

Christian Quiroz Paradigm

Hey, I'm Chris, and I debated for Newark Science for four years in LD and Policy. To start, I'd like to say that although I was known as a particular kind of debater, I encourage you to do what you can do the best, whether that be Kant, theory, performance, etc.

As a common rule, please don't go your top speed at the beginning of your speeches. Go slower and build up speed so I can get accustomed to your voice. I've had times where debaters started at their top speed, which wasn't really that fast, but I wasn't accustomed to their voice at all, so I missed a few of their arguments. To prevent this, please don't start blazing fast. Build up to your top speed.

I've come to realize I am probably one of the worst flowers in the activity. This doesn't mean I won't hold you to answering arguments but it does mean that I am far less likely to get a 5 point response than the next person. Take that as you will.

I'm far from a tabula rasa judge; if you say or do anything that reinforces racist, heterosexist, ableist norms then I will vote against you. This is not to say that you'll always lose Kant against Wilderson; rather, it's about the way in which you frame/phrase your arguments. If you say "Kantianism does x, y, and z, which solves the K" then I'm more willing to vote for you than if you say "Kant says empirical realities don't matter therefore racism doesn't exist or doesn't matter"

On that note, I'm an advocate of argument engagement rather than evasion. I understand the importance of "preclusion" arguments, but at the point where there are assertions that try to disregard entire positions I must draw a line. I will be HIGHLY skeptical of your argument that "Util only means post-fiat impacts matters therefore disregard the K because it's pre-fiat." I'm also less likely to listen to your "K>Theory" dump or vice versa. Just explain how your position interacts with theirs. I'm cool with layering, in fact I encourage layering, but that doesn't mean you need to make blanket assertions like "fairness is an inextricable aspect of debate therefore it comes before everything else" I'd rather you argue "fairness comes before their arguments about x because y."

I think that theory debates should be approached holistically, the reason being that often times there are one sentence "x is key to y" arguments and sometimes there are long link chains "x is key to y which is key to z which is key to a which is key to fairness because" and I guarantee I will miss one of those links. So, please please please, either slow down, or have a nice overview so that I don't have to call for a theory shell after the round and have to feel like I have to intervene.

These are just some of my thoughts. If I'm judging you at camp, do whatever, don't worry about the ballot. If you have any specific questions email me at cfquiroz@gmail.com

UPDATE: I will not call for cards unless

- a) I feel like I misflowed because of something outside of the debater's control
- b) There is a dispute over what the evidence says
- c) The rhetoric/non underlined parts of the card become relevant

Otherwise, I expect debaters to clearly articulate what a piece of evidence says/why I should vote for you on it. This goes in line with my larger issue of extensions. "Extend x which says y" is not an extension. I want the warrants/analysis/nuance that proves the argument true, not just an assertion that x person said y is true.

Dennis Tang Paradigm

West Linn High School '19

Qualified to TOC my senior year and went 3-3. I read debate-bad baudrillard, friv theory, kant, a good amount of Deleuze. I'll vote on any argument as long as it is warranted - even if it's absolutely ridiculous. If you think an argument is stupid then you should easily be able to beat it.

1. Theory/K
2. Phil
3. Larp

Misc:

SLOW Down on spikes and theory underview args in the 1AC. Blippy arguments like "K's must have the same actor because policy education" or "Err aff because time skew" don't have a sufficient warrant and are very hard to flow when you have 10 of these blips all back-to-back. I'll call clear/slow but if I don't catch, I just won't vote on it.

I default Epistemic confidence, but can be persuaded in round.

Tech > Truth but it depends on how much work you do. I will vote on an a priori if it is conceded and implicated in the 1AR. But if the 2NR makes the argument like "They didn't extend their ROB and I did, so reject all their offense", I probably won't vote on it.

Theory:

Please weigh as much as possible - it puts me in an impossible position when one side is winning "time skew" and the other side is winning "ground". Please tell me why your argument should be prioritized

Reasonability means having/extending sufficient defense on a shell, not "The judge should gut check the interp." This means if you win reasonability, but don't answer "may not cut cards" theory at all, I'll still vote you down.

