JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2023 — 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

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.

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

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM. SKILLS vs. RES. OF ISSUES	QTY. vs. QUALITY OF EVIDENCE	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE

ABAD, NINE

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm. Skills vs. Res. of Issues: ⦿ Res. Issues (○ Comm. Skills, ○ Equal)

Qty. vs. Quality: ⦿ Equal (○ Quantity, ○ Quality)

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	5	4	5	5	5

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

Full paradigm available on Tabroom.com under the name "Nine Abad". Please ask before the debate if there are any particular questions.

Style & Delivery Preferences

See Tabroom.com paradigm.

ABREGO, EMILY

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm. Skills vs. Res. of Issues: ⦿ Res. Issues (○ Comm. Skills, ○ Equal)

Qty. vs. Quality: ⦿ Equal (○ Quantity, ○ Quality)

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

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

As a tab judge, framework and ROB are very important to me. The only new arguments that I do not accept in the 2nd constructive are topicality args. I will not vote on a counterplan, but they can be used to support solvency attacks on the affirmative. Other than that, just tell me what to prioritize in the debate and I will sign my ballot accordingly.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is fine so long as you slow down on taglines and signpost.

Judge	Paradigm	Comm./Res. Issues	Ev. Qty./Qual.	Numerical Rankings						Experience

Acevedo, Manuel

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	5	3	3	2	1

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

As a stock issues judge, I expect the affirmative team's plan to retain all stock issues and should label them clearly during the debate. The negative needs to prove that the affirmative fails to meet at least one issue in order to win. I require both sides to provide offense. Sufficient evidence is needed for any claim made during the entire debate. 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 since I don't want to read speeches. I want to hear them. If it's important, make sure to express it clearly.

Style & Delivery Preferences

No spreading! All debaters must speak clearly in order for me to hear all of their points and must watch rate of delivery. I can't vote on what I don't hear or can't understand.

Adams, Clint

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	5	4	5	3	3

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I try to let the students debate and make the decision based what goes on in the round. That being said, I would rather read a Superman comic book than involved Philosophy. If you run a K, you need to be able to explain it to me and how it links to the topic.

Style & Delivery Preferences

If I can't hear you, it doesn't matter how great your evidence is. So make sure that you are clear.

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

ADAMS, JENNIFER

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues:
- ○ Comm. Skills
- ○ Res. Issues
- ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
- ○ Quantity
- ◉ Quality
- ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	4	3	5	3	3

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I approach Cx from a policymaker standpoint. I want to see a plan that is topical, feasible, and solves a defined harm. I teach AP classes and do not spend hours reading theory or K authors. I need you to FULLY explain your argumentation, don't assume I know. I will judge the debate based on what you introduce in the debate and will attempt to adapt to you. I do not favor spread/speed. Be respectful of each other, and me. Flash time counts as prep time.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Number your arguments and make sure your arguments are clear. If you don't say it, I'm not going to flow it. I want to see your face, not your laptop, get your face up.

ADCOCK, KENNETH

Paradigm: Stock issues / Stock Issue--- through policy

Comm./Res. Issues:
- ○ Comm. Skills
- ○ Res. Issues
- ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
- ○ Quantity
- ◉ Quality
- ○ Equal

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

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=239466

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed, since that is what this question is really asking...I tend to err on the side of technical over articulate, as this is an incredibly technical event, and know how much time it has taken to develop that skill.

I will warn you to watch me, or my pen. If I am not flowing the round then there is a high probability that I am not following along with you and the only saving grace for you is the speech drop, fileshare, or email chain if there is one. Please be present in the round and observant that it could be the difference in your win or loss, simply because I could not understand your attempt at spreading.

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

ALANIZ, JOSE A.P.

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	4	4	5	4	5

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I'm partial to the K, if its done well. Good link and impact stories go a long way with me. Please tell me how and where to vote so I don't have to make that decision myself.

Style & Delivery Preferences: Be clear, slow down a little when reading your

taglines and be nice, but not too nice.

ALLEN, JAMES

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

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

Experience: ADJ

Philosophy Statement

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=39383

Style & Delivery Preferences: See paradigm.

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

ANDREWS, BLAKE

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
	3	4	5	5	4	5

Experience: ABDE

Philosophy Statement

Short version: Go for whatever type of argument you want(i.e. I don't care if you go for traditional policy arguments versus a K... just debate well) I find debaters do well in front of me that collapse, extend warrants, do impact calc, and give judge instruction when appropriate.

"If you want my ballot, this is really a simple concept. Tell me 1) what argument you won; 2) why you won it; and 3) why that means you win the round. Repeat."

Policy – If you have questions before the round and want to know anything specific I will do my best to articulate how I view debate and give you any insights into my paradigm. Aff should probably be topical, but its possible to win that T doesn't matter. I have read some critical literature, but slow down for more obscure authors/ positions. Specific DA's and counterplans are great. Kritiks that link to the aff are great. Link of omission K's are not. Word pics, and other random stuff is fine. I'm a big picture kind of guy.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speak at whatever rate you feel comfortable with.

ANTONAKAKIS, ALEXIS

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
	4	3	4	4	5	5

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

Give me a clear framework to evaluate the round under, the warranted offense you have to leverage under it, and weigh your offense against your opponent. I don't mind stock debate and if that's what you're best at go for it. I think you should debate in the way you find most effective, but make your arguments clear and understand them well. I find that much more respectable than running arguments you aren't familiar with. Also, I'm not the fastest judge when it comes to flowing, i.e. don't go full speed. If I had to quantify it maybe my speed is a 7.5/10. I'll say clear 3 times if you're too fast or unclear, after that I'll stop flowing your arguments until you decide to clear up. This will affect your speaks.
I'm inclined to err on reasonability. If there isn't any real abuse going on in the round I probably won't vote on theory.I am NOT the judge for intense theory debates. This means if you go for it I'll do my best to give a good adjudication, but don't be surprised if it's not explained incredibly.
If I think you're being toxic, offensive, or anything else related to this then your speaks will drop and you could lose the round for it as well. I've done it before and I'll do it again.
I won't vote on arguments I deem offensive, which is like most judges, however, I also don't vote on arguments I deem unethical (the following args are not auto-losses, but I won't evaluate them):
1. U.S. Heg Good (comparative hegemony/bipolarity is somewhat okay, but explicit u.s. exceptionalism is not), 2. Cap Good, 3. Hobbes, 4. Libertarian Ideology, 5. Edelman or any combination of queerness with some self-violence, ex: queer bomb. I will simply not flow the argument.If you're going to try to defend something like capitalism or NATO in front of me then you should probably do stuff like prove transition wars would be worse, under current circumstances its not possible to transition from capitalism, etc.

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=73694

Style & Delivery Preferences

I'm absolutely fine with spreading so long as you slow down on tags and cites, as well as making sure you sign post well. I'm cool with stock debate, policy arguments, or K stuff. As a debater I went for Ks the most so I really enjoy a good K debate.

