topicality. Don't spend your precious time on a topicality challenge unless it is a genuinely strong argument. Remember, you have the burden of proof on disadvantages. You must establish by a "preponderance of persuasion" the significance of the disadvantages and how they link to the affirmative plan. I am receptive to counterplans, but make sure they meet all required elements. Remember, the counterplan is off-case and you have the burden of proof to establish its strength.

Finally, treat your opponents with respect. While I enjoy humor and good-natured jibes between comparably matched opponents, I view this as an educational activity, an extension of the classroom. Therefore, do not create a hostile or belittling environment and do not humiliate or embarrass anyone. Enjoy the tournament and congratulations on representing your school.

mark nelson - santa rosa junior college

Question 1 : Please enter a complete judging philosophy for all of your NPDA critics

I am fairly old now which means I am fairly traditional in my debate approach. I tend to be a cross between a stock issues and a policy maker. I am not big on speed. I understand the need to speak at a quicker than conversational rate, but not by much. I prefer in depth development of fewer arguments over spreading out several underdeveloped positions. Speaking of positions, I will listen to and vote on most traditional negative positions including topicality, counterplans, disadvantages and even minor repairs (I told you I was old). I am not a big fan of generic critiques. I am not a big fan of pre-fiat positions. As I said, I view the debate as a stock issues/policy maker so I am more interested in the post-fiat implications of what I am voting for. I rarely will vote for topical counterplans, though I will listen to the position. For POI's, I prefer that they be accepted immediately not two minutes later "at the end of the position." Try to have fun and be civil and professional at all times. Good luck to all of you.

Ian Samuel

Hired/Round Robin Speaker

I competed in college debate from 2000 to 2005, for Truman State University and then the University of South Carolina. Since then, I've judged sporadically and kept up in a general way with the circuit.

In general, I think debaters do best when they do their thing, whatever that is. The activity belongs to you, and I will respect your stewardship of it. So don't try and adapt too much to me---let me adapt to your way of debating. The purpose of this philosophy is just to give you a sense of my defaults, not to lay down a set of rules that you're required to follow. The only "rules" I will enforce are the time limits and getting the ballot turned in on time.

A few notes about the actual mechanics of the round: I flow on my laptop, so I can get a lot down, including the warrants for your arguments. If you want the resulting PDF later (so you can check my work or compare to your own notes), it's yours---I write my email address on all ballots, so just drop me a line. You should speak in whatever way seems best to you---whether that's standing up, sitting down, at a desk, at a podium, fast, or slow.

Since most rounds at least begin as policy debates, a few words about that.

99% of policy rounds are won by the team doing superior impact comparison in the final two speeches. That is because in 99% of rounds, both teams are winning some of their impacts, and the question is which impacts matter more. If only one team has any explanation about why their set of impacts is to be preferred, that team is basically a lock for the win. When both teams do it, the debate is very good. These comparisons can be simple (starting with "our impact affects more people") or more sophisticated. It is almost impossible to spend too much time doing this, although of course the gov does need to spend time answering the key arguments out of the block.

I enjoy procedural debate in all its widely loved (T) and not-so-widely-loved (spec) forms. My default is to think of those debates in terms of competing interpretations, even though I privately harbor some doubts about that framework; mainly I do this because this seems to be the general expectation among competitors about how those debates will get judged, and I am aiming not to surprise people with the way I make decisions.

I also have a fairly laissez-faire view of counterplans; what I mean

by this is that agent, plan-exclusive, and other plan-dependent types of counterplans don't offend any theoretical instinct of mine. But of course, I'm happy to entertain arguments about why they're theoretically invalid. Parli's shortened rebuttal format means that counterplan theory never gets very deep, so if you're the opp, you might want to lay the groundwork to justify what you're doing in the LOC; otherwise, you only get one chance to say anything about it. But that's just tactical advice.

Critique debates benefit from a lot of explaining about their place in the round, because there's so little consensus about how they're supposed to operate. There are actually a ton of different "kinds" of arguments all carrying the banner of "the critique," everything from John Meany's "you're navigating Chicago with a map of New York" formulation to more recent structures that include things like alternatives and such. This is a rich and interesting area of debate, so if it's your thing, I'll probably really enjoy whatever it is that you do. Just do me a favor and explain as much as you can about the place of these arguments in the round, and how the argument interacts with other things. (If a critique gets straight-turned, but the opp wins T, who wins, for example?)

I find that I make more predictable and normal decisions when the gov advocates some textual statement---that can be a plan or one of its more exotic cousins like micro-advocacy, or whatever. If you want to deviate from this framework, go for it, but take a little time and explain how I'm supposed to decide the round. I'll follow you wherever you want to go. (And, obviously, entertain theoretical or framework objections about why where you want to go is a bad place to head.)