Reasonability brightlines are stupid - "having impact and turn ground" is still unfair if someone gives a 15 minute 1AC.

The biggest mistake that 2NR's make when answering theory is not weighing in the 2N. This means I'll default to 2AR theory and the neg will have a hard time (the 2AR can just make up 10 reasons why their standard outweighs)

Fairness probably precludes the evaluation of other layers, but I can be convinced otherwise

K - affs:

I'm fine with them. I'm persuaded by truth testing, so make sure you beat it back.

Aff's need a ballot key warrant - if they don't then I'm very persuaded by fairness is an impact

K's:

Don't blitz through pre-written 2NR overviews.

I'm familiar with most K's but it still needs to be explained/implicated in the round.

If you're reading a K against a K-aff you should explain why having a flawed method/epistemology/etc means the aff should lose the round. Most of the time, I think that K-affs advocacy's are compatible with the K alternative - so you need to explain why proving the method/framing/etc is violent/bad is sufficient to win the round.

"Perm do both" in the 1AR is insufficient - you need to explain why it shields the link, etc.

Darius White Paradigm

My name is Darius White and I debated at C.E. Byrd High School for 4 years and debate for the University of Oklahoma currently.

Speaker Points: I generally give fairly high speaks, and I understand that there is going to be some rudeness in the debate, but try not to over-do because that will be a speak-point decrease. Also stealing prep, and speaking CONSTANTLY during your partners speech will drop your speeches quite a bit, but I usually try to be generous with the speaks.

Cross-X: I defer c-x being binding (unless told otherwise but they need to be nuanced, not tag line extensions of theory shells) and tend to flow c-x

After-round evaluation of evidence: I will try as best as possible to not call for evidence unless you are highly reliant on one piece of evidence in your last speeches, and/or evidence is into question (i.e. if you call for me to look at a piece of evidence after round), but other than that I tend to try to judge the debate on the actually speeches given by the debaters.

Theory: I have a high threshold for theory arguments and hate when teams spray through your theory blocks; I usually default to reasonability and reject-the-arguments-not-the-team unless you win the abuse story i.e. I don't think one conditional advocacy destroys aff ground so just try to be reasonable and very persuasive when going for theory.

Disads/CP's: Impact calculation is always a good idea, and even though I am more on the K side of debate, I am down to listen to a really technical CP/DA as a net-benefit debate, so don't be shy to run these arguments in front of me. But, I feel that the CP does need a net-benefit for me to vote for it, so if the 2NR is just CP with no net-benefits, I will have a hard time finding reasons why I should vote for the CP. Turns case arguments on the DA are always tight.

Impact Turns: I really enjoy these types of debates, and they are very persuasive in my opinion, so if you got any in your files, I am down to listen.

Kritiks: I hate when teams read a random K that they have no idea what it means or says, and that is always a pet peeve. Don't run a K in front that you are not comfortable going for, but if you are very well at going for a specific criticism then do your thing because I am more familiar with this side of the debate. I feel that the alternative portion of the K is very under utilized and would like to be a debate I would want to see, but if your thing is going to turns case, then do your thing.

Framework: This is the argument I least agree with but if will listen and flow if required.

Flashing: I don't count flashing as prep unless you are taking hella a lot of time in which I will inform you that I am about to start your prep time; PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE, do not steal prep.

Random shit: I like jokes, and making me laugh usually gets you some where speak point wise. Using historical references is always a good idea and paints a better picture on the impact calc. Remember to jump your cards over before the speech, and if you read any new cards that aren't on the flash, flash them before c-x or before the next speech is about to start, this is not prep time.

