

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2018 — 1A, 2A, 3A

EXPLANATORY NOTES

Numerical ranking questions — judges were asked to rank the following on a scale of 1-5:

- Qty. Arg. (Quantity of Arguments) — 1 = Limited, 5 = Unlimited
- T (Topicality) — 1 = Rarely Vote On, 5 = Vote On Often
- CP (Counterplans) — 1 = Unacceptable, 5 = Acceptable
- DA (Disadvantages) — 1 = Not Essential, 5 = Essential
- Cond. Arg. (Conditional Arguments) — 1 = Unacceptable, 5 = Acceptable
- Kritiks — 1 = Unacceptable, 5 = Acceptable

DO NOT LOSE THIS BOOKLET!
Bring it with you to each day of competition.

Experience — A = policy debater in high school, B = coach policy debate in high school, C = coach policy debate in college, D = college NDT debate, E = college CEDA debate, J = college LD debate, K = college parliamentary debate

IMPORTANT NOTE: Some judges' philosophy statements may be too long to fit completely in the box, and there may be some new judges who do not appear in this booklet. New judges and expanded printouts for those with longer philosophy statements will be posted in the assembly room. Debaters may ask any judge for a brief explanation of his or her judging philosophy prior to the round.

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	QTY. VS. QUALITY OF EVIDENCE	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
		<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
ACEVEDO, MANUEL	Stock issues			3	3	5	4	2	2	4	
Philosophy Statement											
As a stock issues judge, I expect the affirmative team's plan to retain all stock issues and should label them clearly during the debate. The negative needs to prove that the affirmative fails to meet at least one issue in order to win. I require both sides to provide offense. Sufficient evidence is needed for any claim made. I do not intervene, so the debaters must tell me what is important and why I should vote for them.											
Style & Delivery Preferences											
All debaters must speak clearly in order for me to hear all of their points and must watch rate of delivery. I can't vote on what I don't hear or can't understand.											
ALIM, MOHAMMAD	Tabula rasa			4	2	4	5	5	1	4	A
Philosophy Statement											
Tab, will default policy if I'm not told how to evaluate you. Won't pull the trigger on T unless there's actual abuse											
Style & Delivery Preferences											
Speed is fine, but slow down for the tags. Like a lot											
ANDERSON, JOHN	Policymaker			5	5	5	5	5	5	2	AB
Philosophy Statement											
I'm fine with any arguments so long as they aren't blatantly offensive. Disadvantages aren't necessarily essential, regardless of the indication above, but if you are telling me to reject the affirmative as a policy option, you do need a reason why the action results in more bad than good. I evaluate case attacks in the same manner as disads: I am concerned with whether the plan makes the world better or worse. It is NOT enough to claim the aff might not solve for all of their harms; so long as they are reasonably able to solve for some, I will vote aff, and I will vote on risk of solvency if there is no consequence of doing the plan. Impact weighing is essential. Kritiks need to have time spent on alt and framework. I am not particularly well read on some literature, so feel free to ask beforehand. T can be run as a timesuck but if you want me to vote on it, extend standards, voters, and violation. I default competing interpretations. If you don't know what that means, probably don't go for T in the 2NR. Please don't read new offense in the 2NC. New evidence on 1NC offense, or new case defense, etc. are all fine, but I have a very low threshold for 1ARs answering entirely new turns and off-case. Affs should extend their case in every single aff speech. Negatives should split the block: this means I see the 2NC and the 1NR as essentially the same speech, and I don't want that speech to repeat itself at all. For more, look me up on the judge philosophies wiki, and feel free to ask any questions before the round.											
Style & Delivery Preferences											
I am fine with speed, but I ask that you respect the conventions of the tournament. I like impassioned delivery but I'm not impressed by you being rude, and I'll dock you speaks with no hesitation. I start you off at 27.5, which I consider being the average state qualified debater, and adjust from there. Debate is first and foremost a technical event, and as such, I value technical skills over delivery.											

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
ARMSTRONG, ANDI	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	4	2	3	2	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

Voters and logic are a must. Impact calculus is important, I won't do the work for you. Make argumentation that is reasonable and not just "fun". This is speech and debate so decorum is important: i won't stand for rudeness or vulgarity in rounds.

I don't mind speed but I don't like spreading. If I don't hear it, it wasn't said.

Style & Delivery Preferences

ARMSTRONG, ASHLAN	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	4	5	4	3	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am a tab judge but will default stocks if I am not presented voters. I value logic in arguments, especially when considering evidence, analytics, and kritiks. If arguments are missing key segments they will be considered moot. For example, Ts without S&V or DAs without Links or any other missing parts will not hold proper weight. Impact calculus and voters are a must and help me weigh the round.

I prefer clear, concise and organized speeches. Signposting is a must. Spreading is only acceptable if it is intelligible otherwise I won't flow it or vote for it.

Style & Delivery Preferences

AUSTIN, MICHAEL	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	2	2	4	3	1	3	

Philosophy Statement

I am a Tab-Stock Judge.

Generally, I can judge anything and everything. However, there are a few points that I am picky about. I rarely vote on kritiks or counterplans, so this area might be a waste of your time. I also don't usually vote on Topicality unless the Aff is REALLY untropical and it is an obvious abuse issue. In this case, I take Topicality very seriously.

For the Aff to win the debate, they must at least hold ALL stock issues. If the Neg wants to win, they need only prove one of these to be insufficient. If the Aff meets all stock issues, then I will weigh Advantages vs Disadvantages during the impact calc.

No New in the Two: I will not consider ANY new off-case arguments in the 2NC. However, you may bring in new evidence for your current arguments as well as new on-case arguments.

I ask is that you slow down at the tag lines so I can understand what your card is saying.

I give speaker points on a ranking system: 1st=30, 2nd=29, 3rd=28, 4th=27. This will only change if I really had difficulty understanding your points.

Style & Delivery Preferences

BALDWIN, AARON	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				3	3	2	2	1	1	1	

Philosophy Statement

I look for the stock issues, but am open to other styles, provided the debaters back up their cases with evidence and sufficient support. It is important for those presenting a negative case that they prove status quo, and if not doing so, have a well thought out plan in its place.

I am traditional in that I don't tolerate spreading. If I can't understand you, your opponents may not be able to either, and I won't be able to flow your case effectively.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
BARNES, KEASHA	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				5	3	3	3	3	2	4	

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issue judge. I want to see the clash on the stock issue including DAs and Advantages. I am open to Advantage cases as well as counterplans.

I am looking for good, quality speaking but it really comes down to the clash and attacks more than the speaking. I am not a fan of spreading.

Style & Delivery Preferences

BARSHOP, NOAH

Tabula rasa

Comm. Skills
 Res. Issues
 Equal

Quantity
 Quality
 Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC
5	3	5	3	5	5	3

AB

Philosophy Statement

I am a blank slate. Debaters should tell me how I should vote on substantive issues and how I should evaluate the round. With topicality and theory you will have to grease the wheels extensively to get me to vote on potential abuse (really do work on how x practice undermines the a critical community value); otherwise, to win T or theory point out specific in-round abuse and disadvantages. I am open to all types of arguments from cps to ks, DAs and T, plan flaws, critical case args, non-linear dAs, w/e. For kritiks, I often find that debaters come up short the most on explaining the alternative and how that resolves k/case impacts. if you want to win a K, you need to do work on that front.

Be clear. Be civil. Be respectful.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Additionally, Neg flex is cool until someone points out that it isn't. That being said, both sides should be wary of performative contradictions and be wary to point them out.

BEAN, NANCY

Stock issues

Comm. Skills
 Res. Issues
 Equal

Quantity
 Quality
 Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC
3	2	3	3	3	3	3

Philosophy Statement

I want to see a lively debate with good clash. If a contestant speed-reads, they must do it well or I find it just a distraction technique. I expect contestants to understand the topic and be well informed and have good research. I expect them to be able to correctly pronounce any and all terms and names they choose to use. I want the topic debated - students will lose if they debate off topic or use topicality as their only negative stance. I want to be convinced.

Poise and articulation are most important to me. I want to see professional but interactive debating.

Style & Delivery Preferences

BENAVIDES, JASMYN

Tabula rasa

Comm. Skills
 Res. Issues
 Equal

Quantity
 Quality
 Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC
4	3	3	3	3	3	4

A

Philosophy Statement

TAB Judge that leans Policy -- open to any/all arguments, but at the end of the day, I really want you to highlight all the advantages/impacts of each argument of the round. Need you to really tell me the roll of the ballot - make my job easier and keep me very up-to-date with all drops/concedes/impacts/etc.

I'm "okay" with a little speed, but don't take that as an excuse to read 100000mph. please try to CLEARLY communicate your arguments in the round -- if i can't get it down, it won't be flowed.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Super hate time-suck arguments -> if you run something and you kick it at the last minute, that's gonna flow aff and really hurt your ground.

Also, please don't be incredibly rude in round - hurts your speaks real bad. No need to be a jerk to win.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
BEZNER, JILLIAN	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				5	3	2	3	3	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

CX debate should be educational to all participants within each round. Therefore, the team with the most thorough analysis and researched arguments will win within a round. Intelligent questions should be asked during cross examination. Detailed on- and off-case arguments should be presented by the Neg. Case extensions and a clear knowledge base should be provided by the Aff. Use the rebuttal speeches to weigh the round.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Roadmap before speeches. Organization is key.

CAFFEY, LANI	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				3	4	3	4	4	1	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issues judge. I am open to disadvantages but rarely make a judging decision based solely on a disad. I do not accept Kritiks. I will listen to a Counter Plan, but I do not like them. I have rarely seen one argued effectively.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I believe that debate is an educational experience and that part of being a good debater is being a quality communicator. Spreading/rapid fire is not acceptable to me in any other speech than the 1AC. Even in that speech, I want the speaker to slow down on tag lines so I can flow them.

CALDWELL, JASON	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				3	3	3	3	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I'm a tab judge that is open to all relevant arguments. Communication is key as is quality of arguments

Style & Delivery Preferences

No speed

CALDWELL, LORI	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
				3	3	3	3	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

Lori is a stock judge that hates speed and values quality of arguments

Style & Delivery Preferences

Hates speed

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
CLARK, MEGHAN	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				3	5	4	4	2	4	4	

Philosophy Statement

I am primarily a stocks judge. I expect stocks to be clearly covered by the aff and flowed throughout the round.

In the neg, I am open to CPs as long as they are mutually exclusive. A T-violation with clearly identified standards and voters can win you the round if argued effectively. I am open to a K if run well. If you run a DA, be very clear about your internal links. Do not expect me, as the judge, to fill in the gaps for you. In the 2NC, I expect to see on-case arguments; cover the stocks.

Both sides - presenting a clear and convincing impact calc in rebuttals is crucial. Prove to me why your best-case scenario is better than your opponents'.

Be sure to present a concise off-time roadmap at the beginning of each speech; I expect to know where you're heading as you begin. Make sure you flow FOR me as the round progresses - don't expect me to automatically notice dropped arguments or defenses if you fail to point them out.

Style & Delivery Preferences

NO SPREADING. Spreading will cost you speaker points. Deliver your arguments clearly, at a reasonable speed, and with decent articulation. Be polite to your opponents - if you expect to be taken seriously, treat me and your opponents with the utmost civility.

COHEN, WILLIAM	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AE
				3	3	5	5	2	5	1	

Philosophy Statement

I don't go for ridiculous impacts. Tell me how your plan impacts the real world and how you can realistically solve it and I will weigh your impact. I much prefer timeframe and probability to absurd Nuclear War.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Your mom and your best friend should be able to understand your speed. If she can't and they can't then why are you debating?

CORNISH, ANDREW	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				5	5	5	5	5	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I will listen to any argument presented, but I think it is up to the debaters to explain why I should evaluate it. This also means the debaters are responsible for articulating how I evaluate each position. I need to know how my ballot functions.

I tend to only vote for some offensive reason for your side of the debate (coupled with defense usually helps), but I have a hard time voting for only solvency defense, inherency, etc.

I err neg on CP theory and towards competing interpretations on topicality.

I think new arguments in the 2NC is not strategic and I don't enjoy those debates.

Please ask any questions you have.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I think you should adhere to the norms of the organization for which you are competing. I will punish excessive speed by docking speaker points, but can flow it and will evaluate the win by the arguments themselves.

CORNISH, NICOLE	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
	Offense/Defense			5	5	5	5	5	5	1	

Philosophy Statement

I believe a debate round should have a balance of offensive and defensive arguments and the debaters should weigh those arguments in the round. I am not opposed to any particular argument. Its important to me that krikik alternatives clearly explain the role of the ballot. Topicality probably requires some sort of abuse story or at least an explanation of what arguments you cannot make because of their 1AC choice. I am willing to answer any specific questions you might have before the round.

Style & Delivery Preferences

The UIL ballot indicates I should evaluate speed as a criteria for assigning speaker points, and I will follow the norms of the organization I'm judging for.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
COUNTS, EMILY	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AK
				3	1	4	4	2	4	1	

Philosophy Statement

Show me how you are right and your opponent is wrong. Have quality evidence, well constructed links and solvency. I hardly ever vote on topicality as it usually becomes a time suck for the round and takes away from the debate. Walk me through your arguments, I won't do your work for you.

Spreading is not preferred, but is alright as long as I can understand you. Debate needs to be as respectful as possible. There is a difference between being passionate and being rude. If you are disrespectful, you will lose points.