I assume this is obvious by this point, but I'm happy to give you my decision after the debate is over and talk with you about the round for as long as either team would like. (I do have to get the ballot turned in on time, so this is subject to the constraint that you might have to walk with me while I do that, if you want to keep talking.)

I'm looking forward to meeting those of you that I don't know, and to a reunion with those of you who I do. Have fun & debate hard.

Phil Sharp

UN, Reno

I was formally the ADOF at WWU (3 years) and the DOF at Univ of Montana (2 years). I took two years off to go and teach debate in Korea. I am now the DOF at UNR. I think IEs are fun, but burdensome and not significantly oriented toward the things I value most in debate (argument, analysis, evidence, organization, and strategy). I have seen and or debated in more rounds than I care to admit. While I acknowledge that your participation in debate ought to be a quest for the best speech ever, I will be quick to tell you the ways you fell short of that. Please do not mistake my harsh criticism for a dislike of you. If you want to improve at debate, I believe I will give you feedback that will aid you in that goal, if you choose to accept it.

I evaluate the round as a flow-based policy-making critic of argument. I will flow everything and I will remember the arguments well as I make my decision. I will remember the way you argued it in the member speech and how that compares to the way the rebuttal discussed it. I will remember when the original argument was nothing but a tag with no warrant. I will remember when the PMR changes the argument. I will notice that the violation on the T morphed from the LO to the block. I hold you to the arguments you made and as a critic of argument, I will evaluate the degree to which you have warranted and convinced me of that argument. If your argument did not make sense the first time you said it, it is not likely to win my ballot. At the end of the debate, all judges must do work to make their decision. I feel that I attempt to make my involvement in the decision something I am consciously aware of as opposed to pretending that debates somehow decide themselves. In the event that the decision is not clear-cut, I will attempt to use a standard and fair method.

1. I will weigh arguments through the frameworks the debaters provide. If a team wants me to vote on an Education standard on a T but they are losing an RVI on Education on the K, How do I weigh who has harmed Edu the most? Procedurals and kritiks are ultimately a request for me to employ a different paradigm in the debate (not post-fiat policy-making).

2. In the event of clash, I will side with the team who has the more reasonable story and articulates the best standards to prefer their argument. In the absence of standards, I will default to the team whose argument is most intuitive as presented.

3. In the event of dropped or under-covered arguments, I will vote based upon how well you warranted the argument. If a team drops a 20 second T that didn't make any sense, I won't vote on it. If you think your arguments are winners, make them sufficiently the first time you present them.

Additional Considerations:

1. I have a high threshold on procedurals and reverse/independent voting issues. The interp and violation must not morph at all. The standards must support the voters. Remember that standards debates serve to prove that your interpretation is better for the debate. The voters must be justified within the particular round. I DO think that an AFF should be an inductive proof of the res, but I also think that as long as they are reasonable, the NEG should be quick on their feet with arguments. I might not vote on T but I will consider how well a Neg team does when caught by surprise and give

them the benefit of the doubt a little. I like creative and strategic movement within a topic area, AS LONG AS YOU EXPLAIN HOW YOUR CASE IS A PROOF OF THE RES BEING TRUE. I prefer a policy, if the res allows you to do it.

2. I think that the current policy of blipping and back-filling is disgusting. I don't mind how fast you talk but I think it is intellectually bankrupt to simply spew out a bunch of buzzwords and taglines and try to win without actually knowing what your arguments mean.

4. Organization is critical. ;)

5. A lot of debaters get lost in the minutia and don't understand the purpose of the particular argument they are making. Then they say something like, "The Uniqueness controls the direction of the link." Which is true but is NOT persuasive to hear in a rebuttal. Explain what you mean and how that affects the outcome of the debate. All arguments should be impacted.

6. Rebuttals should not be line-by-line repeatal. You must crystallize the debate and provide some guidance into my decision making given the negotiated frameworks. The less you do this, the more I have to figure out how to vote.

7. I really don't prefer the K or performance. I find them to be interesting (if people explain the critical perspective in a way that makes sense) but I find debate to be a problematic format for that. I will still vote for a K but I have a high threshold on the framework debate and I expect to see a Unique link in the debate with a functioning alternative. Case-turns from critical theory perspective aoften work better through the policy-making paradigm.

8. Overreliance upon buzz words like dehumanization will not be persuasive to me. Explain what it is and why it is bad and don't say things like "Dehum is worse than death" unless you have a good reason that is true.

9. I would like to be entertained in the back of the room. A LOT of your judges have been complaining about the state of debate at the moment. We all enjoy good intellectual throwdowns with solid clash and warranted arguments. None of us enjoy the dry, combative, boring rehashing of theory blocks and race to the bottom that teams are choosing in an attempt to win. The rebellion is coming. If you get lucky and debate a team that you are out teching, you will win. If you debate another good team, as has been known to happen at the top of the bracket, I hope you are making good arguments not just a lot of them.