If you have any other questions feel free to email me: darius12456@gmail.com

Niko Battle Paradigm

Last changed 7/22 2:42P PDT

quick prefs:

performance/id pol k - 1
structural k - 1
theory - 2
larp/policy - 2
(LD) phil - 3
(LD) trix - 3

background:

I debated for **Kamiak** HS in Mukilteo, WA and currently debate for Wake Forest. I started debate in middle school, and throughout my career, I have earned 17 total TOC bids, qualifying in both LD (3 times) and Policy (1 time). I have experience in both policy and LD debate on both the local and national circuit. I primarily read kritikal arguments, but trust and believe I can follow you and have experience in policy, phil, and theory stuff.

THIS PARADIGM IS WRITTEN FOR POLICY BUT MOST THINGS IN HERE APPLY TO LD TOO. LD SPECIFIC THINGS ARE NOTED AS SUCH.

pre round:

you put me on the chain (emailnikob@gmail.com)

Pronouns: black/black or they/them

SPEAKS

Speaks are wack and arbitrary and I don't think they are a good tiebreaker. I wish tournaments would use opp wins as the first tiebreaker instead and I will die on that hill. With that being said, I'm a bit of a **speaks fairy** unless you do something blatantly offensive in which case speaks will go down down down down down faster than Jay Sean can sing it. And, if you don't get that reference then strike me ;)

+2 speaks if you bring me iced coffee w/ sugar and lots of cream because judging is wayyyy more tiring than competing

+1 speaker point for 2 well executed West Wing references throughout the debate - tell me what they were after your speech so I can keep track or in case I miss it.

+0.5 speaker points if you're in LD and you say "we meet" just because I think it's wack that some judges care enough to take away speaks, and as someone who did both events it really annoyed me.

-1 speaker point if you misgender your opponent and they don't call it out. Repeated violations especially if it's called out will lead to larger "punishments" or whatever.

-5 speaker points for saying "I'm not racist but..." or any variation.

random musings:

tech > truth, but tech without some truth is rarely enough

(LD only) good tricks debate makes judging easy **bad tricks debate makes judging hell** // [post camp update] and I will not vote on shoes theory or any other theoretical violation about your opponents clothing and/or appearance (identity args exempt). Arguments like shoes theory and etc. are antithetical to the purpose of this activity and I guarantee you will not like your speaks or the decision should you try to read them in front of me.

if you're gonna larp (straight up policy) please for the love of God **weigh impacts**

A dropped argument is a dropped argument, but it's up to you to tell me the implications of it.

sass and shade are fun...apparently people think I'm a rude debater, but who cares. If sassy/"rude"/shade is your thing then feel free to do you when I'm in the back.

actual stuff:

tl;dr - do you. I like to think I'm pretty tab and can evaluate any type of debate. Tech and the flow are probably more important to me than others who debated like I did in HS. I'm a pretty simple judge so if you weigh your impacts and tell a story in the 2nr/2ar you'll be fine.

TOPIC KNOWLEDGE: After debating this as basically the LD TOC topic my senior year and coaching a PF team on a similar topic, I would put myself at about an **8.5/9** out of **10** on the current topic

*Current LD topic - n/a

k debate:

general

we love that. If this is your thing then go for it, but if it isn't **please don't make me sit through 2 hours of a bad k debate.** I don't think that the negative (for most Ks) needs to win an alternative if they can prove that the aff sucks or that their structural analysis of the world is both preferable and incompatible with the 1ac. Also, chances are I understand and am familiar with your buzz words, but that doesn't mean you should rely on them to win the round. **If I can't explain to the other team why their aff, performance, or implicit assumptions in the 1AC/resolution are problematic then it will almost always be an aff ballot.** For the aff, I never understood why debaters don't go for the impact turn strat against certain K's. Obviously, I don't condone teams standing up and saying things like racism/sexism/etc. good, but going for cap good, fem IR bad, etc. is fine. Lastly, sometimes I feel as if 2as get so focused on answering the K that they forget to win that their aff is in some way a good departure from the status quo, which is to say please extend your offense in the 2ar.