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

BALLWAY, MATTHEW

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	4	3	3	1	1

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issues judge. The team that will win the round is the team that better upholds most of the five stock issues. I do not like speed because I prefer to understand the argument.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I do not like speed. I prefer clarity of argument and quality over quantity.

BEARD, CAROL

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	5	4	3	3	5

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I am open-minded to any well-constructed approach to the resolution and its content. I am not opposed to progressive arguments and unique approaches within the debate space. My primary concern is that competitors intellectually engage one another.

Establishing framework becomes key in any round. Framework established by the aff and not refuted by the neg becomes the criteria I will use to judge the round.

Clarity of argumentation is the most important thing to me as a coach and a judge.

I will flow your round and I will pay attention to drops/extensions/cross-applications that are well founded and well articulated.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I believe that debate in all forms should cultivate the communication skills of the participants. I am open to style and delivery that maximizes the presentation for each individual student and allows them to showcase their argumentative and persuasive prowess.

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

BELL, NAOMI

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	5	2	5	3	2

Experience: ABDJ

Philosophy Statement

I would like all claims to be backed with warrants and impacts.

I enjoy the traditional style of policy debate. I want the aff to show their support of the policy and neg to communicate their opposition of it. The full address of the stock issues by aff and attacked by the neg are the basis for me making the decision as to who wins the round. I am open to a counterplan as long as the negative can defend it well and thereby proving that I should reject the aff. I will attempt to keep an open mind about K's but I am not too crazy about them.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I want effective communication. Claim, warrant, impact and knowledge of the topic is important with the delivery. I am not a fan of spreading but will be open to it if the speaker can articulate well doing it.

BHASIN, ISHIKA

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ◉ Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	4	5	5	3	4

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

Racism/sexism/homophobia/anything else that makes the round an unsafe space is an automatic drop with the lowest possible speaks.

I don't mind if you run very many or very few arguments as long as the impact calculus is solid. Weighing and clash are more important than quantity.

I'm fine with all the typical off-case argument types. I'll evaluate any theory/topicality shell, but if it's frivolous, the threshold for me to vote on it is higher and it'll be easier for the aff to convince me to grant an RVI. Kritiks need to be well explained, especially if they involve heavy philosophy literature. Make the link chain clear in disads.

I listen to cross, but I don't flow it. If you want me to flow something that's said in cross, you need to bring it up in a speech.

If the tournament allows and both teams agree, you can do open cross/flex prep.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Spreading is fine if I have the doc. Slow down on taglines and anything else you want me to flow. I'll call "clear" once.

Don't be aggressive during cross.

Keep speeches organized- offtime roadmaps are appreciated (if the tournament allows) and signposting throughout the speech so that I know where to be on the flow is necessary.

Please use trigger warnings when they are needed.

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

BICOUVARIS, MANUSOS

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

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

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

My philosophy for judging policy debate is Tabula rasa. When I walk into a debate room I go in with an open mind. A debate room is a safe and open place for the exchange of ideas, and testing of the preparedness of the contestants. The history of debate should be reflected in the competition itself, and when the debaters come into the room they carry that history on their shoulders. Respect for the art of sound argument, and for the preparation and work to do the event properly. I have the expectation that both sides will give fair time and attention to the craft each has honed over the last year. Biases and preconceived notions should be left at the door. Judgment on anything other than the strength of the arguments and counter arguments has no place in this very challenging event.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I prefer that the delivery of the case be at a steady pace, and not spread. When the cases are presented, I expect the students to be organized before they come into the debate room. Not to spend a lot of time searching the computer or note pads for the information that they need to present the case. Acknowledging and thanking the judge and timekeeper, if there is one, and asking about judge preferences.

BLAIN, ROBERT

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	4	5	4	3	4

Experience: ABDEJK

Philosophy Statement

CX Debate is an event where clash is needed. A winning debate team is one that at least reinforces why their plan is better. There are no such things as "debate tricks"- don't give me Reductio ad Absurbum and think it's a winning argument.

Quality of sources and arguments is at a premium, in my book.

Style & Delivery Preferences

The delivery style should be one that helps make you seem like an expert, not someone that throws as much against the wall as possible and hope something sticks.

Related to my "no debate tricks" statement in my philosophy, spreading to throw countless contentions isn't a winning strategy.

Winning debate sounds like like what would be heard in a legislative session, courtroom, or college lecture hall than it does spreading.

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

BROWN, DAVID

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	4	5	3	3	5

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I have coached, or actively coach events, on local UIL, TFA and national circuit for over a decade. I feel confident in my ability to properly evaluate most any flow. I'm willing to vote on anything as well as it's clearly explained and sufficiently warranted. Weighing and clear ballot stories attached to framing are really important. I will not evaluate an argument that I cannot explain in the RFD. My job as a judge is to determine the winner of the round through the evaluative tools that you give me. This means that I'm willing to vote for nearly any argument presented in front of me, insofar as it has the necessary warrants and framework to make it relevant to the decision.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I want to judge you at your best so read whatever it is that is your best. Be fast, be strategic, be smart and be effective. These are the traits that I look for in a good debater, which is to say I don't place a limit on the style of debate you do.

BROWN, HEATHER

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ◉ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
2	1	4	2	2	4

Experience: ABDEJK

Philosophy Statement

We are going to have a judge take my place. We are just submitting this info for the record.

Style & Delivery Preferences

See above

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

BRYANT, HANNAH

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ○ Res. Issues / ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ● Quality / ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	4	5	5	3	2

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I usually fall in the policy making judge category. I focus heavily on the affirmative's solvency and how the negative disproves the legitimacy of the solvency. I appreciate when the negative runs a counter plan. However, I still vote on on-case arguments. I also enjoy a strong topicality argument. Having a good mix of on-case and off-case arguments is favorable. Even though I heavily focus on the policy, I still consider the STOCK ISSUES when I evaluate the round.

For the affirmative to win, the team needs to explain why their policy is necessary and sufficient. I do not automatically give the affirmative my vote if they win topicality. If the affirmative can still show that their policy solves and is necessary after negative attacks, I vote for an affirmative ballot.

For the negative to win, the team needs to explain how the affirmative policy does not solve or is not necessary, how the affirmative case is untopical, or how the negative can present a better plan (counter plan) with a net benefit.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I prefer no spreading, however, I can still follow most rounds. If you spread, I appreciate it when a debater slows down during voters or when explaining the main arguments of the round. I enjoy overviews and underviews throughout the debate.

CARPENTER, SARAH

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ○ Res. Issues / ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ● Quality / ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	5	3	4	2	3

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I expect arguments to be well explained and warranted, as well as impacts. Make it clear why you should win. Framework and judge instruction is also an important factor. The quality of the evidence you're presenting will catch my attention. I believe good quality evidence drives a debate more than pathos. I prefer a smooth and fluid cross x, I don't like when speaking over others is used as a power trip to be a dom in the debate. Aff should prove how they are grounded in the resolution. Argument resolution wins debates; explaining the interaction between you and your opponent's arguments and competing claims as well as why it favors you will win you close rounds.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I prefer no spreading but you can speak fast as long as you believe you can be understood.