Style & Delivery Preferences

CUNNINGHAM, JESSIE	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
					4	3	4	2	1	4	

Philosophy Statement

Primarily, I learn more towards a policy maker judge, however there are a few things that I feel are more important. Topicality arguments are reasonable if they are presented logically, include all necessary parts, and are explained and argued intelligently, not just

read from a pre-printed piece of paper. It's important that you understand what your case aims to actually do, if you have no expertise concerning your evidence, then you have no qualifications to debate it. Also, I want you and your partner to flow effectively so that you

can bring up when cards are dropped by your opponents. If evidence is dropped and you never mention it, then as far as I'm concerned, you didn't notice that the argument was ever dropped. Explanations at the end of major arguments are extremely useful to your speech, they help me understand what you actually think your cards are doing, and give you a chance to really show off your

speaking skills. Don't push in 3 DA's and 2 T's that you don't understand when you could really deeply explain and effectively present 1 DA and a T. I think counterplans are acceptable as long as they're well-structured and not overly generic and unformed. I feel like a counterplan should be something that could feasibly be a plan, not just a minor addition that could be slapped on to any plan in the world. I prefer to look at debate as a model for the processes of actual policy decisions, so I find K's to be a little ridiculous most of the time. You wouldn't hear a representative at the United Nations saying how we shouldn't even be talking about this because it's unfair, so don't do this in debate. I want you to uphold the resolution and present effective arguments and evidence that make your case better. For the most part, be respectful, be intelligent, and have fun.

First things first, debate is a speaking event. I feel it's extremely important that I understand you and that your points are clearly articulated and expressed. Spreading in my opinion is nothing more than an excuse to cram in large volumes of information that neither you nor your opponents can keep up with. I want to be able to hear all of your cards, and I will write them down and keep up with them.

Style & Delivery Preferences

DAVIS, LARRY	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				4	4	4	3	2	2	5	

Philosophy Statement

I learned CX debate using stock issues and that is still my default, but I can be a policy maker if both teams take the round that way. I believe a CP should be competitive and non-topical. I believe T should not be a waste of time. DA's are not essential to a neg win, but I like them. I like to think that I could vote on a K that was explained well and made sense to me, but I haven't heard one yet.

I believe debate is a speech contest and like competitors to be effective always and oratorical when possible.

Style & Delivery Preferences

DAVIS, RICHARD	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABEK
				3	3	3	5	2	1	4	

Philosophy Statement

I am extremely "flow oriented". If a speaker delivers his or her case in such a manner that I cannot flow it, it is as if it never happened. While I indicated below that I will vote on arguments such as T or on a counter plan, such things must be run correctly. Generic DA's should be avoided and realize that not everything an AFF team does will end in Nuclear Extinction. I expect any and all arguments made in a round to be applied by the debaters to the round, if I am to give them any weight in making my decision. I also expect debaters to conduct themselves in as respectful and courteous a manner as possible. Rudeness, sarcasm and, or personal attacks will not be tolerated. Speakers of each team have certain responsibilities. To be successful in winning my decision, you must meet those responsibilities. Please do not presume to instruct me on my role in the round.

CX Debate is first and foremost an event demanding effective communication. If you are not communicating effectively, you cannot win my ballot. Speed is never a good idea.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE			
DAVIS, STEPHANIE	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
				4	3	4	4	2	4	2		

Philosophy Statement

A clear road map of the plan is ideal. I prefer a clash especially on stock issues. Do not spend too much time arguing on the dates of evidence. Resolution is most important but I will also be judging on communication skills as well. Evidence should be relevant, I do not enjoy being read to.

Clear and articulate delivery. Road maps are preferred.

Style & Delivery Preferences

DEBORD, LOGAN	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				4	4	3	5	3	2	5		

Philosophy Statement

AFF: I'm a policymaker in the following way: if the harms and advantages outweigh the disadvantages, then that gives me reason to support the Affirmative plan. I like to think about debate in this way because it incorporates all of the stock issues into a simple "for" or "against" vote at the end of the day. For example, having weak Solvency will decrease the extent to which your Harms are factored into my decision. I appreciate lots of offense in the 2AC. NEG: If the disadvantages outweigh the harms and advantages, then that gives me reason to oppose the Affirmative plan. Disads are essential in determining whether a plan makes for good policy. Provide lots of clash and split the block. Topicality is fair game, but I prefer a legitimate reason for its existence in a round (and expect to devote a significant amount of time to it in the 2NR if you plan to win on it). Counterplans are fine, but they should be nontopical and concede both Inherency and Harms. If you run a K, be sure it's a meaningful reason to reject the Aff on principle. Give me voters at the end. BOTH: Impact calculus should persuade me WHY your proposed course of action outweighs the alternative. Be realistic with your impacts. You can win me over with recent evidence that you researched yourself.

It's all about effective communication.

Style & Delivery Preferences

DELEON, ROSENDO	Stock issues	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				2	4	2	4	3	2	3		

Philosophy Statement

I like clashes in the debate. I want to see great analysis and reasoning.
I also like to hear a very well constructed case with support. Do not attack the debater but attack the the case. I want to hear cases that strongly are rooted on the stock issues and deal strongly on the topic.

Communicative style of delivery. I think that speed often gets in the way of communication.

Style & Delivery Preferences

DEMETRION, THOMAS	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				3	1	5	3	3	1	5		

Philosophy Statement

I have to hear the case clearly to be able to judge the round. I don't mind speed but not at the expense of the clarity of the case. In a good CX round I expect to see a clash of ideas. Road maps and sign posting are fine if they are followed as I flow each round. Voters are not mandatory but they can be used to tied up the case.

I dont want spreading as I was clear communication of the cases.

Style & Delivery Preferences

As a policy maker I want to see how their arguments relate to the topic/plan text.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
DICKSON, ALEX	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	3	3	3	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

This is your round. Have fun! I am open to every argument. Please keep in mind this is a UIL tournament, so you must adapt to the philosophy of the tournament when it comes to communication. At the end of the day, I vote where the flow and the debate round tells me to vote. Please ask if you need any clarification.

Speed isn't an issue as long as its clear and articulate. Remember, this is a UIL Academic competition, and you must adapt.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
DICKSON, CHRISTOPHER	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABCDE JK
				3	3	3	3	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I consider myself tabula rasa. I am clean slate. I want you to tell me why a particular argument is important in the round and how I should weigh it. I think it is important to weigh arguments against each other. I don't think you should be rude to your opponent. I think this is an event that has the ability to take you far in life. Have fun and enjoy State!

I can flow speed. You must be clear and articulate. However, please keep in mind this is a UIL State event - so you must adapt to the rules and regulations of the meet.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
Do, HANH	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AJ
	Stocks and Policymaker			3	3	3	3	2	1	1	

Philosophy Statement

I'm a stocks/policymaker and fairly traditional. I will entertain theory and argumentation that is well flushed, developed properly and in proper form! So I am with the school of thought of keeping things simple with DAs, CPs. Just make sure if you do run CPs they don't bite into the DAs you present and also competitive. First voter to down someone is based on burdens. Aff has burden of proof and neg has burden to clash. Please call the other team out if they didn't follow through and give me multiple voters. Write the ballot for me and prioritize the argumentation in how I should view it. Always answer who, what, when, where, why, how, and then what. Narratives are great but I need solid link chains that are easy and clear to navigate. Give the macro analysis and impact the round. Most of all, enjoy your moment, learn, grow, and become better people through all of this!!

Don't sacrifice clarity for speed EVER!!!

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
DONALD, KANDACE	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	2	2	3	3	2	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am a tabula rasa judge, so I come in with an open mind to all arguments. However, I prefer the traditional style of debate and I strictly follow the UIL rules and guidelines. When the round becomes difficult to frame, or neither team shows a clear warrant for the win, I default to stock issues. Although the negative team should always create arguments against the affirmative case, the affirmative team is required to present a prima facie case regardless of whether or not the negative team approaches each stock issue. The affirmative should present an affirmative case complete with all five stock issues in the first affirmative constructive. Ideally, each team will continue to uphold their arguments throughout each speech during the debate.

Speed and spreading are two separate entities. Debaters typically speak faster than someone would while having a normal conversation, so speed is acceptable to some extent. Spreading, or speed that gets in the way of effective communication, will prevent the debater from receiving the maximum amount of speaker points. Debaters should always maintain a professional and respectful demeanor. I prefer traditional debates and discourage teams from running a performance debate.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
DOSSEY, LAURA	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				3	4	2	5	3	1	5	

Philosophy Statement

Paradigm: Stock Issues

I am a traditionalist. I don't default to specific stock issues, but rather I flow the entire round and look for dropped arguments/issues. I expect to hear arguments on both sides of the flow dealing with Topicality, Inherence, Solvency, Harms, and Significance. The Affirmative has to give a good reason for changing the present policies. The burden falls on the Affirmative to prove the advantages outweigh the disadvantages. I expect for the Negative to clash with the Affirmative's stock issues and support the status quo. Clash is important.

Flashing will be counted as a part of prep time.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Debate is about communication skills. Spreading to the extreme and poor communication that interferes with understanding will be severely penalized.

DUTHIE, SHAWN	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				3	4	2	5	3	1	4	

Philosophy Statement

I am a Stock Issues judge. I like a clear debate. Apply your argumentation, don't expect me to intervene and draw the connections for you. Weigh your arguments. Your analysis of the evidence is more important to me than how much evidence that you present during the round. Stay professional and courteous especially during your questioning period. IF you plan to run T--run it in the 1NC. Try not to run T as a timesuck. Make sure that the components of your DA's are clear. Generic DA's are fine with me as long as you prove the LINK. Don't forget impact calculus in the rebuttals. Don't run a K, I won't vote on it. If you choose to run a CP, make sure that everyone is on the same page.

Style & Delivery Preferences

This is a communication event, so speed should not interfere with your ability to be an effective communicator.

EDMONSON, MAELA	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				5	3	2	4	3	2	4	

Philosophy Statement

I feel that I am a tabula rasa judge. I believe that the obligation of the clash and argumentation development is on the debaters. I will weigh the round on what is presented and how it plays out in the round.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I want a well presented, clean round. I think road maps are essential. Students who spread will be penalized only if the speed inhibits communication.

EDWARDS, KAY	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				5	3	5	5	5	5	3	

Philosophy Statement

I have no prior leanings towards any style of argument; you go to state, now do they kind of debate that you are most skilled at/find the most enjoyable.

I prefer to be given a framing mechanism for the round. Absent a framing mechanism, I will probably evaluate on an offense/defense paradigm and will give preference to higher levels of debate (i.e. if the neg reads T, that is the highest layer because it is a meta question about how debate should function). The above being said, I really would prefer to be given a weighing/framing mechanism.

(Note: I placed a 3 on Topicality because it is on a "vote on" scale not an "unacceptable/acceptable" scale. I vote on T the same way I do anything else; it needs to have substantive impacts and a weighing mechanism, not just "T is obviously good, so vote neg.")

Style & Delivery Preferences

I don't have any specific delivery preferences; do what you are comfortable with and best at. Any stylistic questions would be best broached before the round for clarification.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
FARRELL, KRISTIN	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABCDE JK
				3	3	3	3	3	3	1	

Philosophy Statement

I prefer to evaluate each debate individually- as each debate becomes its own unique discussion and art of persuasion depending on the debaters. Their strengths, and the conflict and communication styles of the debaters/teams with each other and with the audience all affect and influence what issues rise to the top. I see the value of both policy making and stock issues, and it depends on how the debaters present and argue their sides that persuade me to choose/vote for what they value/deem important.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Prefer speaking style and delivery that allows the judge to flow, understand, and see communication skills.

FELLOWS, ANDREW	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				3	5	1	5	3	2	4	

Philosophy Statement

I am a blank slate, I look for both on case arguments and off case arguments. I really look for good clash between the aff. and neg.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Make sure that everyone in the room can understand what you are saying.

FONTAINE, MATTHEW	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				4	4	5	5	4	2	2	

Philosophy Statement

My philosophy on judging is relatively simple. As listed, I am a policymaker judge and base my decision on whether or not the affirmative was able to maintain their plan/policy throughout the round. If the negative is able to present more realistic disadvantages than the affirmative advantages and the affirmative can't defend against them, my ballot would flow to the negative. If the negative can't fulfill their obligation then my ballot would flow to the affirmative.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I prefer a clear and concise delivery. If I can't flow your cases, then I can't properly judge your team. Also, if you are using a laptop, make sure I can see your face please. Don't read from behind the screen.

As a judge, I also expect realism, so please do not run anything that can't be attacked simply because it's unrealistic. Remember, just have fun, have a good attitude, and be professional.

FORBIS, DONNA	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				5	1	4	3	4	3	2	

Philosophy Statement

I believe the stock issues are crucial and that the affirmative team should understand these. It is the responsibility of the negative team to clash and show evidence against the affirmative team.

Style & Delivery Preferences

This is a speaking event. I prefer to be able to comfortably understand the speaker at a normal conversation rate.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
FROST, HUNTER	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABCDE JK
				3	4	5	5	3	1	3	

Philosophy Statement

I believe that a judge should be able to follow the debaters. The debaters should not have to conform to a judge. I am fine with most arguments. I like real world, applicable answers. For example, we all appreciate education and want a better system, but education problems will not lead to global thermonuclear war.

I am good with speed as long as I can understand you. I do not want you to mumble a 14 page case in 8 minutes. I would like to know what you're saying.

Style & Delivery Preferences

GALLARDO, ADRIAN	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
	Tab/Policy			3	5	4	5	4	4	5	

Philosophy Statement

Voters & impacts are crucial. Please tell me where to flow your arguments. I am open when it comes to listening to arguments but I want to see signs that you are making connections to your opponent's case, not just reading something that has been pre-prepped.

I do not like rudeness in a round. Don't sacrifice clarity for speed - it's not impressive. CX is a formal speaking event.

Style & Delivery Preferences

GATTIS, JASON	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				3	4	5	3	1	1	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am primarily a policy maker type judge. Absent any technical flaws (topicality, etc) I will vote for the side which has the best policy. Kritiks and multi-world arguments are unacceptable and will be an automatic loss. I must feel like you understand your own arguments and can articulate them well. Do not contradict yourselves.

Smoother the better. You don't have to be slow but gasping is crap.

