Christopher Ahlm
Preferred Debate Styles: Lincoln Douglas, Policy

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.
Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.
Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Citations after article introduction are preferred.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
It won’t

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Build the value that is not overly complicated and should be relatable, and criterion should not be overly technical.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Empirical

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Critical arguments should provide substantial evidence for their support.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Make sure all claims are supported with specific, defined examples, no paraphrasing.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Make sure they have a purpose or illustration for the case at hand.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
The focus should be winning the debate, not just attacking a persons style or flaws of method.
Winning on technicalities isn't winning a debate.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

Remember that in order to win a round, respect towards your opponent is paramount. It is hard to find in favor of debaters who belittle or berate their opponent in or out of round. Graceful winners are as important as graceful losers.
Kelly Aldridge
Preferred Debate Styles: Lincoln Douglas, Congress

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Citations, marked

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Do not oral prompt your partner

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Value and Criteria should be how the round is weighed...you should uphold your V & C with your arguments.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I don't care...just prove it.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I don't appreciate the use of K's in LD or PF. It better be *ah-maz-ing* if you are using them in your LD or PF cases.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Anyway

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Anyway

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Anyway

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Do NOT waste time asking to see evidence.

DO speak clearly (speed is okay, but you must be understandable)

DO enjoy your debates. You're at state...Make it count.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Tag lines

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
It won’t

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Well

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Philosophical, theoretical

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Yes!

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Precise and communicate them well

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Provide great communications and reasoning!

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Give great reasoning

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Communication, eye contact!
Jared Andrus
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas, Policy, Congress

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Citation then evidence then "end the card there" or quote and closed quote

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
I don't want to hear it. I prefer debaters pass notes, but if you whisper to one another that second best. Actually stating arguments instead of guiding your partner is NOT well received

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
I value the analysis. Use examples or states or qualified opinions and then give me your analysis of the evidence...why does your evidence matter...how does it fit

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
No preference so long as analysis occurs. None is inherently better than another

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
They generally are a place for weak debaters to hide. They sometimes win, but most often because of weakness by the opponent, not the strength of the K. I like to actually see folks debate the resolution, not debate debate.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Aff should hope to win or tie every case argument, else the neg will prevail. Neg should provide clash, aff prima facia case.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Aff should actually define terms, that alone dissolves almost all T. arguments. If Aff does not
define, they surrender that to the Neg and generally suffer in Topicality. Neg counterplans or Kritiks do NOT replace the neg need to provide clash on the Af

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

They shouldn't. Debate the resolution instead of trying to be cute or clever...that's a pretty good theory.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

I don't care much about speed, but it is still public speaking discipline. Getting rid of all enunciation and punctuation just to cram in a few more words is NOT a way to make your case in the real world...so why would you purposefully make a speech that is ONLY effective in the world of other debaters?
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A large quantity of arguments prove more persuasive than a few well-developed arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
stay in the allotted time and clash civilly with your opponents convince me

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
i"m against oral promptings and it will change my voting

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
convince me to your side

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
theoretical

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
just convince me

How should debaters run on case arguments?
harms and advantages

How should debaters run off case arguments?
disadvantages

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
by making it convincing

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?

Author and date are necessary.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

Politeness is always best.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

No comment.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

No comment.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

No comment.

How should debaters run on case arguments?

No comment.

How should debaters run off case arguments?

No comment.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?

No comment.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

Be polite, be confident, be persuasive.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?

Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?

Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?

None

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

It will not impact it

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

No preference

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

Theory Arguments

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

I will not vote on kritical arguments

How should debaters run on case arguments?

No preference

How should debaters run off case arguments?

Topicality is to only be run when actually applicable

How should Debaters run theory arguments?

No preference

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Just reference the evidence, and explain how it relates to your point.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Minimal prompting - I want to ensure that the speaker is the one presenting, not their teammate.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
I believe this sets up your case, so be clear in values and criteria - tie it into your case, and use the arguments to support.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Empirical - supported by evidence.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I don't care for it too much.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
All those are fine - how it can harm, the significance of the argument - as long as it is supported by cae.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Support your case - and you can also use evidence to counter your opponents.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Theory is fine as long as it is commonly supported and makes sense and is relevant.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

I always look at a respectful debate. Once you roll your eyes, repeatedly interrupt, or are sarcastic, that's not good.
How Should Debaters approach **Constructive Speeches**?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach **Rebuttal Speeches**?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach **Evidence**?

Tag/last name/cut card

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

Depends on the intrusiveness of the prompting.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

Arguments/evidence should extend the v/c

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

As long as the evidence supports, no preference.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

Not a fan of language K, but can appreciate that various K can bring "reality" to the argument. Please make sure it it is a well defined argument.

How should debaters run on case arguments?

Signpost - as long as I can follow where you are going I should be able to follow

How should debaters run off case arguments?

Let me know you are going off case - be sure your very clear in your delivery - slow down and make sure I'm understanding your case

How should Debaters run **theory arguments**?
Signpost - don't get bogged down on a theory - Overall, I would prefer stock issues.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

Sign post - speed ok but I need to hear your tags and evidence!
Bruce Benson
Preferred Debate Styles: Policy, Congress

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Follow the state rules and guidelines.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
You should be very cautious about tag teaming. I am not a fan.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
They should be referenced occasionally during the debate.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Probably empirical is best for me.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I hate them.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
I am a policy maker. I want to hear a well structured plan and how it will solve

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Topicality is fine if the aff is not topical. Dis ads are good if they apply to the aff. Don't even think of linking this topic to nuclear war. You will lose if you go to any kind of war. I hope you get my point. No Generic dis ads., kritiks. In all my y
How should Debaters run theory arguments?

I am not a fan of theory arguments.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

you may ask for clarification if I judge you
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?

A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?

Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?

no preference

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

Oral prompting is okay in my book

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

Values should be used to support their arguments, especially if they can provide actual evidence of how the value helps.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

I like all three, especially if they can support their philosophical and theoretical arguments with empirical evidence

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

Kritics are awesome!

How should debaters run on case arguments?

I'm cool with solvency

How should debaters run off case arguments?

Yes. Kritiks and counterplans are rad.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
no preference

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

I love hearing arguments that are theoretical/philosophical, especially when backed up by actual historical or political evidence. I also think kritiks and progressive debate practices are rad.
John bolliger
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
You should state the tag line, author, year, and then read the card.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Don’t tag team please. I do not like it at all.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
A value needs to be the highest weighed impact in the round. The criterion needs to be a weighing mechanism for me to determine if we have achieved your value. Your contentions need to show why your side upholds your value better through your criterion than your opponent.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
They’re all great. I am studying philosophy and political science so I would like to hear both philosophical and theoretical but that’s not to say that I won’t accept empirics either.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Run whatever you want.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
They all need impacts. Without impacts, none of it matters. Tell me why it matters.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Run it how you want. This is your debate and whatever you bring to the table I will take it. If it’s a bad argument your opponent will have a response to it.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

Run whatever you want, it’s your debate. I’ll buy whatever you tell me to as long as it’s supported and properly clashed throughout the round.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

I did LD for 4 years. When you’re giving me voters I want to hear good empirical evidence but I also need to know the moral impacts. Use philosophical arguments and we will get along just fine.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?

No preference.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

Oral prompting is allowed. It will not have any impact on my decision.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

Presume that I don't understand your values /criterion and spend some time explaining your values /criterion and how I should understand the importance of your chosen values /criterion. The entire debate will depend upon my understanding of your values /criterion so please do not rush past this crucial part of the debate. Your arguments should support your values and criterion.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

I am more a rationalist than an empiricist. I have no preference for which argument is used to support a value position.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

I will evaluate the kritik first in the debate round before any other question is resolved, and if the kritik must be compared to the plan, then the kritik will outweigh the plan or value position.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Don't be rude. Sassy and humorous are fine. Be confident without being a jerk. If the teams are mismatched don't be condescending; don't roll your eyes. Don’t lie. Debate like you want to be here debating. If this is your first time debating... keep this to

How should debaters run off case arguments?

I will evaluate the kritik / topicality first in the debate round before any other question is resolved, and if the kritik / topicality must be compared to the plan, then the kritik / topicality will outweigh the plan or value position.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?

I have no preference. I am open to kritik and topicality as valid forms of criticisms.

The kritik is an argument that must be adjudicated first before we can evaluate other issues in the round. This pre-fiat discussion takes place before we even get to

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Jack Bradley
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Policy

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?

Arguments should each be addressed individually., Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?

Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches., Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?

Mark the card if you don't read the entire section. Say next between cards. Pretty standard stuff.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

I have no preference. People are welcome to engage in oral prompting.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

No preference. Do what you think is best.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

No preference

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

I was a prolific K Debater in High School and College, so I'm comfortable.

How should debaters run on case arguments?

I think running harms is a waste of time usually, but you do you. I think that reading a plan, solvency, and advantages is the most straightforward way to read a traditional 1AC.

How should debaters run off case arguments?

I have no preference whatsoever. I am comfortable with all forms of argumentation listed. My partner and I in high school often went with 8 minutes of K in the 2NC, and 5 minutes of T in the 1NR.
How should Debaters run theory arguments?

If you don't read an interp, violation and standards then it will be much less compelling, but again, you do you, and I'm comfortable with all forms of argumentation.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

I have a much more detailed paradigm on Tabroom. Just look me up there, and if you have any questions before the round starts, please ask!
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Slow down for tags

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
No impact

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Debaters ought to utilize framing based on how strategic it is for them; I have no preference regarding framework debates, but please don't use framework to just waste time.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Whatever you want.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I am a K debater; but please don't read a K you don't understand. Do whatever you're best at, I love watching a good policy debate.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Well.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Well.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Well.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

I evaluate arguments based on 1) your ability to explain warrants/give evidence why your argument is true and 2) why your argument(s) means that you should win the debate. Yay debate! :)

Kristina Buchan
Preferred Debate Styles: Lincoln Douglas, Policy

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
No preferences, verbal citations are fine.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
I like oral prompting. If it becomes clear that one partner is carrying the round it may impact my decisions.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
I like logic and reasoning in conjunction with values.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
All of them

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
If they are applicable to the round, use them. Blanket Ks are not my jam.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
I'm open to whatever debaters want to run. Obviously, some items are necessary for good clash - so run those.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Strategy is up to the debater.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
If you can run it well, run it.
What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

Play nice ;)}
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them., A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments., A large quantity of arguments prove more persuasive than a few well-developed arguments., Arguments should each be addressed individually., Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches., Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
It should be clear. Transitions like “next” are helpful with tag lines.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
It literally will not impact a thing.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
I do not have a preference.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I do not have a preference.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
You will have to do more work to prove why a kritical argument should win my ballot but I am not against them.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
I have no preference.
How should debaters run off case arguments?
I have no preference.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
I LOVE theory.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
I do not really have any preferences. I think you all should debate however you debate best. That being said, I tend to not see how kritical arguments win my ballot. I am not against them, however if you want to run them, make sure you are really showing me why my ballot is important. I tend to default to a policy option.
Ximena Bustillo
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas, Policy

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments., A large quantity of arguments prove more persuasive than a few well-developed arguments., Arguments should each be addressed individually., Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches., Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Just sign post clearly if you are moving to a new sheet/card/contention

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Not at all. You have a partner, use them.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
In LD, value and criteria should be the focal point.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I don't prefer any specific form of argument. Debate how you have been taught to and to your strengths.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I like them!! :)

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Correctly. Explain your planks if you have them. Provide evidence and warrant out your impacts. Tell me how something happens, not just that it does.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Correctly. If you run off case, make sure to really impact them out.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

Correctly. If you run off case, make sure to really impact them out.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**
How Should Debaters approach **Constructive Speeches**?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments., Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach **Rebuttal Speeches**?

Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches., Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach **Evidence**?

Evidence read in round, must be cited completely.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

Oral prompting will lead to a dock in points.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

Values, criteria, and any further arguments used in round will weigh on the decision as long as they are topical.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

Any and all forms of arguments are accepted as long as they are presented in a clear and topical manner. If they are not properly defended and explained as to why they apply to the resolved, they will not be valued in the decision of the round.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

Kritical arguments are acceptable, but should not be used as the sole argument a case is built around. Arguments should have a balance to moral and logical facts.

How should debaters run on case arguments?

Case arguments will be main deciding factors in rounds. These arguments should be addressed and debated throughout the whole round. Any and all dropped arguments that have been
considered crucial in the round will result in a dock of points.

**How should debaters run off case arguments?**

Disadvantages and counterplan arguments are valid in round. Topicality as long as presented and supported will also be valid. If arguments are not supported then they will not hold in the final decision.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

Arguments should be applicable, and supported with sufficient evidence. If arguments are a stretch they will not result in a win on argument.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

Follow the flow, focus on arguments presented in round, and stay on topic. If arguments go out of the context of the round points will be docked.
Robert Clayton
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
tag lines, citations, evidence read

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
I do not feel oral prompting is appropriate

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
The Debater should be clear, have strong links and clash

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I am interested in many kinds of arguments.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Kritiks must be very clear and run well for me to consider them

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Present them in the combination that makes the most sense.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Very clearly. I would consider any argument that linked well and was debated correctly.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Don't use theory that undermines the activity.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Just be clear and debate what you do best and I will vote for the one that does this best.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?

A large quantity of arguments prove more persuasive than a few well-developed arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?

No real preference.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

Help your partner if needed but don't gang up on your opponent.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

Value and criteria are important to clarify and stick to, if you can get your opponent to agree you may have the upper hand.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

Empirical

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

If you can run it well then go for it.

How should debaters run on case arguments?

In policy all of these things should be well defined and addressed. Stay organized and detail why your plan is necessary and how it solves best.

How should debaters run off case arguments?

I think these are great ways to spread, if you can give your opponent more than they can answer for then you can easily win the round.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Just answer the arguments directly.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

Speaker points are greatly affected by courtesy. Scoffing, eye rolling, snickering: all signs of poor sportsmanship.
**How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?**

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

**How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?**

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

**How Should Debaters approach Evidence?**

Clear tag lines with citations at the start of the card.

**How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?**

Won't.

**How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?**

Arguments should be structured around support of the Value. Criterion are used to judge which value is priority, thus the value criterion debate is very important.

**What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?**

I prefer philosophical arguments, but accept all arguments if they are argued well.

**Please explain your views on kritical arguments.**

I do not like k's. Debate the resolution.

**How should debaters run on case arguments?**

Aff should present a plan and the Neg should refute the plan based on stock issues.

**How should debaters run off case arguments?**

They need to make sure that they are well reasoned with strong explanations. If debaters are running K's they need to be able to fully and clearly articulate why the topic is open to a K.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**
Make sure they are VERY well reasoned and explained. If I can't understand it, I won't vote for you.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Marcy Curr
Preferred Debate Styles: Policy, Congress

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Rate of delivery and emphasis

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Strongly dislike verbal tag teaming.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Should weigh impacts

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
All

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I don't think that there is time or knowledge in a high school debate to develop kritical arguments enough to make them valuable. I HATE them being used as a time suck or a trick.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Students should communicate why they are arguing the issues they are arguing. I tend to have policy maker tendencies and look at REAL WORLD impact calculus.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
They should have a strong link to the case, not just the resolution. I don't like to waste time listening to a 1AC that the neg has no intention of debating. Policy is not public forum...it is not intended for each team to present cases of their own and n
How should Debaters run theory arguments?

Don't spend a lot of time arguing theory.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

Follow the rules. Be nice. Don't run time-suck, crap arguments. Debate with your opponent, don't just try to trick them into dropping stuff.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Citations of evidence read

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Oral Prompting is discouraged, the student presenting should be able to stand alone without help from another student while speaking.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
LD is a value based debate platform and should be presented/supported as such.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Philosophical arguments are best to support a value position.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Do not like K arguments and they have no place in debate.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Arguments need to show the advantages and solvency as pertaining to their case.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
They should stay on case and avoid off case arguments that detract from the true nature of good debate.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
They should not run such arguments that waste the time of the judge during the round. I am here to judge good debate and not trash arguments.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

I am a communication, stock issues judge. Communicate clearly using good oral communication skills and good sensible arguments which will help you win the round.
Angela Davis  
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas, Policy, Congress

**How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?**
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

**How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?**
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery.

**How Should Debaters approach Evidence?**
reading the in text citation is acceptable

**How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?**
It likely wouldn't affect the outcome of the debate, but it would probably affect speaker points for that team.

**How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?**
In L-D I just want you to prove to me that your value is paramount and your arguments clearly back your value up. Basically, prove to me why you are right.

**What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?**
I prefer empirical, but I'm open to anything the debaters want to do

**Please explain your views on kritical arguments.**
As long as you are in line with the resolution, I'm fine. If it seems like you are just trying to surprise your opponent to win, that won't work for me.

**How should debaters run on case arguments?**
I like any of these. Basically, prove to me why you are correct and why your plan works/their plan doesn't work. I'm pretty laissez faire.

**How should debaters run off case arguments?**
I only did Policy debate my novice year, so I don't always understand the intricacies of these, but I'm open to them being used if it's clear what is going on. T, disads, and counterplans I'm more familiar with. A K is questionable.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**
Explain what you're doing clearly to me and then go ahead

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

Don't be rude to your opponents.
Clif Davis
Preferred Debate Styles: Lincoln Douglas, Congress

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Full source & Qualifications of author / NO POWER TAGGING

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Prompting team loses

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Value with associated Criteria Paramount--Criteria is weighing mechanism

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Solid Philosophical preferred--Theoretical acceptable-Empirical is convincing

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
It MUST link to Affirmative plan & show unique damage of resolution through implementation of Affirmative

How should debaters run on case arguments?
I value Stock Issue debate--but have a policy maker--real world--bent

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Topicality (&Extra Topicality should be solid & NEVER kicked--Hate time suck arguments. IF you plan to kick the argument later DON’T run it to begin with
How should Debaters run theory arguments?

Counter plans (per IDC) MUST be non-topical [actor] / competitive [Not perm-able] [can't both exist simultaneously] / Must solve Affirmative harms uniquely--with CP Neg MUST win Solvency

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

Curteousy & ethics paramount
Susie DeBie
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas

How Should Debaters approach **Constructive Speeches**?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach **Rebuttal Speeches**?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach **Evidence**?
I prefer quote and unquote.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
It shows a lack of trust in one's partner. May make your partner feel inferior.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Their criteria should connect with their arguments.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I'm good with all, but prefer philosophical of the three.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I don't like to see it remove the focus, and direct it to something philosophical.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
I don't usually judge Policy, but I do, I'm a communications judge.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
I like clash, communication and analysis.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Topicality is less significant, but counterplans and theories interest me more.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
I prefer they speak slowly and clearly. I do not like when they use negative body language (fist shaking) or yelling to intimidate the other team. Professionalism is key to debate appropriately.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?

read tags

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

Oral prompting is okay with me.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

I have no preference. Tell me what to look at/vote on during your round. If it is value/criterium that is fine.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

I like empirical but any is okay.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

I generally do not like kritical arguments.

How should debaters run on case arguments?

Don’t spread. I am fine with talking fast but DON’T spread. Big stick impacts are okay.

How should debaters run off case arguments?

Explain topicality and theory arguments. Counter plans are okay. No dumb Ks. Four off max.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Just explain them.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

Yes, you may time yourself, but I will be timing you too.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Make taglines clear, with appropriate pacing for card names (Lastname Year). Distinguish between cited evidence and commentary - with emphasis or quote/end-quote

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Oral prompting impacts speaker points; if a teammate is being controlling of their partner, it negatively affects their ethos. It is difficult to justify a stronger argument when one member is carrying the team.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Values ground us in a hierarchy of "what matters" in the round. Criteria provide framework for how to weigh the impacts of evidence and arguments to that value. For example, if "safety" is the most important value of the round, then how do we know we are meeting that value? Sides can debate which value is important, but accepting an opponent's value is not a concession to defeat.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Philosophical arguments give context and meaning to factual arguments. Morality disconnected from reality can be harmful. The ends may justify the means; but some ends need means to justify them.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Kritical arguments must be meaningful. Arguing the topicality or scope of the resolution may be merited, but the kritic should effectively challenge the fiat (that is, the understanding that
the resolution is accepted by the debate). Racism, sexism, ablism, and other ethical critiques must be warranted. I will not deny evidence because its source is considered "racist, ableist, etc." unless the otherwise effectively shows how that evidence is inadmissible as such.

**How should debaters run on case arguments?**

In policy, it is helpful for me to use these as sign posts for flow. Usually, a debate ends up focusing on the points of clash, but I like to flow as much as possible so I can reconstruct the debate in my mind. In LD and PF, these terms can be very helpfu

**How should debaters run off case arguments?**

Very carefully. Kritiks need context; counterplans are dangerous - because I expect these counterplans to meet the same stock issue integrity as the opponents. Disads are most easily effective to apply in arguments. Topicality arguments should be signific

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

I don't recommend them. I accept that debate should be educational, so arguments, burdens, etc. that disadvantage or abuse that intention may be heard. I know enough about the rules not to be hoodwinked by them. If you run a kritik, I do expect the oppone

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

I am biased to believe that debate is fundamentally a communication art. Competition rules and practices conform to that mission. That is, debate style adapts to effectively communication, not competitive tactics. Speaking quickly and clearly is an advantage, but screaming out a case with veins bulging does not make me sympathetic to your side. ETHOS and PATHOS are important, and in the past, I cannot deny that the tone, attitude, and professionalism of the debaters has influence my decision. If you control the information in the round - if you teach me as your judge - I will be more inclined to side with you than if I feel you yelled or were rude to me and your opponent.