Judge	Paradigm	Comm./Res. Issues	Ev. Qty./Qual.	Numerical Rankings						Experience

Casey, Zach

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ◉ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	3	3	4	3	1

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issues judge, I prefer the affirmative to defend all 5 stock issues. The affirmative and the negative should both create direct clash by responding to ALL of their opponents' arguments. To me, an argument that does not have a response is an argument that is won by the team that made the argument. I do not like kritiks. Topicalities are great, but I don't like time being wasted on endless topicality arguments. Disadvantages are also a good argument, but should be formatted correctly and have all four necessary parts. CPs should have a net benefit, or they are not better than the affirmative case. On case arguments are the most effective arguments in my opinion, as long as they relate directly to the opponent's case. I will also listen to reasonable theory arguments. I do not like new in the 2, but if an argument is made for why it should or should not be allowed, I will listen to the evidence and arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I want to be able to understand every word you say. I will award higher speaker points to debaters that speak the most fluently, with the fewest mistakes, as long as I understand them.

Chao, Isaac

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ◉ Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	5	5	1	5	5

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I default to a competing worlds paradigm and am a tech over truth, big tent judge who tries to be tab. To ensure that the round is resolvable, you should 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. Best case scenario for you, I am pulling lines from your last rebuttal to quote in the RFD. If you don't crystallize, layer clearly, or provide clear judge instruction and I'm forced to intervene, it is likely that you will be dissatisfied with my decision.

My strongest preference these days is that teams are doing high-quality research and cutting updates. You should know what your cards say and what your authors defend. I will reward teams with speaks who have done their homework, including re-highlighting your opponent's evidence and pulling lines for the link debate.

I judge frequently across a broad spectrum of styles and am reasonably flex, so you should do what you do best and have the debate that you would like to have. You can find a lengthier paradigm as well as my judging record here:

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=17033

Style & Delivery Preferences

You should debate in the style that you prefer, provided you're clear and keep the round accessible. If you want high speaks you should probably be cutting updates and reading something case specific.

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

CHRIST, ARMAAN

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	4	5	1	5	5

Experience: ABE

Philosophy Statement

Bio:
email: graduated@gmail.com
they pronouns
previously at midlothian
i debate for texas (2a/1n)
i have adhd, please be cautious in clarity for me
i have a lot of old thoughts about debate that probably can't fit in this statement, find it here: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-KidiW8WJQi0-PWf2lx33GPi9kiRySLI1TbV_fGZ1PY/edit?usp=sharing
Paradigm:

Note for disclosure: I will entertain disclosure theory if both teams are not present in the room at least 15 minutes before the round.

I'm good for any argument, any style of debate, all arguments require a claim, impact, warrant, and try not to overly adapt to me.

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=25976

Style & Delivery Preferences

I'm good with speed - on a scale of 1 to 10, I can flow a 6.5-8.5
speaks default at 29 if you do nothing to increase or decrease
increase by: being organized and clear, ending your speeches earlier
decrease by: being late, being annoying, not extending warrants
I'm not dogmatic about style, how you speak, whether you sit or stand; just be the best you.

COLE, TYLER

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

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

Experience: ACK

Philosophy Statement

When it comes to CX debate I find myself normally more of a traditionalist judge. I classify myself as a policy maker judge, tell me why your plan, or status quo/ counterplan, is better than the proposition the opposite side is making. Additionally, I believe stock issues to be quintessential in arguing your side, although drop(s) on stock issues do not equate to a winning ballot. I also believe highly that this event is centered on the competitors ability to communicate, with that being said, roadmaps and signposting every argument and every stock issue is a very effective way of winning my ballot. Please do not read me a list of evidence and not tell me exactly where you want that piece of evidence. I'll flow the evidence, but I will not assume where you want me to put that evidence on my flow, nor will I speculate how that evidence is supposed to be used in round. I am not particularly a fan of K debates, however if the competitor thinks they can be successful in properly communicating the K, I will listen to it.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I favor the quality of your arguments over the quantity. With that being said I would prefer that spreading be kept to a minimum, or if possible, not present in the debate at all.

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

COLUMBIA, KELLY

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

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

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

SUMMARY: I'm a policymaker who did UIL CX in high school, I am familiar with a couple other events though so I'm not super strict on traditionalism. I like theory, I don't like generic stuff, I don't like spreading (speed is fine), I don't like guilt tripping, I'm logical, avoid vague links, give me roadmaps before speeches, be nice to your opponents.

I will vote for whichever case I think has the best outcome. It is imperative in my mind that competitors uphold their burdens. I default to utilitarianism but I love framework/theory debates, so I am open to whatever y'all bring up; I'll flow anything. IF YOU DROP FRAMEWORK, THEORY, OR T, I AM PROBABLY NOT GOING TO VOTE FOR YOU. I am open to every kind of offcase. I see debate as a game with bendable rules.

For more info: https://www.tabroom.com/user/judge/paradigm.mhtml

Style & Delivery Preferences

DO NOT SPREAD, an 8-12 page 1ac read clearly is fine. Be cordial, be clear, summarizing at the end of your speech is a good call. DO NOT make snarky comments at the end of a sentence or under your breath, this includes saying "so that means you don't have evidence, ok" when your opponent answers a cx question. Call them out, don't do that kind of thing.

For more info: https://www.tabroom.com/user/judge/paradigm.mhtml

---

CORNISH, NICOLE

Paradigm: Other / Offense/Defense

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

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

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I will listen to any argument presented, but I think it is up to the debaters to explain why I should vote on it. As long as you are winning that it is an argument that I should be listening to, I will evaluate it. This also means that the debaters are responsible for articulating how I evaluate each position. I need to know how my ballot functions.

Topicality - My default position is that there needs to be an abuse story. I am open to arguments otherwise, but be aware if you expect to win on potential abuse you need to spend a lot of time arguing why I should vote on potential abuse.

Disads - Whatever is probably fine. I think your internal link story should make sense.

Counterplans - Whatever is probably fine without any theoretical objections won by the aff.

Theory - Make sure you tell me how my ballot functions. I tend to think I should reject the argument, not the team. If you think I should reject the team you are going to have to do a lot of work to convince me that that is the best remedy.

Kritiks - I'm not as well versed in the literature as I would like to be. I do not have a problem with Ks (aff or neg), but don't expect me to know what <insert your author> says about the topic. As such, without reading me the evidence, just telling me what the author says does not resonate with me. I want to know how my ballot functions in the world of the alternative and on what scale (am I taking a stance in the debate community, is it just an affirmation of the discussion we had, etc).

