

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

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
ACEVEDO, MANUEL	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	
				3	4	3	4	2	2	
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 has to prove that the affirmative fails to meet at least one issue in order to win (don't just focus on Topicality). I require both sides to provide offense. Sufficient evidence is needed for any claim made during the entire debate. All debaters must speak clearly in order for me to hear all of the points and must watch rate of delivery. I can't vote on what I don't hear or can't understand. I do not intervene, so the debaters must tell me what is important and why I should vote for them. I do not form part of an email chain. I do not like reading speeches. If it's important to you, make sure to explain it clearly during your speeches.									
ACHTSAM, BEN	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	AB
				3	5	5	5	5	5	
Philosophy Statement	I'm a Tab judge so I rely on the debaters and the flow to set both the validity of arguments and the role of the ballot. That means that I'll accept any argument until the other side contests it with argumentation or theory and puts it into play. The thing I like to see most in the rebuttals is weighing of impacts and holistic evaluation that inform my ballot. The words out of your mouth in the 2Rs should be very close to what I write for my RFD.									

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
ALLEN, JAMES	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	DEJ
				5	3	4	2	4	4	

Philosophy Statement

I am not predisposed to reject any particular stylistic elements of argumentation. On that note, I do have certain predispositions given my experiences: I consider myself tabula rasa. Lacking discussion on framework/paradigmatic theory, I will default policymaker/comparative worlds. Clarify before the round if necessary.

Topicality- Please shell and make flowing easy. High standard for T but will vote for the argument.

Disadvantages- My standard for DAs is very high. You will need to do a lot of work in establishing the argument for me to be able to feel comfortable voting for it. To help achieve that end, please give me the coherent thesis of the DA along with clear impact analysis.

Counterplans- I love counterplans. I especially love well-run, non-generic counterplans. I will vote for a utopian/dystopian CP.

Kritiks- I was a K debater in high school. I consider myself well-read on most K literature and many critical subjects. If you are skeptical of whether I am (un)particularly receptive, ask and I will clarify. I will vote for Ks introduced in the 1AR if the argument is legitimate and strategic.

Theory- must be shelled. I will vote for RVIs. I won't vote for unwarranted arguments. Not a fan of frivolous theory, but what frivolous means is up to interpretation.

Narratives- I love hearing narratives, but you must warrant why they're offense within a framework, which for my taste, will revolve around argumentative agency.

Projects- You will need to do a lot of work to convince me to vote for your project, especially if I believe you are insincere or disingenuous.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed- I can handle a 10 of 10 but prefer a rate of 6-8 of 10. Clarity is most important. Excessiveness and overkill where unnecessary is not typically strategic in pursuit of my ballot.

To get 30 speaker points: Don't be excessively catty. Employ a smart strategy in the round. Write my ballot for me. Depict a cohesive story that explains how and why I should vote. Analyze offense, offense, offense. Technical speaking skills are of equal importance to quality of argumentation.

ANDERSON, JOHN	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	AB
				5	5	5	5	5	5	

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 they 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 if you're reading an uncommon K. T can be run as a timesuck but if you want me to vote on it, extend standards, voters, and violation well. 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 tabroom, 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. Debate is first and foremost a technical event, and as such, I value technical skills over "pretty talk".

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
BAUTISTA, REUEL HYLES	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	AB
				5	5	5	5	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

I will listen to any argument as long as the debaters tell me why it leads to a winning ballot.

Style & Delivery Preferences

As long as files are shared, it doesn't matter.

BRANNEN, CHRISTOPHER	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	AB
				3	3	5	5	5	1	

Philosophy Statement

* On Impacts: I prefer real-world impacts.
 * On Kritiks: I don't like leftist kritiks. I think they are anathema to the very spirit of the activity we are participating in. I think Marxism in all its forms is absolutely morally repugnant and reprehensible. If you run Cap/Anthropocentrism/Give Back the Land/Fem/Baudrillard/ etc... I'm not going to like it. These arguments are circular and unconvincing. I'll keep Locke and Montesquieu and the rest of you can have all the foolish Gramsci and Robespierre you want. However, if you and your opponents really want to K debate, I'll hear it and try to judge it.
 * On DAs: Make sure that you do solid impact comparison. At the end of the round I need something to weigh. The link controls the direction of uniqueness/the DA, not the other way around. Arguments like this can be helpful to you
 *On Framework: If you give me a framework, and win the framing debate, I will view the round through your framework. You still have to impact the debate and win down the flow. In other words, if your opponents meet your framework better than you and say so they win. If your framework is morally repugnant to me I will reject it. In the absence of framework debate I default policymaker.
 * On Topicality: The plan is what makes you topical. I will view the round through the lens of competing interpretations unless you tell me to do otherwise. I don't think affs need to specify their agent.
 * On Theory: I default to reasonability. I'll hear a good theory argument, though, given that it is thoughtful and has a point. I don't vote for whining. I really don't care if your opponent hurt your feelings or offended your sensibilities. Beat them on the flow and we can discuss them being jerks after the round.
 * On Counter plans: I like them. I prefer single-actor counter plans to multilateral actor counter plans. I generally believe that if the US already belongs to that organization then the counterplan is plan plus or the net benefit doesn't have a link. Absent debate, I think PICS are good and dispositionality or unconditionality makes for good debate.
 * On Evidence: If you want me to call for evidence, it must be red-flagged in the 2NR or 2AR. I generally find quality round overviews in the last rebuttal to be helpful for me to understand why you think you have won the debate.
 * If you have questions about anything, feel free to come talk to me at any tournament. I'll do my best to answer your questions.

Style & Delivery Preferences

* On Decorum: I award speaker points based on my preferences. I like polite debaters who appear to enjoy the activity and I reward that. I like debaters to stand during their speeches and during cross-examination. I find objectionable language unacceptable as it rarely provides a good warrant.

* On Speed: I'm good on most speed. I'm kind of deaf so yell. Please signpost clearly and slow down for tags.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
BROWN, DAVID	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	ABJK
				4	2	4	4	2	4	
Philosophy Statement										
<p>I am generally a tabula rasa judge. I do default to policy-making or some net benefit paradigm if not given clearer weighing mechanism/method to evaluate. I am comfortable evaluating most arguments and will allow the Negative latitude to run multiple strategies. I will vote on T or theory arguments but do have a high threshold on those positions usually. Please ask specific questions before the round for clarification.</p>							Style & Delivery Preferences			<p>Debate is a communication event and therefore you should be clear in your speech. However I will flow speed within reason. Signpost and clearly separate cards or positions within speeches. Roadmaps off-time for clarity.</p>

CHAO, ISAAC	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	B
				5	5	5	1	5	5	
Philosophy Statement										
<p>I default to a comparing worlds paradigm and am a tech over truth, big tent judge who tries to be tab. I dislike intervening so please weigh arguments and compare evidence. It's in your advantage to write my ballot for me by explaining why you win which layers and why those layers come first. If you don't and I'm forced to intervene, it is likely that my decision will be dissatisfying. Speed is fine; I judge circuit LD often. If the position you're reading is dense or analytic-heavy you should slow down. I presume neg unless the 2NR defends an alternative advocacy which is a greater deviation from the squo than the aff, but it is unlikely I will go to this default.</p> <p>If you're going to throw down on T you should be reading a full shell in the 1NC; none of that 15 word "T is a voter for fairness" nonsense. If you are prepped for a technical, carded debate on T, I'm a good judge for you. Also have a lower threshold for voting on theory than most policy judges.</p> <p>I believe that impacts are relevant insofar as they implicate to a framework. My typical decision calculus goes through the steps a. determining which layer is the highest/most significant, b. identifying the framework (ex. competing interps, util) through which offense is funneled on that layer, and c. adjudicating legitimate offense to that framework. If you're defaulting util that's fine; just be prepared to justify it in a ROB/alternate framing mechanism debate. If you're reading a ROB/ROJ and don't want me to understand it as an impact filter for util you should probably read a justification more robust than "endorse the debater who best challenges capitalism because it causes endless crisis" + Robinson 14.</p> <p>Full paradigm here: https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?search_first=isaac&search_last=chao</p>							Style & Delivery Preferences			<p>Speed is fine, but slow down for tags, texts, dense lit, and heavy analytics. If you want to debate traditionally I'm here for that too. I award speaks based on quality of argumentation and strategic decision making. If you want high speaks you should probably be cutting updates and reading something case-specific.</p>

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
COLLATOS, JOSEPH	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	AB
				3	4	5	4	4	3	

Philosophy Statement

First and foremost, debate and arguments must be persuasive, f I am not persuaded on the argument I have no reason to vote for it.
 I am a traditional judge; I repeat I am a TRADITIONAL judge. Yes, I do believe in the role of the ballot so if there are practices in place that do not belong in debate it may cost you the round.
 Constructives are used to construct any new arguments, do not run anything new in the rebuttals. If you wish to bring supporting evidence or extensions that is fine, but you better be sure that it is 100% not new or I will not flow it. (This won't cost you the round, but I won't be happy with it as it is abusive).
 YES, the neg block does exist. NO Aff, just because they split it that does not mean you get to.
 Neg Strategy- Throwing as many arguments at an opponent as possible and hoping one sticks/dropped is not a strong negative strategy. I will vote for generic arguments, I don't want to, but if the Aff does not do their job then I will. Arguing uniqueness is a fine strategy, but don't think by using that word the argument now goes away, tell me why this matters!
 Topicality is NEVER theory, it IS a stock issue, which are the foundations of this event. However, if you argue topicality be careful that you do not contradict yourself when running on case.
 Do not run Kritiks, just to run Kritiks. If it is just some argument to run without any merit, also if it is not properly structured, it will not end well for your team. Be careful if running a K with certain other arguments, as you may just sabotage your neg strategy.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Debate is a communication event, I repeat debate is a COMMUNICATION event, therefore, speaking well and properly is important. I expect speed to be faster than conversation, but I will NOT flow spreading as I believe it has no merit in debate. Yes, there is a difference between spreading and speaking fast, just make sure you know where that line is.

