

Vineet Agarwal

Constraints: Mira Loma

Background

I am a Policy Judge but have also extensively judged Parli & Public Forum debates. I have been judging for the past 3 years. Besides the numerous league and invitation tournaments (UOP, Stanford, Berkeley, VBT, SCU, James Logan), I have also judged at the CHSSA State Championship (Union City, '09) and NFL Nationals (Birmingham, Alabama, '09)

Approach to judging

As I judge off the flow, please sign post and provide roadmaps. Follow the rules of Parliamentary Debate: Have a plan, advocacy, or value/VC when the wording of the resolution indicates which one is necessary. Topicality is a key voter issue; thus, dictionary/colloquial definitions are always preferable.

Argument preferences

I vote on the flow and penalize dropped contentions/points of analysis heavily. However, it is up to you to inform me of what your opponent has dropped and why it pertains to the round (impact it). It is obvious from the flow what has been dropped, but if it is unimportant to your case, it will not be important to me either. Outside evidence which is NOT general knowledge will not be a deciding factor in the round.

In the rebuttals, make sure I understand why you have won the round. Once again, I will know why you have won, but don't leave this work up to me.

Do not repeat your partner in the Neg Block. Have a clear strategy for these two critical speeches.

Presentation preferences

There is no reason to spread in Parli. If you do, I simply will NOT flow. Speak clearly and try to use your full speech time. Be courteous to your opponents and keep sarcasm out of your tone during POIs. Keep POIs short and concise. There is no reason for both partners on a team to be standing for a POI, as the speaker can take only one question at a time.

John Brodey

Constraints: Campbell Hall

Background

I am a parent and assistant coach. This is my sixth year of judging (including middle school debate). I have done several, Claremont, Fullerton, Stanford and Pepperdine tournaments.

On a normal judging scale I would probably rate myself a high 3, low 4.

Philosophy

As far as my philosophy is concerned it is nice to know that some of the more common issues I take exception to will not be in evidence at a tournament of this calibre. These are top teams and as such will avoid many of the problems that plague more inexperienced teams.

That said; I will have high expectations when it comes to flow and the terminalization of arguments. I don't expect time, topicality issues to be a problem. If topicality does present itself, I trust it will be a valid case for abuse. By the same token good teams know when they have crossed the line. I generally dismiss criterion accusations by teams when they cite policy/value arguments.

Since it is a debate, I consider POIs a part of the process. A team that does not raise them or fails to acknowledge at least one has not engaged as fully as they should.

That said I expect a lively debate with a fully developed AFF argument and a thorough vetting by the NEG with the addition of new counters. Time spent on procedural points when there are clear grounds for a healthy debate, is time wasted.

I expect the high level talent in this tournament will be the ultimate test for any judge.

Stephen Brooks

Constraints: James Logan

Background

I participated in high school forensics for four years at James Logan High School. I was coached in every single debate event (CX, LD, PF, & Parli- Congress is not debate) and competed primarily in Public Forum and Parliamentary Debate. I have coached Public Forum debate for the past four years at my Alma matter, qualifying teams to the California State and NFL National Championships every year, with none of my teams failing to clear to out-rounds at either tournament. My teams won the 2007 & 2008 California State Championships in Public Forum. And while my personal focus is Public Forum, I prefer and enjoy judging Parliamentary Debate rounds more than any other event (random topics, more creative arguments, more fun in general). I have judged Parli rounds for the past five years at several California invitational tournaments such as: U.O.P., Santa Clara, M.L.K., Stanford, etc.

Also, in addition to my forensics and debate experience and in the interest of full disclosure, I like to provide competitors with my personal background if it helps them understand where I'm coming from at all. I am 23 years old, registered Democrat, fiscal conservative, social liberal, I studied economics in college, and I have worked a million jobs: real estate loan agent, personal body guard, retail store manager, debate coach, and more.