Style & Delivery Preferences

I think you should adhere to the norms for the

organization in which you are competing. I

intend to respect UIL rules by reducing your

speaker points if you choose to spread. I am

able to flow your arguments and will make a

decision based on the arguments in the

round.

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

COSIO, JAKE

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues:
○ Comm. Skills
● Res. Issues
○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
○ Quantity
● Quality
○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	5	5	5	3	1

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I'm on the policymaking end of tab. I am most comfortable judging rounds where the aff fiats a plan implemented by the state and the neg contests it with some combination of case/da/cp/t arguments. If the cp is extended in the 2nr, both sides should make sure to give some clear weighing between the aff and the cp in the final rebuttal. I will end up making my decision based on an offense-defense paradigm.

If I were you, I wouldn't run any K's or K-affs in front of me. In most rounds I find that I have a really hard time conceptualizing alts and end up thinking that the perm resolves the K - much to the dismay of the debaters running the K.

I prefer that students collapse in rebuttals instead of extending everything. Make choices and spend time on what matters, don't just extend everything. I would much rather listen to a 2NR that just goes for T than a 2NR that goes for T, CP, DA, and case. Decide what you think your best path to the ballot is and go deep.

I generally award speaker points based on making strategic decisions in the round. If you have any questions, please ask before the round begins.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I really just need to be able to flow you. Be organized and clear in order to make that easy for me.

For roadmaps please just tell me what flows you are going to cover in what order. For example a 1NC roadmap could be: "3 off, then case in the order of Adv 1, Adv 2, Solvency." The 2AC might have the following roadmap in response: "Solvency, Adv 1, Adv 2, T - substantially, Politics DA, EU CP." I don't need to know anything more than that.

CRADY, LESLIE

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues:
○ Comm. Skills
○ Res. Issues
● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
○ Quantity
● Quality
○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	3	5	4	3	3

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I don't mind a fast pace, but I need to be able to understand you. If you spread you risk me not picking up on things, so please make sure I have everything in front of me.

Email chain at leslie.crady@nisd.net

I am not the biggest fan of K debate, but as long as it is debated and I understand it I do vote for it.

Don't be rude to one another or you lose major speaker points.

Give off time road maps and sign post, but try to keep it organized for me.

Style & Delivery Preferences

UIL is a little bit more formal that TFA. Speaking is important, make sure I understand you. Look at your judge not your opponent.

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

CROWSON, VINCENT

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

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

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I am a tab when it comes to CX. I only have a few set ideas on a couple of arguments. First, I consider theory procedural if you do not tell me otherwise. Second, I am cool with framework debate in any capacity. Third, I will consider anything you put in front of me; you just need to tell me what lens I need to view the round through.

To answer more specific questions, please see the list below:
Will you vote on T? Yes, I consider T a procedural argument and am willing to engage with the FW the debater puts in front of me. I generally accept the three common standards of predictability, ground, and limits.
How do you evaluate theory? I do give weight to the violation and interpretation of the shell. However, I am interested in the offense component of the debate. In other words, the discussion around the standards and voters is the quickest and cleanest way to get my ballot regarding theory.
Will you vote on Kritiks? I enjoy K debate. I recognize that Kritiks are not super popular in UIL; however, I will engage with any framework you want to put in front of me. I ask that links be specific and that we stay from any sort of identity cooption.
C.P.'s and D.A.'s? I evaluate these arguments through a pretty strict offense/ defense heuristic. Of course, if you want me to view the idea or their impacts, I will adapt to you.
Adaptation? Please do not worry about adapting to me. As a judge, I need to adapt to the student and recognize all argument forms. However, I will not tolerate bigotry, discrimination, or hate in the round. Thus, if any racist, sexist, anti-LGTBQIA+ argument or xenophobic argument is made in a round, it will be tough to get the ballot and will most likely result in a considerable reduction of speaker points.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I am more concerned with content over style and speed, do what will make you most comfortable in the round. I am good w/ speech, please slow on taglines.

DEBETTIGNIES, STEPHANIE

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	4	5	5	3	3

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I believe the person with the best arguments should win the round.

I also believe that students should know what their cases are saying. Being able to recite a card is fine, but if you can't tell an opponent what that card is saying or be able to find information you just read, it is hard for me to vote for your side.

I enjoy clash. I like when both sides do attacks and have good defensive arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I do enjoy eye contact and students knowing the case beyond just the cards.

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

DELEON, ROSENDO

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
2	3	2	4	2	1

Experience: B

Philosophy Statement

I believe that debate is a communication event. It is not a speed reading contest. It is an event that enhances the opportunity to use reasoning and analytical skills.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Clear and communicative delivery is important. The use of persuasive skills is a must.

DIPIAZZA, PHILIP

Paradigm: Other

Is "argument critic" a paradigm? I

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	5	5	5	5	5

Experience: ABCDE

Philosophy Statement

I view every speech in the debate as a rhetorical artifact. Teams can generate clash over questions of an argument's substance, its theoretical legitimacy, or its intrinsic philosophical or ideological commitments. Spin control is extremely important to me, and compelling explanations and/or examples will certainly be rewarded. Quality and quantity of arguments are not exclusive, but make sure you condense your strategy in the final rebuttals (you obvi don't have to win EVERYTHING on EVERY FLOW to win a debate).

Strong internal link stories and nuanced impact comparisons (beyond just "we outweigh on mag, prob, and TF") will get you pretty far, so be clever.

Two other things that are worth noting: 1) I flow on paper...probably doesn't mean anything, but it might mean something to you, 2) I think there is a difference between intensity and rudeness - please be mindful of this.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Debate is for the debaters! I have no real preference regarding style, but I am familiar and comfortable with contemporary trends such as speed, conditionality, and kritiks. Style should be dictated by content and strategy. Do what you're good at. Go as fast as you like (sorry not sorry, UIL) without sacrificing clarity OR CONTENT, so don't be blippy. I do like seeing the major issues in the debate compartmentalized and key arguments flagged -- it helps to keep my flow neat.

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

DOTY, TIM

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	2	5	5	3	4

Experience: ABD

Philosophy Statement

I began policy debate decades ago as a policymaker. Critical arguments are fine but don't assume that's a beginning point for me--be sure and frame the debate by discussing its pre-fiat implications. As far as performative based arguments and other more progressive styles of debate, I'm not against them...just don't have a lot of experience with them--definitely not my starting point--be sure and invest time helping me get there. Generally speaking, I feel the Affirmative should Affirm the resolution and any arguments ought to have a pretty specific link/buy-in to it.