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	AB
				5	5	5	5	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I will vote on whatever framework you establish, but I default to policymaker. It would be a good idea for you to collapse down to one "position" in the 2NR, whether that be a K, CP + net benefit, T, or an offensive reason to prefer the status quo. I think reading new arguments in the 2NC makes for bad debate and is generally not a good strategy. For the overall debate, I'd like to see less of a focus on reading cards and more comparative analysis after the negative block.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I am capable of flowing speed, but I prefer you to slow down to a slightly faster than conversational pace.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
CORNISH, NICOLE	Other Offense/Defense	<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	A
				3	4	5	5	5	5	

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.

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.

Style & Delivery Preferences

COUNCIL, NATHANIEL	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	ABE
				4	2	5	5	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am generally a Tab judge, I want you to make the arguments. I am also slightly biased against Topicality in its present iteration. I would hope that topicality arguments are made because the Negative is truly being kept out of the round by affirmative playing fast and loose with the resolution. Most affs are topical. I will listen to any argument you make including CP, Theory and K. THERE IS NOT A UIL RULE AGAINST THESE ARGUMENTS. I welcome new args in the 2 unless a compelling case is made against that. Teams are welcome to split the block.

I prefer a quicker than average delivery not to be confused with spreading. Feel free to speak quickly but it must be communicative and fluent.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
CRANE, CARSON	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	A
				3	4	5	4	4	3	

Philosophy Statement

It is important that you have a very clear link chain throughout the debate. It is also important that you clearly weigh and impact your arguments (the earlier in the debate the better). BE COMPARATIVE. Do not make me have to choose which impact I think might be more important than another. Don't just tell me what your impacts are. Weigh and tell me why they matter, and comparatively weigh against your opponents.

I will evaluate whatever arguments you present in round. Please try not to be squirrely. If your argument is constructed to throw off your opponent, your opponent probably does not have to spend a lot of time responding to it.

Please do things to make your speech easier to follow. Slow down/emphasize for taglines. Signpost. Etc.

Also, please be nice to each other.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I am okay with some amount of speed, but if the speed at which you are speaking requires you to take a double breath, maybe reconsider.

CZARNEK, HALEY	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	A
				3	3	2	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I want to be told exactly why I should vote. Be very clear about what I'm weighing and what I should value most highly. If you're running a T or another argument based in rules or morality, tell me what the role of the ballot is.

Evidence is important, but every argument should also have analysis. If you spend the vast majority of your time reading it is unlikely you are articulating your framework or giving me reasons to vote. Signposting is also vital; tell me what you're responding to, down to the subpoint or specific card, and show me the clash. The more work I have to do for you, the less likely the round is to go the way you want it.

The only arguments I am picky about are CPs. I strongly prefer that they be non-topical, and that teams only run one if they have a strong understanding of its competitiveness.

Style & Delivery Preferences

It's important to me that education is prioritized in the round. I take into account clarity (I'm only okay with spreading cards) as well as courtesy. I do not like badgering in CX or teams purposefully withholding information til the last second. Also, I am unlikely to know every obscure acronym or fact; if it's important to the round, make sure it is explained fully and clearly.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
DANIELS, MELODY	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	B
				3	1	3	4	2	1	

Philosophy Statement

I want to see CLASH. For the NEG - I want to see on-case and off-case. It is not likely that I will vote neg on off-case alone. Clash with the aff directly. I am a communications coach - I want to see a practice in debate AND professional communication. I will not flow spread/rapid-fire, but I am fine with speed that is understandable. AFF - tell me what I am voting for and why I should vote for it! I largely want to see real-world application of whatever you're advocating for (aff or neg). Both- give me a weighing mechanism, and do all of this professionally and politely. ANALYZE YOUR EVIDENCE. Tell me the 'WHY' behind the 'what.' Ask questions before the round for clarification. New in 2AC or 2NC is fine. Please don't argue abuse.

Include me in the email chain - meljdd18@gmail.com, and you are at state now - be sure you have a routine down for flashing to the other team in a timely fashion - even virtually. You have had all year to adapt.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Be professional and understandable. I will not flow spread/rapid-fire, but I am fine with understandable speed. Professionalism is key - speak to your judge (me), and be polite to all. There is no excuse for being rude.

DE LA ROSA, ROBERTO	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	AB
				4	4	5	5	4	5	

Philosophy Statement

I will vote on the arguments presented in the debate, and allow the debaters to determine what I prioritize on the flow.

Feel free to read any position that you are comfortable with, and be prepared to defend it. I want to see direct clash and specific analysis, not just a card reading contest.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Be clear, especially on the taglines, and theory blocks.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
DELEON, ROSENDO	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	B
				3	4	2	4	3	2	

Philosophy Statement

Debate is a communication event.

Other than using communication skills, debate requires the us of logic and reasoning. Very important

Is the use of support (Evidence).

Style & Delivery Preferences

No spreading. Fast is necessary but if fast it needs to clear and understandable.

DENNY, MELLESA	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	B
				3	4	4	4	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I am a policy maker judge most often. HOWEVER, I will judge the round by what happens IN THE ROUND and not what I think. I will vote on arguments, whatever they may be, as long as they are proven. For instance, I am not a fan of kritiks but will vote on them if they are the stronger argument. I want to see evidence but also analysis.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I can write every word my pastor says in a sermon because I have been flowing debates since I was 15. However, I still want to hear the arguments communicated and not just spewed.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

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	ABK
				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.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

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	ABCDEJK
				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! Don't mistake all my 3's as a bad thing. I literally will vote on anything...tell me why you win it. Weigh it in the round and I will vote on it.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
DIMMIG, BRENDEN	Other Offense/Defense	<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	ABDE
				3	3	3	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I think that you should set the parameter(s) for the debate. I'll judge the debate as set out. If you have any questions, please ask.

you do you.

Style & Delivery Preferences

DOMINO, BRITA	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	B
				2	4	3	4	3	2	

Philosophy Statement

I evaluate the round based on who creates the most immediate and lasting good for the greatest number of people (Util framework). So, it is imperative that you weigh your impacts and tell me why your voters are more important than your opponents.

If aff make sure your solvency is stated and clear.

Brief off the clock roadmaps are encouraged.

When presenting evidence do not just cite the card and expect me to know it, make sure you are presenting your full evidence.

No spreading

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
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	A
				5	3	5	3	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I believe debate should be about the arguments you are most comfortable with reading, so I consider myself tab. That being said, if you don't give me a way to evaluate the round (framing or theory), then I will default to an offense-defense paradigm. I prefer line-by-line debate over long overviews and would rather hear deeper warrant analysis than listening to blocks of cards. Additionally, I am reluctant to do a lot of the work in the debate for you - as such, you should be telling me why I prefer your arguments over your opponents and why that means I vote in your favor. I also need consistency to vote in your favor - that means that arguments from the 1AC need to be in the 2AC and 1AR for me to vote on them in the 2AR AND 1NC arguments need to be in one of the block speeches for me to vote on them in the 2NR.

I will note that CP's and K's are marked 5 because they are "acceptable" and T and DA's are marked as 3 because those questions are worded differently - what you should take away from this is that I don't think any type of argument is better than any other and will vote on whatever you put in front of me. Conditionality is fine and I tend to find myself in favor of it when theory debates are had on the issue, but am open to listening to that debate if it is one you are interested in having. Also - when I say I am fine with an "unlimited quantity" of arguments, I simply mean that there isn't a number at which I stop listening - you should still be strategic in the arguments you read and how you collapse in the debate.

I am fine with whatever type of delivery you are most comfortable engaging in including speed. Just make sure that your opponents still have access to the debate.

Style & Delivery Preferences

EVANS, ZANE	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	A
				3	4	4	5	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

SNAPSHOT: Firstly, I am a Policy Maker ; Secondly, a Stock Judge ; Lastly, a Tabula Rasa mindset. I need Voters and an Impact Calculus K's must be explained well, topical, educational, and link

I am a policy maker judge who cherishes stock issues and will enter the round willing to flow anything. Frameworks and observations are key to the lens of the debate. I prefer a classic UIL CX round. However, if BOTH teams agree on a progressive debate round, I will still flow and judge the round the same as an old-school CX debate. I love to see plenty of clash during the debate. SHOW me how / why you're winning.

My ballot weighs: magnitude ; probability ; reasonability ; overall solvency ; advantages and disadvantages ; impacts

AFF: I will pay close attention to how you frame your plan text, especially stock issues. If I do not completely understand your plan by the end of the 1AC, it will be hard for me to flow you. Protect and advocate for your solvency! Use fiat wisely.

NEG: I will flow any argument you run against the AFF. Have an even balance of OFF and ON CASE arguments. All arguments must link to the AFF's PLAN. Split the NEG block. Be advised: I'm a policy maker who heavily considers stock issues. T's & K's must show EVIDENT violations and be educational. I will assume there is nothing wrong with AFF's SOLVENCY if there aren't any DAs. I prefer UNIQUE CPs that cannot be PERMED.

BOTH: watch out for drops! - use caution when intentionally dropping an argument, even if it's your own. Carry all arguments throughout the round.

Arguments must be weighed based off their impacts , probability , and timeline - this will used to evaluate them as voters.

All speeches must be clear and well articulated. Bonus points for tapping into enunciation and pathos.

Prioritize taglines—this makes flowing easier. It also keeps your arguments, cards, and evidence organized on my flow—you'll get a better ballot from me. No spreading. Use your prep time wisely. Utilize speaking time wisely - time management is easily noticeable

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
FERGUSON, CONNOR	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	A
				4	4	5	5	3	4	

Philosophy Statement

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=151549

Style & Delivery Preferences

High Speaks? - The best way to get high speaks in front of me is in-depth comparative analysis. Whether this be on a theory debate or a disad/case debate, in depth comparative analysis between author qualification, warrants and impact comparison will always be rewarded with higher speaker points. The more you contextualize your arguments, the better. If you are negative, don't take prep for the 1NR unless you're cleaning up a 2NC disaster. The best way to loose speaker points is being blatantly rude and offensive. My least favorite phrase is: "Judge I'm sorry my opponents made you suffer through this round" - you dont know how I feel about a round so don't assume.