Clash Rounds

For K aff teams, if you are losing my ballot to cap you are probably doing a lot of things wrong. I think most fwk/cap teams I've seen and most of those rounds I've been in has been underdeveloped on the cap side. The 2ac, if done correctly, should pretty much shut down the cap route. There's should be almost no way the 2n knows more about your theory and it's interactions with cap than the 2a does, which should make those debates pretty easy for you to get my ballot. Framework on the other hand...I feel like **k aff teams need to do a significantly better job defending a model of debate, winning debate is bad, winning the aff is a prior question to the resolution, or etc.** I tend to vote for framework in clash rounds (not because I enjoy or ideologically agree with it), because the ^ things are often not executed well. Framework teams, please make sure the arguments the 2nr goes for are somewhere in the block and not just the same tired canned 2nr. Carded TVAs with proper extensions are pretty damning for the aff and your good research/engagement will likely be rewarded (either with speaks or the ballot). Tbh probably **slightly better for policy teams in k aff v. fwk rounds and slightly better for k teams in policy aff v. k rounds.**

k v. k rounds

I got u...win your theory of power, framing and relevant offense.

policy(LD - LARP):

weigh weigh weigh weigh! I think more than any other stylistic approach to debate, policy teams NEED to do more comparative weighing. You will likely be unhappy with my decision if I can't point to specific points on my flow to weigh between your competing nuke war/extinction/etc. scenarios. I love watching policy teams who have nuanced, fun and creative impact scenarios. Some personal preferences for policy rounds are below -

Judge kick/choice is just not a thing. I'm still baffled how teams win arguments on this; its always seemed like lazy debating to me, and you are probably better off investing that time on other parts of the flow. Obviously if its conceded I won't hack against it, but I can't promise it won't be reflected in your speaks. I think strategic 2nrs will know when to go for the CP and when to kick it and defend the squo, so I'm not inclined to do that work for you.

Live by the flow, die by the flow...I think I'm a pretty well-informed person when it comes to politics/IR, but I probably won't know enough to fill in the gaps of actual nuanced scenario analysis which means you need to weigh and make the arguments you want to hear in the RFD.

I'd much rather watch an engaging 3 off policy strat then sit through watching some poor 1nr try to kick 12 of the 14 off read.

(LD Only) Phil:

Usually pretty simple debates imho, but make sure you respond to your opponents fw justifications as well as extend your own. After judging almost nothing but phill working at NSD all summer, I feel like these rounds are nearly impossible to resolve absent actual responses/weighing. Also, I'd much rather watch a substantive framework debate between Kant and Hobbes than see someone use Hobbes to trigger linguistic skep and have to watch a six minute 2nr on it.

Theory:

down for anything - weigh standards and win an abuse story. Here are some defaults (obv up for debate) See my note at the top about certain types of LD friv theory. I should clarify that my threshold in theory is slightly higher in policy than in LD and I'm not as open to friv theory in policy. I think policy is a more educational activity, and I don't want to see it go down a similar path vis-a-vis theory.

No RVIs

Text over spirit

meta theory = theory

theory = K

competing interps

drop the arg

fairness = edu; both a voter

Nadia Hussein Paradigm

Last changed 4/12 4:38P EDT

About Me:

I have debated for three years at Georgia State and did a mixture of debate in high school. Now I'm a graduate coach at Wake Forest

I want to be on the email chain; use gsupanther84@gmail.com

General:

Slow down when reading your tag and author, or I won't be able to catch it.

If GSU debate has taught me anything, it's to be extremely open minded to a variety of arguments. If you want to run death good, afropessimism, deterrence das, no period plan flaw, K affs, traditional affs, feminist killjoy etc, go for it. Just be sure to explain why you should win with this argument. ROB will be who debated the best unless I'm given another ROB with reason to prefer it. I'm against judge fill in but will vote down oppressive/offensive language/arguments especially if the other team points it out.

Aff

Do whatever you're best at, stay topical (or be ready to explain why topicality doesn't matter), be organized, and extend your case and why it outweighs throughout. I tend to err aff on framework if they have and defend a plan text, but you have to lock in if you decide to do that, otherwise I'll be persuaded to neg's abuse claims.