Finally, speak to me - I am the one you are convincing - even during CX.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Line by line, sign posting

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
none

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Tie all arguments, extensions, and impacts back to v/c

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
philosophical

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
If done well, I enjoy them

How should debaters run on case arguments?
solvency

How should debaters run off case arguments?
disads

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
The debater must create or break the link depending what side they are.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Persuade me with extensions of evidence-why should I care?
Donnie Drobny
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas, Policy

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Clear tags with proper oral citations

How would OralPrompting affect your decision?
Over reliance on oral prompting may negatively impact speaker points and, in extreme cases could impact the final ballot. Team debates should remain team events.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Clear links please

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
A philosophical basis with empirical support would be best

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I'm not overly fond of them.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Stock issues should be present in Policy Debate. Planks are not necessary.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Consistently. CPs should address uniqueness and solvency. I dislike PIC's (and PIKs) and am very likely to vote with aff theory on them. K's should include a realistic and reasonable alt.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Theory is fine if appropriate. Please don't run it as a time sink.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
How Should Debaters approach **Constructive Speeches**?

A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach **Rebuttal Speeches**?

Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach **Evidence**?

citations before the evidence

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

I prefer only the debater who is at the podium speak. Absent extraordinary circumstances, I will not listen to the content of the seated debater's comments.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

The value and criteria are the lens through which the other arguments will be viewed.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

Depends on the circumstances. The debaters should use persuasion to convince me to accept their approach.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

I will only vote on a K in extraordinary circumstances.

How should debaters run on case arguments?

I am a stock issues judge. Debaters should focus on the stock issues.

How should debaters run off case arguments?

DAs and counterplans are generally more convincing to me that Ks.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?

Theory arguments may have a place in the round, but it is unwise to run them without regard for the stock issues.
What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

If your speech is too rapid, I will put down my pen so you know to slow down.
Elizabeth Elfering
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Citations should be provided as author, year, source.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Oral prompting in crossfire is acceptable. All 4 debaters should participate in Grand Cross.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Each debater has the equal burden to prove the validity of his/her side of the resolution as a general principle.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
The debaters are equally obligated to focus the debate on the central questions of the resolution.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
No opinion.
How should debaters run on case arguments?
All are fine as long as they are consistent throughout

How should debaters run off case arguments?
topicality and disadvantages

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
as long as they pertain to the arguments presented in first speeches then i am fine with either.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Be courteous - do not bully. Clash is good and I am fine with aggressiveness just don't cross the line.
Darlene Eslinger
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them., A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
I like "quote and unquote"

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Excessive prompting shows a lack of trust in the partner but occasional prompting is OK.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
I want their value and criteria to connect to arguments

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I am OK with all types but prefer philosophical and empirical

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
in general I am not a fan of kritical arguments unless very well done

How should debaters run on case arguments?
I like clash, communication, analysis, impacts

How should debaters run off case arguments?
topicality and disadvantages are relevant to me, but Kritiks and counterplans need to be REALLY well done.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Briefly and succinctly. They should not ignore basic arguments to run counterplans. To quote a fellow judge."I have little patience for involved topicality arguments unless you run a case that is not topical."

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

I like politeness and professionalism. I like analysis
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Debaters ought to provide citations of evidence cited any time they are providing source information.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
It depends on the context in which it is being utilized. Debaters should have a solid grasp of the information they are relaying, and therefore, it may impact my decision in a close round.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
A value must have a measurable criteria on which it can be substantiated. These measurements should be clearly defined and form a logical connection to the value and the argument.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
My preference is empirical arguments that are substantiated by evidence.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
If a debater has a VALID argument of a resolution, they ought to be able to argue that position.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
My preference is for debaters to prove solvency and the advantages of their arguments. All arguments will be judged equally, however.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
As long as it is not ridiculous, debaters should be able to use any logical argument they chose.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

They should remember that the debate is about the resolution, and not necessarily the theory.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

Debaters should always remain civil and use their best judgement at all times during the round.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Clear tags

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Negatively if it is used more then occasionally

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Clear value and criteria

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
All of the above

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Not nearly as important as on case arguments

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Very critical; must slow direct clash

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Not as strong as on case; should not be generic

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
My least favorite

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Professional clear communication is important
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Citations

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
If it negatively affects believability or authenticity, or comes from a lack of preparation, it will impact my decision against them. If two teams are equal, and one used oral prompting while the other didn't, I am likely to judge in favor of the team tha

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Debaters have their own set values and criteria which they should uphold throughout. The team that best supports their set values and arguments through arguments and evidence should win.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Empirical

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
They can be effective, so long as there is solid empirical evidence to support them. I appreciate a well-supported stance that differs from the "norm."

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Significance and advantages.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Disadvantages and counterplans.
How should Debaters run theory arguments?

With respect toward the opponent(s). ie, "I understand your point, however, this is why it won't work."

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

None.
Melanie Gonzales
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Give appropriate verbal cues when evidence is presented.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
A few words are acceptable but excessive prompting will weigh negatively.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
State each clearly so can be included in flow.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
theoretical

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Can be used

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Make case clear, no matter which type of case you run. Any type of arguments are acceptable.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Make sure your reasoning for running them is clear and logical.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Not preferred unless can clearly and concisely explain why doing it.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them, A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
clear and slow

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
will not

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
with well-reasoned analysis

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
philosophical

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
confuse me generally

How should debaters run on case arguments?
slowly and clearly

How should debaters run off case arguments?
largely confuse me

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
probably an ineffective strategy, it would confuse me

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
traditional NFL judging criteria from 15 years past
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them., A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments., Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Tag and author should be clearly read/signposted before returning to a higher rate of delivery.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
If one partner dominates all CX/CF opportunities, it will reflect poorly on the speaker points of the silent partner.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
All contentions must flow through the criterion. The Criterion is the most important part of the case.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I prefer theoretical-philosophical arguments; at the end of the day I need a moral reason to vote for you, not merely a material advantage.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I greatly enjoy and appreciate kritiks, provided they are properly linked.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Without winning stock issues, you will not win the round.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
I prefer DA, CP, and K in the 1NC, though there is flexibility on Ks.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Theory and T without standards and voters are dead to me. Generally I have a low threshold for T.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

I am generally a tabula rasa judge. I will call for any cards relating to war (high threshold). I prefer probability over magnitude on impact calc.
Nick Grunig
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas, Policy

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
And, next, etc... to signal going to the next card. Read the tags and author dates slow. Cool with most formatting just make it clear what your analysis is and what the card is and have a full card or contextualized card for me

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
If both teams agree to I am fine with it

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
If you are going to run a val/cri treat it as a framework and not an argument in-itself. Remember if you win cal/cri but lose your case you have nothing left. Your arguments are what really matter, make sure they have good link scenarios and if you can, impact out a lot.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I am fine with any, I have a minor in philosophy, working on my major in pol sci, and I can keep up with basically any well formed argument

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I've picked plenty of them up before, but please be good at running them

How should debaters run on case arguments?
I'm fine with stock issue policy, solvency is always a go to that I prefer seeing in most rounds.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
fine, links are nice. Ks, cps, t, are all acceptable arguments for neg ground

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

again I am okay with it, though like I said I like good link scenarios

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

Impact calc is great, and voters get ever so important at the end for most debate types, policy I don't expect tbh, but pf and LD I do. When giving voters you need to tell me which arguments you are winning on, why you are winning on them, and what it does for my ballot i.e. it gives you offense in some way. If you tell me to evaluate something I will. I've been doing debate for 7 years now (4 years of high school and 3 years of college) I know a bit about how this game works
Zacharyah Harbauer
Preferred Debate Styles: Lincoln Douglas, Policy

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
have a marked copy

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
it will not

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Use it as a framework to evaluate the round

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
no preference

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
They are fine

How should debaters run on case arguments?
on the case page associated

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Develop them fully throughout the constructives, block, and 2nr

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
thoroughly
What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
How Should Debaters approach **Constructive Speeches**?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them., A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments., A large quantity of arguments prove more persuasive than a few well-developed arguments., Arguments should each be addressed individually., Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach **Rebuttal Speeches**?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches., Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach **Evidence**?

Tag and card is fine

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

It won't impact my decision

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

However they want to

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

I prefer empirical arguments, but I'm open to any of these

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

K's are fine

How should debaters run on case arguments?

They should run them? I don't have a preference for how these are run

How should debaters run off case arguments?
I don't have a preference how off case is run

How should Debaters run theory arguments?

I don't have a preference on how theory is run

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

WARRANTS AND IMPACT CALC
Marcus Hochstrasser
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas, Policy

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Please itemize cards by category, provide tag lines, citations, and read marked evidence.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
I am not a proponent of oral prompting. A minor amount (a reminder) is OK, but excessive oral prompting is frowned upon.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
The debater should make it a point to argue why their value and criteria are the considerations for/against the resolution. The evidence should show the impacts, harms, or benefits of the debater’s position, and how they tie in with their value.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I do not have a preference as to what type of arguments are used in the round. I vote for the debater who has put forth a better argument based on impacts either beneficial or harmful.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I approve of kritical argumentation, but require thorough explanation of the argument. If I don’t understand what you are kritiking, then I don’t feel like I can vote for it.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Please run on case arguments as itemized and organized as possible. Evidence that directly refutes the affirmative is great, but empirical and hypothetical arguments can be valid to me.

**How should debaters run off case arguments?**

Please run off case arguments as organized and labeled as possible. I don't mind if off case arguments are dropped or conceded towards the rebuttals if those arguments are no longer applicable. Turns against off case can have a negative impact on the nega

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

Please be as organized as possible. Please be specific and explain clearly your arguments, how they link, etc. Don't assume that I will understand the idea right out of the box.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

I do not approve of debaters who become rude or passive aggressive during the round. Please be kind and considerate of each other.
Christine Hubbard
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Begin the card by using the authors last name and date (when given) and end the card by using the phrase "cut the card" or end quote.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Although I do not like oral prompting as it makes the teams appear weaker, it is not usually a deciding factor in my vote.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
They should all clearly link together.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
1st empirical and then philosophical and then theoretical.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Kritical arguments are fine as long as they are put together well.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
It's up to the debaters and the debate.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
It's up to the debaters and depends on the round.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
It's up to the debaters and depends on the round

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

Sign post, students should time themselves and their opponents, and voters at the end... and no I do not time road maps
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments., Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?