FERNANDEZ, CHRISTOPHER	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	AB
				3	3	4	5	4	2	

Philosophy Statement

In UIL the eloquence and elocution of the spoken word is invaluable. Please do not spread, I can't judge what I can't comprehend. I understand the need for pacing and will accept everything I can hear. I appreciate arguments that are weighed out by an impact calculus and that are timely. Please debate about the topic at hand, do not turn this debate into a critique about the rhetoric of the topic or some abstract interpretation of what you think we should be debating about instead. Save that type of debate for other circuits, not UIL. It is the one circuit that is as close to the traditional format an old school judge like me is accustomed to! Thank you!

Style & Delivery Preferences

Audible and comprehensive!

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
FROST, PAIGE	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	
				3	3	3	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

You should frame the round however you want as debaters. I welcome all traditional standards of policy with additional changes (such as spreading) should both teams be comfortable with a paradigm that allows it. I believe debate should always start from a perspective of accessibility first, this is moreso true in the era of the pandemic. If the way that you debate could exclude a member of our community from engaging in your content, then you need to reevaluate your praxis with inclusion and accessibility in mind first.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Delivery however you want. Ask about rate at the beginning of each round - if both teams are comfortable with a variety of speaking tactics, so am I. Again, accessibility is first priority.

GARDEA, IRENE	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	ABK
				4	3	3	4	3	2	

Philosophy Statement

Any argument is valid as long as the argument is justified. Quality of evidence is more important than quantity of evidence.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Clear and reasonably paced.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
GARZA, ALEJANDRA	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	A
				3	2	5	3	2	3	

Philosophy Statement

Overall, I am a policy maker judge. Counterplans can be effective if executed correctly. I don't particularly like T or K arguments, however if you lay out the voters, I may be more keen to vote that way. Still, a debate spent arguing nothing but a T-violation is a waste of a debate.

Quality and quantity of evidence are of equal importance.

As a judge, I look for clash from both sides. Can you adequately argue against your opponent while upholding your plan? The Aff's job is to show that their plan goes against the status quo and is a better option. The Neg argues for the status quo or CP and shows that it should be upheld.

Present voters and tell me why your side should win the debate.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I do not judge CX time, those 3 mins are for you to clarify, not argue. If you want me to flow something from that time, bring it up in constructives. I judge CX debate as a team event. Debaters must work together to present clear arguments and clash with their opponent. Also, per UIL rules, I highly discourage spreading. If the speed of you delivery interferes with clear communication, I cannot flow the round.

GLENN, THOMAS	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	A
	Tab will default policymaker			4	3	5	5	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

Tab, treat me like a lay judge who understands debate terms. I'll vote for the team that can explain the voters of the round/significance. I'm willing to hear any argument, conditionality is fine, K debate fine, T fine, CP fine, it's all good (I'll Listen to New case in the 2NC/abuse claims for this, but DO NOT READ NEW ARGUMENTS IN THE REBUTTALS). Just pr

In terms of "threshold," my threshold is if you actually gave me a reason to vote.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is fine as long as I can understand you. If it's not on my flow because I couldn't catch it; it's not involved in the judgment. I don't flow CX. Also reading a tag line is not an extension.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
GREGG, MARY	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	ABD
				4	3	5	5	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

I have mostly experience in policy-style debate. I don't know if policymaker is the best description but I believe the affirmative ought to have a plan and the negative can advocate the status quo or counterplan/kritik. Regardless of strategy, I presume that the status quo/no change is good, and the affirmative has the burden of proof. If you are negative, you are unlikely to win with a case-only strategy in front of me, I strongly advise that you read at least one disadvantage or offensive argument.

Can understand/flow speed, but adhere to UIL delivery rules.

Style & Delivery Preferences

GUSTAFSON, CODY	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	ABCK
				4	5	5	5	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

Full paradigm on Tabroom. I don't have any predispositions regarding the content, structure, or style of your arguments. I will defer to evaluating the debate through an offense/defense paradigm absent a team winning an argument for me to evaluate it another way. Clear impact weighing in the rebuttals and evidence/warrant comparison are typically what I notice in teams I enjoy judging.

No preferences.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
GUTHRIE, KEITH	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	AB
				4	2	4	4	4	4	

Philosophy Statement

Policy Debate is one of the most rewarding events you can participate in during your secondary years of school. Your ultimate goal is to persuade me to support your position. Effective communication, strong analysis of attacks and solid clash are key components to winning the round. It is also important to show respect to your competitor and approach every speech as an opportunity to teach and to learn.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Both style and delivery are important. It is my goal to learn something new every round so take that into consideration during your presentation. Be mindful of your speed.

HEAD, TRUE	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	A
				3	3	5	4	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am comfortable with whatever you want to run. I just think you need to make sure that you understand what you are running if you are going to read an argument. Be specific about your impact calculus and why it matters. It always helps to ask yourself why. I am not going to do it for you so lead me as a judge where you want the ballot to go.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Do what you like

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
HERNANDEZ, MAURO	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	AB
				3	2	4	5	2	4	

Philosophy Statement

I weigh impacts over most arguments. I will vote for alternative frameworks with good reasoning behind them. I dislike contradictory arguments and if they are pointed out by the opposing team I will not weigh either in my decision.

Style & Delivery Preferences

On a scale of 1 to 10 I'd say I flow at about a 7 so I'm quick but not as quick as I used to be.

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	ABJ
				4	4	4	5	1	3	

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. Also, you must give a way for the other side to comply or win, otherwise I will listen to abuse claims.
 Theory is okay but make sure you impact it. I am good with new in the 2NC if it is on-case.
 I am not a fan of performance. 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 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 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.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
HOLLAND, JUSTIN	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	AB
				5	5	5	5	1	2	

Philosophy Statement

I am a games player judge with an emphasis on stock issues. If you are going to run any off case arguments, I want them properly formatted or they will not flow. I do not like conditional arguments and I prefer you don't use Ks or K Affs.

A little bit of speed is fine. Start off slow and slow the tag lines. I do not want the gasping and spitting that comes with spreading.

Style & Delivery Preferences

HOLMES, DAVY	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	AB
				5	3	5	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I haven't judged many tournament policy rounds this year, but I have seen a few. Even though the team I coach likes to read kritikal arguments, that probably isn't your best approach with me. I definitely prefer debates that revolve around the hypothetical implementation of a topical affirmative plan. FYI, if your aff doesn't link to the abolition K, then it probably doesn't enact substantial criminal justice reform. This doesn't mean you will necessarily lose, but you are probably in an uphill battle if the neg is competent at extending topicality. I am aware of the sad state of good policy neg strategies at the moment, so I will try to be mindful of that if you end up going for an argument that is out of my normal comfort zone.

I don't think I am very good at flowing, but I try my best. If I didn't catch something then you were probably going too fast for me, or you were unclear.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE	
HONEA, WILLIAM	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	AK	
				5	5	5	5	5	5		
Philosophy Statement											
I evaluate debate as a game of offense and defense. I believe the aff should have a policy plan text or if choosing to read a kritikal advocacy, a framework to justify your advocacy. Debates are won by offense. I can see myself voting on terminal defense but it will take a lot more work in the rebuttals to convince me to. I am open to every type of debate argumentation except for anything horrendous or offensive. I love Topicality and Theory debate. However, I often find people trying to go for a T position not doing substantial weighing on the voters level of the debate. A good CP/DA strategy is also really nice. CP's must explain competitiveness in the 1nc or i'll be very lenient on aff permutations. I believe Kritiks are an integral part of debate and should be used when the structural antagonisms of the resolution or status quo need to be called into question. However, I am not familiar with all kritikal literature bases, so take the time to explain the thesis of your argument. I tend to evaluate K's vs. Policy Affs as a methodology debate. This means I will evaluate the material implications of each first unless i'm told otherwise.							Style & Delivery Preferences				I have no preferences for style or delivery. I think that factoring the way someone speaks into your decision making is antithetical to the clash based education debate is founded on. I will assess speaker points mostly based on strategic decisions made in the speeches i.e. what arguments are collapsed into in the later speeches. You can go fast, you can go slow. Physical appearance does not play a role in decision making either. As far as i'm concerned, the round belongs to the debaters, I am just here to evaluate clash under the resolutorial question.
SPEECHES AFTER THE INITIAL 2 CONSTRUCTIVES NEED TO TAKE TIME TO EXPLICITLY EXTEND WARRANTS. As a judge I refuse to do the extension work for you on the flow. If you read an impact in the 1ac/1nc but never talk about the warrant for that impact again in the debate, you don't have an impact anymore.											

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE	
HOWARD, BRETT	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	AB	
				3	2	5	5	4	3		
Philosophy Statement											
Tabula Rasa, I default to policy. I like most arguments if they are well thought out and constructed in a manner that enhances the debate. I'm not a fan of Kritiks but if ran well I will vote on them. I like to see the clash, and I want that clash to be well drawn out. I'm probably not going to vote on time suck arguments unless the violation is blatant. This is a forum where you are able to create discourse using real-world problems and solutions and that's what I want to see. I am open to all arguments but I prefer DA's CP's Solvency attacks. I hate redundancy so use the block wisely.							Style & Delivery Preferences				Speak clearly and be concise. Speed is fine if you are articulate, if I cannot hear you I will not flow the argument so it will not count.
I'm not against spreading but only if you are able to clearly pop tag lines. If I can not hear your argument how can I judge whether or not it was good? Speak clearly and articulately.											
You will lose points for rudeness, this is a way for you to express yourself and learn how to speak with passion but also be kind and understanding. With that said I will take your attitude towards me and your opponents into account.											

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
HUGHES, JEFFREY	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	B
				3	4	5	3	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

I prefer debating stock issues but I am open to all arguments.

Speed is fine if speaker maintains clarity.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is fine if speaker maintains clarity.

HUNT, TERRY	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	AB
				4	4	5	4	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am a tabula rasa judge who will allow the debaters to determine how I should evaluate the round. It is important for the debaters to explain to me how I should evaluate the round. I do my best to keep an accurate flow, and I make my decision for each round by how the debaters evaluate the round based on the flow.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Have fun and remember that debate is a communication activity.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
HURLEY, DUSTIN	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	B
				3	3	5	4	2	1	

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock/policy maker judge. I want to see the aff win on the stock issues on case. Off case I feel like it is the negs burden to win sufficient offense in order for me to vote against the policy. Be prepared to run multiple DAs or effective counter plans to win my ballot if you want to win off case. I will vote on topicality.