Ks

I love a good k with a clear link and impact. Your alts have to be clearly explained. I'll buy links of omission but the neg has to defend why the aff can't simply perm. Negs really have to take time in the block to explain why the aff can't perm and why it's net better to do the alt alone. Affs have to explain why they can perm and why the perm is net better than aff alone or why the alt can't solve the case. Don't drop theory args, or I will have to vote the other way.

DAs

I'm good with das but there has to be work done on how it links to the aff, or I will agree with the aff on no link args. If you have a solid Nonunique arg and extend it and I will vote on that. Solid impact calc will seal the deal for me, but if the aff successfully turns the DA or explains why the case outweighs the DA, I will vote on that as well. Long story short the more clash on the DA the better.

CPs

Love a creative CP, but it needs to solve/have a net benefit (DA or a K) along with stealing aff ground; otherwise I will agree with aff's perm and theory args. Aff needs to clearly explain why CP can't solve case, beat the net benefit, and articulate why the perm is best. Don't drop theory or you lose my ballot.

T

I will vote neg on a T arg if you convince me the violation is clear, the aff's counter interpretation is unreasonable, and the impact is big. I will vote aff if they convince me that their aff is reasonable, counter interpretation is better or equal to the negs, and a benefit to their definition, but aff can chuck topicality and still win if they articulate why being topical doesn't matter or is worse for debate. If the aff locks in and says they're T however, they cannot shift or it's an auto win for the neg.

FW

I lean aff in most cases unless the neg provides me with a clear violation, story, and impact. 2acs have to clearly explain why the aff is fair and/or better. Tech is important when arguing FW but explanation is key when you arguing framework. Truth always better than tech.

CX

cross ex is binding, answer the questions honestly, don't ask why the aff should win during 1ac cross ex or generic questions like that.

Lauren Burdt Paradigm

put me on the email chain - lauren.burdtd@gmail.com
she/her

Background: I did LD in Iowa till 2011, have been coaching/working at camp since, and I currently work at the National Speech & Debate Association. I coached LD for a school in Nebraska until 2016, where my students were in semis, quarters, dubs of TOC and finals of NSDA Nats. I've been tabbing more than judging these past few years, so my threshold for speed and immediate recognition of new arg trends is probably going down. Haven't had any problems yet.

I strongly believe that debate should be an inclusive space. As long as you keep it that way, you can do whatever you want. Below is a laundry list of "things that might irritate me on any given day" and general preferences, but feel free to change them by blowing my mind.

Short version

My favorite rounds are when debaters engage in each others' args substantively, whatever format that may take. I flow your speeches straight down, which means collapsing, weighing, big picture analysis, and explicit comparison will get you far. I give higher speaks to students that read creative positions and clearly know a lot about whatever they choose to read, be it Lacan, Ripstein, permissibility, the topic [gasp].

Long version

Speed

- Speed should be fine. I will yell slow and clear as much as needed.
- START YOUR SPEECH SLOW. Please. Please? Pretty please. I don't know how else to ask.
- Like 85% of you make author names incomprehensible. You not only need to take a pause after the author name, but before it as well.
- You would be doing yourself a favor to speak at a conversational pace for interps and ROB/standard texts, and slow down significantly for theory underviews and any one sentence "a, b, c," analyses in frameworks. I give little leeway on extensions when you don't.
- You're reading this and being like "duh lauren", but actually half the time you don't do any of this :(