Source, author, date

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

minimal oral prompting is preferred

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

All arguments should follow the value. Argument should support the value.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

Theoretical and empirical. What is needed best to support a coherent argument.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

I am a traditional LD judge. No kriticals allowed.

How should debaters run on case arguments?

A strong argument will include all of the above.

How should debaters run off case arguments?

Topicality above the rest.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Use evidence before theory when possible.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Kenneth Hunter
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Policy

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Tag Lines

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
May decrease score of person getting it.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Values are key all else should support them

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
No preference

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I prefer concrete arguments but will listen to Kritical if done well.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Prefer harms, inherency, plan, solvency then advantages

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Prefer disadvantages but will listen others

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Prefer concise, simple arguments

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Like people who define terms so I don't have to guess what they are thinking
Libby Jordan
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas

**How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?**
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

**How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?**
Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

**How Should Debaters approach Evidence?**
You should tagline everywhere you go, helps every listener to follow the debate

**How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?**
I judge based on arguments and organization. If they start to abuse something drastically then I consider it.

**How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?**
Every argument should link back to your value and criterion, a good case does this to remind the listener why the argument is important

**What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?**
I don't have a preference as long as they have credible evidence and it applies to the round

**Please explain your views on kritical arguments.**
I don't do policy for a reason. I don't think we should metadebate, just stick to the topic

**How should debaters run on case arguments?**
They need to explain why their case is more advantageous or important than the opponent's, and stay organized

**How should debaters run off case arguments?**
Explain why the opponent's case wouldn't work as well or is not as good as yours. Use taglines as you go to stay organized.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**
Sparingly, metadebating distracts from the overall debate

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

Debate is about persuasion, the way to be the most persuasive is if someone can understand you and wants to listen to you. Presentation should be clear, concise, and understandable (no excessive speed)
Michael Jurgensmeier
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters., Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Citations are key. I need to know where the information came from and what is the debaters original thought and what is someone elses work.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Not sure.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
I want your value laid out clear near the beginning of your constructive. The arguments should be clear and direct.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Philosophical

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Not sure.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Not sure.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Topicality

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Not sure
What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

I am not a fan of catastrophizing or using slippery slope. If the phrase "dystopian hellscape" is said by a debater I tend to tune them out.
Meagan Kelsey
Preferred Debate Styles: Lincoln Douglas, Policy, Congress

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Emphasis on Taglines/Authors/Date.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
I should not have to input into a debate but if a debater doesn't follow paradigm I will interject for fairness in round, however it will negatively affect the person who I had to interject with.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
They should clearly explain how their value and criterion uphold or critique the resolution, and prove why their will be better on either side. Direct clash.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I will evaluate both as long as they are ran well however I go for emperics mostly.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
They should be easily explained and ran well, I don't have much experience with them in LD so the argument would have to be explained extremely well.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Regular style, harms and Inherency and solvency are key points that should be touched every speech.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Clearly and concisely. Topicality shouldn't take a ton of time if DA's or CP's are to be ran with it.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

Explain clearly with simple terminology.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

Clear speaks, well constructed arguments with little contradictions/repetition. Speed is okay AS LONG AS Taglines/Author/Date can be easily flowed.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments., A large quantity of arguments prove more persuasive than a few well-developed arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?

Tag line, Citation, card. Make it clear.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

I don't like it. It's sloppy debating.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

You should understand your value and value criteria in a deep way, and it should be integral to your case.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

No preference. Tell me what to value.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

Not it LD or PuFo.

How should debaters run on case arguments?

No preference. Just make it clear.

How should debaters run off case arguments?

No preference. Just make it clear.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
No Preference

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

Real-world impacts are good. Speak clearly, and tell me how to vote.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?

Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?

Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?

Tag lines

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

It won't

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

Arguments should align with the value criteria and it’s always nice when the opponents can be turned to support your v/c

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

Empirical highly preferred. Theoretical is ok but philosophical is least preferred

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

They can be used to support or negate a position but prefer they are also backed up with evidence and reasoning

How should debaters run on case arguments?

Solvency is preferable but all should be sign posted to a specific contention and tied overall to case

How should debaters run off case arguments?

In LD and PF these are my least favorite but as long as they are well tied to ones own value and advances your position and doesn't just attack the opponent

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Prefer not in LD and PF

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

Be respectful. Love a good debate but have little tolerance for petty comments or disrespectful, it just makes you look bad.
Kaden Marchetti
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Policy

How Should Debaters approach **Constructive Speeches**?
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach **Rebuttal Speeches**?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach **Evidence**?
No preference

**How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?**
No preference/will not effect decision

**How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?**
Only run a value/FW if you are going to use it. Use it for impact calc in voter speech.

**What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?**
Empirical > Logical > Philosophical

**Please explain your views on kritical arguments.**
I love kritical arguments but more common than not they are not run well or the link is not well constructed. You must also remember to give me an alt.

**How should debaters run on case arguments?**
Aff must win all stock issues. If the debate boils down to advantages vs disadvantages then I need impact calc. You can run whatever you want.

**How should debaters run off case arguments?**
Run whatever you are comfortable with. I will vote off anything.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

Run whatever you are comfortable with. I will vote off anything.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

Please extend arguments throughout speeches.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
No preference

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
None- as long as it is minimal

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
No preference

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
No preference

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
No preference

How should debaters run on case arguments?
No preference

How should debaters run off case arguments?
No preference

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Non preference

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Be clear! Be logical.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?

Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?

Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?

Citations and the evidence

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

Substantial oral prompting will be looked at in a negative manner and will have an impact on my decision in the round.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

All arguments should support the competitors value.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

Any type of argument that helps support a value position is preferred.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

I believe in traditional Lincoln Douglas debating, so NO kritical arguments.

How should debaters run on case arguments?

That should all be included

How should debaters run off case arguments?

They should all be included

How should Debaters run theory arguments?

Only run theory arguments if completely unavoidable with clear abuse.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Listen to one another and don't spend your prep/crossfire just asking to see cards!!
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
No preference

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
It would have little affect.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
They should use their criterion as a weighing mechanism for their value.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I prefer a more cost-benefit analysis approach which can then uphold the value.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I don’t like them.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
A stock issues case and an advantage based case are both fine. Please slow down.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
I’m fond of disadvantages and counterplans as long as they are explained properly. I find it difficult to understand topicality and kritiks

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Please explain it

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
None
Madison Miles
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas, Policy, Congress

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Tag lines and author's last and year

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
No impact if not disrespectful

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Value and Criteria should work together to further push the overall position that they are arguing. A substantive philosophical (Value and Criteria) debate will be held higher than just repetitive arguments.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
All are fine. Prefer philosophical.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Allowed. Just don't be abusive.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
As they wish.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
As they wish.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
As they wish. Flesh it out, don't just say it and leave.
What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

Respect your opponent(s) even if you don’t respect their views.
Paul Montreuil
Preferred Debate Styles: Lincoln Douglas, Policy

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should each be addressed individually. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Author's last name, date

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
That's what speaker points are for.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
All of the above

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
All of the above

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
When they're great, they're great. When debaters haven't read the literature, they're awful.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
CASE ARGUMENTS ARE SWEET!!!

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Quickly and in the 1nc

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Articulate them with warrants

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Be nice. Do line by line. Clip cards and I'll ruin your life.
Christina Mottishaw
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Citations

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
I do not look favorably on oral prompting and will see the team as negative for using it.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
I prefer value positions to be done robustly and would like strong arguments to support values.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Theoretical and empirical

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I prefer to avoid them.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Solvency, significance, and the strength of the plan mean the most to me.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
All are acceptable so long as they are on topic and based on the plan presented.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Theory plans must be based in some sort of reality; I do not like theory plans based on conjecture alone

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
I prefer professionalism and courtesy; actions that are rude or unprofessional weaken my opinion of a team.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
No preferences

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Will impact speaker points negatively

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Up to debaters

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
All are ok/can be persuasive

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Ok in policy debate, not in other debate types

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Up to debaters

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Up to debaters.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Up to debaters

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
I appreciate good clash— addressing the other side’s points not just repeating your points. Explain to
me why your argument is better than the other side’s argument. In rebuttals focus on winning the debate, not trying to win every argument that has been in dispute during the round.

I was a former high school policy debater so am very familiar with that style, but I have judged rounds this year in LD and PF. However, I respect (and expect the debaters to understand) the differences between the different styles of debate. I don’t judge the same way in every type of debate, so please don’t debate in an LD or PF round the same way you would in a policy round. Accordingly, speed/spread in policy is ok, but not effective in PF or LD (ie you won’t lose my ballot in PF or LD because you spoke too fast, you will lose because your speed detracts from developing your arguments and making them persuasive to me). Note, even in policy ensure that when you read the evidence fast the card is still comprehensible. Kritiks are ok in policy, not in LD or PF.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?

When referring to your own evidence or your opponents, follow the format of Tag Line, Author, Year and finally the specific portion of the evidence being addressed. Otherwise, the attack and or rebutted will not be flowed.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

I don’t think it will.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

Explain and impact out how and why your value is more important than your opponents. Utilize the criterion and arguments you’ve developed to be credible weighing mechanisms for your value. Finally explain and impact out to me why your weighing mechanisms are more applicable than your opponents.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

Empirical arguments are preferred as long as you are not running extremely progressive arguments. Theoretical arguments such as a counterplan that would allow for a change are acceptable as long as it is explained thoroughly. Philosophical arguments are

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

I don’t like to kritical arguments. I view these arguments to be pointless to an educational debate. It doesn’t progress anyone’s understanding of the resolution, value/criterion, or empirical evidence.
How should debaters run on case arguments?
I prefer not to judge policy debate.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
I prefer not to judge policy debate.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
I prefer not to judge policy.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Please be respectful and courteous to your opponent. I will NOT flow if you are spreading. Please keep your emotions in check.
Charlie Nelson
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Policy

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?

A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?

I prefer signposting before every card so I can properly flow the debate. IE: before delivering cards for the first advantage in the 1AC, the debater should say "Advantage 1." Taglines should be short and summarize the main idea of the card. Verbal citations

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

Oral prompting will only result in a loss of points if the partner not engaged in CX answers more than one question. Debaters are encouraged to pass notes or hand over evidence as opposed to oral prompting to prevent a loss of points.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

My knowledge of LD is limited, but I believe that the value should be the main focus in an LD debate. Criteria should directly support the value, and any arguments made should be focused on why the debater's value should be preferred over their opponents.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

Empirical evidence is preferred, but it's always interesting to watch a good philosophical debate.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

I enjoy kritical arguments and think they make debates more interesting. That being said, the kritiques should be well-developed enough to stay relevant throughout the whole debate, otherwise it feels like a waste of time.
How should debaters run on case arguments?