10. Watch my freaking non-verbals. If you continue to say "we are the most limiting interpretation" and I am holding my hands up and shaking my head, I probably am looking for you to explain how your obviously under limiting interp is actually providing for better limits.

11. I am liberal. Don't be rude. Avoid sexism, racism, and all the other isms. Be a good sport. Some of the things you say are inevitably going to be a little stupid. Don't act like you should win every single argument.

David Worth, Ph.D.

D.O.F., Rice University

Making Decisions: My decision is based mostly on how the debaters argue I should decide; I avoid using my own decision-making philosophy as much as possible but will if the round demands it. There are many cases where this might be necessary: If asked to use my ballot politically for example, or if both sides fail to give me a clear mechanism for voting, or if I know something to be factually incorrect (if you are lying). In these cases I try to stay out of the decision as much as I can but I don't believe in the idea that any living person is really a blank slate or a sort of argument calculator.

Decision-making Approach: I'll judge based on given criteria. This might include but are not limited to a policymaking approach, stock issues approach, a comparison approach, a "proof of the res/case" approach, or an advocacy approach. I can think in more than one way. This also means that the mechanisms for deciding the round are up for debate as far as I'm concerned.

Assessing Arguments: The argument's weight depends on how strong it is. I think line-by-line vs. "big picture" is an artificial divide anyway. This can vary by round. I would say you need to deal with all the line-by-line stuff but should not fail to frame things (do the big picture work) for me as well. It's pretty rare that I vote on one response but it's equally rare that I will vote on the most general level of the ideas.

Presentational Aspects: Speed: OK as long as you are clear. --Use of gender-culture-orientation neutral or promotion language: I'd rather see you try to be inclusive than not.

Strong Viewpoints: As I've said before, I probably won't vote to kill everyone to save the planet/galaxy/universe. Otherwise I haven't found "the" issue yet that I can't try to see all sides of.

Cases, DAs, CPs, Ks, T, etc.: I guess I vote on procedurals a bit less than other arguments but that doesn't mean that you shouldn't run them for whatever reason you might have in mind. ASPEC and the like aren't favorites but are sometimes necessary.

Points of Order: Call them, or don't call them; I'll know whether the argument is new and not calling them does not change their status as new. Also, if you're clearly winning bigtime don't call a ridiculous number of them in your opponents' rebuttal. Just let them get out of the round with some dignity (if you don't, I will probably be pretty angry right about the time I assign your speaker points).

Other Items to Note: 'Relax, have fun, and be great. Don't lie and don't sing unless you're good...'

Christa Sloan

Pepperdine University

My judging philosophy is that the best debate team is one that can make good solid arguments and present them in a clear and respectful manner. I do not like when debaters speak at a pace that makes it hard for me and your opponents to follow the argument or flow your argument. Furthermore, I hate when debaters get arrogant and rude with one another. I appreciate good old straight up debating and will almost never vote on a Kritique or poorly run topicality arguments.

Tony Damico

Azusa Pacific University

Judging Philosophy 11-09

I prefer a debate that furthers critical education, engages unconventional perspectives, and seeks to progress the collective intelligence of the debate community on issues that matter. I think a lot of procedural debate can be regressive; however sometimes it is absolutely necessary. I also understand that debate is a game, and I enjoy game aspects of debate, so long as there is some educational value that could reach beyond the round. I enjoy critical debate when the speakers care about and understand the lens they are using, yet I enjoy a straight-forward stock issues debate just as much.

I am always looking for the next great creative argument, ideas which will help debate evolve, and help our understanding of a complex reality to expand. I encourage creativity in the modalities of debate, and the strategies used to win the round, yet also expect teams to exhibit fairness, in other words--make your case accessible to the other team.

Cathy Glenn,

Saint Mary's College

I'll flow and evaluate what you argue and make my decision based on it. At the same time, I am NOT *tabula rasa*, ostensibly a note-taking mechanism evaluating arguments from some mythical "nowhere" perspective (objectivity). I'm a critical scholar and teacher, and that professional approach constitutes my perspective and influences my evaluation of the round. It also means I EXPECT to be moved (persuaded) by your rhetoric/advocacy (e.g., intellectually, affectively). This expectation assumes a rhetorical process in which we ALL engage and is always already a qualitative rather than quantitative exercise. If my philosophical take on the communicative process in a debate round concerns you and you can't (or choose not to) adapt, your best bet is to strike me.