Approach to judging

I always tell competitors that I am a "flay" judge, which means that while I do flow rounds that I watch and value line-by-line approaches, I never vote or base my final decision strictly on my flow. I like to base my decisions on common sense and reward teams that won the key arguments in the round with logical reasoning and presented their side in a more persuasive manner- things that most lay judges tend to value. In other words...

I AM NOT A POLICY JUDGE. I will NEVER decide a round based on an unimportant sub-point that wasn't responded to, let alone mentioned until the final speech of the debate. I DO NOT enjoy listening to debaters that speak at a rate of speed that can't be comprehended by most normal human beings (speed is okay, spreading will get you killed). I DO NOT BUY BULLSHIT NUCLEAR WAR IMPACTS (I will buy LEGIT nuclear war impacts, but you better work pretty damn hard in the round if you're gunning for one of those). Furthermore, LISTING LOTS OF ARGUMENTS ISN'T GOOD ENOUGH. In order for a team to have access to any offense in the round, they must explain and/or properly impact their arguments during the debate, and weigh them against their opponents'. And lastly, because I am not a policy judge, I RESERVE THE RIGHT TO INTEPRET YOUR ARGUMENTS using my own personal knowledge and common sense. This doesn't mean I won't vote on arguments I don't personally believe in- I do that all the time. What it means is: if you tell me the sky is green, and I look outside and it's clearly blue, well then, you sir are F@#\$ed. Don't BS me.

Argument preferences

In general, I feel that my judging paradigm in Parli fits the "Policymaker" profile of policy judges, and if you want my ballot, you should always remember to impact and provide clear voters. As for specific areas of the round and types of arguments are concerned...

THANK-YOUS:

No need to pretend. You're here to win a round, you probably hate your opponents and will talk smack about them two minutes after the debate, and I'm only here because I got forced into judging because my school couldn't afford to hire a judge. Just get down to business. Also, if you don't shake my hand and thank me for judging after the round, you won't hurt my feelings, trust me.

GOVERNMENT TEAMS:

If it's a policy resolution, you better have a clear plan, and you better have some sort of solvency to go with it. I tend to vote for government teams that do a good job of demonstrating how their side will effectively provide benefits/advantages versus the status quo.

Stephen Brooks (*cont'd*)

OPPOSITION TEAMS:

I'll pickup opposition teams that do a good enough job highlighting disadvantages and negative impacts of the government case, as well as those that poke enough holes in the government plan. I also LOVE COUNTER-PLANS, because as a policymaker, I like voting for teams that improve the status quo.

Run'em if ya got'em.

STANDARDS:

If either team claims that the standard should be "net benefits" you are effectively telling me two things. First, that you're lazy and not at all creative, because "net benefits" is the default standard, and if you didn't say it, I would just assume it anyways. Second, that I should just pick out and vote on the team with more arguments I personally enjoyed since you provided me no criteria or weighing mechanism. You might as well offer me a coin to flip. Please, tell me EXACTLY how I should score the fight.

THEORY:

Don't run it. You'll lose. Only run it if the resolution is desperately crying out for it, and even then you still might lose. You've been warned.

DEBATE GAMES:

Homey don't play that. You shouldn't either. You'll lose.

ABUSE:

It's the government's job to define and provide fair grounds for debate. 60/40 is fair enough in my book. Government teams, play nice. Opposition teams, if you cry abuse, you better be right, otherwise you'll lose because you wasted forty-five minutes of my life.

POINT OF INFORMATION:

It's nice to be nice. As a courtesy, I believe good teams should always be willing to take 2-3 questions per speech. Also, don't be an ass and spend thirty seconds telling the other team that you don't have time for their question when you could have just answered the stinking question in that time. Shame on you if you don't take any questions.

POINT OF ORDER:

No blood no foul. Don't bother calling these unless the other team did something really egregious, like insult your mother. In virtually all cases, if the other team spouts some bullshit, I will catch it and drop them.

CLASH:

Do or die. If you remember one thing from this long judging paradigm of mine, remember that it's very important to impact and weigh your arguments against those of your opponent. If you're not telling me why the crap you're talking about is more important than the crap the other team is talking about, I just might pickup the other team. Don't let that happen.