I expect very little from on case arguments. I do like alt-causes to harms and debates on solvency above all other arguments, but, like I said, pretty much everything is free game as long as you're following the Idaho Debate Code.

How should debaters run off case arguments?

If a topicality argument is ran, then the negative needs to provide an alternative definition and why it should be preferred over the affirmative's. Topicality arguments should not be on words that are diametrically influenced by each other unless definit

How should Debaters run theory arguments?

Theory evidence must be provided to the judge for examination before it will be considered.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

Please slow down on signposting and tag lines. Refrain from sarcasm and unnecessary comedic quips as they're very unprofessional.
Kennedi Newman
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas, Congress

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Directly State

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
If used excessively, it might create a negative impact

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Debaters should use values, criteria, and arguments to support a value position in a way that allows the argument to flow and progress logically. Contributes to the moral argument.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
theoretical or empirical

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
To change worldview or a moral case.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
A Priori

How should debaters run off case arguments?
B Priori

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Limit them, they are not that important.
What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?

A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually, Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?

Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?

Tag lines

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

It won't impact my decision

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

They need to use the criteria as a weighing measure to show that they support their value. Impacts should be connected to the value.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

whichever

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

I am fine with them

How should debaters run on case arguments?

however

How should debaters run off case arguments?

however

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
however

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

I like to see clash and argumentation, not repetition.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. A large quantity of arguments prove more persuasive than a few well-developed arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
No preference, as long as the evidence is in clear support of the debater's argument and that connection is made during speaking time. As a judge, I should not have to connect the dots for the debater.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
I generally let the students know tag-teaming is discouraged simply because I have specific amount of time to judge each debater and if you're tagging out to your partner, that's less time I have to judge you. It doesn't impact my decision on who won the

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Evidence for value criterion should be given in the form of recognized political philosophers and their theories or established criticism lenses -- Socrates, Nitche, Feminism, etc. Evidence that delves too deeply into policy (empirical) belongs in every other form of debate.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Philosophical and theoretical. LD is designed to debate the moral framework behind policy decisions to help policy makers understand WHY they hold the values they do and crystallize those values in order to guide future, actual policy.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Personally, I'm more of a utilitarian... but in LD if a team wants to argue deontologically, I'm open to it as long as they make that clear from the beginning. That way the opposing team doesn't spend time arguing the consequences, that the original team has chosen not to consider in their argument.

How should debaters run on case arguments?

In a logical and prioritized order -- remember you have a limited amount of time and structuring the use of that time in an inverted pyramid is a great idea. Put the most critical-path items and evidence at the top of your time, and lesser but still supp

How should debaters run off case arguments?

Topicality should only be run as a last resort. I like to think about Topicality as Jurisdiction in the real world. You're never going to show up to the ICJ or actual Congress on a day scheduled for open debate and nit-pick about jurisdiction. Jurisdiction

How should Debaters run theory arguments?

If one team feels the other's argument is unfair, they should note it quickly at the top of their remarks and then move on and build the best case they can. Regardless of whether they think their opponent's case is unfair, the debate isn't stopping and we

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

I love to see speed with clarity! If your mouth can move as fast as your brain, by all means show that off! However, speed does not always make for a good debater. I enjoy unique and creative approaches to a topic and in an opponent's rebuttal. These are the future thinkers, policy makers, and voters of America and we are in desperate need of creative solutions to centuries' old problems.
Ortmann, Paul
Preferred Debate Styles: Lincoln Douglas, Policy

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
I like the citation first so it's clear that the material is not something written by the debater. i.e. "Smith in 2018 states:..... 'end quote". But, as long as I can distinguish what's quoted and what's original by the debater, that's what matters. It'

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Prompting is O.K. as long as the prompter doesn't take over.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
They should explain the appropriateness of their value and criteria for the resolution and their case and briefly explain their interpretation of what their values and criteria mean.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
All work but the philosophical and theoretical arguments also need to be rational... An empirical argument can carry more weight with me but not if it's clearly an isolated case or two.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
It's hard to make them without appearing to be complaining about the resolution. I'd prefer debaters to simply prepare their best case to address resolution.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
I have no preference. Their job is to make a convincing argument using their evidence and skills.
How should debaters run off case arguments?

Topicality arguments and kritiks sometimes come across as cop-outs. Again, just make a convincing argument about the resolution. I select winners based on the strength and delivery of their case. Period. Moving the debate to something other than the r

How should Debaters run theory arguments?

Briefly commenting on debate theory issues; topicality, etc. is fine, but DO NOT turn it into a debate about debate. That too suggests the team has a weak case on the resolution.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

I have a pet peeve about pronunciation. Teams should be familiar enough with their cases to pronounce every word in the evidence they plan to read correctly.
Kerry Payton-Jenkins
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Policy

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
tag lines and citations

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
I'm fine with it.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Just make sure that your arguments support and are in line with your value and criteria.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
No preference overall, but I do like empirical arguments the best

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
If it's well done, then it works for me. I have seen some K's that should have been rethought. They don't always work, so if you are running it, it better be good.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
I like a solid framework and I'm good with significance, inherency, advantages and solvency. However the student wants to run the case I can adapt, just make it clear when you are moving on from one thing to another. Structure is important to me to hav

How should debaters run off case arguments?
You can run DA's and topicality and counterplans, again be careful with a K. Make sure you can
adequately support it if you are running it.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

No preference, just use solid structure so I can follow it and make sure it is relevant to the plan or counterplan.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

Clear concise communication. If you are speaking fast, slow down for the contentions or tag lines. Adhere to the rules of debate for your event. Clash is fine, but be respectful. It will cost you speaker points if you are not respectful. I will be flowing, so make sure that your arguments are fully supported.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
All evidence should be presented according to the guidelines in the IDC. Otherwise, I prefer to hear citations and it should be clear when evidence is being quoted versus paraphrased.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Oral prompting by a team mate will likely negatively affect the speaker points of a debater that needs prompting to assist them in making an effective presentation. It may negatively impact the prompter’s speaker points, if it is deemed to be an unnecessary.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
I think debaters should have good logical arguments for their choice of values and criteria. These concepts should be consistent with each other.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I do not specifically prefer one type of argument over another. Rather the quality of any given argument will be weighed against the quality of an argument using a different approach. It would be difficult to see a situation where a well-documented empirical argument would be used over a better, more persuasive philosophical argument.

Please explain your views on critical arguments.
I have no bias against critical arguments. I am more concerned with whether the argument is persuasive.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Debaters should, when possible, run on case arguments in order to get a good clash with the opponents affirmative case.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Topicality should be presented in the 1NC and be clearly defined and supported. The disadvantages, kritiks and counterplans should be logical or well supported with evidence that is on point and appropriately link to the opposition's plan.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

Theory arguments seem to be centered on avoiding debate by having a separate debate. I do not find this persuasive. I am open, but will likely not vote on theory.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

Ultimately, I will vote on persuasive arguments that are within the parameters outlined by the rules of debating in Idaho. Good luck.
Teya Peck
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
State clearly what they are and why you're using them.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
If and only if it does not distract and is respectful.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
I think their passion and confidence on the information they have should show through.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Theoretical, if supported by strong evidence. Empirical, again if supported by strong evidence.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Critical arguments if valid and supported.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Make sure it's clear, understandable, and I'm taught. I drop circle arguments.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Listen to each other and make the run off case argument valid.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Clear, concise, and valid.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

0-1 years
Years of Judging Experience
Teach me
Justin Petersen
Preferred Debate Styles:Public Forum, Congress

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Name and date published.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Will not impact my decision.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
With statistics, evidence, sources.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Empirical

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I would rather vote on empirical evidence rather than theory/speculation.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
With the support of statistics, evidence, sources.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
With the support of statistics, evidence, sources.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Show me the big picture and prove that you can think outside the box.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Date and author

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Not at all

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Value and Criterion are very important to me.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
All of the above

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I'm okay with them

How should debaters run on case arguments?
NA

How should debaters run off case arguments?
NA

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
NA

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Be respectful
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Author and year/date is fine

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
No impact

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Just make your framework/standard/criteria clear for substantiating offense

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
These are all value positions in themselves, so all of them. Whichever ones work for you.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Encouraged. Just make your framing and alt clear

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Run them in a way that gets you offense and I'm fine.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
I don't really like it when people run Theory and Kritiks and then kick the alt because it tells me you clearly don't care about what you're running, but I'll still pick you up on whatever you can win on. I love counterplans.
How should Debaters run theory arguments?

As much as I hate it, everything, even frivolous T is okay. If I see you using it on inexperienced teams just to be jerks and make the round noneducational, there's a solid chance I'll drop you. It's all about aesthetics

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

I'm okay with anything from a stock aff to Tropicality and the Mao K. I can do both line by line and crystallization. I can handle speed but it's been a while...I'll let you know slow or clear. Just make your framing and offense clear and don't be jerks. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have before the round. Have fun!
Logan Potter  
Preferred Debate Styles: Policy, Congress

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?

A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.
A large quantity of arguments prove more persuasive than a few well-developed arguments.
Arguments should each be addressed individually.
Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?

Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.
Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.
Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.
Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?

Just read me a clear tag line and your author's last name/year. I just need to keep track of your cards.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

Do what you want!

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

Do what you want as far as arguments. Value/criterion is not required, so choose how you want to frame your case.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

Whatever best fits your case.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

They're fun and effective if you run them correctly. If you don't, your chances of winning are not nearly as high.

How should debaters run on case arguments?

However they want, just give me an effective road map and signposting throughout.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
These are fun! Only run them if they’re relevant, not just because you want to.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

Do whatever you want!

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

Don't be rude, but clash is cool.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?

Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?

Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?

I prefer tag lines and oral citation. Example: "According to Dr. Tom at ISU says" then further reference to the card can be used with a tag line like "ISU card"

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

I am fine with it to a degree. If it turns into talk over your partner then it will negatively affect my decision.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

I believe that Lincoln Douglas is a value debate thus all of the arguments made must be made in a way that strengthen both your value and criterion. And they must be based in morals rather than something like Cross Benefit analysis.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

If you can justify it in round then I'm fine with pretty much whatever but I do tend to enjoy theoretical and philosophical debates.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

If you can convince me then it's fine. But I think if you run a K that is goofy or nonsensical then it can cost you my ballot.

How should debaters run on case arguments?