That said, I've heard very poor quality fact and value debates this year, mostly because most current debaters aren't trained to argue (and don't practice a whole lot) in either of those paradigms. The consequence is that their sketchy understanding makes for very messy (and VERY difficult to judge) rounds. I won't take space here to make my own arguments for/against the productivity of fact or value debates in parli—just know that both teams are better off arguing in a policy paradigm in front of me. If you get what can be argued is a fact or value resolution, I'm inclined to be convinced that fact and value are both assumed in policy cases. That means I would view the "facts" of a policy case probably as part of inherency (which I usually hear in background), and the "values" of a policy case to flow from the "facts" and as what is assumed to be impacted (good or bad) in harms, advantages, and disadvantages (e.g., lives, dehum, etc.). Finally, then, a policy case offered in support of a "fact" or "value" resolution would NOT be extra-topical, in my view, simply because it offers an action and consequences based on fact and value claims and assumptions. Certainly, though, these are ALL up for debate in the round, and I will evaluate the arguments you make. You know where I stand.

In a "straight-up" policy round, stock issues are obviously important, but how to weigh stock issues in relation to each other and other issues is up to your argumentation. Without that, I have to intervene, and I'm inclined in a stock-issues paradigm toward weighing terminal impacts (via solvency and d/a uniqueness): case advantages vs. disads and/or c-plan.

Counterplans: I'm completely open to arguments (pics, topical v non-topical, delay, consult, a of a, etc.)—that is, I have no preferences right now. Perms can be either tests or advocacies and, again, I have no preference, nor do I have any conditionality preferences—debate it out. Texts need to be very clear and out when the c-plan is initially offered and perm texts should also be very clear. Basically, I'm open to hearing the theory debate from both aff and neg. Be very clear in your impact calculus, both theory-related and not.

Fast is usually fine and I prefer a quicker rate of delivery; be clear, organized, structured, and signpost. I'll give you clean non-verbals if I'm not getting your arguments. Smart and clean issue selection in rebuttals is worth many speaker points.

I'm finding that I'm repulsed more and more by arrogance, and my facial expressions in a round will tell you when that's the case. (My former coaches would find this ironic given my own approach as a competitor.) You don't have to be "nice," but you should be respectful by recognizing that the other team and I are human beings, not just obstacles (the other team) to a ballot (me).

Critiques (Ks): I love critical arguments, and I evaluate those arguments from a particular perspective. My perspective (or critical orientation, in McGee's sense) is informed by my work in philosophy of communication, critical theory, and cultural criticism (for your purposes, poststructural, queer, and postcolonial). That said, an adequately developed critique, for me, includes a relevant philosophical/theoretical framework, a clear link story to the affirmative or resolution, compelling impacts (terminal or not, depending on the critique) with a weighing mechanism, a viable and developed alternative, and warranted voting issues. Defending against a critique in front of me, then, could include pressing these issues.

Finally, in a critical mode, you always already invite me to interact with your advocacy--both intellectually and affectively--from my perspective, and that always already assumes the risk that my interaction and response may not be to your benefit in winning the round. If any of this worries you and you can't (or choose not to) adapt, strike me.

Performance/narratives: I'll evaluate performance *qua* performance (think Butler and Conquergood for performativity/performance and Pollock for narrative performativity). I'll consider the quality of the aesthetic (evocative/affective impact) of the performance/narrative, how well the arguments are developed using that aesthetic, and the critical advocacy impacts (not necessarily terminal, depending on the critical argument). Again, you invite me to *affectively* interact with your advocacy in this mode, so see my comments above about that risk and decide if you want to assume it. If all you have prepped are crit/perf/narr positions to run and aren't enamored by the risk, you should strike me.

Procedurals: I LOVE meta-debate; please support your claims (running or defending against the position) with sound analysis, not just blipped assertions (tags=claims).

That's it. Ask if you need more specifics. I'm happy to oblige.

I always hate writing these. I feel like no matter what I say, you all still end up asking me specific questions in round. But, I suppose my dislike of that habit is my philosophy: you tell me what I'm supposed to judge on. I believe the round is yours to define and I'll vote on any argument (T's, K's, CP's, whatever) that is reasoned out, impacted, and persuasive. Answer the "so what?" question. If you blip it, I won't buy it. Don't just tell me something is "a priori" and expect me to obey that without any analysis. Argumentation should be organized to enable me to flow your arguments better. Your rebuttals should be a time for you to advocate your positions. Enjoy!

Joey Mavity

Azusa Pacific

Making Decisions: 'I don't know that a single philosophy dominates my paradigm nor do I view my judging as a stagnant thing that can be etched in stone. I suppose that alone says more about my philosophy than anything else I'll say but I'll try and point out a few of my quirks. I don't know what debate is so it's difficult for me to establish a regime during the hour y'all are talking seems egotistical and doomed to failure. It seems to me that arguments about theory and practice should begin by establishing what debate is and why your perspective best achieves that vision.'