Style & Delivery Preferences

GILLESPIE, JULIE	Policymaker	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				3	3	5	4	2	2	1	

Philosophy Statement

I really love a great debate. I want to hear your arguments articulated clearly. I want to understand that you clearly understand your very own case.

Speak clearly and highlight the tag lines.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
GILMORE, GARRETT	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				2	4	1	5	3	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

Back up points with relevant evidence. Don't Read Cards at me. Your Case should set out to realistically solve the resolution. Don't use CX time for argumentation.

If spreading make sure to highlight important information in your speech. Roadmap and Signpost.

Style & Delivery Preferences

GLADSON, ARNOLD	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AD
				3	2	4	3	2	3	4	

Philosophy Statement

I am a Stock Issues Judge. I believe Affirmative must lay out their case and decide the points they are going to attack/support in the resolution and then fix/adjust with their plan. They also assume a burden of proof to show how their plan improves the status quo.

I look for clarity of presentation over high-speed rate of delivery. I want debaters to clearly communicate their thoughts.

Negative will seek to defend status quo and prove Aff Plan will not work and should not be adopted.

I match arguments of each sides and evaluate how well they present their arguments. I am looking for point/counterpoint refutation of ideas. I prefer quality use of evidence by using it to support your debate points. I am not fond of debaters reading volumes of evidence without tying it to their ideas.

I look for clarity of presentation over high-speed rate of delivery. I want debaters to clearly communicate their thoughts when refuting their opponents or supporting their ideas.

Style & Delivery Preferences

GREEN, DENISE	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				5	5	3	4	1	1	5	

Philosophy Statement

Debate should be about clash and communication. I generally vote on stock issues, but inevitably I will go in with an open mind and vote for the team that is most persuasive in the round.

Communication is important. A little speed is fine, but I have to be able to flow what you are saying.

Style & Delivery Preferences

GREGORY, TESSA	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				4	3	3	4	3	2	5	

Philosophy Statement

Since I'm Tab, I'm accepting of most arguments. I highly value impacts throughout the round so make sure you have some type of offensive arguments if you are the negative. (Side note, providing an impact calc throughout the round is highly encouraged.) With any argument you run I need structure. I want you to label each part of the T, DA, CP etc. First looking at T, make sure that you have voters to accompany this argument because without them, this is just a definition and has no weight. Second, DAs need to have a clear link to the AFF. I am ok with generic DAs but you still need to prove how it links. Third, CPs need need need to have a clear net benefit. If there is not one, the likelihood of me voting on a CP goes down drastically. Last but not least, Kritiks. Kritiks are definitely not my favorite argument to hear and I would recommend not solely relying on it in a round. That being said, I have voted on them in the past so if you do decide to run one, there are a couple things you need to do. First, run it correctly. I've heard numerous kritiks that are missing components and just make the round messier rather than add to the debate. Second, make sure you allot enough time to further explain the K in your speech. If you take the time to break it down for me, there is a higher chance of me voting on it. Lastly, make sure when extending arguments throughout the round you are telling me what I'm extending and why. If you need any clarification or have any further questions, feel free to ask in round!

I value clarity above anything else when it comes to delivery. I am good with speed but if you are aware that your clarity decreases when your speed increases, I highly suggest speaking slower.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
GUIITERREZ, M.A.	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABD
				3	4	4	3	2	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

I judge each round as it happens. I consider myself a tabula rasa judge. I expect you to show me why I should vote a particular way. All arguments are acceptable as long as they are run correctly.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I consider debate a form of public speaking and do give some importance to style. However, what you say is more important than how you say it. Spreading is not a problem unless it hinders communication.

HALL, BAILEY	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	3	4	5	2	4	5	

Philosophy Statement

I will listen to most arguments. I love theory and framework debates. DAs should be specific or have specific links if they are generic. Tell me why I vote on the argument or I wont. Be in-depth with your arguments. Be respectful of one another. Mostly I'm looking for an evidence filled debate with plenty of clash and analysis of the evidence.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I am good with most speeds. With that being said if I put my pen on the desk, slow down. Be respectful of one another.

HALL, MIKE	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
	Policymaker first - Stock underlying -			5	4	4	5	4	4	5	

Philosophy Statement

CX Debate is a speaking event relying on applied research for argumentation and refutation. Decision making based on a well-established and supported affirmative plan compared to a countering negation is the very heart of the judges role. Presentation quality can be judged based on verbal, non-verbal, organization, and argumentation can be judged based on application, and analysis. The topic is the topic, but alternatives are possible if reasonably made and supported.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I'm great with speed. The question is... how are you? If you sacrifice clarity for speed. Garbling, muddling, or mispronunciations are point reducers. Verbal and non-verbal are part of judging. Be intentional with tone, volume, speed, and clear in presentation. Also be intentional with body movement and motions.

HAMILTON, SUZANNE	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
				3	1	1	3	3	1	5	

Philosophy Statement

CX debate is based on communication and persuasion. To be successful for me, the debaters need to communicate and then persuade me on their plan and/or negative attacks. Clash is nice!!

Style & Delivery Preferences

I want a speech that I can understand! Speed needs to incorporate enunciation and persuasion.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
HAREN, DEBBY	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	BD
				3	1	5	3	2	2	1	

Philosophy Statement

I am a recently retired high school CX coach of many years experience.

If you want to put a title on my debate philosophy, I'd call myself a policymaker.

When I judge a CX round, I pay attention to my flow. I care about dropped arguments, and I don't like the neg to run time suck arguments and then kick out. That said, be sure I can take a good flow by speaking at a reasonable rate of speed. If you MUST speak quickly, at least give me a chance to catch your tag lines and source citations.

I have no issues with theoretical debate or critical arguments, so long as you make me understand them. That said, I still prefer to judge a round about the resolution instead of a round about whether or not someone was abusive. Stock issues still matter to me.

Don't be rude to your opponent. Respect the activity with professional demeanor.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Debate is a public speaking activity. Debaters with poor speaking skills will lose speaker points, but I will not use delivery as an RFD unless your delivery makes it impossible for me to understand your arguments.

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
HARVEY, BILLIE	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABC
				4	4	4	5	3	2	5	

Philosophy Statement

As a judge, I want clash. I lean towards stock issues debate, BUT I am open to any arguments as long as they are relevant to the case.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Organization is KEY. Speed is ok as long as it is very clear and I am able to flow it. Being polite in the room is very important to me.

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
HEBRON, FORREST	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABD
				5	2	5	3	5	5	3	

Philosophy Statement

I am open to basically any type of argument. I'm tab, but that means the responsibility is on you to give me a way to evaluate the round. Untraditional arguments need a framework, or some sort of way given to evaluate them.

At the end of the round I evaluate my flow by seeing who has more offense. Generally, the team that does the better job articulating this, weighing, mitigating, giving their own analysis wins. I'm not the type of person to call for cards at the end of the round, so accurately represent your ev. to me, and pull out the warrants.

Theory is a meta-debate, but can be fun to engage in. I will listen to any theory argument, but default to competing interns to evaluate Theory and Topicality args. Topicality I don't vote on as much as I think I could be, but that's a reflection of debaters not being all that much into going for it, so no issue here if you don't want to run it as Neg. Never really had a firm opinion on New in the 2NC.

Kritiks- Feel free to run them. Don't assume I know the intricacies of the argument, esp. if it's something uncommon. Tell me how it functions in the round (see:Framework); CPs and conditional args- I start at the beginning of the round assuming they're ok unless a theoretical objection is presented. That being said, my own opinion is they're 100% OK--however, if you can present a good argument that they're not, I'd be willing to vote on it; Disads- Run them if they're part of your strategy. Otherwise utilize some other sort of offense--case turns, K's, etc.

Case debate- I've always liked it when teams prioritize the case.
 Paradigm: https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?search_first=&search_last=hebron

Style & Delivery Preferences

Be clear and concise. Give roadmaps and signpost. If you are an un-organized person, number your arguments. Extend arguments. Explain arguments, and how they function in the round-- this makes it easier for me to vote for you. Always point out mistakes your opponents have made. Make cross-x interesting and useful. Doing these things will give you better speaks. Good strategy wins rounds! Not every argument has to be carded, but MAY help.

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
HERRERA, JONATHON	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				4	4	5	5	4	5	4	

Philosophy Statement

My expectation is for the teams to decide what issues in the round are important AND why they are winning those arguments. I am willing to consider all arguments except theory since most debaters fail to spend sufficient time giving me any compelling reason to consider voting on theory alone. I also strongly dislike any debater who repeats the same argument multiple times during their speech. State the argument once and then move on.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed for the sake of speed is bad. Always know your limits for how fast you can speak while effectively communicating.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
HERTEL, CRAIG	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				4	3	3	4	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I generally weigh a round in a Policy Maker fashion, and am usually impressed by both clear organization and by clear explanation. I think it is the debater's job to explain arguments and connect everything together. I am open to all types of arguments, but generally don't like arguments that seem tricky. I time flashing as prep time of the team supplying the information.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I don't mind some speed if debaters still use clear taglines and signposting.

HICKEY, JOANNA	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABJ
				3	4	4	5	1	3	4	

Philosophy Statement

I consider myself a policymaker judge although I do give importance to the stock issues. At the end of the round, I vote on the impacts of the competing policies. If you run T, it must be run first in the 1NC – a new T in the 2NC is not okay.

Kritiks should be germane and run well. I don't like Kritiks run just to confuse the opponent. I think those are a bit abusive and you also risk me not understanding. I prefer an Alt that is not "reject the Aff".

Framework is not a separate argument but a lens through which to evaluate the round. As long as it's not morally repugnant, i.e. white supremacy good, I am open to it. Theory is okay but make sure you impact it.

I do not agree with topical CPs – I won't automatically vote against it, but I am very open to arguments against it.

I am good with new in the 2NC if it is on-case. I am not a fan of performance. Again, I won't automatically vote against it, but I am biased against it. I usually don't count flashing as prep if you don't abuse it. I will usually let you know if I'm going to start prep.

If you are going to "kick" an argument (on the Neg), you need to let me know and I prefer that it be for a good reason. If you kick T in the 2NR, I will not be happy and will be open to abuse claims by the Aff.

I do not like conditionality, as in multiple worlds or contradicting arguments. I am not a hypothesis tester judge so that's not a good strategy with me. Crying abuse with no in-round impact is not likely to persuade me.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I can flow speed, but I don't necessarily like it. I really don't like the droning style of speaking or the style with quick breaths that sound like gasping. To me it is not good communication. If you speak fast, it is imperative that you speak clearly. Signposting is very helpful and makes me happy.

Be nice! You don't have to be overly nice, but don't be mean.

HIRSCH, CHELSEY	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
				2	5	5	3	2	2	1	

Philosophy Statement

I do not have a specific philosophy. I believe the winner of a debate will be due to their argument staying on topic, addressing and solving the arguments of their opponent, listing more advantages than disadvantages, and if their argument stands that it will work.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I like a debater who is easy to follow and understand, and will provide roadmaps.

HOFF, ROXANNE	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				3	4	2	3	3	2	3	

Philosophy Statement

Communication is important.

A brisk pace is okay, but don't spread.

Stock Issues are important.

Persuade me on which stock issues are the most important in the debate.

Back up any claim with evidence.

Use logical reasoning and make connections.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Communication is key. A brisk pace is okay, but don't spread. Wheezing and sounding like you're gasping for air is not good communication. Sounding like an auctioneer isn't, either.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
HOLCOMB, REBECCA	Tabula rasa	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
				3	2	3	5	3	1	2	

Philosophy Statement

I consider myself a Tabula Rasa judge; meaning anything goes. I want the debaters to tell me why and what I should vote on. I like to see clash within arguments as well as fully developed arguments with substantial evidence and knowledge to prove support for their stance in the debate. I strictly follow the UIL rules and guidelines. When the round becomes difficult to frame, or neither team shows a clear warrant for the win, I default to stock issues.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Since I am new to debate I allow spreading as long as the speaker is understood. I can handle speed; however, it is not something I truly desire to hear. A fast conversational pace is my preference.

HOLLAND, JUSTIN	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	3	2	4	1	1	5	

Philosophy Statement

I prefer a traditional style of debate. I prefer off-case arguments to be properly structured. I believe that the second affirmative speech is still a constructive but I also believe it is abusive to put off-case arguments in this speech as well.

Style & Delivery Preferences

This is a communication exercise. If I put my pen down while you are speaking, you have lost me. Slow down, breathe normally, and communicate with me and your opponents.

HOUGHTON, ROSLYN	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABD
				3	2	4	5	2	2	5	

Philosophy Statement

The purpose of the debate should be the cultivation of the student in two chief areas: first, the student should learn to effectively communicate and persuade using well-evidenced claims. Second, the debater should be cultivated in such a way as to develop an ability to logically respond to arguments that are brought up. Likewise, the role of evidence is to back up claims, it is not sufficient to be an argument in and of itself. In short, the focus of the debate should be creating clash using well-reasoned and persuasive argumentation. Argumentation that is designed to purposefully avoid clash (Kritiks, overly squirrely affirmative cases, overly generic Disadvantages, etc.) is highly discouraged in the round.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I cannot flow what I cannot understand. If you must speed, your diction had better be flawless. You must do internal signposting and slow down for the tag lines.

HUTT, LEA	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				2	4	2	3	3	3	1	

Philosophy Statement

I'm a very traditional Stock Issues judge. I want you to be responsible for your side of the debate. Be specific in your arguments. It is not my job to figure out what you mean.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I must be able to understand you! Speed does not bother me but must still be communicating.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
JOHNSON, AMANDA	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABE
				4	3	2	5	3	1	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am typically a traditional stock issues judge who needs to see each upheld in order to justify your aff case. The neg needs to pursue the stock issues. Both teams should show me your knowledge of debate and its basics.

I don't prefer K's.

I am fine with speed in the delivery, but if it interferes with communication then you have used it to no avail.