I prefer a slower more communicative style. If you spread your speaks will suffer.

Style & Delivery Preferences

HYMAN, STEVEN	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	A
				3	3	5	4	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I am a tabula rasa judge really, but I will default to stock issues to make a decision, unless you want to argue for a different paradigm.

It is a contest of reasoning and eloquence. I am not impressed by how fast or loud you can read evidence.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
ILANGOVA, SRUTHI	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	AB
				5	4	5	5	5	4	

Philosophy Statement

I coach and judge regularly. I'm fairly comfortable with the topic. I would rather listen to you debating your strongest argument than you adapting to my preferences. Having said that, I'm most comfortable judging CP + DA debates, since that is what I know best. Make sure to tell me what I'm voting on in the 2NR/2AR.

I like counterplans. In terms of counterplan theory, I lean affirmative on process CPs (consult, delay, etc.). I lean negative on PICs. I don't have a preference on conditionality, 50 state fiat, or international fiat.

I like disads. I find evidence quality matters a lot more than evidence quantity, especially in politics debates and impact turn debates. Evidence comparison is under-utilized.

I like topicality. These debates come down to the execution of your standards. Quality of your definition matters, especially if you are going for a precision or predictability impact. Reasonability is a debate about the aff's counter-interpretation, not their aff.

Kritiks are fine. I've dabbled in the fem K and the cap K, but I have very little expertise in critical literature. Be clear with your explanations. The more case-specific your link is, the more likely you are to get my ballot.

I will not vote on any argument that endorses racism, sexism, homophobia, or otherwise offensive ideologies. I will also not listen to any arguments that endorse self-harm, suicide, or purposeful death.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Yes, I'm okay with speed (as long as you are clear). No, flashing and emailing are not prep (unless it's excessive).

JACKSON, EDGAR	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	B
				5	3	5	5	4	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am a fairly conservative judge who is open to arguments unfamiliar to me. The debate belongs to you, and you should tell me which lens I should use to frame the round and evaluate argumentation. I prefer a resolution-based debate that hits checkpoints in structure, but I will listen to any debate that contains clear direction and warrants. Please do not rely on me to make assumptions for you or fill-in warrants you have not provided. I will weigh the round based on the evidence and analysis given to me.

I will vote on arguments you tell me are important. I default to reasonability over competing interpretations, but I am flexible on this. Extend arguments throughout the debate, and please engage the opposing side. Please be clear about conditionality of arguments, and, likewise, please be clear if you disagree with conditionality (not just conditionality bad). I am aware of most literature but by no means deep on it. However, I am a rational individual willing to listen to your application of any literature to the round.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I prefer clarity over speed but will listen regardless. I will try to give a vocal cue if I cannot understand you.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
JEFFCOAT, SHELBY	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	BEJK
				3	3	5	3	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am definitely a tab style judge. I enjoy traditional policy rounds just as much as I enjoy a more progressive style. My only job is to evaluate the round. Not how I would have debated the round but how the debaters debated the round.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I am okay with a slower speed and I'm okay with a more fast paced. Spreading is fine if you must just be very clear on tag lines and voters.

JENNINGS, NICHOLAS	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	ABDE
				5	2	5	5	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I prefer the simple contestation of ideas and the testing of strategies for policymaking. I do not believe politics must or only forms from the top-down approach and appreciate reasoned and well thought out kritiks as well as more traditional policy arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Clarity is what matters, pace won't if you're clear.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
JIMENEZ, VALENTIN	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	AB
				4	3	3	5	2	2	

Philosophy Statement

I see debate as a learning tool for skills necessary to be successful in life. With this, I see policy debate as a means of judging the effectiveness of policy goals dealing with the topic. Communication is important and begin able to clearly explain your arguments is key to my ballot. Do not simply make an argument and read a card without telling me why it is vital. Although, one can drop argument in the end (Neg), do not waste my time by dropping everything and just making a small point the overall voter. Please weigh the round at the end...

Communication is key and therefore speak to me rather than read to me. Explain your positions and do not assume I know what you are saying.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JONES, TASHA	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	AB
				3	4	4	4	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I consider myself a strong Tabula Rasa Judge. Ultimately, I do my best to minimize my role and preconceived notions about the world in the round. I value debates with comparative analysis regarding the differing versions of the debate or how the arguments interact. I value an incisive and strategic CX period and consider what is said to be binding.

Debate is fundamentally a communication activity in my eyes.

I believe you can be passionate, ardently advocate your positions and criticize your opponent's arguments without screaming at the other team for 90 minutes. It won't

affect my ballot, but it will affect speaker points (and my general demeanor).

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
JORDAN, RICARDO	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	B
				3	1	1	3	2	2	

Philosophy Statement

I am a traditional judge. I like stock issues. I also like class. I prefer direct attacks and a good debate.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I like communicative style. I do not prefer spreading.

KHALEQUE, YASH	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	A
				3	2	5	4	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am a "games" judge, meaning I accept any and all forms of arguments as long as proper rationale is delivered. Although I have a high threshold on topicality. Barring anything fancy, I have a policymaker paradigm. I like framework arguments, as it tells me what things in the impact calc matter. I restrict new arguments in the 2NC to oncase only. I focus less on the amount of evidence provided, and more on how debaters address claims and warrants.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Please signpost when transitioning from one topic to another. No speed reading, especially not in the online format.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
KILPATRICK, DAVID	Other https://www.tabroom.	<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	AD
				3	3	5	3	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=11271

Style & Delivery Preferences

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=11271

KLEIN, MARTIN	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	ABD
				4	2	5	5	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I believe judging paradigm is an issue to be debated. I default to a policymaker paradigm if the issue isn't raised. I don't rule arguments off limits if I haven't heard them. Logic, strong warrants and quality evidence are very important. Note: My response to the questionnaire inquiry concerning topicality should not be interpreted as meaning I think topicality isn't important. The question asks if I vote on topicality often. I don't because there aren't many negative teams who go for topicality in the 2NR in rounds I've judged.

Please be nice to one another. It's an honor and privilege to be debating at the UIL state debate tournament.

Style & Delivery Preferences

If you are concerned with my ability to comprehend speedy delivery, please demonstrate prior to the round so I can provide meaningful feedback. Every debater's camera is to be on for the duration of the round.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
KOHLEFFEL, ADAM	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	B
				3	3	1	5	2	1	

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issues judge. I like clash in debate, and I do not like K's or Counter-plans. I will vote on topicality, but it has to be very convincing. I want real-world, realistic scenarios and impacts.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Medium speed preferred

KUANG, HANSON	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	A
				5	5	5	5	4	5	

Philosophy Statement

An argument is a claim, warrant, and impact. If they drop something you said, it doesn't mean it was an argument.

I like all arguments except those that are racist, sexist, transphobic, or homophobic.

Do not adapt your choice of arguments to me. I will adapt to you.

Aff:

- I suggest putting case on top (not a paradigm thing, just advice).

- Know how to use a permutation.

Neg:

- Split the block.

- 2NR should collapse down to the neg's winningest position.

The winning team is almost always the team with the better strategic vision of the debate. You don't have to be fast or buzzwordy or super prepped-out. Just be smarter.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I reward speaker points for humor, kindness, confidence, paperless efficiency, clear judge direction, smart cross-ex, strategic vision, organization, clarity, and passion.

I dock speaker points for rudeness, stealing prep, low effort, bad spreading, and not flowing.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
LANDRY, 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	
				2	3	5	5	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

Speech is vitally important to the future of all students. CX debate builds confidence and creates students that are mutually diverse. I feel like well developed arguments and clash are very important and this event does this.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Clear and concise. Speed is fine, but must be spoken well (this is a speaking competition).

LEWIS, JULIE	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	
				3	5	4	4	4	3	

Philosophy Statement

I believe the round is about you, not me. I will judge whatever arguments you present. I like logical arguments where you connect the dots for me. Tell me what is important. I am not a fan of running off-case arguments in the 2NC.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Just slow down on tag lines.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
LIPPERT, BRANDON	Other Tabula Rusa, lean 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	A
				3	4	3	5	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

In the world of CX debate, the main character is and always should be the resolution. It's the framework for building a case for the affirmative, as well as tackling the negative as well. As a judge, I look holistically at who has done the best job affirming or negating the resolution, plain and simple. To do this, having solid and reliable evidence as well as establishing continuity in the debate process throughout the round. I tend to look at the stock issues as a frame work for a thorough and thoughtful argument and would love if I could be moved internally to one side or the other in the debate process. Treat each other with dignity and respect, and remember, sometimes less is more! Big words and endless phrases sound cool and all, but only if they're substantiated by great evidence and an organized plan to back it up!

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speak clearly concisely; don't just speed read whats on the page!
Speak to me, not at me and most of all, respect your opponents!

LIPTON, ADAM	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	ABC
				3	3	3	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I have a paradigm written on tabroom.com
https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=6472

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
LOVELL, RYAN	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	
				2	4	2	1	2	1	

Philosophy Statement

Please speak so that I can understand and focus on the main stock issues.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed should not compromise your ability to communicate.

MARTINEZ, ENRIQUE	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	AB
				4	4	5	5	4	3	

Philosophy Statement

Overview: As a policymaker judge, I prefer that arguments stay within the realm of the resolution. With that being said, I am okay with K's, T's, and theory arguments, as long as you can explain their applicability in the round or policymaking. I will break down my thoughts on most arguments. If you have any questions, please ask.

DA- With every DA, make sure it covers everything in a DA, such as impacts. Also, generic DA's are fine, but the more specific to the AFF, the better.

CP- I am good with CP's, but make sure that you cover everything when presenting it in the 2AC. Explain how the resolution is not plausible or why the CP is preferable. Make sure that I can completely understand

T- Topicality is fine with me, with the most crucial thing in the round being the interpretations. It would help if you also conveyed to the judge why your interpretation is preferable to the opposition's definition.

K- While I am a policymaker judge, I am willing to hear K's out. I ask the team running the K to take some time to explain how the K lit because I may not be as familiar with it depending on the K. Also, explain how the K does/doesn't relate to the actual resolution and policy.

Theory- This argument is fine with me, but make sure it's run correctly. Be able to explain if there is/ isn't an issue of abuse.