Presentation preferences

I enjoy good ole fashioned line-by-line debate throughout the entire round, EXCEPT for the final two speeches. During the final two speeches, I could really care less about my flow. Voting issues only please- pretend I fell asleep during the first thirty minutes of the debate and you need to instruct me on how to fill out my ballot (depending on the hour and how many rounds I've judged, this might actually be the case).

As for rate of delivery, again, speed is fine, but please no spreading. I'm all about quality over quantity. You can read off a hundred different arguments, but if you don't explain/impact them properly, or even appear to understand them yourself, I don't weigh them as offense for your side.

I think that covers just about EVERYTHING. If you have any questions before the round, please do feel free to ask. Also, if the tournament rules allow, I typically disclose and critique after every round (and in most cases, I'll do it anyways even if the rules don't allow it).

Dave Chamberlain

Constraints: Claremont

Sharmi Doshi

Constraints: none

Caitlin Emmons

Constraints: Lynbrook

Background

I have judged mainly high school policy and middle school parli for the last two years.

Approach to judging

I'm not a huge fan of any procedural arguments (this comes from a policy background) but I am also willing to listen and vote on anything that you present to me, assuming you do it well.

Argument preferences

I will listen to theory but I usually don't enjoy voting on it.

I think critical arguments are an incredibly important addition to parli debate and thoroughly enjoy evaluating them, but like all arguments you need to articulate the relevance to the round clearly and effectively.

Presentation preferences

I am fine with speed as long as it doesn't trade off with your persuasiveness.

Erica Furer

Constraints: Bentley

Background

I debated for all four years in high school, and have assistant coached and judged this year.

Approach to judging

I love a well-rounded debate. That is to say, try to have persuasive rhetoric along with intelligent, logical, and solid arguments. Give me a roadmap, impact your arguments, and link everything to the resolution and/or value. Respond to all arguments, do not spread, and please be courteous to your opponents.

Argument preferences

If procedural and critical arguments are necessary, I will of course take them into consideration.

However, please know what you're talking about and do not throw around terms (such as abuse) without fully intending to pursue that line of argumentation.

Presentation preferences

I need to understand what you are saying so I have time to flow, so speak clearly and not too quickly.

Sean Lindorfer

Constraints: Bishop O'Dowd

Background

I debated from the founding of O'Dowd's parli team in October 2007 to the qualifier in 2009. I was a solid debater but not elite, but maybe a step below. However, I spent enough time hanging out with top-level talent, learning from them and sometimes defeating them in GGSA tournaments, that I understand when you're getting your butt handed to you or when you're getting the upper-hand on intense, policy-running teams and watching them flail because they don't understand that charisma and persuasive skills have as much to do with parli as structured arguments. If you want to win solely on policy points do policy debate.

Approach to judging

Pretty much stated above, but I don't worry so much about the flow as I do about who I feel is presenting the overall better argument in general. I like feeling and emotion, and I feel these are just as important as the contentions and rebuttals being made.

Argument preferences

I could care less about theory unless you can explain it in lay terms and apply it to the point at hand. I hate theory as a crutch for those who lack creativity. Please debate instead of bickering about topicality issues that really aren't topicality issues. I hate whining and punish whiners. Make your arguments profound, passionate, and emotional. You may be thinking I suck, but I think the core of parli is the rhetoric. But don't let your theory fly completely out the window. Last year I went up against Kate Drew a lot in practice and she can bring that stuff fast and furious so I know what it's all about.

Presentation preferences

Don't speak too fast. Don't take yourself too seriously. Don't act like you're changing the world because you're not. It's just a parli tournament. If you're funny and can inject humor into the proceedings that's a plus.

Emily Maine

Constraints: Claremont

Graciela Miller

Constraints: Carlsbad

Background

I have done high school parli and LD. Going to college, I have done NPDA for a while at the JV and open level. I have coached Policy debate at the high school level for a few months. I have judged high school LD, policy, and parli.