Delivery: Once upon a time, I erroneously gave myself credit as being a speedster from both a delivery and flowing perspective. I've gotten older (OLD) and am not in that kind of shape any more. I haven't coached or judged national circuit style of debate in a LONG time. I value efficient, quick delivery with lots of arguments--but; word economy is more impressive to me than the rate of speaking. If you must talk as quickly as possible, I'll do my best to keep up but don't be surprised if I miss stuff and/or don't have enough time to process it in a way that does you a lot of good. Definitely go slow on tag lines, game-winning arguments, transitions between arguments, and anything that you'd like to have show up on the RFD. If you enjoy "rapid fire," I get it--it's fun and I want you to have fun--and I don't question the pedagogical value in any way; but if you want me to get most of everything on my flow, I recommend slowing it down to at least 75% of your norm.

e-mail: timothy.doty@lubbockisd.org

Style & Delivery Preferences

Once upon a time, I erroneously gave myself credit as being a speedster from both a delivery and flowing perspective. I've gotten older (OLD) and am not in that kind of shape any more. I haven't coached or judged national circuit style of debate in a LONG time. I value efficient, quick delivery with lots of arguments--but; word economy is more impressive to me than the rate of speaking. If you must talk as quickly as possible, I'll do my best to keep up but don't be surprised if I miss stuff. Definitely go slow on tag lines, game-winning arguments, transitions between arguments, and anything that you'd like to have show up on the RFD. If you enjoy "rapid fire," I recommend slowing it down to at least 75% of your norm.

DREXLER, COLTRANE

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	2	4	4	4	5

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I am open to pretty much any argument you want to read. Please do not read new arguments in the second half of the neg block, I will not flow any of them. Additionally, I don't love hearing completely new, complex arguments in the 2AC (i.e. a performance k in the 2AC) and won't flow them. If you're reading an extension of an argument in the 1AC or a more basic disad, case turn(s), or theory shell I will flow them.

K- Same goes as above. I am more likely to vote off of a performance k in CX than LD since there is a lot more time for either the off or neg to flesh out the k.

Theory/T- I can guarantee I will never vote off of substantial T unless it goes 100% conceded. It is a lazy argument that almost never wins rounds. I am far less likely to vote off of RVIs in CX since there is so much time that can be dedicated to the theory debate. Unfortunately, all that time also means I usually end up evaluating theory as a wash unless there is a clear winner, which there usually isn't.

CP- CPs are fine as long as they are well researched and explained. Picps are fine as well, though I think they run the risk of engaging in a Picps bad debate which I am comfortable voting off on if the win the shell.

Stock Issues- While I am a progressive, modern CX judge, if both teams want to debate stock issues I am comfortable evaluating that as well. I usually end up voting on inherency or topicality out of the bunch.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I don't really care how the debaters deliver their speeches as long as everyone has access to each other's documents; non-disclosure between teams is not an option for me. Speed is fine, just go slow on tags please.

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

DUFRENE, BRENNAN

Paradigm: Policymaker

COMM./RES. ISSUES: ○ Comm. Skills ◉ Res. Issues ○ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

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

EXPERIENCE: A

Philosophy Statement

The function of the debate should be education. To that end, be courteous, resolute, and considerate while planning an offense. Lean towards lay judge (but can still run progressive tactics).

Style & Delivery Preferences

No spreading, evidence is more important than theory arguments.

EDGLEY, FLORENCE

Paradigm: Policymaker

COMM./RES. ISSUES: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	5	5	5	5	5

EXPERIENCE: AB

Philosophy Statement

When I think about debate, I think of debaters choosing truth based on their world view. To ensure a resolvable round, the weight of arguments and comparative evidence is essential.

My strongest preference within a debate is to ensure that the judge has a wealth on evidence to support the debaters bias. With a sound case, the debaters will be able to present and defend their case to the best of their individual ability.

Style & Delivery Preferences

In a debate the participants should speak clearly and concisely, always articulating their points for clarification. Rapid fire speaking indicates a lack of preparation and confidence in their case therefore it is not a delivery preference of mine. Debaters should remain case specific as well.

| Judge | Paradigm | Comm./Res. Issues | Ev. Qty./Qual. | Numerical Rankings | | | | | | Experience |

EDWARDS, KAY

Paradigm	Comm./Res. Issues	Ev. Qty./Qual.	Experience
Tabula rasa	○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal	○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal	A

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	5	5	5	5	5

Philosophy Statement

Debate should be about the arguments you find "best" for you. This means if you have a specific way you want me to view the round (as a policymaker or through the stock issues, for example), you should tell me that is how you are framing the round, tell me why evaluating the debate through that lens is good, and then tell me why you win under that lens.

When not given another framing mechanism, I will default to an offense/defense paradigm. This means I am very flow-reliant and want you to explain why arguments are true, why they matter, and why they outweigh. This is the quickest route to my ballot because it requires me to do the least intervention.

If you would like to know more about specific preferences, please reference my Tabroom paradigm at: https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=74114

Additionally, a note on the numbers: I have marked everything as a 5 to indicate to you that everything is equally acceptable to me.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I tend to assign speaker points based on strategic decision-making and organization (including signposting and coherent line-by-line) more than flourish. Excessive rudeness, demeaning others, etc. will all result in decreased speaker points.

ERDMANN, JULIAN

Paradigm	Comm./Res. Issues	Ev. Qty./Qual.	Experience
Policymaker	○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal	○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal	A

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

Philosophy Statement

CX: I'm getting older as a result my ability to keep up with speed has faltered as a result of not keeping in form. I will let you know if you are going too fast. It is typically theory/T standards/voters where I will lose you if you spread through them. I am comfortable voting for just about any winning argument within any framework you want to explicitly place me within. I evaluate and compare arguments through an offensive/defensive heuristic as well as impact calculus. I would say that I am more a policy maker judge than anything else. This means that I will vote for the best advocacy in the round, which means you have 3 options as the negative (squo good, CP, or K). I would say very much tech over truth. Default condo good. On T I prefer a well developed standard debate. I tend to default reasonability but at the end of the day if you can sell me on competing interps, I'm not opposed. This should be the only thing you are going for in the 2NR if this is your strategy. DA's - I love good uniqueness updates on DA's and 2AC N/Us. Love a good Politics scenario. Will vote on the impact turn on either the DA or the ADV. I'm cool with CPs. On the K debate, I am unfamiliar with a lot of K literature, I know the basics of Cap and Security but because I haven't engaged with the arguments in a few years, I'm definitely a little hazy on the details. If you are going to run a K or a K AFF please make sure you can explain it well. I want to feel comfortable after the initial cross-x that I know what your world looks like. I will vote on Framework regarding the K debate. Finally, on the Theory debate, make sure there is a clear violation and that you have some real offense coming off the argument if it is something you are going to commit to.

Style & Delivery Preferences

UIL puts a premium on effective communication as a result I also hold debaters to the same standard. At no point in the debate should your speed come at a sacrifice of effective communciation.

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

Evans, Zane

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ⦿ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ⦿ Quality ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

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

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

PHILSOPHY: I am a policy maker judge who cherishes stock issues and will enter the round willing to flow anything. No spreading. I like debate rounds that have plenty of clash , weighed arguments , excellent speeches , and good sportsmanship. Frameworks and observations are key to the lens of the debate. I expect each round to be educational. SHOW me how / why you're winning. My ballot will reflect the round's voting issues and my own expertise / knowledge.