Framework- Framework is a debatable issue in the round. Be able to explain why I should prefer your framework over the one presented by the opponent.

Impact Calc-Highly appreciated.

Style & Delivery Preferences

If spreading is 100% speed, try going at 75-85% during the round. I understand if you speed up towards the end, but make sure I understand what you're saying.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
MASON, MOLLY	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	A
				5	5	5	4	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issues judge. I support when a team can run a good DA. I appreciate brave teams that want to run a CP.

I don't mind speed while reading evidence as long as you slow down for the tag. This is a speech event, so let's hear some debate!

Style & Delivery Preferences

MASSEY, STORMEE	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	AE
				2	4	5	5	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

What is most important to me in a round?
 ORGANIZATION! I like overviews that actually serve a purpose. I like speeches that tell me where they are going, stick to that roadmap, and tell me where they are on the flow.
 FRAMING! You gotta tell me how to frame your impacts- especially in a clash of civilizations debate. If you have impacts functioning in different worlds, clear that up for me so I don't have to intervene. If you have the same impact framing- give me the breakdown of the magnitude and timeframe.
 DECORUM! I really do NOT like aggressive CX. You can get ethos without yelling over each other. Find strategic ways to control CX and generate ethos without being mean, please.
 Ranked 1-8- 1 being most preferred/tolerated arguments, 8 being least preferred
 Ks & K Affs: 1- You will not lose my ballot just for running a K. Ever.
 D/As 2- Make sure your link scenarios aren't ultra tenuous- I need clear and strong connections
 Theory: 3- I actually enjoy a good theory debate- but just like T, don't make it frivolous- run it if you need it and leave it if you can't win on it
 D/As 4- Make sure your link scenarios aren't ultra tenuous- I need clear and strong connections
 CPs & PICS 5- No Topical CPs- I like PICS
 Topicality: 6- Don't run it frivolously- prove in-round abuse
 Politics D/As 7- This kind of depends on context- Affs are welcome to run theory on Politics and I will listen
 Tricks 8- I don't know what this means, so don't do it. I am too old for that.

Speed is fine. I do not ever look at the speech doc during round, so I expect competitors to slow down on analytics and stay organized.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
McGEE, GREGORY	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	ABD
				3	3	5	4	4	4	

Philosophy Statement

My background is primarily in LD debate and Congress, although I was a policy debater many years ago. As such, my default is as a fairly traditional judge, operating primarily as a policy maker, and evaluating the stock issues. I am, however, open to most arguments, including critical arguments, if they are explained clearly and link well to the topic. I think Debate rounds should be fair, the arguments reasonable and educational.

I do not have the ear for speed that I once did, so the debate needs to be clear and intelligible.

I also strongly prefer debaters to explain how the different arguments work in a round. Put more effort in explaining links to DA,s, T violations, or what exactly the plan does. A clear story is persuasive to me. Debaters must be polite and respectful.

Style & Delivery Preferences

i prefer a slower to moderate paced debate. It really helps if debaters pause to explain how an argument is functioning in a round as opposed to reading more cards. Be very clear and slower on argument tag lines. Brisk reading of the card is fine.

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	AB
				3	4	4	4	3	2	

Philosophy Statement

I am a tabularasa judge. If you can sell it well, I will buy it. I am not a fan of Kritiks or turning traditionally policy debate into a philosophical one. If someone attempts to run a K, will need to spoon feed it and that may still not turn out in your favor. I weigh what is presented in the round and like structure to fall back on, ie stock issues. Information dumps/spreading is not a strategy I favor.

Style & Delivery Preferences

This is a communication event after all, so needs to be understandable in pace, fluid in delivery, and well organized with great analysis.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
McKENZIE, RORY	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	AB
				3	3	3	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

Tab judge but default policy. Comfortable going many places in the round. Prefer for debaters to do their thing and I'll adapt to them.

Just be clean with tech, don't be rude, use delivery to enhance.

Style & Delivery Preferences

MELIN, ERIC	Other	<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	AC
	No argument preference. Do			4	3	5	2	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I think debate operates in a unique place in the high school experience, where it serves as a crucible for the development of advocacy skills and critical engagement that is not replicated anywhere else. I love this activity and want each successive generation to be able to enjoy it. As such, be good to one another! Take care of our space and leave it better than the way you found it. Come back and give back if debate has given you a space to develop yourself.

Be yourself, you do you, etc. Keep the speed reasonable because it is a UIL expectation.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Paradigm stuff:

These are some of my thoughts but I'm not dogmatic. Do what you do best.

1. Please forward a well-developed ballot story. Compare methods and offense
2. Tell me what you want me to vote on
3. Compare evidence - this doesn't happen enough and it's usually what close debates depend on to resolve.
4. K aff's - I default to believing that K aff's should still be affirmative arguments. I think switch-side debate is good and develops a portable skill that other activities do not. I think what you clash abilities is important. K aff's should forward counter-interpretations as needed. I am willing to vote on framework.
5. Counterplans are best when case-specific. PICs are fine. The aff should have to defend their plan.
6. I prefer line-by-line debate more than long overviews. Too many rebuttals I've seen recently spend a ton of time explaining arguments in overviews that should just be done on the flow. Numbering arguments and following the order of your opponents is preferable or at least be explicit when re-grouping the flow.
7. I cannot flow a string of unending analytics with no time to type even if it's in perfect outline from in speech doc. Slow down just a bit, change your tone, and or pause for a moment when reading strings of long analytics.
8. I will be following along with the evidence read in the debate on my computer.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
MILLER, FLYNN	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	ABD
				1	5	4	4	1	4	

Philosophy Statement

More stock issues as I get older. I despise silly argument, irrelevant tirades. Solvency is big for me. I will accept kritiks BUT they must not be of a ridiculous nature. I am not going to vote on issues that are not related to the topic from either side. New case arguments are ok in 2nc but only those.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Moderate accelerated speed is ok but remember this is UIL.

MITHANI, ALY	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	ABDE
				4	3	5	5	3	4	

Philosophy Statement

I treat each debate round as an academic exercise in decision making. I leave many questions of framework and impact calculus to the teams debating, however if not otherwise explicitly stated I will default to a policy making framework and utilitarianism, respectively.

Style & Delivery Preferences

-It drives me crazy when debaters are disrespectful to each other. There is no reason why competitiveness needs to turn into aggression. Treat the debate space like a classroom.

-Another pet peeve: debaters who do not seem to legitimately enjoy what they are doing. Debaters who go through the motions are usually the ones that end up with the lowest speaker points from me. Even if you are not keeping up with the technical aspects of the debate, if you remain engaged and committed throughout the debate, I will definitely feel more comfortable with giving you higher speaker points.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

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 type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	ABCDEJK
				3	4	5	5	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I'm a policy-maker judge. I look for reasonability in plans and also an argumentation. In UIL stock issues are important. I judge solely on the flow. If it is not my flow I cannot and will not judge it. I do not argue the round for you. I will take some conditional arguments. Apocalyptic rhetoric needs to have impeccable sources.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed should never impede clarity. While spreading the flow has some benefit it also has some downside because if I can't flow it it didn't end up on the flow and it's not going to be judged on. Quality of your argumentation impacts my decision for more than how much information that you give.

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	A
			5	5	5	5	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

First, I'm capped to 300 words, so you'll find a more extensive and helpful paradigm at this link: <https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml>

Second, don't pay attention to the numbers - they all mean different things and are extremely confusing at the best of times. I just 5'd them all as a control essentially.

Third, I am tab. I'll vote for any argument in any given framework. Without a framework I'll vote based on offense in the round. I'm extremely focused on the flow and on warrants, so the best things you can do for yourself are be thorough and be organized.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I'm not a stickler for style - do what you're capable of which means if you like to go fast go fast, it's unlikely you'll spread me out. Do know that I won't give speaks based on style or delivery - those are based on strategy for me. I tend to be a stickler for points, but I've probably given out more 30s than a lot of people, so I'm not all bad.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
NAVA, VICTOR	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	AK
				3	4	4	4	4	2	

Philosophy Statement

I am moderately open to whatever strategy you prefer to run in CX debate. Some preferences I have noticed over the years include:

1. I am not really a fan of spreading for the sake of spreading or just getting through massive amounts of text. Taglines need to be perfectly enunciated at a normal speaking rate and any key sections of the text you believe are crucial to the round must be clearly highlighted as well. Debate is a speech event and I do place emphasis on style and presence.
2. My biggest request for affirmative is that all taglines are perfectly read and the plan text clearly enunciated. I don't mind squirrel cases as long as you are well prepared to defend your topicality.
3. For negative you really have the freedom to run whatever strategy you want. I enjoy listening to clash on a good (read: non-trivial) topicality argument, exploring the real-world implications of specific disadvantages, and straightforward on-case arguments. I entertain counterplans, but the 1NC must clearly articulate the counterplan text and any important advantage tags after. Kritiks are where I do tend to get lost because they sometimes assume a lot of background knowledge from the judge which is sometimes lacking (and debaters don't always know how to gauge when they might need to stop and break down the technicalities and details of their position).
4. Though I don't flow CX, I do pay attention to it and feel it gives insight to your confidence and ethos

Aside from that, I believe CX should be an educational experience for everyone in the room and hope to always walk away having learned something new. Above all, take a breath, relax, have fun, and congratulations on making it to state!

Style & Delivery Preferences

Spreading does provide for a good show at times and serves an intimidation factor, but please make sure that you read ALL taglines at a normal speaking rate. If I didn't catch what you said I'm not going to assume and flow it. Eye contact should be direct (kind of hard this year) and you should appear confident and informed. Tones should show exigency and respect for the opponent.

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

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 your 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.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
NGUYEN, KATLIN	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	ADE
				3	2	3	3	4	4	

Philosophy Statement

Don't use language that's racist, homophobic, etc. or derogatory terms. I understand that debate does come with aggression at some points, but never be condescending to your partner or opponents. That's unnecessary and will result in low speaks.

Affs: I'm pretty lenient on types of affs you can run, whether that be policy or K affs. To be more specific, K affs with a relation to the topic can have an easier time on the FW debate, but if your aff doesn't do that, then just give me reasons why it functions well in the debate space.