Theory/Topicality

- I judge a lot of T debates and moderate number of theory debates.
- In those rounds that's like 2 shells in 1N, 2 more in 1AR, and a slew of "evaluate after 2nr, no 2nr weighing, etc." issues - I'm prob a fine judge for you in prelims, but not sure you'd want me on your elims panel. If I am, you're better off collapsing and weighing than forcing me to wade through a sea of blips.
- I think that theory debates can be cool, unique, and organic. The more specific the violation the better - in front of me, you're better off running more nuanced T on a plan aff than "plans bad" theory. That said, my preference would be that you engage in a different way if reasonable because I truly find these debates boring.
- I am not persuaded by "competing interps = risk of offense on theory is sufficient" and will most likely look to substance if there is terminal defense on a shell
- I think you should extend all parts of a shell throughout the round, even if conceded. It can be one sentence. But I still think I should hear "extend fairness is a voter" come out of your mouth in the 2.
- If you run theory/T against someone who has no idea what theory is, I will make hellllaaaa leeway for substantive responses that aren't in the typical structure and treat them as terminal defense because come on
- I enjoy a good T debate in which there are competing methodologies of what debate should look like. Substantive T debates (T acts as turn to aff method or args of that sort) are more preferable than "fairness first, don't evaluate the K" arguments.

Phil/Tricks

- This is how I debated, and I feel comfortable evaluating these rounds.
- I think the less-sketchy (sketchy = hidden, one sentence, shifty about it in cx, warrantless, etc.) deployment of things like contingent standards, skep triggers, permissibility, etc. can be cool.

- AFC hurts my soul. That includes ABC, AEC, APC, and whatever else you youngfolk have come up with these days. I'll vote on it, but not my fave.

Plan/DA/CP whatev

- Sure. I love and am always impressed by great, topic-specific prep
- I'm pretty sure I understand most "debate lingo", but for some reason, I've had an issue with some of the jargon that's thrown around in these rounds. I'm honestly pretty sure some of you are making stuff up, like "X is a net benefit to the internal link of the uniqueness which takes out the competition and shields the link so the alt can't perm the squo", like excuse me

Critical

- This is what I coached, and I feel comfortable evaluating these rounds.
- I dock speaks when you over-use your author's jargon, particularly while trying to clarify the position in cx
- Please establish some kind of framework that allows me to evaluate impacts (role of ballot, role of judge, standard, whatever). I do think role of the ballot args are generally poorly warranted, impact justified, and have no explicit appeal to the ballot. But that rarely comes up in round so OH WELL!
- ROBs that are well done are cool. I really like RotB/Js that deviate from the common "you're a critical educator" "combat structural violence" norm, and creativity in this area leads to some of my favorite debates. I particularly like args that make normative or descriptive claims about a part of the world (academia, text, literature) and use those to make implications about what model of debate is best.
- K affs are fine, non-topical affs are fine, and I'm open to different interpretations of what it means to be topical.

Cross ex

- Use the full 3 min of cx for cx please.
- If you want me to hear a concession during your prep just be like "lauren pay attention", otherwise I'm definitely not paying attention.
- YOUR SASSY BANTER IN CX SERIOUSLY HURTS ME. I don't like it when people are rude! I think we should be nice! Debate is fun! Love each other!

Speaks

- When you ask if I disclose speaks, my response will be "no, but they're fine", even if they're not fine. I think disclosing speaks would make me subconsciously inflate speaks across the board so that I wouldn't have to tell anyone they got a 25. I also can't think of a reason you need to immediately know the arbitrary number I assign to your performance, aside from people who try to calculate speaker awards/seeding before the bracket is released, which is a weird way to spend your time anyway.
- Speaks given out based on strategy. I average a 28. I try to make them relative to the rest of the pool.
- I couldn't care less what you're doing (sitting, laptop, walking around the room on your hands while you read the NC, playing death grips for the first 4 minutes of the AC, etc.) as long as you're respectful.
- I will dock speaks if you're incapable of sending docs in a whatever I arbitrarily deem a reasonable amount of time.
- No-prep 2ars and speeches where you sit down early DO NOT impress me.

Content warnings

- If you are reading a description of violence in your args/narratives, I think it's probably a good practice to give a content warning before the round. If someone asks you not to read it, it should be as easy as removing the part of your case that is descriptive of violence.
- I do not believe this includes a discussion of racism, sexism, etc. I realize that those kinds of things may be triggering for some students, but that is an issue that should probably be handled by a coach.
- I won't dock speaks for failing to do so and I think that there needs to be a more in-depth discussion of how this should work, but I've been in situations that have made me think this is probably a good norm for now.