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

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.

Style & Delivery Preferences

ALL SPEECHES MUST BE CLEAR AND WELL ARTICULATED. Bonus points for tapping into annunciation and pathos.

PRIORITZE 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 efficiently

UTILIZE SPEAKING TIME WISELY

Fahrlender, Austin

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ⦿ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ⦿ Quality ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	5	3	4	4	3

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I. Love. Clash.

Please have clean, respectful clash throughout the round. Please follow the required style of each argument presented (disadvantages should not just be an argument you call a disadvantage). I would prefer debaters follow the standard flow of arguments throughout the round, but I will judge the round however you are comfortable. I will fall back on an affirmative case if there are no on-case arguments at the end of the round and all off-case arguments are successfully refuted.

At the end of the round, I will vote on the arguments you tell me to. Explain, in detail, why I should vote your case as opposed to your opponent.

Be respectful. Be structured. Have fun.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I do not have an issue with speed, so long as you signpost and are able to be understood.

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

FLORES, JEFFERY

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	4	4	4	1	5

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I like debates who can debate the ideas as much as they can debate the evidence provided. Cards are great, but seeing engagement and clash is more important to me.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I like intelligible reading, not too big a fan of spreading.

FRAZEE, DARREN

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	5	5	4	4	5

Experience: ABD

Philosophy Statement

Overview

I have no problem with K's, theory, or speed. I ran all types of arguments myself as a debater. I evaluate a round based on impacts in the 2NR and 2AR. An argument without an impact gets you nowhere. Weigh your impacts for me. If you can paint me a clear picture of the debate round and why you won, I am much more likely to vote for you. Be kind.

Kritiks

I love Kritiks, but you need to put in the work. I do not like vague links and warrantless claims.

Counterplans

I think counterplans are best when they are unique and creative, but I will consider pretty much any counterplan. Its up to the AFF to tell me why a certain type of counterplan should not be allowed.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed

I have no problem with speed, but you must be clear. If I can't understand you, I will yell clear. I will not flow arguments that I could not hear. I will not evaluate arguments that I did not flow.

Demeanor

Be kind and respectful. If your opponent is being abusive, tell me why its a voting issue.

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

FRERICH, RACHEL

PARADIGM: Stock issues

COMM./RES. ISSUES:
○ Comm. Skills
● Res. Issues
○ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.:
○ Quantity
● Quality
○ Equal

NUMERICAL RANKINGS:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	5	4	5	2	2

EXPERIENCE: A

Philosophy Statement

CX-

I like stock issues, but am willing to follow any argument laid out by debaters in the round. I flow, but need to know where to apply your arguments. I don't use written evidence or arguments shared via files. Information needs to come from debaters. Explain impacts and analysis.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed should not interfere with intelligibility. I have to be able to understand what you are saying in order to follow your logic.

FRONTERA, TAYLOR

PARADIGM: Tabula rasa

COMM./RES. ISSUES:
○ Comm. Skills
○ Res. Issues
● Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.:
○ Quantity
○ Quality
● Equal

NUMERICAL RANKINGS:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	5	5	5	3	4

EXPERIENCE: AB

Philosophy Statement

Case structure, content and matter are heavily important to create the foundation of the round. But your foundation only gets you so far. After giving your constructive speech, your skills are then showcased to the fullest extent via your argumentation, engagement, and analytical thinking. Therefore when looking at the round on a timeline spectrum, the main things I look for are: case content, case knowledge, engagement, argumentation and rebuttals. Always give voters at the end and continually advocate for your case.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Spread only when necessary (aka first constructive speeches) and even when spreading still be understandable, clear and concise. Speaking and debating is not only academic, but it is a performance. Tone, volume and body movements are all part of your presentation.

Judge	Paradigm	Comm./Res. Issues	Ev. Qty./Qual.	Numerical Rankings						Experience

Gardea, Vanessa

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ○ Res. Issues / ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ○ Quality / ● Equal

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

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

What is the issue at hand. As a judge, I would like to hear and understand the issue at hand, and how you and your partner plan on fixing the issue. As the neg, tell me how their plan will fail (the flaws/holes in their plan). Explain HARMS.

Respect towards partner and opponents is very important when judging.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I do not prefer spreading. As a judge, I like students to have clear, concise delivery where I can understand their plan/arguments/debate. Communication skills are very important.

Gardiner, David

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ● Res. Issues / ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ● Quality / ○ Equal

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

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

As I get older, I am not able to flow as well as I use to. I prefer 4-5 positions and then I hope it comes down to 3-ish in the rebuttals. I am willing to vote on any issue as long as the debate occurs in the round. I will not read additional evidence after the round unless a direct issue is in question. I expect realistic arguments and not just a generic end of the world scenario.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Quality of argumentation is preferred to massive generic dumps. If the aff case is so abusive that it requires only generic positions, maybe a theory dump is required as well.

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

GARZA, ALEJANDRA

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ◯ Comm. Skills ◯ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ◯ Quantity ◉ Quality ◯ Equal

Numerical Rankings:
Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	1	4	3	2	2

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I judge CX debate as a team event. Each debater should bring the same amount of work to the round. Lean on each other if necessary, but don't be a one-person team.

I expect clash and clear voters. If you want me to flow something, say it in the round, point it out to me.

As a policy maker judge, I expect the Neg to uphold the status quo.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I usually discourage spreading. If your speed impedes with your ability to clearly articulate your points, I cannot flow the round. If I cannot understand you, I cannot flow appropriately.

GIBSON, ANDREW

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ◯ Comm. Skills ◯ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ◯ Quantity ◉ Quality ◯ Equal

Numerical Rankings:
Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	4	4	4	4	4

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

Policy:I am open to all types of arguments in policy debate. AS LONG AS THEY ARE RAN CORRECTLY. Clash is key to my ballot and impact calculus is everything. I believe in the power of the ballot and its your job to prove to me that my vote ultimately does more harm than good for the world. Here is my stance on certain Key Issues :
* The neg block does exist
*No new arguments in rebuttals but it is your job to point that out
*Drops are your responsibility to tell me and why that drop is important Just because they drop 1 link argument doesnt mean they lose entire shell you need to tell me why that link matters in the big picture
*I will vote Topicality if ran correctly
*I will vote framework if ran correctly
*Cross Examination is CLOSED
*Prep is not flex
*I will vote a correctly ran K but they are not my favorite typess of argument. They still need to prove how the K is bigger than the case or resolution.
* a card or shell is nothing without you linking and impact calcing it
CP's are fine if ran correctly
* I pay attention in CX for speaks but I do not flow it*

Style & Delivery Preferences

I am open to all styles make your arguments!