I think that solvency tends to be my biggest voter in rounds. I need to know your plan will actually work!
How should debaters run off case arguments?
If you can convince me I'll take it.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Convince me. I don't like nonsense.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
I need tag lines and clear organization especially in rebuttals. If I can't flow I can't judge the round.
Kelsey Rain
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas, Policy, Congress

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
I need citations and evidence to prove or disprove the arguments in the debate.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
It won't

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Criteria should prove their moral position. Criteria should be expanded on. Value criteria debate is a framework. It is not the center of the debate.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
All of the above.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I like them so long as they are relevant to the round and don't completely take away from education.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
As long as they sign post and follow the flow, I don't care.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Topicality and CP if won on Neg means a Neg ballot, but I like on case to still be addressed.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Theory is fine but I also like on case.
What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

Flow judge with a touch of communication expectations. I have to be able to follow the debate to follow the flow. I also enjoy impact calculus.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them., A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Slowly and clearly.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Negatively

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Strongly linked

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
All

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Not favorable.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Yes.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Yes to Ts and DAs.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
To support concrete arguments.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Smile, have fun, be nice!
Braden Ridgewell  
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas, Congress

**How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?**

Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

**How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?**

Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

**How Should Debaters approach Evidence?**

No preference

**How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?**

It won't

**How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?**

Should be brought up in all of their arguments.

**What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?**

Empirical

**Please explain your views on kritical arguments.**

I don't mind if a team runs a 'K', just make strong note of it during speech.

**How should debaters run on case arguments?**

No preference - just make it clear.

**How should debaters run off case arguments?**

No preference - just make it clear.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

No preference - just make it clear.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

0-1 years

Years of Judging Experience
Courtesy and Respect towards not only the judges, but opponents as well goes a long way and will be noted.
Holly Romriell
Preferred Debate Styles: Lincoln Douglas, Policy, Congress

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Slow down for tag lines, cite author and date, designate "next", "and" and "cut the card there" when applicable.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
It won't. I allow oral prompting when I judge.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
I would consider it framework. It sets the perspective in which to view the round.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I have no preference. I appreciate whichever arguments best apply to the topic.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I don't mind kritics. However, they need to have a strong link and a measurable alt for me to consider them a voting issue in the round.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Stock issues are elemental to an affirmative case. However, if the affirmative chooses not to run stock issues in a round in favor of theory or a kritik, I would definitely entertain those types of arguments if the case was conscientiously framed, well de

How should debaters run off case arguments?
I feel all of the above are valid strategies for a negative case.
How should Debaters run theory arguments?

I would consider any and all well developed arguments in any form of debate. I don’t like to limit the creativity of our debaters by having a strict paradigm. I would not want to miss out on a truly exciting and inspiring debate because I had too many o

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

Help me help you by making every argument clear and concise no matter which speed you run it; I am willing to hear any argument you want to run, just please don’t leave me to connect the dots.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Easily understandable

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Since it is not prohibited, I am OK with it - at a minimum level.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
In a logical and understandable manner.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I look for arguments that are understandable and logical.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
OK as long as they logically support the position.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Logical and understandable

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Logical and understandable

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Logical and understandable

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
I like to see professionalism and courteous behavior.
Meagan Schrey
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas

How Should Debaters approach **Constructive Speeches**?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach **Rebuttal Speeches**?
Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach **Evidence**?
taglines

How would **Oral Prompting** affect your decision?
I am not a fan. I'm okay with a little tag teaming, but would prefer that the person being asked is answering the bulk of the questions. If a team tag-teams too much I do take that into consideration as to how prepared the debaters were coming to the round.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Value and criteria are the premise of your case and thus should make sense within your debate round. V and C are not the most important aspect that I judge on, but they could be used to sway me from one side to the other so should be argued.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I prefer empirical arguments. When weighing an argument I look at the facts and the realistic outcomes that could/would occur. Sob stories about 1 occurrence won't evoke favor. I want data and numbers.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I am okay with them, but they need to be topical and make sense in a realistic application.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Tell me WHY. I don't advocate change for change, I want you to explain to me WHY the status
quo is ineffective, WHY there is a problem, and HOW you're going to fix it with your plan. I prefer plans with detail, simply "we should change this because it's b

**How should debaters run off case arguments?**

Similar to on case, I want the WHYS and HOWS. Push theory and disadvantages. Explain to me WHY the status quo is the better option and WHY the new proposed plan will not work. I am okay with counterplans, but you have to NAIL it, not just throw something

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

Specificity is important to me. Too specific and the plan will help no one, too vague and the plan will not be effective in its implementation. In debate, go for the plan text, what about it specifically will/ will not work

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**
Harley Schroyer
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
It is preferred that debaters provide taglines as well as marked evidence cards/pieces.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Oral prompting will reflect on the capability of the debaters being prompted, as well as the preparedness and utilization of teamwork.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Debaters should use their values and criteria in order to support their value position by providing solid argument which shows the debater not only upholds their own value position but that their position is also more sound.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I do not have a specific preference.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Kritical arguments should provide clear connections in the philosophical mindset that challenges the opposing teams "world view".

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Debaters should run on case arguments focused on solvency and advantages.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Debaters should run off case arguments on disadvantages.
How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Debaters can run any form they wish so long as it fits the flow of round.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Amber Schulz
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas, Congress

**How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?**

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

**How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?**

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

**How Should Debaters approach Evidence?**

Clear tag lines and be clear on when you cut card.

**How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?**

I do not like tag teaming and no oral prompting

**How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?**

Value should be clear and supported throughout your case. Use your criteria to show me how you weigh the round. All arguments must be tied back to your value and criteria.

**What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?**

I prefer empirical arguments.

**Please explain your views on kritical arguments.**

I don't like kritical arguments in LD

**How should debaters run on case arguments?**

I believe presenting all of the stock issues helps support the overall case. I believe in order to have a well rounded debate you should touch on all of these.

**How should debaters run off case arguments?**

I am not a fan of counterplans, I prefer straight up stock issues, topicality and disadvantages. I
do not like counter plans and kritiks.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

Theory arguments are basically kritiks so I do not particularly like them being ran in a debate. Stick to cold hard facts that support your case.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

I am a stock issues/communication judge. Please stick to the quality of an argument not quantity. Avoid theory arguments and stick with stock issues to support your case. I also encourage respect in a debate round. There is no need to be mean and petty to your opponent.
Melinda Schulz
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas, Policy, Congress

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Clear tag lines and be clear on when you cut card

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
I do not like any oral prompting. no tag teaming

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Value should be clear and supported throughout your case. Use your criteria to show me how to weigh the round. All arguments should tie back to your value and criteria

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
A combination of Philosophical and empirical.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I don't really like Kritical arguments in Lincoln Douglas debate

How should debaters run on case arguments?
i am a stock issues judge - present them all to me. Prove there is a problem that exists, that it is significant, that you have a plan to fix it and that your plan will work.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
I am not a fan of counter plans and only like well written and well presented Kritiks. You need to link your kritik to the resolution. Don't waste my time on things that have nothing to do with
the resolution. Yes, topicality is an issue and an importa

How should Debaters run theory arguments?

I don't mind a good, well written theory argument however if it is not well done and connected to the resolution - don't wast my time and yours on it.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Madison Seymour
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Directly Stated

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Use in moderation; if excessive, it may create a negative impact

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Debaters should use values, criteria, and arguments to support a value position in a way that allows the argument to flow and build logically. Everything should contribute to the moral argument.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Theoretical or empirical

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
To change worldview or a moral case.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
A Priori

How should debaters run off case arguments?
B Priori

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Limit them; they are not that important.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**
How Should Debaters approach **Constructive Speeches**?

Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach **Rebuttal Speeches**?

Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach **Evidence**?

Tag lines should be read off slowly so I can flow them along with author last name and year. Please pause for a second so I can flow them :)

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

It wouldn't. My decision is solely based on the arguments presented

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

Value and criteria are weighing mechanisms - just because your value or criteria are dropped doesn't mean you win the round. They provide a framing mechanism so that I can weigh impacts accordingly. They become the lens in which the arguments are looked at.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

I don't prefer one argument to another. All arguments, regardless of their type, should have a claim and a warrant. Each type argument can be used for a warrant, y'all will just have to debate on which argument wins. :)

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

I LOVE them. Krtical arguments were my main game back when I debated. But, I won't do work for you. I have read a lot of literature, and know the arguments pretty well. But if you don't make the arguments, I won't flow them and connect the dots for you. I am willing to hear any arguments you want to run.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
I don't have any strong feelings on how any of these should be run. Just be clear in your signposting and tagging, and I'll keep up.

**How should debaters run off case arguments?**

I don't have any strong feelings on how any of these should be run. Just be clear in your signposting and tagging, and I'll keep up.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

I don't have any strong feelings on how any of these should be run. Just be clear in your signposting and tagging, and I'll keep up.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

TL;DR: Run what you want and have fun. I don't like the notion that you have to cater to what the judge wants to win the round. You should be doing what you want and enjoy. Debate is fun; enjoy the round! But if you say something racist/sexist/homophobic/problematic I will not hesitate to call you out on it. But most importantly have fun. :) 

Long Version:

I've been doing debate for a hot minute, and boy do I love it. One thing that I quickly learned in college is that debate is more than just an activity, but it's a space where I could have a voice, uninterrupted for the duration of the round. I ran a lot of critical race theory arguments (anti-blackness and Islamophobia were the main ones) and it was a way for me to talk about issues that I faced on the daily. Debate quickly became my space to exist un-apologetically. That's why I think that catering to what the judge wants to see in a round is problematic. The debate round is yours; do whatever you want. If you want to have a traditional round, go for it. If you want to toss the topic in the trash and talk about Star Wars for the round, power to you. I will judge the round however you tell me to. 

That being said, you do have to tell me how to judge the round, because at the end of it there is a winner. If you don't tell me a framework or weighing mechanism, I will just weigh the impacts on both sides and make my decision accordingly. Everything is up for debate, though, and it is up to you all to tell me what to do. Ideally your rebuttals should be writing my RFD for me.

On top of that, I won't be doing any work for you, because I don't like judge intervention. If you half bake an argument, I'll weigh it accordingly. If you say "my partner will get to it" and they don't get to it, it doesn't exist. I'll end up making my decision based on the arguments in the round.

I try not be, but I'm a pretty interactive judge. You will know pretty easily, based on my body language, if I like/understand your argument. I make a lot of faces. I can't help it. :) 

Other details that might interest you:

- I don't care about speed. Go as fast or as slow as you want; I'll keep up.