Approach to judging

For the RFD I need debaters to point out and tell me where to vote and why. I don't really like when all the weighing of impacts are coming in at the end of the debate, I like when debaters start telling me why their arguments right away mean the world in this round. I have a tendency to vote on dropped arguments that are later blown up. I find it frustrating when a debater drops arguments and the other team ignores it and doesn't blow it up. If arguments are dropped on both sides, it all comes down to weighing. I'll listen to any argument openly that some one puts in front of me, but if it's not weighed, it's really not going to matter in my RFD.

Argument preferences

I'll openly listen to any argument that's put in front of me as long as it's weighed out and the debater tells me why I should care. Go ahead and run procedurals and critical arguments, I'll welcome them happily as long as they're unique and relevant. With that in mind, I'll vote on something that is partly relevant only if the other team fails to acknowledge that the argument shouldn't be weighed. My only bias is against source debates. I hate when debaters attack sources as made up instead of providing examples or an optional link story as to why the source cannot be true. I especially hate when attacks on sources are made and are in no way justified.

Presentation preferences

I am fine with any rate of speed- Only spread if you know how to. I will not weigh any arguments I don't hear (especially when the other team stands up and tells me not to). I can go flow or lay, though I believe flow is more appropriate for debate in most instances. I don't like new arguments in the last speeches and I ask debaters not to try. I personally protect my flow against new arguments to the best of my ability, but I welcome points of order. Please try to time yourself and don't ask me to give you time signals.

Harrison Noah

Constraints: none

Background

I am on my 6th year of competition in Parliamentary debate and am the current president of the UC Davis debate team. Throughout my career I placed highly in state and national competitions, and I was a competitor at the 2010 NPTE (National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence). I also coach my old high school Parli squad. All this to say that I know my way around parli specifically and debate in general.

Approach to judging

I believe that debate is a game about wit and strategy, and as such I think that as much strategic options should be open to the debaters as possible. This doesn't mean that the crazy performance project you have been working on is the best strat, as I tend to favor academically rigorous rounds, but if you can warrant things out and tell me how and why the round functions I will not reject you because of the type of arg you run.

I am a flow judge, and I do expect both teams to keep a good track of the round to point to the arguments that you are discussing. This is your best bet to make sure your point gets made and is put in the right place.

I would prefer that both teams have a way to time themselves, you want your judge focused on what you're saying and not hand-signals.

You don't need to thank everyone in the room for "making it a great debate," a brief 'thanks' at the beginning of your first speech will suffice.

Argument preferences

As said above, I do not have a "will-never-vote-on" list of arguments, but I do favor certain types of arguments.

I prefer well-warranted link scenarios to moderate impacts as opposed to tenuous links to nuke war, genocide, etc. The team that can use real-world knowledge to show me a guaranteed link to minor economic detriment affecting 20K people is in better shape than the team that runs with the standard "X → economic collapse → resource wars → nuclear winter" in my mind.

Policy cases that are warranted with examples, analysis, and (gasp!) facts will be more competitive than blippy links and bad/no analysis.

Value/Fact cases need to tell me how the round works. What do you have to do to win a fact/value case? Why? These types of questions are lacking in this forum, and I think there is good ground to be explored there.

I have a reasonably high threshold for procedurals, I favor positions that demonstrate in-round abuse and/or non/extra-topical case-construction. Obviously if you run a bad procedural and it gets dropped, I am not going to ignore it.

Although they are rare in high school, kritiks are also cool with me. If you run one, you HAVE to have a clear framework (this is how debate/the world works), link (how the case applies), implications (what that means for the round/world), alternative (what you're going to do to fix it), and solvency (exactly how the alt solves).

Any arguments that show global-thinking, novel ideas, and strategic merit gets a smily face on my flow. You want smilies, they're a coveted item.