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

GONZALEZ, RAMIRO

Paradigm: Tabula rasa / 2) Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

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

Experience: ABJ

Philosophy Statement

I try to be as close to a Tab judge as possible. I will listen and vote on any argument or style of debate as long as it is well developed and given clear voters in your speeches. I don't count flashing or e-mailing as prep but don't steal prep please! I do request to be on the e-mail chain if there is one. (lolthedisad@gmail.com).

Style and Presentation: Try not to make sarcastic/hyperbolic comments. Explain why arguments are wrong and engage the warrant and evidence. Impact Calculus and Weighing (framework debate) will be key. I would also like debaters to include analysis of what the role of the ballot should be. Overviews should be short and sweet. I prefer most of the debate to occur on the line-by-line next to the evidence that makes the arguments to keep the flow tight and encourage clash. I don't like judge kicks. Debaters should have a clear and firm defense of the arguments they wish to the present in the rebuttals.

Tech vs. Truth – I would say that I am more for Tech over Truth. Make sure to extend arguments to keep them on the flow. I don't like whole advantages just showing back up in the 2AR after being absent since the 1AC. I will vote on weaker arguments if they weren't answered only if debaters make that argument.

K – I am familiar with most common critical debate arguments and will vote on them. I prefer specific links and love evidence indicts. Please give a straightforward and intellectually honest explanation that will help your opponents understand what your arguments mean. Explain what the alt does/is compared to the aff and the status quo. I don't like "Reject" alts as it doesn't tell me anything about your advocacy.

T/Theory – I will vote given independent voters, I prefer pointing out in round abuse. Don't go crazy with a flurry of Ts or random theory args sprinkled through your speeches as time sucks.

CP – I prefer your counterplans to have an actual CP text that's written down so it can be reviewed by both teams just as a plan text would be. PICs are fine as long as you can defend the theory and do well explaining why it gets a net-benefit against the aff's specific plan.

Style & Delivery Preferences: Speed is fine as long as it's clear and consistent. The tags and analytical arguments NEED to be slower so they are easy to differentiate. I will say "CLEAR" if it gets too muddled.

GOODMAN, HOLLY

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

Numerical Rankings:

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

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

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. I require both sides to provide offense.

Style & Delivery Preferences: 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.

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

GOOSMAN, JUSTIN

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
2	5	5	5	3	1

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

CX in my opinion should all be about debating the policy that is introduced. That being said, I don't like K's and I feel as though often times they ignore the resolution in order to debate something else. I am a traditional judge, but as a college student I've debated all different styles and can understand all types of arguments.

I won't vote on K's, but CPs, T and Theory, and DAs are bread and butter. Run those well, and I'll be happy. Solvency is most important on case, so make sure that it is addressed from start to finish. Even if you just get one solvency takeout in the 1NC, do that and then extend in the 2. I'm good with splitting the block, just always make sure I get the order clearly.

If you run multiple disads and then add a cp to it, make sure that your CP won't trigger those very same disads. Unique disads make debate fun, don't run the same generic DA every round. I like fleshed out, organized arguments, and will vote for a good unique DA over a good generic DA every day of the week.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I really don't like spreading. I especially don't like spreading at the state level. That doesn't mean I won't still flow arguments, but it won't get a high amount of speaks on my ballot. I see debate as both an evidence and delivery competition, with both being equal. A great delivery with decent evidence beats good evidence with a bad delivery.

GRAFF, MATTHEW

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	4	3	4	1	2

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I am a primarily STOCK issues judge. I understand the inclusion of offense/off-case in CX, but I primarily want arguments that will drive clash. I am fine with topicality as long as it isn't abusive.

DA's are ok with me, but I will prefer AFF case impacts where magnitude and timeframe are similar (AFF wins extinction vs extinction for example)

CP's should be non-topical and should show more ingenuity than generic "change actor - PIC" type stuff. Use CP's that fit the aff, not generic arguments.

I am heavily biased against K, but only because they are poorly run in my experience. If you can't run K well, it will not benefit you to run it. I also strongly dislike generic Cap K.

All argument should be structured. Without impacts or voters, there is no reason for me to vote.
T & Theory = Definition, Violation, Standards, Voters
DA = Uniqueness, Link, Impact
K = Link, Impact, Alt

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed should be necessary for the persuasive value of the argument. Tags and dates should be clearly separated and distinctly announced. If they are not understood, they are not flowed, and if they are not flowed they didn't happen.

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

GREGG, MARY

Paradigm: Policymaker

COMM./RES. ISSUES:
- ○ Comm. Skills
- ● Res. Issues
- ○ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.:
- ○ Quantity
- ● Quality
- ○ Equal

NUMERICAL RANKINGS:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	4	5	5	3	5

EXPERIENCE: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I debated on the NDT circuit in college and have predominately coached policy debate since then. I am familiar with topicality, kritiks, etc. and am open to non-traditional arguments. As a competitor and coach, we mostly do policy arguments like DAs and CPs, but also other arguments.

I tend to be very flow-oriented and value evidentiary support for arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I adhere to the UIL policy regarding delivery.

GRIFFITH, ANDREW

Paradigm: Policymaker

COMM./RES. ISSUES:
- ○ Comm. Skills
- ○ Res. Issues
- ● Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.:
- ○ Quantity
- ● Quality
- ○ Equal

NUMERICAL RANKINGS:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	4	5	5	2	4

EXPERIENCE: A

Philosophy Statement

Traditional CX judge, Focused on framework and plan Text.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Keep speed at moderate pace, no spreading

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

GU, DANIELLE

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ◉ Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	3	5	5	4	5

Experience: ABDE

Philosophy Statement

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=93720

Style & Delivery Preferences

Clarity matters more than speed.

GUTHRIE, KEITH

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ◉ Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

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

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I have nearly two decades of judging experience, primarily on the UIL policy circuit. I am a policy maker judge and will look for the most pragmatic and real world situations in round.

It is the role of the negative to provide sufficient clash, and I'll vote on most issues in the round if you are believable and persuasive. Feel free to run any argument and make sure you provide impacts to weigh on the ballot.

I am okay with speed in the round but will signal to you if I am unable to flow. However, I am ultimately not concerned with the number of arguments in the round. I am looking for quality, depth of understanding, and educational clash. Make sure both teams are listening to arguments being ran in the round and respond accordingly.

Above all, be respectful to each other.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is not an issue as long as you are clear and are able to provide quality analysis to the evidence.

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

HAMILTON, KATHRYN

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

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

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

Per state rules, I believe teams should follow the set standards of formality. This includes, but is not limited to, maintaining a timely debate, not facing the opposing speakers and refraining from any implication of perceived abuse towards another speaker. Eye contact and speeches should be directed toward the judge only. Additionally, hard copies or electronic copies of a team's case must be presented and available for the opposing team at the beginning of debate and upon request. Spreading and speaking too quickly during a round is also frowned upon. In terms of topicality, I prefer a tabula rasa approach, and feel that there is room to allow deviations from traditional language, and provide metaphorical examples to support a case, within reason. Proof that the affirmative's plan is not in line with the resolution should be held to a high standard.

