Within debate rounds, students are expected to adapt to their judges. Students learn to shift their explanations of arguments or make strategies based on their judges. In order to do this, judges are expected to write a paradigm (aka “judge philosophy”). This is a written guide giving debaters (and coaches) information before the round to prepare accordingly. Below are some suggestions to include in your paradigm. This is not an all-inclusive list and is merely a guide for what you may wise to include – yours may have more, or less, information at your discretion.

For the Wisconsin State Debate Tournament (WSDT), you are required to have a paradigm for the event you are judging If you regularly judge multiple formats of debate, it would be great to include a paradigm for any formats you judge-then students can use it at all tournaments! Please see the separate attachment about how to put your paradigm into tabroom.com and fillable templates that can be copied & pasted into tabroom if desired. The templates are NOT the required format. They are merely a starting point for anyone who may be newer to making a paradigm. If you already have a paradigm in tabroom for the event you are judging at state, you do not need to change it.

Thank you for the work you do judging our students. Putting in some time to create an accurate paradigm makes everyone’s experience a more educational and enjoyable one!

Stephanie King

Judging Standards and Ethics Chair

Things to consider including in your paradigm

All Forms of Debate:

1. What school(s) are you affiliated with?
2. Were you a competitor when in school? If so, what style of debate did you do and for how many years?
3. How often do you judge?
4. How fast can students speak during speeches?
5. If a student is speaking too fast or unclear, will you give any cues to them?

Policy Debate:

1. List types of arguments you do or do not prefer to listen to/evaluate. For example, do you like disadvantages? Kritiks? Topicality?
2. List stylistic items you like or do not like to see. For example, do you like debaters that do line-by-line (i.e. respond to arguments in the order they were presented)?
3. In a few sentences, describe the type of debate you would like most to hear or any other things debaters/coaches should know about your judging style.

PF Debate:

1. Do you prefer arguments over style, style over arguments, or weigh them equally?
2. What do you see as the role of the final focus in the round?
3. If a team plans to win the debate on an argument, in your opinion does that argument have to be extended in the rebuttal or summary speeches?
4. Will you vote on arguments raised in crossfire?
5. Do you weigh evidence over analytics, analytics over evidence, or weigh them equally?

LD Debate:

1. How do you evaluate framework in the round?
2. Do you expect to see a value and a value criterion?
3. What are your thoughts on reading plan texts, counterplans, or kritiks in LD?
4. What is most important to you when you decide who wins?