Disclosure

- I'll vote on disclosure theory, but I tend to think that the more specific interps (nonT affs, broken plan/advocacy texts, etc.) are way more compelling than something that mandates that whole-res stock affs are disclosed. To be clear, I think all of you should disclose all of your positions. To also be clear, I do not enjoy listening to disclosure theory even a little bit. If you're debating whether to run it in front of me & have something else you can read, I'd err on the side of not. If you're debating whether to run disclosure when I'm on a panel and the other judges love disclosure theory, please go for it.

Misc

- I'm more lenient on aff extensions and extensions of dropped args, but I want at least "extend contention 1 jones card that says living wage closes wage gap because X".
- Don't tell me to "gut-check" something. Make arguments.
- I don't want to hear violations I can't verify or new shells in the 2ar or flashing theory or anything of the sort.
- I have absolutely ZERO tolerance for the teams that play games before outrounds with disclosure of the aff, the flip, etc.
- I'll answer questions after the round for sure, but there will come a point where I'm like "meh better luck next time I need to go".

If there was anything I was unclear about, feel free to have me clarify before round or email lauren.burdt@gmail.com. If you need to reach me immediately, facebook is the best way.

David Childree Paradigm

Paradigm for LD & PF

Add me to email chain. Dchildree@hotmail.com. Feel free to email me for clarifications if needed.

15 years' experience coaching across all events. While some of my paradigm is LD specific, most of it applies to both LD and PF.

I am a very traditional flow judge. I value traditional well-researched debate and in LD I especially appreciate strategically applicable values and value criteria. Remember to show me how you achieved your value better than your opponent, or how your value and VC achieve your opponent's value better. Solvency is nice but not always necessary in every topic or clash. I value organized, clear and coherent debate with clash. I am most interested in seeing a values debate under NSDA rules, that affirms or negates the resolution. I want to judge debaters who have learned something about the topic. I am much less interested in someone using technicalities to tell me why LD or the resolution is pointless. Engage in an argument with the other person's contentions. Don't try to steal the ground of the debate. I do love smart use of philosophy. I'm not usually a fan of theory, especially when excessive/unnecessary or irrelevant to the topic, but there have been rounds where it was done exceptionally well and I voted for it. I am a fan of topicality debates and definitional debates. If you run a K, you transfer the burden to yourself, and many Ks are poor substitutes for a good debate on the resolution.

I typically vote for the person/team with the most convincing, most factual, and most impactful arguments. The quality of reasoning and evidence carries more weight than the number of arguments or cards. I consider failure to address a significant argument a reason for giving the win to the other team. A minor point that flows through will rarely determine the outcome.

You will most likely lose if you make unsupported claims; make up or misrepresent facts; or abuse your opponent or the process. Likelihood of a win is greater if you effectively and truthfully rebut your opponent's voters and emphatically point out why your contentions are true and outweigh.

Crystallization is key. Explain clear grounds and warrants on all voters. Frame the debate strategically. Explain how an argument directly links into framework and impact and weigh that argument for me if you want me to weigh it heavily in my decision. I reward smart and sensible strategic frameworks that are clear, reasonable, and topical. There should be context for me to consider and weigh an argument, and the resolution should be interpreted within a particular context. I appreciate creativity within plausible and non-abusive limits.

Evidence must be clearly tagged, clearly linked within each claim, and immediately produced when asked for. The specific line(s) referenced should be quickly pointed out.

Cross ex should be strategic and civil. I do flow cross ex. I appreciate clear strategic questions, direct answers, and efficient word economy.

Clear signposting is appreciated. I appreciate slightly-higher than conversational speaking rates, and am ok with a brisk pace, but find spreading antithetical to key purposes, values, and benefits of debate as an activity and communication as a life skill.

Thanks for reading this and best of luck in your debates!