Decision-making Approach: 'I focus on the comparison of advocacy. I'm not a policy-maker nor do I play one on T.V. though sometimes I'm asked to in debate rounds. The power makes me heady. As a result I don't have the problem some people seem to have with fact and value rounds. This doesn't mean I particularly want to see them but I don't particularly want to see a policy round either. Do with that what you will. Let me suggest you make what one person calls, 'good, smart arguments.' These take a wide variety of forms. '

Assessing Arguments: 'How I "handle" dropped arguments generally depends on how debaters deploy them. I've ignored dropped arguments because both teams ignored them. I've voted on dropped arguments because I was told to. Look I'm not a particularly smart person. While this has many practical implications here it means that I don't know how arguments in the round interact with each other unless I am told how they interact with each other. Generally when people accost me for intervening it's because I was too dumb to get the implicit meaning of what they were saying. Consider yourself warned: be explicit! I do my best to decide who won or lost based on what I see in the round. The more you help me conceptualize your arguments the better.'

Presentational Aspects: 'I'm pretty expressive as a judge. This makes it easy to adapt to me. If you're going to fast I'll say something. If you're being racist I'll likely shame you. I prefer you not use speed as a tool of exclusion but absent winning argumentation I'm unlikely to take it upon myself to do anything—it's just a preference and will make me like you better as a person for whatever that's worth.'

Strong Viewpoints: 'It would be hard for me to buy that human life doesn't have intrinsic worth. '

Cases, DAs, CPs, Ks, T, etc.: 'I think government cases should tell me how to judge the round in order to be prima facie despite what the rules say.'

This is often presented as "vote for plan that is more beneficial " otherwise known as a policy-maker paradigm. While this is sufficient I prefer a more developed picture for how I should view the round. I think T should have interpretation violation standards and impacts. I suppose I prefer them in that order though it s not necessary. I don't know what predictability is why it should be valued or how one could be predictable. I also don't know what a social contract is why it should be valued how we could all have equal access to it or what its function is in a debate round or why it should be adhered to even if all my previous difficulties were overcome. Critiques almost always need a framework. I don t like "deep" vagueness though I ve voted on it. An easy way to reply is to point out the infinitely regressive nature of the position. ("Deep vagueness" means "they didn t tell us how many people they re hiring in California" for instance. Of course the depth varies depending on the nature of the plan.)'

Other Items to Note: 'I prefer that you point out new arguments in rebuttals. I think it's unfair for me to assume you realize they're making a new argument and it's unfair for the advocate that thinks the argument is not new for me to decide alone. I go back and forth but I'm currently inclined to think that the LOR is not an extension of the MOC. I also think arguments about how impacts should be weighed are new if the first time I hear it is in the rebuttal. The current NPTE rule set is deeply flawed in that it only allows one round of rebuttals. I tend to look unfavorably on MG strategies that seek to exploit this flaw. Generally this disfavor causes me to do nothing more but shake my fist in anger at the NPTE rule set but it could conceivably go further.'

Kyogen said: `Zen is like a man hanging in a tree by his teeth over a precipice. His hands grasp no branch, his feet rest on no limb, and under the tree another person asks him: `Why does Bodhidharma come to China from India?'

`If the man in tree does not answer, he fails; and if he does answer, he falls and loses his life. Now what shall he do?'

Mumon's Comment: In such a predicament the most talented eloquence is no use. If you have memorized all the sutras, you cannot use them. When you can give the right answer, even though your past road was one of death, you open up a new road of life. But if you cannot answer, you should ages hence and the future Buddha, Maitreya.

Kyogen is truly a fool
Spreading that ego-killing poison
That closes his pupils' mouths
And lets their tears stream from their dead eyes.

Name: Tim Ernst

Affiliated Schools: University of the Pacific

Debate history: 4 years High School Debate, 4 years college debate (2 in CEDA/NDT and 2 in NPDA), 6 years judging, 4 years coaching Paradigm: Policymaker

There are a few key things I look for in round: 1) Weighing of impacts--Impact calculus is critical to debate. I need specific reasons why I need to evaluate your arguments. This requires framing the debate, using "even if" statements, as well as standard impact calculus. 2) I believe Kritiks should have competitive alternatives to the plan. Without competition, the kritik is nothing more than a non-unique case turn, and the aff can address it as such. 3) I will vote on topicality. Topicality is competing interpretations for me. This means that you need to focus on the standards debate. Again, this requires framing of the T debate, as well as impact calculus. 4) I will listen to performance, but I don't think a debate can be won just on the fact that you perform. I view performance as a means of claiming personal agency, but that in and of itself is not enough to win a debate. You still must defend the warrants of your arguments, and I will listen to policy oriented responses to performance. 5) Theory is not my strong suit. Explain yourself well and, go slow. 6) I don't mind speed, but clarity is necessary. You ought to go slower on tags and cites. I like to keep a complete flow, so this will be to your benefit. 7) I don't like framework debates. Avoid them to make me happy.

Most importantly, be yourselves and have fun. I like a good natured, competitive debate with lots of clash.