DA's/CP's: Just prove why the CP is competitive and show me the net benefits. Have clear, valid links with the disad. Be sure to do impact framing here as well and explicitly give me reasons why your impacts outweigh your opponent's.

Kritiks: I understand the way they function and have a general idea of what most of them are, but don't assume I know everything about your literature base. You're more than welcome to ask me about my knowledge of a specific K before the round starts, and I'll be happy to tell you my position with it. Be clear with your in-round application and link and alt explanation. If you're running a K on the neg against a policy aff, you'll win by either impact turning the education the aff introduces or just proving the plan makes xyz worse, which outweighs and turns the aff.

T/FW: For T, I typically default on competing interps, but can def be persuaded otherwise. I think that fairness is an internal link to education/clash/other FW impacts, but can def be down to vote for it if the aff does nothing, in which a TVA would be strong here as well. If running FW against a K aff, I'd like both team to explain to me why their model of debate is best for the space and why your opponent's is worse.

Debate is a learning space, have fun with it. Online debate also a lil different, but I'll just let you know I flow on paper, so speed is fine; just be clear on your tags and slow down a bit for analytics.

Style & Delivery Preferences

NICHOLS, 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	AB
				5	4	5	5	5	2	

Philosophy Statement

Old school stock issues judge. Not a huge fan of modern theory. This is a communication based event and not a speed reading contest. I only judge what I have on my glow. D/A's, CP's, and topicality arguments are good with me. Careful with K's.

Speak clearly and separate your words. If I don't get it on the flow than I can not judge on it. I can keep up pretty well, but I think of this as a communication based event and not a speed reading contest.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
NORIEGA, BENJAMIN	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	ADE
				5	3	3	4	5	5	
Philosophy Statement										
I will evaluate any argument as long as its impacted. I am a huge fan of Kritiks, so if you're a K team, go crazy! For the policy debaters, I would appreciate internal link analysis, and spend a good amount of time weighing impact calculus. Each team should provide framing arguments that instruct me as to how I should evaluate the round. If this is done right, the round is pretty much secured. I DON'T TOLERATE IN ROUND VIOLENCE. If the teams bring up examples of in round violence and gives it an impact to it, I will 99% vote on that a lone. I think these arguments are particularly useful for K teams. Argument thoughts: T- Not a big fan, but will listen. If T is gonna be the 2NR Strat, it better be good. DAs- Good tools. Impact cal and framing help in the long run of the debate. DA turns the case argument required. Ks- Love them, specifically the Cap K. Framing and impact analysis are particularly important for critiques, but I also think discussions of how the arguments affect both the people in and out of the round. Cps- Also useful tools, but generics are really hard to persuade me with. FW/Theory: Similar to my feelings about T, but since these can generate more clash, I am a little more interested.							Style & Delivery Preferences		Speak as you wish, but please adjust for online debate. If your'e not clear, just know it will hurt the way I evaluate your arguments.	

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
OCKER , MARILYN	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	
				3	3	5	3	5	3	
Philosophy Statement										
I am a speech and theatre teacher. A students articulation, and speech is more important than anything to me. I have to be able to understand your argument. I would also prefer quality research than quantity.							Style & Delivery Preferences		Please be articulate.	

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
PANELLA, BRENDA	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	A
				5	5	3	5	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I expect debaters to provide tough analysis of evidence presented in the round and may miss it if you choose to spread. I judge on stock issues including Neg DA's, and debaters really need to prove which stock issues are present or not. As for cards, I want to hear an explanation of why one card outweighs the opposing team. Don't just say "cross apply" or "there is no link". I want to hear the argumentation even if you are repeating yourself. The negative side has the burden of clash, and in the event that the negative fails to provide clash to the affirmative case, I will default affirmative. Kritiks and counterplans should be competitive and have a clear, well-explained advocacy. I do not vote on a round based on Theory.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Professionalism and courtesy are important. Rudeness and immature behavior will result in low speaker points. Always be aware of your posture, eye contact, and volume as you speak. Try your best not to fidget or sway as you speak. Providing a roadmap and signposts as you present your case is most appreciated. I do not mind spreading as long as you are clear on your taglines.

PHELPS, RUSSELL	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	ABCD
				3	3	3	4	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

policymaker. if you want something else, explain why and if you win why I shouldn't be one that's fine. your risk. I am ok with any type of argumentation just understand how to argue issues in the right format. I try not to intervene but that depends on you creating reasons I should vote for you and against your opponent. individually I do give credit to good cx periods that set up the round vs asking for evidence. I think the questions below have somewhat of a caveat. If you run arguments I don't give a high score it is fine to run them. That is about argument preference. I don't really have a predisposition as to how you should debate. I prefer nice vs mean to me and the opponents, but won't vote against mean. You are in this activity to persuade and convince. Choose your strategy and focus on what you do best, explain why it is the best policy, argue against theirs and it will be a wonderful round. new args in 2nc is old school but a constructive and is debateable or ask for leeway and da's are important as a policy person .

Style & Delivery Preferences

Look pathos is nice, but understand not everyone is capable of being Churchill. Clarity is key and I don't care about dress. Let's get more students participating. you do you. with clarity. and be nice.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
PORTER, JAMES	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	AC
				4	3	5	4	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I would call myself a heavy tab judge. I will listen to any argument that you could possibly read in front of me, but only if you can do so, well. Ks, K affs, theory, framework, performances, wipeout, CPs, Ts, and anything else you could possibly run is okay with me. My only condition is that Voters must always be read. I don't care how long you spend on the argument, if you don't properly cover the voters on the individual argument, then I have no reason as a judge to vote for it.

Explicitly sexist, racist, xenophobic, and homophobic discourse does not belong in debate, so don't engage in it. People should be nice. If you are not, then you may be looking at a low point win. I do not vote based purely on speaking style but if you are rude or offensive, then don't hope for anywhere near that 30. Other than these caveats, I am comfortable voting for just about any winning argument within any framework you want to explicitly place me within. Absent debate to the contrary, I default to voting for the advocacy with the most net beneficial post fiat impacts. On all portions of the debate I tend to use the heuristics of offense/defense, timeframe/probability/magnitude, and uniqueness/link/impact to evaluate and compare arguments.

Won't be able to spread me out of the round as long as you are clear. If you are not then I will say clear once and then after that anything that does not end up on the flow does not get carried over.

Style & Delivery Preferences

POWERS, TONYA	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	ABJK
				4	5	5	5	4	5	

Philosophy Statement

I consider myself a judge that will listen to anything as long as it is warranted. I have voted on just about any argument you can imagine. I am open to both traditional and progressive arguments. Do whatever works for you. Please give me voters. I love seeing clear ways you think I should evaluate the round. Voters are incredibly important in the rebuttals. Don't make me do the mental work for you

I competed for 3 years in policy in high school, 4 years of pari and 2 years of LD in college, and I was a graduate assistant for the WTAMU speech team. I have been coaching in some capacity for the last 8 years, so there's not much you can run that I have not seen.

I enjoy a good T debate. Stock issues are still very important in traditional policy debate, and I want debaters to do it well. Run T if there is a clear violation. Please emphasize voters.

Please read specific links if you have them. Tell me exactly how the aff plan fits into your scenario. I'm fine with terminal impacts as long as they are warranted.

I like CPs when they are run well. Please have a unique net benefit on the CP. You can read CP theory for the aff or neg. It's a neglected argument, but I actually like hearing theories on different types of counterplans.

Just like disadvantages, I think Ks should have specific links. Theory is great, and I enjoy it when it is run well. Make sure you have more than just a reject alt. What does the alt call me to do besides vote for you? Do not run multiple Ks in the same round/speech. A good K is a big enough theoretical and ethical issue that it should be your main advocacy.

UIL rules prohibit spreading, but you can speak more rapidly than normal conversation. Please make sure you enunciate clearly. Please don't gasp for air while you read. It's one of the few things I truly hate. If you're doing that, slow down. Make your signposts and taglines very clear, so I know where to flow.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
QUINTO, CHRISTINE	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	A
				3	3	5	3	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

My full paradigm is on Tabroom, but if you want a brief rundown:

Tell me my role in the round and I'll do it. If I'm not given a specific role, I'll default to what world is "better" based on what's on the flow.

I believe that people should run what they're passionate about and believe in. I don't mind what form those arguments come in, so long as I can reasonably flow them. That being said, being specific and deliberate with your arguments makes it easier for me to be a judge.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Substance over form, clarity over speed. I don't mind what form your arguments take, as long as you enjoy what you're reading. Just be clear if you're spreading and keep in mind that we're virtual.

RABALAIS, JOSH	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	AB
				4	5	5	5	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I am a tab rasa judge and will listen to any argument as long as it is run effectively and well.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is okay as long as it is understandable.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

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 type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	A
				5	5	5	5	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I default to the best policy option if you don't tell me what framework to go through. I'm not as comfortable with Ks and K affs. If you choose to run the then be prepared to explain well. Also be respectful of the forum and remember we are online go slow enough I can understand what you are reading.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Please don't spread due to the online nature of debate currently.

RANGEL, VANESSA	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	A
				3	1	5	5	1	3	

Philosophy Statement

I am a tabula rasa judge and I will flow anything you decide to run. However, if you run any conditional arguments or Aff K's you'll probably lose my ballot.

Evidence cards are not warrants. Reinforce your warrant tag at the end to show me the implications of whatever you just read. I don't flow warrantless arguments because they aren't substantial enough to be weighed on impact calc. They are also just claims at that point, not arguments.

If you have any specific questions just ask me before the round starts.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I do not like spreading, I give a max of two clears before I stop flowing your speech. You can speak quickly but make sure you are still coherent, this is a communications event after all.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
RECKER, NOAH	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	B
				3	3	5	5	1	1	

Philosophy Statement

I am policymaker judge. Please weigh impacts appropriately. Line by line is so important for me. Fine to split negative block. NO SPREADING.

Style & Delivery Preferences

No spreading.

RENFROE, JAMES	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	ABK
				3	3	3	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I am a tab judge. Email for link is soccergoaliejames@gmail.com

I am fine with anything but in terms of what I weigh with each individual argument here is how I view each of them:

K - If you run a K I want to know the specific role of the ballot and why the alt will solve for the problems manifested within the K. If the alt is just a rejection of the opposing team I am less likely to vote for your K.