- I am a heavy flow judge. Make sure you slow down on tag lines and authors so I can get it down. If you have an important argument; a ROUND WINNING ARGUMENT or something, emphasize it, repeat it, throw a paper at me with the argument; just make sure you make it clear.
- I'm pretty sure you're just skimming this whole paradigm, or just read the TL;DR, so if you are actually reading this whole thing, show me a picture of your pet or a meme and I'll give you extra speaker points.

- I love Star Wars. Like, a lot. If you make references in your speeches you'll make me the happiest judge in the world.

- I don't care about tag-teaming in CX, and I don't time flashing. But I will if y'all take too long.

- I also don't time. If I need to I will, but I assume everyone can time themselves. And yes you can use your phone as a timer.

- I also talk too much. If you already haven't figured that out from this novel of a paradigm. Don't be afraid to tell me to shut up!

- If you see me outside of rounds, don't hesitate to come talk and ask questions! I'll be more than happy to talk to you about your round and help you get ready for the next one.

- I won't turn down food. Do what you want with that information :)

- If you have questions, I'll probably give you a book to read to get more information than you wanted. If you have books for me, PLEASE give me the titles. :)

Like I said, the round is yours. Be as outlandish (or inlandish?) as you want. I'm just here for the ride. :)

Important note: If you say/are racist/homophobic/sexist/problematic things, I will not hesitate to call you out on it. It's 2019; there is no reason for that. If you have to think about if something you would say would be problematic, it probably is. If it's an accident, I'll help explain and educate. I believe that self-reflection is very important; try and learn and grow from the things you learn.

If you have any specific questions about my paradigm, or anything else, please ask. I'll probably give you a longer answer than you want. :)
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
State tag line clearly.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Oral prompting will result in one team member seeming to be ill prepared and this will impact speaker points.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
the value and criteria must be shared, explained and linked to current resolution

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
any of the above

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
There should be a link to the resolution.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
In the first constructive speech.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
In the first negative constructive

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Well prepared and in the 2nd affirmative speech
What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. A large quantity of arguments prove more persuasive than a few well-developed arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?

No preference

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

I would prefer it not be used.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

I expect them to be used and debate in a Lincoln Douglas round.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

No preference

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

As long as they are run well and not just tossed out to time suck I like them

How should debaters run on case arguments?

I expect all the stock issues to exist in an aff case but have no preference of what order.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
I dont like things that time suck. Dont run topicality if it is ridiculous and generic arguments are the worst.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

I just dont like time sucks. Debate the topic and use arguments that apply. It doesnt matter what they are.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

Don't be a jerk.
Kara Smith
Preferred Debate Styles: Policy, Congress

**How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?**
Arguments should each be addressed individually.

**How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?**
Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

**How Should Debaters approach Evidence?**
Tags should be read slower

**How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?**
As long as it isn't overly used, it doesn't factor into my decision

**How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?**
This is the main part of LD

**What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?**
Whatever the debaters make the priority

**Please explain your views on kritical arguments.**
Ks need to be thoroughly explained, and should have a clear link story

**How should debaters run on case arguments?**
Stock Issues need to be upheld by the aff at all times

**How should debaters run off case arguments?**
All arguments are okay as long as they are explained. I hardly ever vote of Ks though

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**
Teams need to be able to clearly articulate the abuse story that would necessitate a theory argument.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
citations and evidence read and marked

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
A quick prompt from their partner is fine, but I will judge full on tag teaming harshly.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Whatever value they pick to run in their case they had better be able to back it up and stick to it throughout the round. Arguments should not go against their value and the criteria had better be cohesive with their value.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Empirical evidence is the best and then theoretical, I do not appreciate philosophical evidence.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I don't think kritical arguments are helpful, don't try to redirect the debate, just stay on topic and debate the true resolution. I don't like game playing.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Prove to me that there really are harms, show me the significance and impact, then prove solvency or non-solvency.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
I don't like kritiks, Stay topical, if the other team isn't topical call them on it. I'm not a fan of
counterplans, but I will allow them if it is well thought out and has better solvency and you can prove that the other plan has harms.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

Back up everything with evidence, if the other team doesn't have evidence call them on it, provide clash.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

I like a good clash, but I want debtors to be respectful of everyone in the room. Don't make faces, rude remarks or mock your opponent.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. A large quantity of arguments prove more persuasive than a few well-developed arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Author and date. Mark with a Pause

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Don't do it excessively

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
In whichever way they choose (tab)

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Any (Tab)

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Run it well (Tab)

How should debaters run on case arguments?
They should run them well (Tab)

How should debaters run off case arguments?
They should run them well (Tab)

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

They should run them well (Tab)

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

I am a tab judge. This means I have no preferences. Which is why I answered the questions above the way I did. I am open to any style of argumentation on either side within the rules. Just do what you do best. If you have specific questions please ask them before the round.
Mike Spaulding
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas, Policy

How Should Debaters approach **Constructive Speeches**?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach **Rebuttal Speeches**?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach **Evidence**?
Tag with author/source and year

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Very little

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Persuasively; with strong link to case arguments

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
All; I prefer the competitor uses their strongest argument that fits the need.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I like them quite.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Any way that best advances their case or position.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
In any way that they feel will be the most effective in the round.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
With purpose and clarity.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Crystallize, collapse, condense ... give me the one or two voters that you think won you the round. Also, don't drop your framework!
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
tag lines

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Indifferent

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Well with clarity.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
No preference

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I will vote on what is presented and argued. I hold no grudge against critiques.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
There should be a connection between the inherency and the impact and it should be resolved or caused by the plan.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
I would prefer these declared before the speech to clear up flow.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Standard.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

I'll always declare myself as a tabs judge. If you want me to vote on something you make it clear. If I default to making my own voters it is prima facie issues, impacts, critiques.
Izzy Stoddard
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas

How Should Debaters approach **Constructive Speeches**?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach **Rebuttal Speeches**?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach **Evidence**?
Tag lines

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
I won't give a loss because of it, but try not to use it - it will effect my decision if over utilized.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
However they feel they can best persuade me.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
A variety is best.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
If it's purposeful and contextually makes sense, it's okay. Using them just to use them is not a great tactic.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Do not spend a lot of time on harms. Explain links from plan to solvency well.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
I prefer disadvantages, but if it's done well, I am not picky.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Steer clear if it takes away from the meat of the subject.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

Show me your purpose for debating is more than just winning, but educating yourself and others involved.
Jeff Stoppenhagen
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas, Policy, Congress

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
tag line, source, state "cut card"

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Not a major factor

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Value and criterion are instrumental in LD - arguments should support

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Open to any

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Not a fan - if they are used make it clear WHY you are running it

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Fan of stock issues debate

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Fully explain WHY

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Fully explain WHY

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

Debate is a game we play with our friends - be nice!
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them., A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
I prefer Quote/Unquote

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
If only a time or two....no problem.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Strong argument between value and criteria is important....well thought out.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I prefer empirical.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Wow! Sometimes that can be great but I'd rather not see it.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
I usually don't judge Policy but when I do I call myself a communication judge.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
I would listen for disadvantages. I would prefer not to hear kritiks & counterplans.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Good solid arguments are the best!!

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Machine-gun fire delivery drives me NUTS!! Good matters towards the opposition wins the day.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
If you are using evidence to support your claim, please provide some kind of citation. It can be a tag line.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
If the exchange is polite, not a personal attack and adds to the debate, I have no problems with oral prompting. Rudeness or disparaging behavior will have a negative impact on my decision.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
The arguments should be clearly aligned with the value and criterion. Tell me how they work together. Tell why one is better than the other.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
While I prefer empirical arguments, I do not penalize cases that contain philosophical or theoretical that are clearly explained. Give me reasons to prefer your philosophy or theory.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Give me a good framework, link it to the case, what are the implications and why do they matter. What is the alternative and how does it connect to the kritik.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
In your constructive speeches clearly layout your plan, the issues and their significance. How
do you solve for the issue what is the advantage to your plan. What is the mechanism? What is your inherency? Make it clear.

**How should debaters run off case arguments?**

If you are going to claim topicality, why is it not topical. If you are claiming disadvantages or kritiks again clarity in your explanation is essential. Stick to your opponents case show me were it is non topical. How is the plan a disadvantage? Why is i

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

Again if you are going to run with a theory argument, don't just make a claim. Link your claim to the case, provide impacts and/or alternatives. Clearly connect the dots, don't assume I am following your claim. Don't tell me your opponents case is abusive

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

I find many debaters think excessive speed helps their case. They lose fluency and some of their case is lost because of this. I prefer quality to quantity of arguments. Logical well supported arguments, when using moral values convince me why I should believe it is either moral or immoral. Provide me with a weighing mechanism to determine who wins the debate. I like good clash during cross. Use this time to clarify the details of your opponents case. Keep it polite and not personal.
How Should Debaters approach **Constructive Speeches**?

Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach **Rebuttal Speeches**?

Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach **Evidence**?

Tag Lines and citations. Highlight of what you read from the evidence is strongly suggested.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?

You will lose speakers points if you are being prompted. If the final decision turns out to be close and only one side used oral prompting that side will not get the win.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?

All of these are used to weaponize your position and make it stronger but can also be used to take power away from the other side. Remember that if you use any of these to propagate fallacies in round you will be dropped.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?

Empirical is the strongest as it has substance and data supporting your claim/statement/stance. Theoretical is next as it has a basis and strong logic. Philosophical has logic but cannot necessarily be proven only critiqued upon. Evidence is above all and

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.

I am a mix of a games judge, policy judge, and stocks judge. I enjoy a kritical argument but be sure to adequately explain yourself as I refuse to intervene on a kritical argument.

How should debaters run on case arguments?

I prefer it ran the same as policy in college: harms, plan, solvency, advantages in that order.
Significance is put in place through your evidence throughout.

How should debaters run off case arguments?

Start off case first before going on case. Make sure to state you are going going off case first. Road mapping is important!

How should Debaters run theory arguments?

I prefer that debate theory argumentation starts your speech off. Tell me what you see and then tell me why or how. Once done with that run your case.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

Logic is an ever deceasing part of not just politics but in general communication. Debate is essential to any argument and should be done respectfully as disrespectful debate is a waste of time. I hate fallacies! Slippery slope, tu quoque, strawman, ad hominem, appeal to tradition, red herring, loaded questions, and argumentum ad populum are particularly common fallacies that you see in presidential debates, news segments, high school, college and unfortunately sometimes even educational debate. I will have judge intervention on your ballot if any of these are used. You should know your case and have run it before making sure to prevent wobbly logic or fallacies. I can keep up with speed and have to do so in college but DO NOT USE SPEED AS A WEAPON AGAINST YOUR OPPONENT. I will not tolerate that and you will lose substantial speaker points and often the win because of it. I give back to the debate community as I appreciate its importance both in my life and in the world at large. Remember that you are arguing your side but that you must respect both sides simultaneously even if you disagree, prove why your side is better but do it respectfully, logically, and proudly.
Ryan Trude  
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas, Policy

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?  
Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?  
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches. Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?  
Clear distinctions between tag, citation, evidence and analytics.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?  
Oral prompting is fine with me. It doesn't effect my decision

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?  
Value and criteria set the viewing mechanism or steps to achieve. It independently isn't a voting issue, but can set the stage for the voting issues.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?  
I don't have a preference

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.  
I like them and i know them but it means they must be run perfectly to be evaluated.