Tim Kamermeyer

Pacific

I'll make this simple:

My goal is to see the best debate round possible, so debate in whatever way that will allow you to debate at your best. Whatever style/performance that you've learned and are good at it, do that. Additionally, speaker points will be decided on the substance and execution of the arguments in the round. So dress however you want, sit or stand, talk fast or slow, be topical or not. I don't care. As long as you justify why your side warrants my ballot, I'm happy.

With that said, I will entertain any argument you decide to advocate. Though, I'll admit I have my biases, which in case you would like to placate to keep me entertained I'll list.

- I prefer speed debate.

- I love smart procedurals.

- I like politics debates, but I'd appreciate a link scenario that is realistic. Loser's lose/Winner's win doesn't explain concessions and doesn't explain why the plan is specifically going to pass or prevent your disadvantage. The more specific, the more likely you are to keep it in the block.

- An argument with warrants. Go figure...

- People who don't waste my time by continuing to talk when they have nothing left to say. Use the full allotted speaking time if you need it, but if you don't there is no need to be redundant and kill your persuasion by boring me with nothing of value to discuss.

Point of orders should be called. Talk during your partner's speech, but don't start becoming a puppet master, that's annoying.

Bring your own timers. And expect me to ask for paper. I'm lazy, so make the round easy to adjudicate.

Stephanie Eisenberg

Hired

I currently coach the SFSU policy debate team and I debated in CEDA/NDT land for 3 years at SFSU where my partner and I achieved much of our success running critical and performance arguments. This generally means that I will favor teams who are winning the fundamental, well explained and warranted thesis of their argument over teams who are winning drops on the flow.

I default to the paradigm of argumentative critic, which means I expect teams to present me with the criteria for how I should evaluate the debate. Write the reason for my decision in your rebuttals...tell me which arguments to weigh and how I should weigh them and you will most likely get my ballot.

Now onto the nitty gritty...

You can run pretty much anything in front of me, but I know you expect a list with argument types and preferences so here ya go:

Ks: I think a lot of K debaters are great at explaining the theories behind their argument but forget to do work on the link debate. I need to know why the aff causes your impact, not just why your impact is hella bad. I love alternatives that “do something” (aka something other than “reject the aff”) but am open to a wide variety of alternatives – if you can dream it, you can run it in front of me.

D/As: I actually think there is a lot of value in pointing out disadvantages to the case, however you will not win a disad in front of me without lengthy explanation of the story (aka internal links) that make your disad realistic and coherent.

CPs: Fine with me. For CP theory questions, see below.

Theory: Not the easiest to win in front of me. I prefer you actually engage the arguments from the other team more often than not. If not impacted, I will default to the side that is responding to the theory arguments. If you are going to go for theory, I need a clearly explained impact scenario and why this means the other team should lose the entirety of the debate. I’m sympathetic to “reject the argument, not the team.”

Topicality: I evaluate topicality like a disad – you need a clearly impacted scenario with a reasonable link scenario. If you treat topicality like a blippy theory argument you’re wasting your time running it in front of me, and if you want to go for this argument at the end of the debate, you should probably go all in.

Most importantly, debate is fun and educational and I love teams that exemplify these wonderful traits of our community. Sass and assertiveness are cool -- anger and aggressiveness are not. If you have fun, I probably will too!!

House, Josh

Hired

2009 NPTE Judge Philosophy Form

Section 1: General Information

Please begin by explaining what you think is the relevant information about your approach to judging that will best assist the debaters you are judge debate in front of you. Please be specific and clear. Judges who write philosophies that are not clear will be asked to rewrite them. Judges who do not rewrite them may be fined or not allowed to judge/cover teams at the NPTE.

While I keep a good flow I don't transform into a robot after the round that puts the completed flow into one end and gets a decision out of the other end. Because then my decision would be poo. I think you deserve better.

To clarify, I have opinions about procedural arguments that you should know about. You can find those in Section 2 (no. 4), and you should look because they're an instance of something that I might not evaluate strictly in the context of what the debaters in the round have said.

Aside from procedurals and arguments that are just out and out offensive or insultingly stupid I'm willing to listen to pretty much whatever you have to say, and I try not to intervene. I think I have a pretty reasonable threshold for what is offensive and what is stupid, in terms of what I will intervene on. I don't imagine it will be a problem at this tournament.

Here's how I decide who I think won at the end of the debate:

I limit what arguments I'm looking at to the ones you're going for in the rebuttals. If you didn't think it was important enough to mention the last time you got to speak I'm not going to vote on it. (To be clear, in the case of evaluating arguments that you did go for I will certainly consider how the argument played out during the round and not necessarily just what was said about it in the rebuttal.) Also, even though my flow is usually pretty tight I occasionally miss a word or two that you say. Don't get upset if I don't vote for you even though you claim to have made an argument I don't have on my flow. If it's that important then make sure there's no way I could miss it.