Add new arguments in the 2NC. Add new evidence in the rebuttals if you need to do so. It is acceptable to me, especially when it adds to the clash of the debate. Try to keep your evidence current to the issue unless you are showing a historical context.

Be sure to address all arguments in the round, and as neg, if you need to 'kick' some then tell me that you 'dropped' them from consideration.

Most of all, have fun! You just made it to State so congrats!

Style & Delivery Preferences

No rapid fire. Address the judge, partner, and opponents plus timekeeper if one is present. We are not collectively "the floor" when you deliver the speeches. Stay organized and label your arguments.

JONES, BRAD	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				2	3	2	3	1	1	3	

Philosophy Statement

Debate is a speaking event. You must convince me with a understandable, organized format. Stock issues are important and you must be able to show that your plan solves a problem or improves the status quo. Clash needs to be clearly demonstrated and the flow of the round needs to be reviewed in the rebuttals.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Must be unstandable. Spreading will negatively affect your team. Speeches must be well organized.

JONES, JOSH	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABD
				5	1	5	4	5	5	3	

Philosophy Statement

Quintessentially tabula rasa. Run whatever you want and I'll flow it!

Style & Delivery Preferences

If your opponent isn't comfortable with speed slow down to accommodate them.

KNABEL, WHITNEY	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				3	2	5	3	3	3	4	

Philosophy Statement

I believe that debate is all about making great points and having the evidence and argumentation to back it up. CX is not just about being able to read card after card, a debater needs to be able to know and apply that information to what they are arguing. To me it is better to use sound analytics along with evidence to bring your point across.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I do not like spreading! If you read fast, you need to be able to articulate and be understood. If I cannot understand you I will not flow your arguments.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
KULAK, CYNTHIA	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				5	5	3	5	3	2	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am a tab judge and I need you to give me clear reasons why I should vote for you. I will listen to any argument as long as you know how to explain it. Impacts are also pretty important to me, but it is your round so make the arguments you want and I will listen.

I am pretty good with speed and most styles of delivery.

Style & Delivery Preferences

LAWLESS, SHELBY	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AC
				2	5	4	4	2	3	1	

Philosophy Statement

I am a critic of argument, please understand that evidence must be presented to win any argument. All arguments must be applied, signpost, do not expect the judge to do so (the word "and" is not a transition of a signposting.)

I primarily gravitate towards stock issues. Please also keep in mind that you are trying to get me on your side, always.

Passion is necessary in debate. I want to enthusiasm for your topic. Clarity is key, so please enunciate and speak loudly. If you find a certain style of delivery that you believe is most persuasive, please use it.

Style & Delivery Preferences

LEY, NOLAN	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				4	2	3	4	5	4	4	

Philosophy Statement

I prefer a debate in which clash from the Negative team towards the plan proposed by the Affirmative in the 1AC is created throughout the constructive speeches and cross examination. Stock issues are an important structure to the debate but not the entirety of which I would make a final decision. I prefer to judge based on the policy of the Plan as it relates first and foremost to the resolution and secondly, how the Affirmative plan compares to the Negative team's arguments. In voting on any proposed Counter Plan, DA or Kritik I will often judge based on the Impacts and weight of the argument provided. I prefer these run in the 1NC or if run in the 2NC, limit the number (1-2) you provide to avoid spreading. If time or information is lacking to run advanced arguments in the 1NC, a brief preface or warning at the end of the 1NC or in C-X is appreciated. A wise and incorporated use of the 1NC will be valued over spreading arguments into the Negative Block. That said, I am not against any new arguments occurring in the 2NC.

Although I do value empirical over theoretical evidence, I will consider creativity and deductive reasoning throughout a debate round if given argument(s) have both logic and understanding.

I appreciate clear and appropriate pronunciation. I will deduct speaker points for profanity, rudeness and/or any demeaning remarks during both cross examination and speeches. I do not mind speed but will alert speakers if I believe their delivery is too rapid.

Style & Delivery Preferences

LIVINGSTON, LYNETTE	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				4	2	2	4	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I vote on stock issues and evidence. I like plenty of evidence to back up the arguments. I do not like to hear the same evidence used over and over again.

Policy Debate is a speaking event first. I do not like speed to the point that I cannot understand what is being said. I expect debaters to demonstrate professional courtesy towards each other.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE			
MACIAS, ALESIA	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				4	4	4	2	5	3	1	4	

Philosophy Statement

The most important thing I need to see in a round is plenty of clash. Don't bring up arguments that clearly don't apply to your opponent and try to pass it off. Topicality is a big voting issue for me. The whole point of the round is to follow what has been presented to you in the resolution. I will listen to analytics, however it is essential that you provide an ample amount of evidence throughout the round. Other than that, debate it out and prove to me why the round flows to you.

I can handle speed as long as your words don't run together and you enunciate. Be sure that if you do spread, be sure to emphasize your taglines and your sources. Project your voice as well.

Style & Delivery Preferences

MARKHAM, JAMES	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				4	4	4	3	4	2	2	5	

Philosophy Statement

Honestly, get out there and do what you do best... Debate! All I ask is that you provide me with decent clash and voters at the end of the round. I'll listen to pretty much anything, but be warned that CPs must be run correctly and adequately apply for them to be a significant voter for me. Also, just know that I can count the number of times I've voted for a K on one hand, as most of the time they are run incorrectly, provide zero education in the round, and/or are just vague and silly timesuck arguments. I'm not saying I won't vote on a K, just be cautious in doing so. I'm fine with DAs, Ts, Theory, and all other on-case, as long as it's relevant and applies. Other than that, be decorous, communicative, and most of all have fun!

I don't mind speed. As long as you don't sound like an auctioneer or like you're about to pass out, we should be good. Remember, "if everyone in the room does not understand what is happening, then it isn't debate." -Joy Morton (Namesake of "Joy of Tournaments")

Style & Delivery Preferences

MARTIN, JEFF	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				4	4	4	5	5	3	2	5	

Philosophy Statement

I really believe debate is a communication competition about a clash of ideas/argumentation. Please provide this in a round. Apply arguments where you want them, I cannot do that for you. Show me that you are paying attention in a round, by addressing your opponent's arguments with good labeling and signposting. Make sure you clearly communicate during your speeches. Please do not use CX time to present arguments. Ask questions, get answers, then use what you acquired as an argument during a speech. Please ask specific Paradigm questions before the round. My last request is for all contestants be professional, I would hate for you not to advance because I had to dock speaker points because you were rude or attacking your opponent personally.

If you are muddled and unclear then I cannot flow it. If that happens then it cannot be used by me to adjudicate the round.

Style & Delivery Preferences

MATHIS, TERRI	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	

Philosophy Statement

I judge each round as a true tab judge. Contestants mold my standards in each round. I prefer the culminating issues be weighed at the end of each round through either impact calculus or simple weighing of the round. Without contestant direction, I rely on both stock issues and policy making paradigms. I want to see a display of debate skills and knowledgeable, polite exchanges.

Speed of delivery should be set so there is clear communication.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
MATTIS, MICHAEL	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				5	3	5	4	5	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I want you to do whatever it is you do best. I would much rather adapt to you than you adapt to me. I am comfortable weighing the round based on how the debaters can best convince me to weigh it. Congrats on making the State Tournament and I look forward to watching you.

Be clear and concise. I am fine with speed, just make sure you are communicating effectively.

Style & Delivery Preferences

McCULLOUGH, HUNTER	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABDE
				3	5	5	5	5	4	3	

Philosophy Statement

I generally try to evaluate the arguments in the debate as objectively as possible, but I'll discuss my biases below. In general debaters should just make the arguments they're comfortable winning.

Speaking fast will help make more arguments, but that doesn't matter if you're not clear.

Style & Delivery Preferences

McDONALD, JANICE	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				3	4	2	4	3	1	2	

Philosophy Statement

I am kind of a hybrid of policy-maker and tabula rasa. I prefer quality evidence over quantity. I do not care for spreading or Kritiks.

No spreading.

Style & Delivery Preferences

McELYEA, PRESTON	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				5	3	2	4	3	1	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issues judge. From the affirmative team, I appreciate a clear inherency, significance/harms, solvency, plan, and advantages. From the negative, I do not like hearing Ks or CPs. I prefer on case attacks with a T and/or a couple DAs.

A little speed is fine, but it is important to remember that this is a communication event.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
McHANEY, JONATHAN	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				3	1	5	2	3	5	1	

Philosophy Statement

I am typically a tabula rasa judge, but this years topic has made that difficult.

This year I have preferred to vote with the Stock Issues.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I prefer clear and steady.

McHATTON, CHRIS	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				5	5	5	3	3	2	1	

Philosophy Statement

Tabula Rasa... I will buy it if it is sold well. I like to see use of current well sited evidence that supports arguments and is organized in its delivery. I like to see teams Listening to the opposing team rather than just bringing up canned cards and speeches. This shows a real understanding of the craft making it more educational and generally provides good clash.

Style & Delivery Preferences

This is a communication event after all, so delivery needs to be clear and intelligible. I can handle flowing spread, but find that the best rounds don't need to sound like a person hyperventilating with a judge yelling 'clear'!

McVICARS, SHAUN	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				4	2	3	4	2	1	3	

Philosophy Statement

Stock Issues should be the main framework. Students can present arguments in a variety of different ways. For example, a Topicality or DA argument is valid when presented in a rational, logical way. In other words, there is not only one way to present these arguments. Students should also try and move the debate along with a variety of arguments, links, and extensions. For example, do not argue funding for the entire debate round, address it and move on. Rebuttals should be organized and persuasive .. tell the judge why you are winning the round.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Enjoy clear speaking voices with a variance in tone. Do not spread and make the experience of judging a round boring. I need to understand what the speaker is saying.

MENEFEE, MELONIE	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				3	3	3	5	3	3	1	

Philosophy Statement

I will default to policy making as my decision-making paradigm. Stock issues are important for me and will be a major consideration, with net benefits as a criteria for my final decision. I do not believe that the judge should limit what the debaters should or should not discuss or argue during the round. At the end of the round, I will compare the affirmative plan with the negative plan and/or the status quo and will make my decision based on the advantages and disadvantages of each. I will listen to Ks as long as they are easy to follow and appropriate for the case. Topicality arguments are fine as long as they are legitimate and not just thrown in as a time suck.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I think that a good debate should include good speaking skills, not just a blur of words that all run together. I cannot flow what I cannot hear, so at the very least make sure your taglines are easily understood, even if you spread the evidence. Analysis is important to me.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
MILLER, WENDY	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				3	4	4	4	3	2	4	

Philosophy Statement

Good signposting, organization, and brief roadmaps are appreciated.

Arguments: I lean toward stock issues so therefore I value on-case arguments, but also enjoy a well-run and structured disadvantage or topicality argument.

Counterplans and theory arguments are acceptable, but must be extremely relevant and well presented. All arguments should be relevant to the debate, nonsense arguments or generics that do not link well will not win the round.

Quality of arguments and explanation of the relevance to the debate are more important than a high quantity of cards. You should be able to explain why the evidence you read is needed, and how it impacts the debate. A good analytical argument can outweigh a generic evidence card.

Additional Comments: The 2NC is a constructive speech, therefore new arguments are allowed, but presenting all new arguments and neglecting those already in the debate is nonsense. There should be a reason to open an all new direction that late in the debate, and arguments like topicality should definitely be presented early.

Finally, I will weigh the round based on the evidence and arguments presented therein, not any predispositions.

Style & Delivery Preferences

No Spreading. Speaking fairly fast is acceptable, but your arguments should be able to be followed by someone that doesn't have a copy of your evidence in front of them. If it is valuable enough to weigh in the debate, it should be important enough to make sure it's heard. Professional behavior in round, to your judge and your opponents, is vital. Defending your arguments without being rude, condescending, or petty is part of the event.

MONTANA, ERIKA	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				5	4	4	4	3	2	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issues judge. I like to hear arguments that are clear and concise. There is an expectation of educational value and not just tactics on rule interpretation. All valid arguments will be considered and it is up to the debaters to communicate why each argument is valid and is a voting issue. Critical thinking is a must and should be conveyed during the round.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Communication is key. As a judge, I must understand where your arguments are applied in the round. Clarity and pacing are linked. I must be able to understand you in order to effectively judge the round.

MOORE, ASHLEY	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
				4	4	3	3	3	1	1	

Philosophy Statement

I am open to any argument presented by each team. Be able to tell me your argument and why I should choose you over your opponent. Communication is the key. I look for Convince me why I should vote for your team. Remain professional.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I do not prefer speed delivery or spreading. Speak at a pace where I understand what you are talking about and I am able to flow along with you.

MOORE, KENNEDY L	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	5	4	5	1	1	1	

Philosophy Statement

I am a Poliymaker who judges hard on impacts, solvency, and obviously which team has the best policy option. Mechanics are important!!! I do NOT like theory arguments. I love DAs, CPs, and especially topicality. ****These arguments have a formula and must be run well and in ideal order.*** I say "well" as in having a real T file, not just making up a def. or analytically answering T (or other args). Analytics are always good, however, should not be the only means of argumentation presented in the round to your opponents. Politics Disadvantages are fantastic, but the UQ should be updated and relevant to current issues, so be cautious. Impact calcs are much appreciated, and I will listen intently to the entire round, but more so when it comes to the 1AR speech. I am not a fan of impoliteness. This is a professional event in which you are roleplaying policymakers, so please be respectful to all in the room. I don't count flash as prep, just be quick. Any other specific questions can be answered on competition day. I look forward to being your judge!

Style & Delivery Preferences

Quality over quantity. If I cannot understand you, I will stop flowing your speech. I am fine with speedier paces, however, keep in mind that UIL has different speed preferences than, for example, TFA, and since this is UIL State, I will heavily abide by the UIL Handbook.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
MORRIS, JANET	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABCDE JK
				4	3	5	5	2	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I am a policymaker judge (as this is UIL stock issues matter). Reasonableness is important. I will accept kritiks only when an alt is presented early in the round. This topic in makes a CP very acceptable. I don't argue the round for you. It is very important you use a roadmap and sign post where on the flow you want an argument to go. Speed should never impede clarity.

