

Judge Paradigm (Preferences) Sheet

Judge Name: _____

Tournament: _____

Round: _____ Division/Event: _____ Date: _____

1) What I Evaluate

Flow/line-by-line first (extensions must be on the line; new offense late is disregarded)

Big-picture weighing welcomed if clearly labeled and applied to the flow

Impact I prioritize:

- Magnitude
- Timeframe
- Probability
- Reversibility
- Strength of link

Delivery:

- Speed fine, if clear
- Slow on tags/author/date
- I'll call "clear" once

Defaults (if not debated):

Evidence vs. analytics:

- Evidence quality wins
- Analytics can outweigh weak cards

Theory/T:

- Competing interps
- Reasonability

Weighing:

- Comparative weighing required
- I'll infer minimal weighing if uncontested

Voter? Yes No Standard: _____

Kritiks/Framework:

- Fine
- Need explicit link & alt clarity
- Prefer policy-making lens

2) Time Enforcement

Who keeps time?

- Judge
- Debaters
- Both confirm

Hard stop at time?

- Yes
- Grace _____ seconds
(for finishing a sentence only)
- No, but I stop flowing

Prep tracking:

- Shared by teams
 - Judge tracked
- Total prep/team: _____

Speech Times (fill for your event):

• 1AC/1st Pro: _____ 1NC/1st Con: _____ CX: _____

• 2AC: _____ 2NC: _____ CX: _____

• 1AR: _____ 1NR: _____ 2AR: _____

• OR Lincoln-Douglas: AC: _____ NC: _____ 1AR: _____ NR: _____ 2AR: _____

3) Evidence Requests & Ethics

Evidence Transfer:

- Email chain
- Flash/USB
- Paper viewing
- After-round only

Reading during speeches:

- Allowed, if efficient
- Prefer after speeches

Card calling standard: I will read:

- Only if decisive
- Upon challenge
- Rarely/never

Clipping/ethics: Zero tolerance. **Allegation protocol:** stop round, take statements, render ruling.

4) Speaker Point Bands (HS 20–30 scale)

30.0	Exceptional — rare; national-final caliber
29.5–29.9	Outstanding — clear, strategic, compelling
29.0–29.4	Very strong — persuasive, minor issues
28.5–28.9	Solid — good command; some gaps
28.0–28.4	Adequate — mixed clarity/strategy
27.0–27.9	Needs work — clarity/strategy problems
< 27	Major issues (conduct/ethics/etiquette)

Low-point win allowed?

- Yes
- No

5) Reason for Decision (RFD) — Quick Template

Winner: _____

Side: Aff/Pro Neg/Con

Round synopsis (1–3 sentences):

Decisive issues & weighing (line-by-line):

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Evidence notes (quality, warrants, recency):

Theory/Procedurals (if relevant): _____

Speaker points & ranks:

Team ____: Spkr 1 ____ (R__) Spkr 2 ____ (R__)
Team ____: Spkr 1 ____ (R__) Spkr 2 ____ (R__)

Feedback / Next steps (actionable):