Among the arguments you go for in the rebuttal I'll look where you tell me to look first, second, and so on. As I look over these arguments/positions I'm looking to see which arguments are offense and which arguments are defense. I think truly terminal defense on a position is almost impossible, so don't expect to win a position you don't have offense on. I then determine who is winning which arguments, evaluate the impacts of those arguments, mitigated by whatever defense is being won, based on probability, magnitude, durability, timeframe, etc. (Hopefully the debaters in the round are telling me why their impacts are more important) and decide who comes out on top.

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.

Unless you're offensive I probably won't give less than a 24, and you'd have to have a pretty bad round to get a 24. I almost never give 30's, but I'll give a 29.5, and if all the debaters in the round are good or bad their points might be bunched pretty tightly.

2. How do you approach critically framed arguments? Can affirmatives run critical arguments? Can critical arguments be "contradictory" with other negative positions?

I like critically framed arguments generally. I think they open up new ways to think about what's being said and done in the round, and I think that kind of self reflexivity is good. I also think that they make for a better generic strategy than procedural arguments. I certainly think that Gov. teams can run critical arguments, if they have critical things to say. Otherwise it's a terrible idea. I don't think that critical arguments can be "contradictory" with other opp. Positions. I don't know how that round would make any sense, and I don't feel compelled to vote on nonsense.

Although I like critical arguments I frequently see them run pretty poorly. Make sure you explain how the position functions in the round and in relation to the other team's arguments. If those things are really clear then it should make for a good round.

3. Performance based arguments...

All debate is performance. If you want to make your performative choices or the other teams performative choices a reason to vote in the debate then I'm willing to listen to them. If you choose to perform in a non-traditional way I think that's acceptable. While I don't think that you should necessarily have to go out of your way to defend your choice to perform in a non-traditional way I think the flip side is that if what you do is difficult for me to understand as an argument that relates to what the other team has to say don't expect me to vote on it just because it's different.

If you're running an argument about why the way the other team performs means they should lose despite the content of their speeches I'm going to want a pretty good justification, just like I would for a procedural.

4. Topicality. What do you require to vote on topicality? Is in-round abuse necessary? Do you require competing interpretations?

I'm going to address procedural issues generally here, but I'll be sure to make it T specific as well.

I think people forget when they ask me/tell me to vote on a procedural argument what they're asking/telling me to do is to ignore what the other team has to say because they've violated a procedure. Apparently a procedure so important that we would be better off not having a debate at all than going on despite the violation. I don't think that my role is to ignore what the other team said about the topic because they could have said something else about it that would have been more grammatically correct in relation to the topic or because you didn't predict it.

If you want to run procedurals to protect your ground, say specify something and you want to make sure they don't shift when you provide your specification, that can be done correctly. To do it correctly you 1. Provide a reason your specification is likely (you don't just get to blindly assert that since they didn't say who the U.N. would use to enforce their plan that the KKK would do it), 2. note their lack of specification (ok, maybe not in that order), then 3. explain that it's unfair for them to specify now in a way that links out of your reasonable arguments. That way, if they shift, there's a place for me to vote, if not you can have the debate you wanted. Providing the equivalent of a reasonable specification in the T debate is harder. Even if there isn't a "definitions" section in the PMC, and there usually is, the Plan (or advocacy or performance or however you view/articulate it) gives you an understanding of your ground. I think that the closest thing to "protecting ground" you can do with T is to make arguments about why it is critically objectionable to interpret the round the way they do. For example, if the resolution says something about natives and the plan is something about the Cleveland Indians baseball team then you should probably run a position that says the resolution shouldn't be interpreted that way.

Outside of that kind of scenario or some other egregiously abusive interpretation of the topic (if they only leave you repugnant ground or they run a tautology) I'm really not going to vote on T.

In every other area of the debate I think it's my job to stick to evaluating the round based on what the debaters say. However, for the reasons articulated above I feel fully justified intervening on procedural arguments so that what one team has to say isn't ignored because they aren't as up on the procedural debate. I think that's a messed up thing to do.

One last random thought—Even though we often forget about it (I do, and this form uses phrases interchangeably) in parli we have Government and Opposition teams, not Aff. And Neg. teams. The job of the Government team is to advocate some kind of change in the world. The job of the Opposition is to tell me why I shouldn't make that change. The job of the Gov. is not to affirm the topic like it would be for an affirmative team, it's to use the topic as a basis for advocacy. Looking at it that way my arguments don't seem that crazy do they? Really, still? Ok, well then I hope we can talk about it.

5. Counterplans -- PICs good or bad? Should opp identify the status of the counterplan? Perms -- textual competition ok? functional competition?

I generally think PIC's are ok, the Gov team should have to defend all of their advocacy.