Speed should never impede clarity. If your intake of are is audible and quick, you are probably speaking too fast.

Style & Delivery Preferences

MORTON, JOY	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				4	4	3	3	3	2	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am a communication freak. If you are communicating, I will follow you wherever.

Communication/clear crisp articulation

Style & Delivery Preferences

MOUTON, ASHTON	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
	Blank slate to the extent that is			3	3	5	3	2	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I will vote on any kind of well-reasoned argument. Notes about my judging preferences: 1.I despise negative arguments that are run with the explicit purpose of over-burdening the 1AR. Debate should be educational, and running arguments that you plan to kick for a time-suck benefit is abusive. 2.Both sides should note extensions and drops. I will not do this for you. 3.I'll vote on whatever becomes important; I don't weigh certain arguments more than others. 4.Don't just read to me. Tell me why your arguments are important. Don't expect me to make this jump for you. Analytics should be combined with evidence. Preferences for specific arguments (not comprehensive/limited space, feel free to ask questions): 1.T is always a voter, but I want a complete T-shell, with a specific definition and violation, case specific rather than generic. Aff, I want a convincing "we meet" or counter-definition/interpretation. 2.I love Ks when they are complete and compelling. Theory + Alt required. I don't like generic, run for everything, Ks. Aff, I want to hear a convincing Perm or convince me K doesn't apply to case or aff world. 3.Disadvantages need a full DA shell with a case link, usually an internal link, and definitely impacts. Impacts should be believable and have a clear timeframe. Aff has options; debate the links, impact reasonability, or impact calc. Impact calc is important to me; who has bigger positive/negative impacts and which impacts happen sooner? 4.Counter-plans are not my favorite stand-alone. I like to see a neg world where the CP allows the neg to access benefits the aff can't access; the neg world should have a good narrative with complementary arguments (CP should compliment DA, K, etc.). Aff has options; you can perm the CP if possible or debate the impact calc. 5.Case clash is appreciated.

Speaking quickly is fine, but no spreading; I know the difference. Don't just read to me. I will not place arguments for you, so always tell me where to flow your arguments and how to evaluate them. Be sure to extend warrants and impacts, not just tags.Roadmaps are essential, but should be brief. I am fine with splitting the neg block, but I need to be informed in the 2NC roadmap.

Style & Delivery Preferences

MUNSON, CHRISTIE	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
				4	4	1	1	1	1	1	

Philosophy Statement

These debate rounds should be run so that the competitors are either defending the affirmative that is presented or trying to negate the affirmative that is presented. Let's all debate the topic at hand instead of trying to confuse things and bring in negative arguments that do not actually attack the affirmative's case.

I prefer a round that is delivered such that everyone understands what is at the center of the topic of the debate. When speed and tricks are thrown in to confuse or muddle the round, a fair debate cannot happen.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
MUSGROVE, STEELE	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				5	3	5	5	5	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I'm completely tab. I have no predisposition to any arguments you're going to make whatsoever - give me a way to evaluate the round via a framework, win that framework, and win a reason you meet that framework and you will win. If you don't read a framework I will default to an offense/defense paradigm of essentially "who does the most good?"

Don't do anything offensive in round - I will dock speaks.

* note - I put down a 3 on T - I will vote on T, but you have to win a violation, standards, and voters for it - a 3 just felt more like a no disposition answer.

** another note - I put down new in the 2 acceptable, but if aff reads theory and wins theory it's not... again, no disposition - same with condo.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Pop your tags and signpost where you're at on the flow.

MYRICK, MARILYN	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				5	2	5	3	5	5	1	

Philosophy Statement

Theory:
This is fine. Do it if theres abuse. I'm prob not the most receptive to frivolous theory.

Topicality:
I used to have a sticker that said "Topicality is a Timesuck" but my paradigm on this front has probably changed. Especially on this topic I think Topicality is a pretty good litmus test at weighing arguments and offense but I don't think I would hedge my bets entirely on T with me as a judge. I think policy ignores a lot of standards comparison/clash that it probably needed to have an in-depth T debate leaving me mostly disappointed a lot of the time. T probably isn't enough to win you a debate round on neg so if you are going all in on T you probably aren't winning unless your opponent drastically mishandles it. Overall not a huge fan.

CPs:
Do it, I'm receptive. A strategically ran CP/PIC is probably a good strat in front of me as long as you weigh under a given policy fw. They're good if you run them well.

DisAds:
Im fine with it - I am more receptive to specific links/internal links and won't just sign a ballot if you have a big stick impact. On this note, I am probably decently persuaded by a 2AC that does a lot of impact defense. However, defense isn't enough to win on the flow here.

Ks:
Probably my favorite style of argumentation. My kids run a lot of fem and critical/performance stuff so I am familiar with the way kritiks exist & their debate application. Make sure you articulate the alt well and the impact story following the links. I am fine with K affs as long as you emphasize the framing and why my ballot is important.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I'm fine with speed and any argument style. I'll say clear or slow if needed, start off slower at the beginning of your speech so I can get used to your speed and voice. You probably won't be too fast for me but gauge your speed - I make pretty evident facial expressions if I am lost.

NEEL, BREELEE	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	2	3	5	2	1	3	

Philosophy Statement

I am a policy judge who also appreciates stock issues for structure. I will vote on the team that provides me the best world after the resolution is, or isn't passed. You need to show me why you win this debate round. An impact calc is a must for me, and can win you the debate round if done properly. You need to show me why your arguments are impactful, and how much weight they carry in this debate round. Please do road maps and most importantly be respectful of each other.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is fine as long as I can understand you. If I can't understand you I can't judge you.

NEEL, LEE	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				4	3	3	4	3	1	2	

Philosophy Statement

I believe that debate is an academic event and as a judge my role in the academy is to evaluate and facilitate the academic trajectory of the debaters. I don't think my notions of what debate should or shouldn't be should ever limit the academic path of the debaters. I am generally open to any type or style of argument as long as it is relevant and topical. Explain to me why you have upheld your standard and your opponent has not upheld theirs and you will win the round. I like good debaters that have intelligent affirmatives with specific internal link stories and introduce impact stories. I also like debates where the negative creates crafty negative strategies that demonstrate a grasp of the case and how to beat the case specifically having a link story that shows the inherent problems specific to that affirmative. The only arguments that I generally find unpersuasive are arguments that are completely non-topical and have no relevance to the resolution. I am not fond of speed. Clarity and basic public speaking skills are highly valued. Everything begins with clear communication. The slower speed will help me with my flow. I award speaker points based on general clarity and the quality of support for your arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

There is value in remembering that this is a speech activity. Debaters are often tempted to speak as quickly as possible. This is a flawed approach and very few speakers speak effectively by speaking fast. Speaking slowly leads to the following benefits: allows debaters time to think before speaking, makes the speaker appear calm and confident and gives the judge time to process and evaluate the points delivered.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
NEIDHARDT, TANNER	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	4	2	4	4	1	2	

Philosophy Statement

I am a traditional policymaker that is interested in the merits of the case before me. I am more interested in comparative analysis than quantity of evidence. I do not mind hearing that certain aspects of an opponent's case have value (all of them do, even if just a sliver). It is ok for a debater to recognize the value of an opponent's case, but then I want to hear why even despite that value, it will be better to adopt your position over your opponents'. This is usually best done by analysis *supported by evidence.* I think the Affirmative's job is to propose a topical policy solution and the Negative's job is to demonstrate why that policy should be rejected. Keep in mind I am interested in sources. Evidence supported by a source that lacks credibility is not persuasive evidence. For example, when presenting evidence to a jury, if the witness is not credible, a jury ignores what the witness says. Similarly, if a debate judge should disregard your opponent's evidence because of the source, explain why. I am also interested in effective C-X. I will give weight to this interaction. C-X is a highly effective way of framing your opponent's arguments. Remember you do not have to rebut his/her argument in C-X; instead, you should set up that argument in C-X so that you can destroy it in your next speech. Keep in mind that asking one question too many, especially on the ultimate issue—"So you're case won't work?"—is a mistake. At the end, I will give the round to the side that has done a better job persuading me of his/her position based on many of the criteria above (although please do not let what is written above ever stifle your awesome creativity).

Style & Delivery Preferences

I believe debate is about honing persuasive skills that you will use in the future to advocate for your position in whatever field that may be. I want to see persuasive skills more than debate tricks. No bill has ever been passed in Congress based on the speed of presentation. The best persuasion combines emotion, analysis, and evidence. An advocate must determine what moves his audience and focus on reaching that audience, not on what makes the advocate most comfortable. Look for cues; if I look confused, maybe you need to explain your point in a different way.

NICHOLS, JO BETH	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				5	1	3	5	3	3	4	

Philosophy Statement

Mostly, I want to hear to good debate. I expect teams to listen to one another, to make arguments which apply and to provide evidence to back up their claims. I lean toward stock issues, but I am open to kritiks and counterplans. I don't mind speed, as long as it doesn't interfere with communication. I am not a fan of topicality arguments, unless a team is clearly outside of the resolution, and I do not like generic disadvantages.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I prefer more of a conversational tone. Once a speaker has read his evidence, I like for him to explain what he just read and to try to persuade me to vote for his team.

NOBLE, GAY	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
				4	4	1	4	3	1	1	

Philosophy Statement

Debate should be educational and fun. If there is no clash then there cannot be debate. Sidestepping the resolution at hand and introducing something new is not debating; I see it as manipulating. As a judge, I look for meaningful and believable arguments. I do not believe that everything will lead to nuclear extinction. I want to hear intelligent attacks and refutation I want to experience respect and engagement between opponents. I want to be educated and inspired by future possibilities.

Style & Delivery Preferences

If I can't understand it, I can't flow it. If I can't flow it, it didn't happen. I believe debate to be a speaking/communication event and effective communication must first be understood.

OBREGON, KALEB	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				4	4	5	1	5	5	2	

Philosophy Statement

Run whichever arguments you feel comfortable with. I am a tab judge so I don't think its my job to tell you what you should and shouldn't debate. K Affs: These are fine. if its related to the topic in some way then its much easier to weigh against framework. Please explain your method throughout the debate. Kritiks: Specific links contextualized to the aff are a must. You're articulation of the links is much more important that what the evidence says. Please have a clear explanation of the alt. There should be a good explanation of permutation especially for K affs. I am much more persuaded by one good perm than 5 blippy perms. Da's: Good link analysis and turns case arguments will get you a long way. I want to see impact calc by the block and the 1AR. Cp's: Explain the solvency mechanism and how it solves the aff. The aff should have solvency deficits to the CP. PICs are fine. The solvency advocate should be as specific as the aff solvency. Topicality: Default to competing interps but can be persuaded to vote on reasonability if there are good warrants for it. Reasonability is just a question of whether the Aff counter-interp is good. I appreciate a good standards debate. Framework: Tva are important to weigh your impacts. I'm fine with education and fairness impacts. Theory: Slow down. If both teams spread through theory blocks then I will probably make an arbitrary decision based on the arguments I can understand.

Style & Delivery Preferences

As long as you are clear.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
OLIVER, SHERYL	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABDEJK
				3	4	5	5	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I like all styles of debate in the general sense, but kritik neg strategies need to bear some measurable weight against the aff plan, not just against the historic system of education or sins of generations past. If an aff plan results in oppression or is couched in inherent bias, the neg team should be able to specify how the current agents of action are complicit in said bias. The key for me on kritik theory is that too often the theory seems to imply that we can arrive at a perfect outcome free of bias if the aff plan is simply avoided. This is too one dimensional, and kritik arguments should have to prove that the aff's actions are actively turning the dial of bias, not only crafted from a system of inherent bias.

Debate is a communication event, not an audition to become an auctioneer. Speed is fine as long as it does not hinder understanding.

Style & Delivery Preferences

ORTIZ, ANA

Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AK
			4	1	5	5	5	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

If you plan on running a CP/ALT/The T either slow down and repeat it twice, or just provide me a copy. I personally do not flow cross-examination, but this does not mean I will not listen to it. If there is something said within CX that you want me to flow, bring it up during your following speech and how it relates to the stock issues/T,ALT,CP, ect.

I consider myself a tabula rasa judge, however I am not at all against running a K, in fact I love listening to them! In my view the K is a way in which we do not limit ourselves to classical standards of debate and we can open further discussions that will garner a better impact than just talking about policy issues. Make sure to paint that picture as to why this might further the most impacts, education, competition, discussion, solvency (if the k talks about why standards like these might be bad, then explain why in the context of the debate space and the real world)

If you are running a CP/Permutation:

magnitude, time frame, and probability are key here, you need to be clear as to why the counter plan would be a better alternative than the squo or why the perm will solve better than the plan by itself. If there is a reason why I should reject the perm/cp provide some disads to the perm/cp.

The only reason as to why I would vote against an untopical argument is if the opposing side does not provide some kind of link into the rez or why we should reject the rez all together. I am a big proponent of offensive rather than defensive arguments, as the team should lead the debate rather than letting your opponents attacks on your case dictate the entirety of your speech.

I am more than welcome to speed within the round, however it becomes an issue when neither I nor your competitors can understand you but if that occurs I will be sure to clear you. Spreading out your competitor is bad for education and competition, I will consider it abuse if there is no room for clash just because your opposing side could understand what you said on the flow.

Style & Delivery Preferences

OSBORNE, MARIE

Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
Policymaker/Stock issues			3	3	3	5	2	1	4	

Philosophy Statement

I appreciate traditional debate. I consider myself somewhat of a hybrid judge. I do flow the stock issues and expect the affirmative to present a plan that addresses these issues and expect the negative to address them as well. I do, however, vote mainly as a policymaker judge. One of the teams will convince me that they have the better policy decision for our country. For me, debate should always be evidence-driven with well-qualified expert proof. I am ok with appropriate counter-plans but do not like Kritiks. I dislike most theory arguments. I will vote on topicality if the affirmative cannot logically defend it.