Presentation preferences

Speed is fine with me. If you choose to use speed in the round please make sure that it's understandable and not choppy, otherwise I will say "clear." You absolutely do not need to use speed; I think that slow rounds that focus on a few issues in depth are also very educational.

You can speak standing or sitting, I don't care which

You may prompt your partner within a reasonable degree. Don't give the speech for him/her, but if there's something that you think needs coverage point it out and/or briefly say what it is you want to convey.

Almost most-importantly, BE COURTEOUS! Heckling, personal attacks, and rudeness in general have no place in an academic environment and will compromise your contention for my ballot. Y'all didn't get up early on a Saturday to be in an unwelcoming environment, so please demonstrate maturity and professionalism. That being said, humor is much-appreciated!

Of course, HAVE FUN! You are all smart individuals in a tough event, enjoy the experience.

Artem Raskin

Constraints: Lynbrook

Background: 4 years of high school parli, 3 years of circuit LD, 1 year of NPDA parli. Political Science major, focus in International Relations.

Approach to judging

- I am a flow judge. I try to intervene as little as possible. If you run arguments I don't like, I will be more willing to buy answers which debunk them, but I won't intervene against them myself. If I can't vote for either side without intervening, I will go by the path of least intervention.
- Voting issues are crucial. Rebuttals should be used to explain argument interaction, levels of argumentation, and why you are winning these levels, not just to restate PMC/LOC contentions.
- I vote for a team that has offense in the end of the round, defense doesn't win rounds.
- Try to avoid bringing up completely new arguments in the second constructive – this creates a truncated discussion of an argument. I will be sympathetic to PMR turns against new arguments in the block.
- I am not a fan of splitting the block, but I don't think MOC and LOR should be identical. The LO doesn't need to extend non-essential defense if the MO already made the responses. I give LOR some leeway on extensions: simply referencing an argument is fine, you don't need to spend too much time extending MO warrants. In general, LO should briefly extend chief pieces of offense and crucial defense and spend most of the time on big picture argument comparison.
- If an argument is unclear the first time I hear it, I won't vote on extensions which clear it up.
- Rebuttals are for weighing; weighing is not a new argument. There is, sometimes, weighing which borders on making a new argument – call a Point of Order if you have doubts.
- I do not require a Point of Order to strike a down a new argument. However, in a lot of cases, an argument is borderline new, and in these cases, I will typically give the speaker the benefit of the doubt unless a POO is called.
- I will not vote on blips. The best, though not the only way to ensure your argument isn't a blip is to structure it.

Argument preferences

- I like positional cases. This means that the Government should have a specific plantext or a thesis. I welcome specification theory on vague plans.
- Set up clear burdens for each side from the start of the round. Establishing control of the framework can be very strategic.
- I am not a fan of trichotomy. I don't think any resolution *has* to be a value, that's up to the Government to decide.
- I enjoy listening to structured critical arguments with a clear and realistic alternative made by debaters who have read the philosophy behind them. If one of those elements is missing, I won't enjoy them.
- I have a high threshold for voting on procedural arguments. If you run topicality as a timesuck when there is no clear abuse, I will be very open to arguments that topicality should be a reverse voting issue. Theory needs to be structured and you need to explain why it is a voter. I tend to buy "reasonable limits" answers to it. If your opponents are just grammatically/logically not topical, don't bother talking about fairness, jurisdiction voter should suffice.
- I default to Millsian net benefits. I think more specific standards exclude relevant argumentation. Weighing should be done primarily on contention level. Critical and philosophical debates are an exception to this rule.
- Counterplans are very strategic – use them.

Presentation preferences

- Moderate speed is fine if it is used to present more in depth arguments, but blatantly spreading out your opponents is never cool.
- I will flow each position on a different piece of paper. When signposting, indicate clearly when you are moving on to a new position. Tell me in which order I should arrange my papers in a roadmap; roadmaps are not timed.
- I prefer teams to take at least 2 POIs per constructive speech. You should definitely take clarification questions after reading a plantext, or you will open yourself up to various specification arguments.
- I get influenza after every tournament and I blame it on handshakes. No handshakes.