T - Standards and voters in terms of the real world are how I vote on topicality. If there is ground loss but you do not talk about why that is a voting issue, I am not going to vote for it. T's have a tendency to irritate me if it is obvious they are topical. If you make a topicality as a time suck I will be less willing to give you ground for other theory arguments based on fairness.

DA - Really vague links irritate me, but you can lose the terminal impact and still have a risk of the DA succeeding.

CP - I need a flushed out method on why the Net Benefit of the CP should outweigh the case.

Case - I find oncase really important, and needs to be stressed on both the aff and the neg. Case specific impacts on either side can easily sway a round

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed - I am fine with speed, however I much prefer quality of arguments as to why they are logical rather than extending impacts that the other team did not hit as well.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
RITZ, HOWARD	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	B
				3	2	5	5	1	2	

Philosophy Statement

I have been Judge, Debate Coach for 24 twenty four years now in Texas circuits both UIL, TFA, and NSDA. I did not debate in college but have taught, coached, judged Debate for Rio Vista HS, Burleson High School, Wichita Falls HS, Northwest HS, and Now Mansfield Legacy High School, all in the DFW area of Texas. Have judged outside the area at Harvard U. , Berkley U, and Stanford, as well as colleges in Texas. Taught Policy and LD debate at Cameron University Summer Debate work shop for several years.

My Policy Debate Paradigms fall in the Traditional Debate category. I look for quality of arguments over quantity. Although I classify myself as a Stock Issue judge, I am open to some Negative Kritiks and conterplans. I am not a fan of theory based affirmatives or alternate worlds and really hate performance debate. Spreading will cost you speaker points if not the round if I can not understand your case. No Open CX for me. No Prompting of Partners written or verbal. Make arguments clear. Evidence and cards should be followed by analytics but analytics without evidence is of little value in my book. Show me that you understand what you are reading and not just reading cards.

NO Spreading and reading faster than I can flow the round. Be clear, Kind. Arrogance and demeaning communication will not be tolerated.

Style & Delivery Preferences

ROBINSON, TERRI	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	ABD
				4	5	5	5	3	5	

Philosophy Statement

I default policymaker but have no problem voting for critical rather than policy frameworks.

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.) Please, please, please extend your offense.

Things I don't like to see: blippy theory arguments, 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. Don't go for everything in 2NR.

Don't kick the puppy rule: If you are clearly winning the round against a much less experienced team, be kind.

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

Speed: Slow down on tags and authors.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
RODRIGUEZ , DAVID	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	A
					1	3	5	5	3	

Philosophy Statement

I am a policy maker judge. I believe 100% that the aff has the burden of proof and Neg burden of clash. I do not vote on topicality unless it is obviously not topical. Do not waste time on T.

Speed is not an issue. You must be articulate.

Style & Delivery Preferences

ROWE, RUSSELL	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	ABE
				3	3	3	4	4	2	

Philosophy Statement

CX Debate is preparation for persuasive legal and policy verbal presentations. Topicality and inherency can be considered legal arguments and solvency, advantages, harms, and disadvantages can be considered policy arguments. I'm generally a tabula rasa judge who will consider all arguments presented but do believe stock issues and policymaking positions are important. Don't argue topicality against apparently obvious topical cases. Don't argue topical counter-plans. I don't like Kritiks, insist upon them having a viable alt, and generally think they fall on theory, but the aff still must answer them or I will vote on them. Avoid abusive power-tagging on DA's and advantages. New arguments in the 2N should be case side (not really new to the round), never off case. Provide an impact analysis.

Moderate speed is preferred. Its a persuasive speaking activity not an auction. That applies to style as well. Don't just read to me.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
ROY, RENARD	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	AB
				3	5	4	4	2	2	
Philosophy Statement										
Old school, stock issues judge. Prefer slower to faster presentation with strong outline (I., II., A., B., C., 1., 2., a., b., etc.); use outline to signpost arguments. NEG should link their outline to specific signposts of AFF. Keep debate focused on topic area. Kritiks are "begrudgingly" welcomed as long as they are specifically linked to the topic and help me understand how to (re)evaluate/(re)consider established "norms" of society and the debate community, but always with respect to the topic. Theory is highly frowned upon. At the end of the round I expect to cast my ballot for the team which has presented advocacy that will improve the situation (in 2021, with respect to criminal justice) or in the rare alternate, do the least additional harms to the S/Q (try to avoid this, a very detailed impact calculus weighing discussion will be expected from both sides).										
Again, slower and highly organized.										

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
SALZMAN, JENNA	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	A
				2	1	3	5	2	3	
Philosophy Statement										
I am a combination of a policymaker and game player. I'll evaluate the round by how many arguments each team wins, but teams win those arguments based on their policy and how their advantages and impacts stack up.										
I'm fine with Theory and Framework, but apply the card to the round don't just read it out.										
Please put me in on the email chains: jenna.salzman@gmail.com										
Speed: I'm fine with speed as long as you're clear and understandable. I'll say "clear" if I can't understand you and I expect you to slow down. Speaker points docked for rude comments and behavior.										

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
SAUVE, COFFEY	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	AK
				3	4	5	5	3	1	

Philosophy Statement

My biggest concern is impacts. I want an explanation of how the plan is either beneficial or has harms. These impacts need to be thoroughly explained and clearly linked. Solvency is also very important, the plan must be feasible. In the end, debate is an educational activity. When we walk away from the round we should have all gained some knowledge.

Be careful about letting speed dominate your performance. I need to be able to clearly understand your arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

SCHNUCK, BEN	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	A
				5	4	5	3	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I often identify as a Gamemaker judge as I'll take whatever you'll throw at me. However, since this is UIL I will abide by official UIL rules, if you want to break them and your opponent calls you out I'll have a hard time voting for you. Be respectful and I will not tolerate any bigotry. Kritiks and Theory are my favorite but conceptualize for the round and don't waste any of our times by reading only shells - it has to pertain to the round. Affirmative Kritiks are also ok in my book as long as they are substantive.

Speak as fast as you want so long as we get a copy of the case. Since this is UIL I'd actually consider voting for spreading theory - although it would still be hard for me to do that.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
SERNA, JOSE	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	A
				4	3	5	5	4	5	

Philosophy Statement

If no one runs framing I default to Util. So if you are going to run soft left arguments or kritikal arguments PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE run framing with it. Tech>Truth for the most part

Topicality: I think T is okay, it's not the most persuasive but it's a pretty good strategy and definitely can win you a lot of round.

Counterplans: My least favorite argument is probably a topical cp because its just not persuasive and you give up a lot of theory ground to the aff. I have no bias on 50 state fiat. Conditionality is fine by me but you best be ready to face theory in the 2ac. CP's don't necessarily have to be textually competitive but I would prefer them to be.

Theory: I think a lot of us know when the other team is being unfair so use it when necessary. I can see myself voting on theory alone but it has to be a pretty severe case and the other team was purposely being toxic. Just don't run it if you really don't feel like if you've been hurt AND you know you could had have time for other arguments that could have more substance in the round.

Kritiks: I think that kritikal arguments are basically inevitable in with the CJR topic. Clearly define your alt and be prepared to defend it though. Performance is okay to run with me but if you are gonna run more advanced POMO be sure to spell it out in the rebuttals.

Obviously there are no perfect Tab judges but I try my best, above are some of my potential biases in arguments but by all means DO NOT let them limit you. Ultimately, I just really want you to run what you are most comfortable with.

The one thing I really do ask you is to really slow down on the taglines. You can go as fast as you want in the text but slow down a little on taglines and any analytics that you run.

Style & Delivery Preferences

SKINNER, KATRESE	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	ABCDEJK
				4	5	5	5	2	3	

Philosophy Statement

Remember, I am an educator first. Debate in a way that makes your community, your coach, and your parents proud. K's are fine if they are your primary advocacy or if they enhance your arguments. I like to see that the neg strat fits together cohesively. I despise partners who speak for their team-mates. I want to be included in the round. I want to hear the source cites. Aff gets to set the scope of the round and neg gets to choose the arguments. If neg. chooses to go for stock issues, aff. should be ready to answer; if neg wants to run K and a CP, aff needs to defend their policy. I love an old fashioned Topicality debate. Don't be rude. Have fun.

This is on-line, I don't feel rapid speed translates well to the online platform. I will not look at evidence unless it is being challenged.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
STEWART, MATTHEW	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	B
				4	2	5	5	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

Will default to offense/defense when left with no other way to evaluate the round.

Open to any arguments, pretty high threshold for T though - someone has to do really poorly on the tech side or it needs to be genuinely not topical for me to go for it

Be kind in round, there's no need to be weirdly rude to people.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Slow down for taglines and cites, give me a separation word between cards (and, or next, are good options)

If you're gonna read out a lot of theory analytics, slow down for those also.