I strongly dislike rapid delivery that interferes with communication. I view debate as a speaking event, and it should be treated as such.

Style & Delivery Preferences

PARKER, JOEL

Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
			4	3	2	5	3	2	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am primarily a stock issue judge. That being said I will not base my whole opinion on whether you know your terms or not. I find that arguments that are well structured and have all the key components are more persuasive. I like to hear the terms used and the structures maintained.

I am open to topicality arguments but they should not be the core of your case. I like DAs as long as they are structured. I am not big on kritiks or counter plans.

I like to hear good speeches and dynamic speakers, after all this is a speaking event.

Not a fan of spreading or whatever you would like to call it. This is a speaking event and I would like to hear good speeches.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
PEEK, SANDRA	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABE
				4	2	5	4	3	3	4	

Philosophy Statement

EVALUATION-I will evaluate the round through the framework/interpretation provided and argued by the debaters. In other words, if the aff wins framework, I will evaluate that way; if the neg wins framework, I will evaluate that way. In the absence of a framework, I will revert to policy maker, which is my personal preference. Unless you have an exceedingly strong policy advocacy and an exceedingly clean link story, I do not want to see a performance aff or neg.

KRITIKAL ARGUMENTS- I generally will accept well applied, resolutionally focused kritiks and affs. K's need to have a clear alternative beyond reject.

DISADS/ADVANTAGES- I feel that disads are almost essential for the negative. I will vote a disad down if the aff articulates and wins that the link fails. I generally will not vote on a minuscule chance of the disad or on a "try or die" analysis from the affirmative. In sum, I want impacts to have a reasonable chance of happening before I consider them.

TOPICALITY- I will vote on topicality as it is a key limiter.

INHERENCY-I will not vote on inherency unless the negative proves outright that the aff plan is already happening.

SOLVENCY- I like solvency and vote on it often usually in conjunction with another argument.

COUNTERPLANS- I vote on them and generally accept that they can be topical.

THEORY- I buy warranted ground loss based theory arguments and will vote on them.

FUNDING- I cannot remember a time when I found funding arguments convincing (by saying this I am NOT saying that I do not like funding based DA's).

GENERAL- Be certain that one gender is not preferred over the other through interrupting or condescending. Rude/sexist behavior will result in lower speaker points.

SPEED- I prefer a moderately-paced debate. I understand the need for speed in the 1AR, and I can follow well signposted fast argumentation. However, I want to hear the text of the evidence. I am not okay with speed so fast that the words in the evidence are not enunciated.

ORGANIZATION-Organization is critical to me. I need you to give a succinct road map before your speech starts and then signpost as you go including numbering. I prefer most negative positions to be started in the 1NC.

Style & Delivery Preferences

PEREZ, AUTUMN	Tabula rasa	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
				3	1	4	3	3	1	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am a tab judge. That said, I want debaters to convince me using not just evidence, but by constructing a well-thought-out argument and showing clash at every opportunity possible. I do not usually prefer Kritiks. Debaters need to clearly signpost during their speeches and should be sure to give an off-time roadmap.

No spreading! Spreading will negatively affect debaters' speaker points, as well as my understanding of their speeches. This could potentially cost a debater important arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

PETTY, LEIGH	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				4	3	4	4	3	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

I consider policy-making to be an important aspect of CX. The affirmative team should present a case that aptly puts the resolution into action. I would expect the case to contain several advantages and/or solvency cards. Likewise, the negative team should attempt to invalidate the affirmative's plan by highlighting its weaknesses. I love counterplans and disadvantages, but I'm not a huge fan of kritiks. All that being said, I firmly believe that the affirmative is obligated to uphold the stock issues. If a negative team can demonstrate a true disregard of the stock issues in the affirmative's case, I will almost always vote negative.

Debating the effectiveness of the affirmative's proposed plan is the primary objective of a CX debate. However, this can only be accomplished if both teams (and the judge) are able to clearly understand all of the arguments. To this end, it is imperative that debaters speak clearly and audibly. Sacrificing enunciation and clarity for speed is never wise. Additionally, I believe that gesturing and sarcasm should be kept to a minimum.

Style & Delivery Preferences

PHELPS, RUSSELL	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AD
				3	3	5	4	3	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

I think you are responsible for how I vote. It is up to the debaters to weigh arguments and evidence coherently and explain why your arguments or evidence is better. That is the activity in a nutshell. How do you do that? By explaining what the argument is and why there are fallacies in your opponents positions. I weigh issues as you do. I am fine with counterplans, topicality, and alternative arguments if they link to the aff. I have never voted on a reverse voting issue on topicality. I have voted one time on conditionality bad. Simply, there aren't arguments I won't listen to, there are arguments however that aren't persuasive. Be nice in cx and let your opponent answer your questions. There is never a question that either side must be forced to say either yes or no. If you are nice to each other(and you should be)the round will be educational.

You must be polite and speak clearly. I will not tell you if you aren't clear. Rate of delivery is dependent on your clarity. If you can't spread, don't. It can be very overrated.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
PHILLIPS, SAVANNAH	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	5	4	5	5	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

We all know there is no such thing as a tab judge, but i keep a pretty open mind when it comes to judging a round. All I want is for the debaters to tell me how to vote, if you tell me to vote stocks or policy then frame the debate in that manor and bring up the key components of the style you pick. This helps me know that understand key components and have knowledge of not only debate but the round itself. I enjoy watching debate and seeing the connections of each argument being made, I also enjoy watching each debater grow throughout the round in how they argue or frame points. I also love seeing two debate teams that can have a civilized debate while also being polite. This shows maturity, wisdom and great sportsmanship.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I enjoy structure and organization, without these things debate would be impossible. Brief roadmaps, sign posting and being efficient with time is what I love to see during a round.

POWERS, TONYA	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABJK
				3	3	5	5	3	2	5	

Philosophy Statement

While I consider myself open to anything, my default paradigm is that stock issues are a gateway to policy-making. In a perfect world, I would love to vote on the best plan or counterplan in the round and consider advantages vs disadvantages. However, a case that fails to meet its prima facie burden should not be considered. I will vote for other issues if either side makes a compelling case. I have voted on theoretical arguments and kritiks before, but there must be a clear in-round justification for running these arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed should not be used simply to skew your opponent out of the round. I allow clear calling and will do so myself if the speaking is unintelligible. Having a clear, persuasive argument is more important than being able to speak quickly. I will say "clear" three times before I stop flowing.

PRITCHETT, JAMES	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				3	3	5	4	2	4	1	

Philosophy Statement

I weigh the Aff net impacts vs the Neg net impacts. Please give me some type of framework/role of the ballot so that I know how you want me to weigh/evaluate your arguments. Please be clear on where you want me to flow arguments. Signposting is great.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Please be clear.

PUSTEJOVSKY, ERIC	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				5	3	1	1	1	1	2	

Philosophy Statement

I am a policy judge. To me it is all about the evidence. If evidence is equal on both sides, then the burden of proof falls on the negative to disprove the affirmative by attacking the stock issues.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I have to be able to understand what you are saying and trying to tell me. If you speak to fast, I will stop taking notes and flowing.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
RANDOLPH, SHELBY	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				3	4	5	4	5	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

I try to judge debate rounds holistically not off of one certain issue. I believe that in CX debate it is important that both sides have a clear strategy and plan. I don't really enjoy rounds where teams try to throw things out there to see what sticks. For specifics-- I default to competing interps on T; I prefer real world alternatives on K's; I am fine with new in the 2NC; I default to a utilitarian framework if no other framework is given to me.

I want to be able to understand you, speed is not as important as clarity.

Style & Delivery Preferences

RECIO, FRANK	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				3	1	4	5	3	4	5	

Philosophy Statement

I'm from small school debate, but I also know how big school debate works. I prefer the debate to actually be about analysis of evidence vs the delivery of evidence. I tend to vote Aff and Neg evenly. Speaker Points are based on strategy, clarity, and professionalism.

As long as every thing is clear, I can follow you. That said, do slow down your rebuttals.

Style & Delivery Preferences

REEDY, CARLEY	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	4	5	5	4	3	4	

Philosophy Statement

I'm a tab judge who will default stock issues. I'll listen to anything you put on the flow as long as you tell me where to put it and why it's there. I love impact calculus at the end of your speeches and voters help top it off. I love when debaters sign post and slow down on tag lines so I get the whole round on paper. I will deduct speaker points if a debater is rude to myself or their opponents.

I'm okay with speed as long as your opponent and I can flow appropriately.

Style & Delivery Preferences

RICE, COURTNEY	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
				3	3	4	5	2	1	2	

Philosophy Statement

I want to see structured argumentation, and tell me where to apply your arguments on the flow. Please road map and signpost as you present your arguments, and I like to hear a summary of key points made throughout the round. Be able to back up any claims with evidence. I will vote on topicality, but don't let that be your key strategy. I am okay with counterplans, but I don't like kritiks. I'm not a fan of presenting new off case arguments in the 2NC.

I can handle a quick, conversational speed, but spreading is unacceptable. I appreciate persuasive speaking skills.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
		<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
ROBERTSON, JONATHAN	Policymaker			3	3	3	4	2	2	3	B

Philosophy Statement

I refer to myself as a policy maker. I believe that you should run arguments well and cover your arguments and the argumentation made against you, as well as you can. This is policy debate. Please do not expect me to give you the ballot if the majority of your arguments are analytical. I'm not that fond of cute little tricks, ...debate! Don't make me think that your whole approach is to avoid direct debate. However, humor can be very effective if used appropriately.

I don't mind on-case arguments in the 2NC; after all, this is affirmative ground. The affirmative should know their own case.

If your opponent's case is vague, please call it that. If it's bogus, please call it that. I will weigh the amount of offense in the round and if it is all on one side, that side will win.

This is UIL State, I take that very seriously and I hope that you respect that privilege also.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I will defer to the words of the wise Joy Morton, "If everyone in the room does not understand, then it isn't debate."

ROBINSON, TERRI

PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE			
		<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
Policymaker				3	4	5	5	3	5	4	AD

Philosophy Statement

Things I like to see in a debate round:

- Impact Calculus
- Evidence Comparison
- Clear signposting (If you make me guess where it goes on the flow, it might not be on my flow.)

Things I don't like to see:

- Rude debaters (Speaker points will suffer.)
- Reading 5-10 pieces of evidence that all say basically the same thing combined with no analysis of how it responds to the argument.
- Repeating arguments rather than extending them
- Not a big fan of theory arguments

Please feel free to ask me questions before the round. Congratulations on making it to State. I hope you have a wonderful tournament!

Style & Delivery Preferences

Please slow down on tags and authors so I can flow them. I don't care how fast you read evidence. Please be polite and respectful. I'm not really physically able to flow speed due to the condition of my hands.

SALIANS, AARON

PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE			
		<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
Stock issues				4	5	5	4	5	5	4	A

Philosophy Statement

CX should be seen as a team event. A dance of two polar ideas with a clear leader by the end of it. A clear resolution or counter plan can set a team leaps and bounds above the rest.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I really value a debater who presents their stocks well. This is for educational purposes spreading is not allowed.

SAUNDERS, SETH

PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE			
		<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
Stock issues				3	3	4	4	4	4	5	ABCDE JK

Philosophy Statement

Stock issues are weighed the heaviest for me. I'll listen to any argument, but I won't vote on anything run incorrectly if the other team points it out. Any argument made is about quality for me, not quantity. That said, always have a full 8 minutes in the 1NC. If you're going to put all your eggs in one basket, it had better be a pretty sturdy basket. If you're going to run a kritik, convince me of its value in the round. If you're going to run a counter plan, make sure that it is a serious addition to the round, not just a time suck. Analytics should supplement cards, not replace them. However, using analytics to point out a lack of links or impacts is fine with me.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Persuade me. Engage me. Debate is an art, show me you've mastered it. Never be anything but respectful to your opponent. If you're rude, you lose some speaker points. Simple.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE			
SHELLER, ALEXANDRA	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				4	5	5	5	3	5	3		

Philosophy Statement

I am a policy maker. I am willing to listen to any argument however be aware that I am primarily concerned with comparative weighing of impacts when we are looking at the post fiat flow (prefer this to be done through a formal impact calculus, but you do you). I default to weighing arguments through a util framework unless another framework is presented (and won obviously).

I vote on T a lot, however that does not mean that I am willing to vote on any T. The 1NC T shell has to have standards and voters on it or I will consider the T flow a wash and not weigh it. Also, I default to competing interpretations on the T flow.

Make sure that you are clashing with your opponents arguments or your speaker points will suffer.

I will listen to theory arguments, however make sure to read any lists in them slower so that I can flow them properly.

If you have any specific questions, feel free to ask me.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is fine as long as tags and authors are VERY clear. Make sure it is apparent where a card text ends and a tagline begins. Give roadmaps before starting the speech, keep the flow as organized as possible, , and sign post during the speech or your speaks will suffer. I will not do much extra work to figure out where on the flow you want something to go, so take the time to tell me.

SCHWARZ, COOPER	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				5	5	4	4	5	5	1		

Philosophy Statement

I will listen to any argument you throw out there, unless it is to intentionally degrade the round, or agitate the debaters. I would rather you frame the round for me, versus defaulting one way or the other. Make my decision easy. Warranting and weighing is important, I need to know what I am voting on, and why. Topicality and kritiks are my favorite arguments, but only when properly debated. That doesn't exclude DA's or CPs, know your argument and explain it to me.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed, as tournaments permits, is fine, just make sure I CLEARLY know whenever you are moving on from one tag to the other. I don't care about delivery style (unless I cannot understand you), I care about content.