Erick Rector

Constraints: Saratoga

Paradigm

I judge based on the legitimacy of the argument and the logic behind it. I will also be focusing on the element of clash and how well students can come up with counter-arguments to their opponents. The base of which lies in the initial definition of house and resolution. Far-fetched and non-relevant, impractical and unbelievable houses bother me.

Ultimately, the quality of the arguments and rebuttals will win a debate for me.

Kyle Reykalin

Constraints: James Logan

Judging Experience

I debated for four years in policy debate at James Logan High school. I hate when people list all the tournaments they broke at and camps they went to in their judging criterion because I don't think it provides any info, but I did debate on the national circuit in my junior and senior years.

In college I debated for two years on the NPDA circuit for UC Davis.

I coached policy debate for two years at two different schools, and parliamentary debate for one year at Logan.

I'm currently not involved in Parli because I'm busy pretending to be a lawyer.

Judging Preferences

I think my judging philosophy is pretty easy, but for some reason it has been incredibly hard for debaters to follow it this year. I have judged over 20 rounds this year so I am fairly fresh on parli (not that it matters since the topics change). Here are the things I think are unique or important to know when debating in front of me:

- 1) I think topicality is legit in Parli and am willing to pull the trigger on it. Still have to articulate a voter and impacts.
- 2) I think kritiks are also legit- although I have yet to see anyone argue one well/at all. (In high school parli). I don't care if your impacts are in round or out of round as long as its explained.
- 3) I don't have a preference for any style of argumentation (LD/Policy/Pofo? [pofo argument is an oxymoron]). All I care about is that you impact your choice. That means tell me why I should view the round as a policymaker versus an LD paradigm, how it makes for a better debate, and what the impact of my choice is. I default to policymaker until someone tells me to do otherwise.
- 4) Same goes for any other argument- impact it, tell me how it relates to other impacts, and why your argument is more important.
- 5) Don't be mean- I'll still vote for you if you win but I'll shake my head and look sad. And I'll walk by you all the time at tournaments doing the same thing.
- 6) I prefer clear signposting of arguments (more like a policy debate style- breaking arguments into chunks instead of just talking about an idea).

Feel free to ask me about any of the above- or any other questions in round.

Alex Smith

Constraints: none

Eric Smith

Constraints: Valencia

Experience:

I have three years High School parli debate experience and two years in college at both Moorpark College and UCLA. I won an NPTE bid this year and placed in the top 50 in the country in both NPTE rankings and at the NPDA national championships. I have also coached the Valencia debate team for two years.

Flow ability:

I can flow speed well but prefer not to.

Types of Arguments:

I understand all types of case and off case arguments.

Way of weighing the round:

I default to whatever the debaters tell me to do. I will vote on anything I am told to vote on. I do like to see claims warranted and impacted (in context of that argument and also with regards to its effect on other arguments). I weigh content over delivery for arguments and delivery over content for speaks. If you want high speaks, speak fluently and be polite. Should you not tell me where to vote I tend to look at the debate by examining how arguments function in context of each other and how they evolve over the round. but if you want to be safe, tell me where to vote and why (include why that argument is more important than ones you may be losing).

Sharon Smith

Constraints: Los Gatos

Background

I have been teaching English (including AP) and coaching debate for thirty-four years. I have coached State Champions in team debate, and State and National qualifiers in team, LD, and, currently, parli debate.

Approach to judging

I view debate as an educational activity, the purpose of which is to arrive at truth. I consider this a serious endeavor, and appreciate debaters who take not only themselves but also the topic and the activity seriously.

Argument preferences

I would prefer to hear a debate about the topic rather than a debate about debate. If a team is going to argue topicality, the topicality violation should have been blatantly obvious to me from the first affirmative. If I don't see a topicality violation in that first speech, I'm unlikely to buy neg's argument that one exists, and I'll probably just be annoyed. I'll flow it, but I won't be happy about it.