I don't think the opp should identify the status of the counterplan. I've never seen an opp team kick a counterplan in a parli debate that made any sense at all. The activity isn't really structured that way.

Making sure counterplans are textually competitive as a way to ensure stable access to ground is a good thing I suppose, but textual competition is not the end all be all decider of acceptable competition.

Your counterplan should be functionally competitive.

6. Is it acceptable for teams to share their flowed arguments with each other during the round (not just their plans)

Um...if you want to share your flow, if you're not using it or something, then I'm not going to stop you. But if you don't want to give it up, if you're using it or something, then I'm not going to make you.

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?)

I'll look at procedural arguments first, which is why I have the standards I've articulated above.

In some instances, especially if there is a critical argument about what people are actually doing during the debate round, I will look to critical arguments before I look to procedurals. Otherwise, I'll look to them directly after.

Then I'll look at the cost-benefit analysis of gov and opp args.

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")?

When arguments are not explicitly weighed by the debaters I'll weigh them however I want. Seriously, if you're not going to tell me how the arguments interact I think you're asking me to judge how I think it would play out. In terms of how I will want to weight them, I've come to prioritize probability much more heavily than magnitude. I will also evaluate how well the arguments have been constructed and break ties based on better argumentative structure.

If claims are diametrically opposed I'll look to argumentative structure (who has better evidence, warrants, etc) and if all else fails break ties based on my own knowledge of the issue. Things very rarely come to that, but I can't think of another reasonable way to do it.

In terms of abstract vs. concrete impacts, they should be explained and weighed by the debaters. If they can't explain how they relate to each other I'll refer you back to the top of this answer.

Kristina Whalen, Ph.D,

Director of Forensics, CCSF,

BACKGROUND

Extensive experience in policy. I've been coaching parliamentary debate for three years.

ARGUMENTATIVE PREFERENCES-STYLE

If I embraced a pre-established judging paradigm, it would be "critic of argument." I see education as the primary purpose of this activity. The artificial constraints of this activity limit my interaction in the round; however, at the end of the debate I'll explain how someone with my background, my theoretical lens, my general sensibilities process what you say. My expectation is students will educate themselves on the possible ways their arguments can be interpreted.

That being said, here are argumentative stylings that appeal to me:

I'm the type of judge that likes to hear debaters "relate" arguments, "dimensionalize" positions, , flesh out an argument with explanation, demonstrate argumentative understanding, and be helpful and respectful to those around you. Since I am a rhetorician engaged in critical pedagogy, I do not enjoy hearing debaters who "crush" arguments; "kill" positions; ask me to "pull the trigger," or move from one sheet of paper to the next without ever *relating* ideas. In sum, I consider it my role to determine the adequacy of argument concerning the proposition in dispute. I do not vote on tag lines that are non-arguments simply because they were dropped. I understand the strategy of constantly trying to interrupt your opponent with a stream of POIs, but I don't like it. I don't care for all the ceremony associated with parliamentary debate. In other words, if skip the excessive "thanks yous," they will not be missed.

ARGUMENTATIVE PREFERENCES-SELECTION

Affirmatives are invited to be creative but do not run cases in front of me that would require me to evaluate evidence from expert testimony before I could reasonably be expected to accept your claims. If parliamentary debate is willing to accept the idea that modest amounts of evidence read in rounds is a good thing, I'm a good judge to test that idea in front of. I don't mind if your paraphrase expert testimony and mention sources that you have read before entering the round. On the negative, I often award decisions to compelling solvency arguments. Dispositional counter plans are fine, but I need to be able to hear them when they are initially put out so slow down a little during the reading of the text. I always appreciate good debates comparing competing policies. With the development of kritik type net benefits and popularity of exclusionary counter plans, theoretical arguments should be well developed in justifying or indicting such positions. This becomes especially true with permutations on certain types of counter plans (like the above). When arguing against the counter plan, please state the permutations clearly. I enjoy hearing kritik debates. Permutations of kritiks should be well explained. I think topicality is a jurisdictional argument. If you are a "performance" debater I don't have a problem with your framework (usually) but I do have a theater back ground and I would really like to see a quality performance—otherwise you are just using a gimmick.

LAST WISHES

Ask if you have questions. I haven't seen any parliamentary debates that were quick enough to challenge my ability to flow. After 15 years in CEDA I can obviously "handle speed". But, to be honest, I don't miss it all.

WELL WISHES

Lastly, I pledge to be a disciplined critic who is fully present. Good luck to all the competitors!

Duval Bodden

CSU Long Beach

Duval Bodden

I competed in speech during my college career and now am a Graduate assistant at Long Beach focusing on IEs. I am teaching a class on debate and have an understanding of the basics. I would recommend that you slow down and explain the arguments to me, also focus on the big picture and not the line by line.