SEXTON, KELLY	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				2	3	2	4	1	1	1		

Philosophy Statement

I coach at Roscoe Collegiate High School- a 2A in West Texas. I have two years experience in debate and have judged about 16 rounds total. I am a stock issues judge mostly, but will vote on impact cal if evidence is clearly linked, reasonable, and the strongest argument in the round. I am not experienced with Ks, Pics, or CPs so run them at your own risk. I am a little more familiar with CPs but make sure there is a net benefit. If you have too many arguments, I might get lost, so less is more with me. Quality of evidence is equal to quantity of evidence in value.

Speaker points are given based on clarity of speech, organization of arguments, explanation of evidence, comparative weighing of issues, and respect and courtesy for others.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Do not spread, sign post, slow down for tags, and give pretimed road map. Give a line by line analysis of round and arguments. If you go too fast for me to understand, I will set my pen down and won't be able to flow or follow your argument.

SHELTON, JANET	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				4	2	2	4	3	2	1		

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issues judge who will listen to all reasonable arguments. Disads are a big deal, but must be run, or refuted, correctly.

CP's, I will listen to but it needs to be run correctly and explained well. Evidence is paramount to any argument

Style & Delivery Preferences

I don't mind speed as long as I can understand, but know that communication skills are extremely important to the flow of the debate.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
		<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
SIMS, JAN	Tabula rasa			3	1	1	3	1	1	1	B

Philosophy Statement

I am a tabula rasa judge but have a strong leaning to stock issues. However topicality is not relevant unless it directly affects the case and then no more than one argument. I believe in classic debate because that's why we have a topic to work with. I do not care for arguments based on card dates unless the case or evidence is extremely outdated. No new arguments in rebuttals - arguments and extension evidence are different things. No DA's or Topicality in the second neg constructive. The aff does not get a chance to answer them and that is abusive.

Speed and spread is unacceptable. If I can not understand I can not flow. I don't get a copy of the case, so understanding is imperative. Be courteous throughout the debate. This is a communication event.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
		<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
SKILLMAN, VANESSA	Policymaker			4	3	5	5	4	1	4	A

Philosophy Statement

I am more of a critic of argument, this meaning that I care about the actual arguments and evidence laid out in the round. In other words, tell me why you should win, what you think is important, what I should and shouldn't weigh in the round- essentially, do the "hard work" for me. However, should this be an issue, I default Policymaker. I try my very best to not have any sort of "judge intervention", hence why I ask you to "do the work for me."

I can handle speed, but not muttered attempts. I would rather you read slow and be direct than just try to spew words to get more cards on the flow. If I can't flow your speech, that means I am not getting down any of your arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
		<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
SLOANE, KIMBERLY	Stock issues			4	4	2	5	1	1	5	AB

Philosophy Statement

While I am primarily stock issue, I also do have policy tendencies. Remember to explain/apply your arguments. Do not just read to me. Arguments should be organized.

Flashing should be done quickly and effectively. You know that it will be asked for. Have it ready. Excessive time will count towards prep time. Road maps are timed after about 10 seconds.

Debate is a persuasive event and debaters should remember this. While I can flow spreading, I do not recommend it as you are losing your persuasiveness. There is NEVER a reason for rudeness.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
		<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
SMITH, DEBORAH A	Stock issues			3	1	3	2	2	3	2	B

Philosophy Statement

I adhere to the Stock Issues approach in my judging. Good research and evidence that is used logically will uphold the issues.

I also want the debaters to remember that debate is communication, and so blasting out words so quickly they could never be understood doesn't work for me.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
SMITH, TREVOR	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	4	3	4	3	2	3	

Philosophy Statement

I was taught policy debate with the burden of proof on the affirmative. I hold each stock issue to be a voter and those issues are what I believe discussion should be over. Affirmative must prove inherent harms in the status quo, they must have a plan that solves them topically, and it must have significant impact. The negative team needs only to prove the affirmative has failed a single one of these obligations to win my ballot. I appreciate road mapping that is stuck to. As for clashing evidence, I prefer quality sources. Instead of throwing more cards at an argument, explain how your initial card is superior to theirs.

I prefer a style that is professional and polite. Hostility towards any other person in the room will lose speaker points. As for delivery, I simply remind debaters that if I can't understand them then the argument they just made counts for nothing in my final decision.

Style & Delivery Preferences

SNOW, JOHN-PATRICK	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				3	4	4	5	3	1	4	

Philosophy Statement

First and foremost, debate is a communication event. You need to communicate with me. Explain each piece of evidence and how it applies to your arguments; do not just read long card blocks. Eye contact with the judge is an essential way of making sure you are communicating with the judge. Be sure to give weight to every argument and explain why it matters in the round. I will vote on topicality if it is well structured. I will vote for counterplans, but counterplans should never be only time suck arguments. I find kritiks are never used correctly at the high school level. Kritiks and critical affs do not belong in high school policy debate. Debate should be professional and polite. Unprofessional behavior or rudeness will cost you valuable speaker points.

Debate is communication, not a contest to see who can speak the fastest. While debaters must speak faster than everyday speech, speed should not interfere with clear diction and proper communication skills. If you are speaking too fast, I will stop flowing the arguments. Excessive speed will result in a deduction of speaker points.

Style & Delivery Preferences

SOLIS, SHIANNE	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				5	1	3	4	2	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

Tabula Rasa. The way that I vote at the end of the round depends entirely on the delivery and information presented. I'm very careful to stay objective during rounds, and judge based solely on who I believe effectively presented their case (AFF or NEG).

I don't really like topicality arguments, but they are acceptable and it won't influence the casting of my ballot. Arguments are paramount. I want to hear why I should vote your way. Never drop an argument, and be careful to not only map your arguments, but your opponent's as well. Not keeping track of what your opponents are saying is the easiest way to miss mistakes that could flow to you. I don't mind you being passionate about your topic, but make sure to stay professional when addressing your opponents.

Basically, it's all up to you to make me vote your way.

Speak clearly and with purpose. Don't talk so quickly that neither I nor your opponents can understand what you are trying to say. Be sure to make eye contact at some point during your speech.

Style & Delivery Preferences

SOLIZ, MATTHEW	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				4	2	2	5	2	1	3	

Philosophy Statement

In terms of delivery and structure I am a stock issues judge. The organization is necessary to structure the important issues of the debates around. Each stock issue is of high importance. Negative teams should capitalize on arguing against the affirmative's stock issues as they provide the foundation for the affirmative's case. Affirmative teams must answer every argument. Every opponent must flow. The judge will be flowing all arguments that are brought up. Never should a team falter on an argument otherwise it will be considered a drop. No arguments should be used as time wasters. I am here to judge the performance of the debaters and not the cases or arguments themselves. I will not buy into claims of abuse unless the team can structure them into legitimate arguments with claims, warrants, and proof.

Clear and precise supersedes speed of delivery. I will not flow if I cannot understand what is said.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
SPEARS, SANDY	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				3	4	2	4	3	1	4	

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issues judge. I am looking for T, significance of the hams, inherency, solvency and I will vote for advantages over a DA. If T arguments are ran I would like standards, the violation and the impacts. I will not vote on a Kritik. I believe a debate should have clear arguments supported by evidence. The affirmative plan should be the main focus and on case arguments should be present.

I expect the debaters to not use speed.
Please make a commitment to have good communication skills and speak clearly

Style & Delivery Preferences

STANDLY, STAN

Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC		
			3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

I will not debate for you. I will only evaluate what happens in the round. I want you to signpost. "AND" is not a signpost when you move from one card to the next. I like each card separated, please do not allow it to become one long run-on sentence.

Please use Claim, Warrant, Impact. If all you make are claims, they have very little weight in the round.

Please apply the attacks you are making. Do not just read a lot of "dumps" and generically tell me the aff can't solve. Use the evidence and explain how the aff can't solve.

You do the math, you add up 2 plus 2. Don't expect me to vote for you if you just expect me to follow your thoughts. Tell me how you get the answer "4". Be detailed.

Communication is more important than speed

Style & Delivery Preferences

STONE, NICHOLAS

Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
			3	5	5	4	3	5	4	

Philosophy Statement

I believe it is up to the debaters to decide the significant issues in a round. As long as voters are presented, I'm willing to vote on any attack that isn't blatantly abusive. Respect and manners are a must, please do not harass your fellow debaters in or out of the round.

As long as the speaker is understandable I'm happy

Style & Delivery Preferences

STRAUS, BOB

Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABD
			4	3	1	5	3	1	1	

Philosophy Statement

Stock Issues, Aff must present Prima facie case. I want to vote on policy as it will stand submitted by Aff. Do not like Kritiks, or counter plans

Follow flow on voters

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
STUBBLEFIELD, K. DAWN	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABE
				4	4	4	4	2	2	3	

Philosophy Statement

Debate is about CLASH! I expect students to listen to each other. Take some time to flow and respond to the answers from the other team. I want a debater to listen and refute as well as build her/his case. Be polite.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Please be clear and articulate. It is your job to communicate to the judge AND the other team.

SULLIVAN, SUE JANE	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				3	3	2	4	2	2	5	

Philosophy Statement

Please communicate in CX policy with sound evidence, solid analysis, an understanding of policy format, and specific attacks to opponents' arguments. The political arena you witness in 2018 does not always offer quality debate as a model. Show me you know better.

Style & Delivery Preferences

At this level, I want to see some polish on those speeches. Be prepared, articulate, and organized.

SUNDARESAN, SANKAR	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	4	5	5	4	5	4	

Philosophy Statement

I am a games judge so I believe debate is just a sport/competition/game like any other sporting event. There are rules to adhere to and best strategies to utilize to win. Your job is to put yourself in the best position to win and go onto the next round. Because of being a games judge, I have a very strict view of the rules. Just like any other game where if you step out of bounds or the clock runs out the play is dead. When the speech time is up YOU ARE DONE TALKING. I will not flow a single word a millisecond after time expires. I am reasonable up to a certain level but if you go 5-10 seconds past speech time, I will dock points. If you continue to do this, I will give you a straight up 0 for speaks. Do not call for the end of prep then proceed to do a few more quick things for your speech. This is cheating, if I catch you doing this for the first time I will resume prep time.

Theory: I have an extremely high threshold for abuse. I WILL NOT vote on sob stories of how unfair it is that conditionality exists and how hard that makes life. If you want me to pull the trigger on theory, you need to impact it on two levels –both at the in-round level and the macro level of debate.

Topicality: I tend to default to competing interpretations but am open to arguments on alternative evaluation mechanisms. I am pretty convinced by reasonability arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

A speaker that gets 30 for speaks from me is someone who does the following:

- 1) Differentiates between tags/evidence bodies
- 2) Signposts well and does not jump around in a single flow or worse across flows
- 3) Conducts a very thoughtful cross-x where they dig into evidence warrants, try to bind the other team into links, etc and not "In your own words, can you explain what your aff does"?
- 4) Do not participate in the round with a thick stench of arrogance and an idea that you are god's gift to this earth. Treating your competitors and/or your partner with blatant disrespect. This will automatically get you 0 speaks

TAFF, LAUREN	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				3	2	2	5	3	1	4	

Philosophy Statement

I focus on stock issues, clash, and the games of debate. Counter plans must be presented according to debate structure, and I do not care for Kritiks.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I do not want to flow spreading, and I appreciate professionally dressed students. Please be respectful of your fellow competitors as they have worked hard to be here too.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
TANKERSLEY, STEPHANIE	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				5	4	1	5	3	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

As a speech communication professor, I see the importance and value of quality communication over quantity in any competition. The stock issues are of great importance to setting up a round and my decisions are reflected upon the arguments brought up and answered adequately in each of those areas. Debate needs to have clash in order to utilize the component of persuasion. Therefore, I am not a fan of counterplans for the lack of attack made on the affirmative plan that is on the floor. At the same time I do not like to see a debate reduced to arguments over the definitions of terms.

Clear, concise, communication that is understandable.
 Not a fan of speeding...lacks eye contact and emotion.

Style & Delivery Preferences

TILLER, JANA

Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
			4	3	3	4	3	2	3	

Philosophy Statement

I consider myself a good mix between a stock issues and policy maker judge. However, lately I have weighed more rounds in a policy maker fashion. I value both organization and explanation of arguments. Debaters should clash on significant arguments against the affirmatives plan and should be sure to include specific links to related case arguments. Although I am open to all types of arguments I do not prefer those that attempt to trick their way into a winning ballot. Teams should make good utilization of time in speeches and prep.

Speed is acceptable as long as debaters do not lose the clarity of the argument and explanation. I appreciate roadmaps, clear taglines, and signposting.

Style & Delivery Preferences

TOBES, RACHEL

Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
Skills - Who debates with the			3	4	3	2	2	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

I look at a round in real-world terms of logic. Outside of the debate bubble, do the arguments, ideas, and analysis make sense? Do the ideas connect?
 I like to see arguments developed with critical analysis. Have the WHY's and HOW's been answered? Neg, what is 'wrong' with Aff's case to merit this particular argument? What does your argument show in terms of Aff's violation? How does this argument connect to your others? Aff, why does your case need to be enacted? How will it work? How do you show your case is stronger than Neg's attacks?

Deliberate. Like a professor, a lawyer, a politician. NOT an auctioneer or medical warning ad label reader on tv commercials. (Don't spread, I won't flow.) Including, banging fists in the air to keep time, bouncing on your heels to keep time, gasping between paragraphs, reading to yourself without looking up, or holding the timer at your face.

Style & Delivery Preferences

TREVINO, SETH

Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
			5	4	2	5	1	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am a tab judge but default to policy maker if nothing kritikal is run. I will flow and vote on anything as long as you have the proper warrant and you tell me why it matters. With that being said, I hate having to rely only on taglines for my decision, you need to throw your own analysis explanation for what you are running. Do not run arguments you do not understand for the sake of getting them on the flow. You should run what you are comfortable with and make the arguments you want to make. Ultimately, do what you do and I will follow, just make sure to give me some voters along with it.