STUBBLEFIELD, DAWN	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	ABE
				4	4	3	4	2	2	

Philosophy Statement

I believe that all Debate is about CLASH. It is important that you not only defend your position, but also must point out why your opponents is wrong. I may not be a fan of K or any specific argument, but I do my best to come in with a clean slate and judge the round on its merits. As the debater, it is YOUR job to explain why I should vote for you. Do not assume that I know everything. I am a bit more traditional in CX, but I am willing to vote on any solid, well-developed argument.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Communication is very important--especially in this virtual format. Speed is not always your friend when you are trying to speak to a judge through a computer. Slow down and make your points clear and concise.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
SULLIVAN, SUE JANE	Policymaker Stock issues do come into play--	<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	B
				3	3	2	4	2	2	
Philosophy Statement										
<p>It may be that many competitors may not have debated as many rounds as they would have in a non-pandemic year. That is a consideration because usually at this level I would expect seeing a polished AFF case and tried and true DA's that would have been tested during the course of fall competition. That simply may not be the case for many, especially smaller schools.</p> <p>However, that does not mean that I don't expect competency in the round. I want to see preparation, knowledge supported by solid evidence, and the clash that shows debaters are listening to each other's arguments.</p> <p>Thank you all for competing in an event that demands a great deal of time and research. You are to be commended for that!</p>										
Style & Delivery Preferences										
<p>Argue with passion but with rational thought--I am NOT impressed with simplistic sound bytes that sound good but demonstrate little more than shallow knowledge. Debate is not a rally; it is an exercise in communication, researched evidence, and persuasion.</p>										

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
SUTTON, DAVID	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	
				5	3	4	3	3	3	
Philosophy Statement										
<p>I am a rhetorician by degree and trade, and as such, there are few things I enjoy more than a well-executed argument. Rather than enter a debate with a preconceived notion of an issue, I prefer to operate as a tabula rasa, an open mind ready to see how you sway my thoughts, ideas, and judgments.</p> <p>While my personal preference is for performances over spreading, I appreciate all arguments that are well-articulated, I do not believe speed detracts from articulation unless the speaker has not practiced, rehearsed, and considered the audience. If you spread, spread clearly, otherwise, it can hurt you more than help you. Moreover, as one who enjoys seeing where a line of reasoning may take us, I am not opposed to hearing most arguments, approaches, or evidence. In the end, I will make my decision based on which side has established the best argument for their perspective on the resolution.</p> <p>I look forward to your thoughts, preparations, insights, and passions.</p> <p>Include me in evidence chains - dsutton@ems-isd.net</p>										
Style & Delivery Preferences										
<p>While spreading is contrary to the rules of rhetorical delivery, I understand and embrace its purpose in CX. If the speakers are clear, I can keep up with any speed.</p>										

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
THACKER, WENDY	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	B
				3	3	4	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I appreciate clear communication and the ability to explain your plan in layman's terms. I am a stock issues judge. I also expect for you to explain how your stock issue argument is impactful on the round. Please, please be considerate and kind.

Please don't talk too fast.

Style & Delivery Preferences

TOBES, RACHEL	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	
				3	2	2	2	2	2	

Philosophy Statement

I am a very strict UIL judge! NO SPREADING!!! I will not flow any argument that is not clearly identified or that I have to struggle to understand. DO NOT SPEED READ! This is not a reading competition, it is a debate - based on logic, analysis, critical thinking, and development. I want to hear arguments that explain why the plan won't work, why it is a significant problem that needs to be addressed, how it can be solved, etc. I don't want the round to focus around a series of petty arguments that don't address the overall importance of the case.

This is a speech event; as such, I expect the delivery to be clear and to show communication skills. I do not want to see bouncing up and down to keep a pace or to hear gasping and hyperventilating!

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
TURNER, MICHAELA	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	A
				3	5	5	5	4	4	

Philosophy Statement

The winner of a debate round is the person who creates the best world for the most amount of people. For the affirmative this means proving some amount of positive change to the status quo while operating under the constraints of the resolution. This requires having all necessary parts of an affirmative plan in order to create a fully developed story of the world both pre and post Aff. For the negative this means proving that the affirmatives plan will either create no change, or preferably, a negative change to the status quo. If it is impossible for the negative to do so the only other acceptable option is to prove that the affirmative plan is unfair or abusive to the negatives ability to refute. Topicality is a round deciding issue only if it is valid. I will not vote on topicality unless this is the only possible option for the negative and the negative has clearly proven the Aff has limited their ability to research and apply. This means when relying on topicality arguments the negative should have no other attacks unless theoretical in nature. Arguments with real world impacts and clear cut structure will be preferred first. In simpler terms, my favorite arguments are disadvantages If the negative can logically show the affirmative does more harm than good other less traditional arguments become less critical. However, if run properly structured and with a clear understanding of the strategy, theoretical and new age debate tactics are not discouraged and can win you my vote. They must make sense and should also still create some sort of story. I lean heavy towards the stock issues and prefer that method of organization in your arguments. However, I consider myself a policy maker because if you can direct me and clearly tell me why your arguments are more significant to the real world or the debate world I will not vote against or for any particular strategy.

Communication is incredibly important. If I cannot understand your arguments, they will not flow. I am fine with speed as long as your diction is not affected. Organization is critical. Arguments should have proper structure and you should frequently be clarifying your place in the flow with some sort of apparent strategy. Rude behavior is not tolerated. Do not speak over or down to your opponent. While condescending and pompous attitudes will not lose you the round it will significantly impact your speaker points.

Style & Delivery Preferences

VANDENBERG, MATT	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	A
				3	2	3	3	2	1	

Philosophy Statement

Debate is a clash of ideas -- I want to know why a policy is the best or why it should be discarded in favor of the status quo. Reasons a policy should not be adopted include (but are not limited to) that it does not achieve what it intends to, that there are significant defects or unintended consequences associated with the policy, or that there is a better policy that would be supplanted by the proposed policy.

In determining whether I agree with arguments of the types identified above, I will look to the strength of evidence marshaled to advance an argument. One compelling argument may be sufficient; more plausible, but not compelling, arguments may also be convincing. A smattering of dubious arguments will not be. Irrespective of the number of arguments, if they are not sufficiently developed, explained, and defended under scrutiny, then they will not weigh strongly in favor of accepting or rejecting an argument. Arguments are also not compelling if they are not specifically tailored to the policy.

The purpose of debate is to allow students to develop useful communication and persuasion skills. I look for communication that reflects this understanding. No spreading. Eye contact is also important.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
VILLAFUERTE, JOSE	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	B
				4	3	5	4	2	5	

Philosophy Statement

I listen to just about any argument. Make sure it has a valid warrant and I'm all ears. For AFF I'm looking for topical plans with stock issues first. I'll listen to AFF Ks but I need clear voting issue to give you the ballot. Savvy theory has a special place in my heart. On neg. I'm looking for clear links to the AFF plan. I dissuade generic link arguments with DAs and Ks. I want to see clear clash on the issues debated. You can run T but I still wanna see some kinda engagement with the 1AC position

Speed is fine if I'm flashed the case. I prefer clear delivery anyway however.

Style & Delivery Preferences

WALTHROP, TIFFANI	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	AB
				4	3	5	5	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I consider myself an offense/defense judge. I am mostly tab (except for a few things I'll explain below) but I will default to a policymaking paradigm if not given a clear way to evaluate the round by the debaters. I'm open to all arguments as long as they are impacted out and articulated well.

T- I don't vote on T very often unless there is a good standards debate and voters are being extended throughout the round. I don't want to see T ran as a time suck and no work being done on it for that reason. It's a waste of time when you could use the time more effectively elsewhere.

DAs- Please run disads. I want them to have a strong internal link story into the impact, and most preferably have specific links to the aff. Generic ones are fine as well as long as you're doing work on it.

CPs- Please read a clear counter-plan text, otherwise have fun. I love a good competitive CP.

Ks- I'm fine with Ks, as long as they're not being used in a "gotcha" manner. Please do not run them if you cannot articulate the argument beyond the flowery language of the literature. Meaning, do not "explain" the argument to the other team by rereading the link tagline. Also please understand how the alt functions and be able to get that across to everyone in the room as well.

Case- I always love turns, whether it be impact or general solvency turns. For aff teams, please be extending on your case throughout the entire round. Don't get so caught up in answering neg arguments that you forget to extend your biggest pieces of offense.

As I said above, I am open to most everything that could happen in a round. But I absolutely do not want to see new arguments in the 2NC. There is no reason you can't introduce everything in the 1NC. The only exceptions to this is when you read on case arguments in the 1 and don't get to them all so you have your partner finish this in the 2. Try to read all on case turns in the 1 if doing that.

I am never okay with racism, sexism, homophobia, or any of the like.

If you have any specific questions that didn't get answered in this, please do not hesitate to ask me.

I'm fine with speed, however in this virtual world speed does not always come across very clearly. Please keep this in mind.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
WARREN, JASON	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	ABJ
				1	3	5	3	1	1	

Philosophy Statement

I am primarily a stock issues judge. I believe debating the resolution as presented is a paramount concern and will vote based on whether the plan (or counterplan) reasonably solves a substantive issue (or not). Make my life easy by weighing impacts, engaging in direct clash, and providing clear voters. Cards are not gospel- just because a reporter said something doesn't make it true. Just because a card wasn't read doesn't make the claim false. I don't need to be on the email chain and will only call for evidence if its veracity is in question.

Do not spread. Clear organization is strongly encouraged- be explicit with the order and 'go down the flow' when possible.

Style & Delivery Preferences

WHISENHUNT, TOBY	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	ABE
				4	3	5	4	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

toby.whiz@gmail.com

Fundamentally I see debate as a game. I think it is a valuable and potentially trans-formative game that can have real world implications, but a game none the less that requires me to choose a winner. Under that umbrella here are some specifics.

1. Comparative analysis is critical for me. You are responsible for it. I will refrain from reading every piece of evidence and reconstructing the round, but I will read relevant cards and expect the highlighting to construct actual sentences. Your words and spin matters, but this does not make your evidence immune to criticism.
2. The affirmative needs to engage the resolution.
3. Theory debates need to be clear. Might require you to down shift some on those flows. Any new, exciting theory args might need to be explained a bit for me. Impact your theory args.
4. I am not well versed in your lit. Just assume I am not a "_____ " scholar. You don't need to treat me like a dullard, but you need to be prepared to explain your arg minus jargon. See comparative analysis requirement above.

Side notes:

Not answering questions in CX is not a sound strategy. I will give leeway to teams facing non responsive debaters.

Debaters should mention their opponents arguments in their speeches. Contextualize your arguments to your opponent. I am not persuaded by those reading a final rebuttal document that "answers everything" while not mentioning the aff / neg.

Civility and professionalism are expected and will be reciprocated.

Clear.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
WILLIAMSON, LAUREL	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	A
	I'm all of the above, the best			4	4	4	4	4	3	

Philosophy Statement

I'm really easy to please, as long as what you are saying can be backed up by facts I'm happy. Whoever has the best plan that does the most for the people will normally win. I want your plan to do more good than harm.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Make me believe what you are saying. Prove your points with facts.

WOODS, VICTORIA	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	ABCDEJK
				2	5	5	5	3	4	

Philosophy Statement

Policymaker focus on impact (magnitude, timeline, probability)

I like Topicality arguments and will listen to K's but they must be warranted.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Absolutely NO Rapid Delivery (Spreading) Quality over quantity

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2021 — 4A, 5A, 6A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
Yu, HARRY	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	ABD
				3	1	4	5	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

Traditional. Tabroom has my updated paradigms.

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=25980

Style & Delivery Preferences

Clarity over speed