I also would prefer that debaters not lecture me about preserving the educational value of debate. I'm here (at the crack of dawn on a weekend), and I'm a teacher—obviously I think debate is educationally valuable. To me, it seldom seems a reasonable argument to say that your opponents (who are also here at the crack of dawn on a weekend) have deliberately entered a tournament for the single purpose of destroying debate as an educational activity.

I'd also prefer not to hear about how the opposing team is abusive. Unless the abuse is deliberate and quantifiable (such as an obvious violation of rules), bringing up abuse is just whiny.

I do vote on the flow. Let me know where you're applying your arguments. If you don't, I'll put them where I think they belong, which may or may not be what you intended. However, I'm unlikely to give a win based on a small dropped point. A team could drop a minor point and still carry the debate based on the more significant arguments. In final speeches let me know what you think those significant arguments are and why they matter to the debate as a whole.

Presentation preferences

Thanking the judge before speeches and shaking hands after are interesting traditions. They're nice things to do, but I won't be offended if you don't.

I prefer a presentation style that is organized and conversational in tone. Do not spread, not even a little.

John Thorpe

Constraints: Bishop O'Dowd

Background: I have no formal debate experience but I founded and have coached O'Dowd debate for three years. I have judged lots of parli rounds of the last three years at GGSA tournaments and at the major invitationals. I also possess a J.D. and have practiced law before becoming a teacher. I'm not a perfect judge, but I'm a decent judge.

Approach to judging

The purpose of parliamentary debate is clash and I cannot stand when teams, particularly the affirmative, attempt to evade this with ridiculous interpretations or rhetoric. However, I judge debates based on all components. I look for clash, logical and reasonable arguments, structure, knowledge and use of theory, speaking ability, practicality, impacts, and solvency.

Argument preferences

I prefer policy rounds because they give ground to both teams. More than anything, I hate when the government refuses to leave any ground for the opposition. I'm a flow judge, so I prefer structured rounds with clash. If theory is brought into the round, be positive you understand what you attempt to use. Do not throw theory around; it's a waste of time unless you can do it well.

Presentation preferences

Avoid speaking too fast (I despise this as it's antithetical to parli). The best speakers are charismatic, understandable, and clear. Additionally, because I flow, I prefer speakers who both provide and follow road maps so that I can follow their cases. Also, be civil. I hate it when people are jerks.

Charlie Tierney

Constraints: none

Background: I just concluded my second season on the UC Davis parliamentary debate team. During my time at UC Davis I have begun judging high school debate tournaments. Prior to that I spent 3 years doing parli at El Dorado HS.

Approach to judging

I try to come into the rounds as a blank slate. It is your job as debaters to tell me what matters within the context of the round. I will do my best to avoid any form of intervention and will instead vote solely based on my flow. Tell me how to weigh the round and why you are winning under your criteria. If you do not weigh your arguments against your opponents arguments in the round it puts me in an awkward position where I am forced to intervene at some level. If neither team weighs their arguments I will try to use what I see as the most intuitive weighing method for the round (for example, magnitude multiplied by probability) so as to decrease my intervention.

Argument preferences

I will hear any argument. It is your responsibility to tell me why and how your arguments function in the round. If you don't like a position the other team is running tell me why it is bad and why your alternative is better. If you run a procedural tell me where it functions in the round (a-priori or weighed against impacts?). Same goes for critical arguments, make sure to assign some framework to them so I understand how they function against other arguments in the round.

Presentation preferences

Your presentation will not effect who garners the ballot. As long as I can understand the words you are saying I will flow them. I will, however, award speaker points based on your usage of strategy, your presentation of compelling warranted arguments and the strength of your positions in round. I prefer slower well thought out arguments to blipped out speedy arguments (this is not to say I dislike speed, simply that I prefer quality arguments over a great quantity of inferior arguments). I am used to teams spreading and can flow teams that do spread. If I stop flowing you are going to fast. I have no preference on speed as long as the speeches are understandable, just make sure the things you are saying are important to the round.