Speed is not an issue for me, though if you try spreading and cannot enunciate your speaker points will show that.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
TUCKER, KELLEY	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				5	5	3	4	2	1	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am looking for clash in the debate, not a lot of generic off-case arguments. Communication is important. Reading evidence is good, but it needs to be explained and tied to what your opponent stated.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is not an issue as long as I can flow what you are saying. If I put my pen down you are too fast, otherwise you are fine.

TUCKER, KRISTAN	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	4	2	4	4	1	4	

Philosophy Statement

I primarily vote on stock issues and DA's. I expect direct clash of arguments, direct links to case, and quality of argumentation not mere quantity. I have been known to occasionally vote on a CP, but please do not utilize K's. Utilize your negative block, but be sure to state that you are doing so. As a judge, I am not debating the round; therefore, as participants, you need to point out any drops, contradictions, gaps in logic, etc.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I do not mind speed as long as I can flow the argument. Please pay attention to whether I'm flowing or not and use this as a guide. Organization and speaking ability is important.

TURNER, RIKKI	Polycymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				4	5	5	3	3	1	5	

Philosophy Statement

CX is policy debate. I want you to debate the efficacy of the policy on both sides, keeping the best interest of the country in mind. Solvency arguments are what I tend to vote on because they tend to show the real-world side of debate. If you argument to reject the affirmative plan, which is usually to fix a set of problems, you need to show why it will be more bad than good. Overall, I will listen to any argument besides a Kritik.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Debate is a communication and education event. As such, I need to be able to understand you. Speed reading is not acceptable. Roadmaps should be for labeling your arguments not for vague statements. You are just giving me signposts of where you are going.

URBAN, REBEKAH	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	1	3	4	3	4	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am a tab judge but will default to a policy maker without framework. I believe the quality of arguments is more important than the quantity of arguments and want to see teams spending the appropriate time needed to develop and answer arguments well. I will listen to any argument, but I want to see teams understand the things they are running and be able to explain the warrants in their cards. Clear solvency is a must on the side of the aff, and I have a high threshold on T unless the aff case is blatantly utopical.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Teams should only use speed in the debate round if they can be clearly understood when speaking.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
WAGNER, FRANK DUFF	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				3	5	1	5	1	1	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am a Stock Issues judge; therefore, please do not run a counterplan or kritik on the neg if you want my vote. The aff must win all 5 stock issues in order to win. The neg must cripple or win only 1 stock issue to win. I am an old fashioned stickler for a prima facie case in the 1AC. A prima facie case must include definitions of terms read aloud, not offered upon request, or operationally defined. I want to hear the resolution clearly stated, and standard debate case structure adhered to that shows organization, and all parts clearly labeled, with significant, inherent harms to indict the status quo, a 5 plank plan that solves for the stated harms, PMNs and advantages. I also like framework attacks. If you run a DA on the neg, please clearly label it with the terms: Uniqueness, Link, Brink, and Impacts. Roadmaps and signposting are a must. Please do not make me have to figure out where to put your arguments on the flow. Remember that a good argument includes a claim, warrant and data otherwise all you have is an opinion.

I am an adept flow taker, but if the speed of your delivery interferes with the clear articulation and communication of your ideas, facts, evidence, and arguments, then low speaker points will be awarded. If I cannot understand you, communication has not taken place and I cannot vote for you. Speed delivery kills!

Style & Delivery Preferences

WALTERS, JANET	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				3	2	2	5	4	1	1	

Philosophy Statement

The affirmative plan should present a strong persuasive plan that is topical and is supported by adequate and reliable evidence. The plan should explain the harms that the status quo cannot fix, the inherency, and the advantages of enacting the plan. The negative should signpost as it presents its arguments against the affirmative plan. It should show that the harms are not that important and that the disadvantages of the aff plan far outweigh the benefits. Ultimately, the decision is based on persuasive style and argument and outstanding research. The rebuttal of both teams should make it easy for the judge to flow the debate as both teams respond fully to the remarks of the opposing team and to the evidence presented.

The first aff and neg should clearly and persuasively present both sides of the proposed plan. Persuasive delivery is interesting and pleasant. Spreading is not persuasive or pleasant.

Style & Delivery Preferences

WALTERS, JORDAN	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				5	3	5	3	3	5	4	

Philosophy Statement

I will listen to anything that you put on the flow, as long it is not explicitly offensive. I like to see framework debate that allows me a lens through which to evaluate the round. Don't read something that you don't understand on the off chance that you opponent won't either, it makes the debate really bad.

Be clear and concise.

Style & Delivery Preferences

WARREN, VIVIAN	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	BD
				2	4	3	3	3	3	2	

Philosophy Statement

I am looking for a clean debate with clash on issues. Debate is a communication tool about the information from both sides of the issue. I flow with the format given to me by the debaters and follow that line in the debate. I am not a particular type of judge.

A clean communicative debate. Not a spit-at-me with a bunch of "cards." This is a debate of information - use proper speaking techniques and eye contact with the judge.

Make me believe you believe what you are saying.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE			
WHITE, JOHN	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ABE
				3	3	3	5	1	5	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I am a traditional stock issues judge. I am open to kritiks, however, you must provide compelling reasons for me to abandon my paradigm.

I do not like speed. I should be able to hear your evidence and confirm that it supports your tag lines.

Style & Delivery Preferences

WHITNEY, JILLIAN	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				5	3	3	3	4	3	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issues judge; however, please refrain from simply reading evidence to me. Debaters should take some time to explain arguments in their own words and show understanding of the evidence they have read. Road maps over 10 seconds will be timed as a part of the speech. When opponents ask for evidence please quickly provide it in a easily accessible form. If an undue amount of time is taken to provide evidence, it will be counted as prep time.

Debaters should remain polite and professional during the round. Remember that debate is a persuasive event and treat it accordingly.

Style & Delivery Preferences

WIENECKE, CARSON	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				5	5	4	4	5	4	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am open to any argument that you wish to run. However, the moment that offense is conceded or arguments are dropped, I default Stock Issues.

Speaker points are awarded based on organization and structure of the speech, the answering of arguments, and communication skills.

All parts of every argument must be present for me to vote on it. For example, if the Negative reads a DA without a link, I'm less likely to vote for them on that argument.

Speed is fine, as long as the speaker is clear and signposts as they go. If you notice me not flowing, you should probably slow down.

Run any argument you choose, and extend throughout the round. Use your rebuttals to point out drops and give me voters, not to read completely new evidence.

Good luck, and congrats on making it to State!

Style & Delivery Preferences

WILKINS, EMILY	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				3	4	5	5	5	2	3	2	

Philosophy Statement

I usually defer policy, but I will listen to other arguments like stock issues and theory.

Clear speaking is very important; spreading is acceptable if it does not impede your ability to speak clearly. Roadmaps are appreciated but not necessary.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE		
WILLIAMS, JIMMY	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	AB
				4	5	3	4	3	1	3	

Philosophy Statement

I generally lean toward stock issues, but will accept most well-formulated arguments. I am not a fan of spreading but am fine with speed as long as long as it is within reason. I am also not a fan of K's that are far-fetched. Analytic arguments are best when supported by evidence. Neg, be sure to link your arguments directly into the aff. Aff, be sure to cover every argument made by the neg.

Debate is about influencing the judge to agree with your arguments. If your delivery is clear and at a pace that is understandable, then you may not effectively communicate your points.

Style & Delivery Preferences

WILSON, ADAM	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
				4	3	3	4	5	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I'm a tab judge that defaults to policymaker if not given (and convinced by) a clear framework. I evaluate framing/pre-fiat impacts before post-fiat impacts such as DAs, Ks, and case advantages. I'm truth > tech for the most part, therefore warrant analysis will beat speed reading for me anytime. Solvency is a round deciding factor for me.

Speak to me- DON'T READ AT ME. I don't expect the debaters to present their arguments in any particular format so long as I can understand and follow their flow. Take into account my previously stated opinion on speed here. I won't give you any visual cues that you are going too fast for me- please speak so that all may understand.

Style & Delivery Preferences

WITT, MELISSA	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	BEK
				3	3	5	4	2	5	4	

Philosophy Statement

I enjoy policy debate and do not have a preference as to type of arguments ran in the round (progressive v. traditional). Theory arguments are fine as well. I like a debate with as much clash as possible - that means arguments with specific links to the opposition team. Rudeness will be dealt with via speaker points. Obscenity and/or open insults will earn zero speaker points. Show respect to everyone in the room at all times. To clarify: 1. Argumentation & Communication - I think the winner of the arguments wins the round, sometimes they are the top speakers, and occasionally they are not. 2. Evidence - Enough evidence to get the job done. I am a fan of overviews/underviews of positions. 3. Quantity of Arguments - I don't believe in putting all of your eggs in one basket. I think there need to be multiple lines of attack. However, I do not enjoy a strategy where too many arguments are run such that they are ill-prepared arguments and designed to earn a "win on drops." 4. T, DA, CP, K - all valid types of argumentation 5. Conditional & New in the 2NC - Not a fan, but will listen to theory telling me why I should be. EXCEPTION: New on-case arguments should be run in the 2NC, but I will listen to theory telling me why they shouldn't be.

Always verbally emphasize taglines, citations, and warrants when reading evidence. Spreading is ill-advised, as I have a hearing impairment. I do wear hearing aids, but if you cannot stop yourself, you'll need to be loud and very clear. I will not say "clear" in the round because I believe it is part of your job to demonstrate effective communication skills.

Style & Delivery Preferences

WOODS, CASSIE	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				5	3	5	4	2	1	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am also a traditional UIL judge and consider myself a stock issues judge. However, there is not a single stock issue that I will default to. I flow the entire round and will weigh each round based on that round and that round alone.

Since I am a traditional UIL judge I place importance on the communication aspect of the event. If I cannot understand you and cannot flow it undermines the communication aspect of debate. CX is in the business of creating future leaders, politicians and CEOs not speed readers.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE			
WRIGHT, RIVERS	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	
				3	3	1	4	1	4	1		

Philosophy Statement

I prefer clash. Don't waste time on definitions unless they are necessary. Brief road maps are nice, be clear and concise. Use your CX time to actually ask questions, don't hold a conversation.

Be clear and concise. No spreading. Don't belittle your opponent. Don't get aggressive.

Style & Delivery Preferences

WYATT, DARCY	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	ADE
				4	4	5	5	3	3	5		

Philosophy Statement

At the end of the round, I will weigh the affirmative against either the negation's counterplan or the status quo based on the advantages/disadvantages of both. Impact calculus is very useful for this purpose, and will make my decision a lot easier most of the time. I will also accept debates that are framed as Stock Issues, as that is what I debated in high school. However, if you want to branch out a little, that is also fine with me. I am okay with Kritikal arguments that clearly link to the case, but if you are just trying to pull something off the wall in the hopes that your opponents have never heard of it, you should probably reconsider. Competitive counterplans (must be mutually exclusive) are a good strategy. I am okay with Topicality arguments, and will definitely vote on them. HOWEVER, please do not use them as a time-suck if the aff plan is clearly topical. This is just annoying to me, and will not get you anywhere in the debate. Essentially, have good warrants and strong links for every argument. Clash directly with your opponents' contentions and evidence. I will be flowing the round carefully. Dropped arguments can definitely be big voting issues, but you must tell me WHY. I will not fill in the blanks for you. Also, try not to run arguments on the neg that are obviously contradictory, even if you plan to kick out of one or both. Remember that the aff can turn a conditional argument and keep you from kicking it.

I expect you to be courteous and respectful at all times (NO VULGARITY). I allow a reasonable amount of speed, but clarity is of utmost importance- if you're gasping for air, I probably can't understand you. Please sign post so I can flow properly. I also don't like when debaters extend cards with just the author/date. Recap the argument and tell me how it fits into the bigger picture.

Style & Delivery Preferences

YEAGER-SAMS II, PATADORA	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				3	5	4	3	2	3	4		

As a lay judge, I have found that I lean towards Tabula Rasa. I believe that when the debate starts I should be a clean slate and let the best argument win. So the team that best argues their points and refutes their opponents points wins.

While, I do not mind if a speaker reads/speaks fast, I should be able to understand them. I judge on what I hear, if I didn't hear it because a speaker was speaking too fast, I will not consider it. Also all debaters should be polite and courteous to each other and the judge.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I look for concise arguments that use evidence to support the argument. I would rather see one or two well thought-out/ defended points versus a bunch of barely conceived ideas.

I also take into consideration the CX questions asked, how the teams respond to each other, and the professionalism each team exhibits, i.e. arguing the points not the individual.

YOUNG, KATIE	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	A
	Stock Issues/Policymake			3	1	5	5	4	2	4		

Philosophy Statement

The Affirmative must adequately refute all arguments presented by the Negative. For an argument to be a voter, the Negative must adequately convey their arguments and apply them to the Affirmative case. Topicality arguments are typically a waste of time, as most cases are topically by the State competition. Be respectful. Rudeness will be reflected in speaker points.

Speed is fine, until it interferes with speaking abilities. I prefer students flash evidence after speeches, so they listen to your opponents.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2017 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE		
YOUNG, PAM	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty.	Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	2NC	B
				3		5	3	4	3	2	4	
Philosophy Statement												
<p>I believe Debate is first of all an exercise in communication. I want to hear what each team believes the issues are in this round, and I also expect that there should be a clash between the two sides' perspectives.</p> <p>I want to hear and understand every syllable of every word in the round, and I hope that both teams will use their prep time wisely, and will speak for most of their allotted times.</p> <p>I expect the debaters to be proficient in their skills, and courteous in their manner.</p>												
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Style & Delivery Preferences</p> <p>As already stated, I want to be able to hear and understand every syllable of every word. If I can't hear and decipher what's been said, I can't flow it. Usually, my decisions are based on reflecting back on the flow and my memory of what was said.</p>												