How should debaters run on case arguments?  
Cover case args. Extend turns. Focus on impacts.

How should debaters run off case arguments?  
Focus on impacts and make sure to cover responses.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
idk, with standards, voters, a violation or two and an interp.

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

I vote where I'm told and I am as tabs as i can be. Saying flow judge is an understatement.
Arie Walker
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas, Congress

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Evidence read

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Doesn’t impact as long as it is respectful

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Arguments should support Value and Criterion which should support or negate the resolution.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Empirical

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I would prefer they aren’t run when I am judging

How should debaters run on case arguments?
I don’t judge Policy

How should debaters run off case arguments?
I don’t judge Policy

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
I don’t judge Policy

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?
Eddie Walsh
Preferred Debate Styles: Lincoln Douglas, Policy, Congress

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Sign post, tag line, author, date, evidence, "Next"

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
Students should be able to manage their speech and cross examination independently. Based on this, it will impact my decision.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Yes. Yes, they should, very much.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Anything that can be quantified at the end of the round if preferable.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
The kritik should be emotionally compelling. I need to believe the K is something you advocate, in and out of round. The alternative needs to be crucial in solving for the implications. If I don't believe you actually care about the K, then it turns into an RVI. Also, I tend to see counterplans in LD as lazy.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Arguments should be clearly stated and numbered. All case components need to be clearly stated within the first constructive. If something is missing, I have a tendency to believe case doesn't hold up.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
I prefer to see all arguments in the first constructive. I want you to split the block. Only if the Aff tries to introduce more case materials in the 2A do I think it acceptable for Neg to bring more arguments in the 2N. I prefer DAs and CPs to topicalit

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

Standards and voters on everything. Teams need to prove abuse on the flow if they want it to become a voting issue (advocacy switching, link dodging, etc). Otherwise, I tend to hear it as a lot of complaining.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

I am a no flow judge, so I rely on your communication skills to build compelling stories in each separate argument you create. I am not asking you to talk to me like a kindergartner, but please realize that speaking is a skill, I am a human, and this is a debate tournament. By this I mean, communicate your point clearly as you would for a general audience, appeal to my pathos, and put forward your best arguments only. If I feel like you are just reading evidence, or just going through the motions, it have a tendency to tune you out.

I need to hear you do the work pulling through arguments throughout the debate. I will not do the work for you. I can recognize new arguments in rebuttals, and I can remember if something was not addressed in a previous speech, but I won't count them as a voter if goes unaddressed.

I rarely get as much organization in a debate as I want, so if you want to gain the advantage, you will signpost effectively and make extra certain your arguments have all of the necessary parts.
How Should Debaters approach **Constructive Speeches?**

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them., A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments., Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on resolving all substantive issues.

How Should Debaters approach **Rebuttal Speeches?**

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches., Arguments should be delivered more rapidly with emphasis on a broad array of evidence.

How Should Debaters approach **Evidence?**

As long as you use a transition word/phrase i.e. (and, next, etc.) As long as you do that we'll get along swell.

**How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?**

I believe this is helpful and why you have a partner to begin with so I don't care as long as your partner isn't giving your speech for you and/or controlling the other's cx period we'll be just fine.

**How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?**

Use them, extend them, and impact them out so I can see and evaluate the story of your argument. You also need to defend the link and internal link chain as well.

**What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?**

I am of the belief that it is best to do what you're best at and most comfortable with so you do you boo.

**Please explain your views on kritical arguments.**

I generally enjoy nuanced kritical arguments but I need you to do the same work if not more in explaining how the argument functions and what effect that has outside of the debate round.
Do not assume I know the author or their philosophy. If you try to skirt by with philosophy jargon your coach wrote down and said to read, you'll have a hard time meeting my threshold for kritical arguments.

**How should debaters run on case arguments?**

Before you go any further if you are here for policy, here is my Tabroom paradigm. This has my complete paradigm and will give you more help in answering questions than this format. https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=43564

**How should debaters run off case arguments?**

Go for them. I have no predispositions to these arguments. Of these, topicality has the highest threshold for me to vote on it but all of these arguments are explained in my paradigm above.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

Run them to the best of your ability. I have a high threshold for theory as well so you have to put in the work if you want me to vote on this. Just like everything else, this needs to be impacted out properly and I need to know what in round abuse is act

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

Again here is my full Tabroom paradigm:
https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=43564

I will be more than happy to answer any questions you may have before the round begins. Have fun and best of luck :]

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
After initial citation, refer to the thesis of each evidence and what it's main use has been, tag line basically. Author credentials and other evidence qualifications are a plus.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
I don't mind notes being passed but expect each witness to answer questions on their own, and each interviewer to ask question themselves.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Criteria are very important. Each argument or contention should explain it's relationship to the criterion and how that is better upholding their value. What are we doing in LD when we don't do that?

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
I prefer them in this order: Empirical, philosophical, then theoretical

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Not a fan

How should debaters run on case arguments?
They should definitely prioritize the stock issues.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
Don't run off case arguments. Have a straightforward debate. Go slow. Communicate like people do OUTSIDE of the debate world.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

I do like when someone partitions their time to attack the educational value of any such argument. This is really only a refutation tactic to me, other than that, get back ON case!

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

Humor is highly valued.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them., A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
tag lines

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
It will result in less speaker points, but won't have an effect on my RFD

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Logic is my primary focus

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Situational

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
If it takes away from the potential education gained from the debate, then I'm not a fan. If they are utilized simply to win as opposed to benefit everyone in the round, then it will rub me the wrong way.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Either show me that the harms aren't harms or that the plan does not link to the solvency or advantages.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
I prefer disadvantages. Topicality is fine if it is clearly non-topical. Counterplans can be fine but
agency counterplans are a little shady.

**How should Debaters run theory arguments?**

However they feel necessary as long as it is logical and intended to benefit everyone in the round.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

Do not be a toxic debater. This activity should be about education.
Sterling Willford
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas, Policy, Congress

**How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?**

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Arguments may be grouped in order to address all of them. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

**How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?**

Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

**How Should Debaters approach Evidence?**

If debaters cite in accordance with IDC, I'm content.

**How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?**

I am completely happy with quick card references or statements to jog a partner's memory. However, if a partner takes over during cross-ex or crossfire, they will almost certainly lose the round. It simply makes it look like they don't trust their partner.

**How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?**

All arguments should tie in to the value of their case through the criterion. Debaters who can show that their arguments (either through their or their opponent's criterion) better meet both values, will most likely get my vote.

**What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?**

I'm not crazy about philosophical evidence, but it can be used effectively. Theoretical evidence is necessary to promote an aff case, since it presumably isn't part of the status quo. I love empirical evidence, but if it's scope is too narrow, it won't ho

**Please explain your views on kritical arguments.**

I've never given a win based on a kritical argument. I'm fairly certain it's never even influenced my decision.
How should debaters run on case arguments?

Give me harms and inherency first, then quickly get to the plan text, so I can mentally categorize everything else with that plan in mind. So long as you sign-post clearly, the rest can come in any order.

How should debaters run off case arguments?

Topicality and DA’s are great. However, hit them quickly, and move on. If it's a good T or DA, I will logically be able to accept it and move on to the next idea. If either of these take more than two minutes to explain, they're too obscure, and you proba

How should Debaters run theory arguments?

Quickly... and limit the use of the word "abusive". Repetition in debate theory arguments quickly begins to sound like "We weren't ready, and this is all we know how to run."

What other preferences do you have, as a judge?

Make sure you logically tie evidence back to your arguments. You should know your evidence well enough to summarize it after quoting it and in cross-examinations/crossfires.

Idaho Debate Code states that students are responsible for the reliability of their technology. As such, I believe that flashing counts toward your prep time. I don't believe in free prep time while my partner slowly loads files on a jump drive.
Paige Wooten
Preferred Debate Styles: Public Forum, Lincoln Douglas

How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments. Arguments should each be addressed individually.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Arguments should be delivered slowly with emphasis on communication delivery. Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
Taglines!

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
If it is used rudely, I will mind. If it is used respectively, then it is fine.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Don't beat the value debate to death. It matters, but if it completely distracts from the debate at hand, then it isn't worth it.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Empirical arguments are always appreciated and often necessary. Theoretical arguments are less appreciated, unless it's done right.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
Not necessarily a fan, but if done right maybe that could change. Maybe

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Make it clear what you're talking about here with taglines and explain the actual relevance to the overall debate.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
First off, do it in a timely manner, and just be very clear on the impacts

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
Carefully. It depends on how it's being applied. Being a bully in round to try to win is obvious to see, and from what I can recall, debate theory can be abused for this purpose.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

Don't be rude. I find it really annoying when opponents are blatantly rude to each other. This includes interrupting your opponent, during cross when they haven't answered the question. Go down the flow! It is going to make it a lot easier for me if you not only go down the flow, but also use taglines so I can follow along.
How Should Debaters approach Constructive Speeches?
A few well-developed arguments prove more persuasive than a larger quantity of arguments.

How Should Debaters approach Rebuttal Speeches?
Rebuttals should provide voters to address the important issues advanced in constructive speeches., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually and provide voters., Rebuttals should extend arguments individually which debaters advanced in constructive speeches.

How Should Debaters approach Evidence?
No preference as long as it's clear/consistent.

How would Oral Prompting affect your decision?
If one person dominates that is a negative for me. Not necessarily a voting issue, unless it's super egregious or a close round.

How should debaters use values, criteria and arguments to support a value position?
Each contention should be an independent reason that you achieve the value as measured by the criterion.

What arguments (such as philosophical, theoretical or empirical) do you prefer to support a value position?
Philosophical, empirical.

Please explain your views on kritical arguments.
I will entertain kritical arguments, but I am skeptical of generic K's.

How should debaters run on case arguments?
Clearly.

How should debaters run off case arguments?
With excellent signposting and strong links.

How should Debaters run theory arguments?
With excellent signposting and strong links.

**What other preferences do you have, as a judge?**

I prefer not to give time signals.

Be civil and ethical.