Style & Delivery Preferences: No spreading or fast-talk. Age of supporting research documents is flexible, within reason.

HERNANDEZ, MAURO

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	2	4	4	1	3

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

Older school judge. I still love stock issue debate and persuasion through communication as opposed to overwhelming through volume. That being said, I will listen and vote on each team's framework, or their evaluation of how I should vote. Don't get too crazy though, as I do have a predisposition to traditional debate structure and norms. If you're doing something way outta the box, then be very convincing and have a lot of support because I may not be as easy to sway as a more progressive judge. I dislike contradictory arguments and if they are pointed out by the opposing team, I will not weigh them in my decision.

Style & Delivery Preferences: I can flow moderately fast but obviously if I can't understand you I can't flow. Be reasonable and clear and we should be ok.

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

HERRERA, JONATHON

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	4	5	5	4	4

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

While I prefer to be a policymaker, I open to any framework the debaters use in the round. Evidence to back up arguments are good, but reading cards just for the sake of quantity is not ideal. I prefer teams to use the Neg block (do not repeat arguments in the 1NR that were made in the 2NC) and for both teams to extend impacts in all of their speeches. New arguments are possible in the 2NC but I feel that limits the ability to truly expand upon argumentation. I will not make an argument for any team, but I will not consider any new arguments made in the 2AR so please extend key Affirmative arguments in both the 2AC and the 1AR before getting to the 2AR.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed for speed's sake alone is foolish. Please keep an eye on me because if you do not see me flowing then I may have missed your argument and will not consider it when it comes to my decision on who wins the round.

HOLLAND, JUSTIN

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	5	5	5	1	3

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

Policy maker judge. Prefer you don't use Ks but will listen to them if they are spoon fed to me. Big on structural integrity. If you only read one card, you don't have a T or a DA.

Style & Delivery Preferences

You can be fast but don't spread.

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

HONEA, WILLIAM

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	5	5	5	4	4

Experience: ABK

Philosophy Statement

I believe debate is a game of offense and defense with the ultimate goal of deciding if a policy action is best to solve presented issues. I evaluate offense first in debates, it provides the most sound decision for any judge to make. I have no preference for any type of argumentation. Nor do I stand opposed to any arguments as well (unless they are problematic). I only evaluate arguments that are explicitly said in the round. I will not do any extra work for you on the flow. Please remember to extend plan text, advocacies, and interpretations throughout the debate. Don't just assume I remember what they are. When it comes to traditional policy arguments like CP's and DA's, I think they are the cleanest way to evaluate clash. Topicality debates were probably my favorite debates to have when I competed. I default to competing interpretations unless told otherwise. Also, don't just read T or Theory as a time suck, read it with purpose. When I debated, I read just about every Kritikal position thats out there. However, don't assume I am well read on your K or author. Don't read a K just because its trendy or you think I'll think you're cool because of it. Only read one if its strategic and you are well read enough to adequately defend it.

Finally, remember before the round that this is supposed to be fun experience. So while you should take it seriously because you want to win. Don't always make it life or death. Lighten up a little, its all gonna be alright. :)

Style & Delivery Preferences

Throughout my time in debate I have debated against and judged some of the fastest debaters in the country. HOWEVER, I think there is a place for every type of delivery. In respect to keeping UIL accessible, I would refrain from all out spreading. You can go faster than conversational, but if you start double clutch breathing, its gonna get rough.

Additionally, explicit slow downs or roadmap phrases to indicate new arguments or cards are good.

HOWARD, BRETT

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ◉ Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	3	4	5	3	3

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I am a policy maker judge, I prefer to see a CP/DA Strat from the neg and a good Plan/Advantage from the Aff. I do not enjoy overly vague plans and will assume that workability is required unless a good reason otherwise is presented. I enjoy CX theory debate but only if it is not just filler argumentation. For a more specific paradigm please review my tabroom paradigm.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I like tech but there is a time and place, UIL is neither, know your audience and know your platform. That is part of the event.

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

HUDSON, LAWSON

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	4	5	1	3	5

Experience: ADE

Philosophy Statement

TLDR: Do what you want to do and do it well. Paradigms can be more dissuasive than informative so let me know if you have any questions before the round. I've almost exclusively done K debate so more judge framing in policy v policy rounds is very helpful. I almost never judge policy vs policy rounds and I never have these rounds when I debate. This means I have almost no predispositions in these debates but also means you shouldn't assume I know what you're talking about. Depth over breadth, if your strat is 7 off Im probably not the judge for you. I'll always read ev and be engaged in the round but it's your responsibility to tell me how to evaluate the round/impacts. Debate is fundamentally a communicative activity, I usually flow on paper and if you want me to evaluate your args I need you to explain your warrants rather than just extending tags/card names. If there's disputes over what a piece of evidence says I'll read evidence but I shouldn't have to sift through a card doc to resolve a debate. If there's anything I can do to make debates more accessible for you, please let me know before round either via email or a pre-round conversation. Debate well and have fun!

Style & Delivery Preferences

Fast as you want just be clear

HUGHES, DUDLEY

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	4	2	5	4	1

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issues judge

I very seldom vote on a critique or Counterplans

I will entertain any argument

I really like courtesy

Style & Delivery Preferences

I Like UIL Style

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

HUNT, TERRY

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues:
- ○ Comm. Skills
- ○ Res. Issues
- ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
- ○ Quantity
- ○ Quality
- ◉ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

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

A 90 minute debate can pass very slowly for the judge if the debaters are not fully committed to the activity. Have fun and speak passionately!

HURLEY, DUSTIN

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues:
- ○ Comm. Skills
- ○ Res. Issues
- ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
- ○ Quantity
- ◉ Quality
- ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	5	5	5	2	1

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I am a policymaker. If your plan was actually enacted would it make the world a better place. You need to do a solid impact calculus and give it to me in voters. The neg should outweigh the aff either with DA's or a CP that generates more impact than the Aff plan. Losing one DA does not mean the Aff loses if it still outweighs. I will vote on T. The plan has to be topical.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Do not spread. I should not have to be on an email chain to understand the round. If that is the case you are not doing an effective job as a debater/communicator. You will lose speaks for excessive speed.

Judge	Paradigm	Comm./Res. Issues	Ev. Qty./Qual.	Numerical Rankings						Experience

Jennings, Paige

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

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

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I am comfortable with anything content wise, just make sure you are doing the comparative analysis necessary for me to filter arguments effectively. I want to be as neutral as possible, but I can't if you aren't doing the work of framing the round for me.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Any speed is fine but be sure you are keeping your speech organized, so everyone can at least have a chance to be on the same wave.

Jennings, Andrew

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	5	3	3	3	4

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I am primarily a stock issues just, but I am more progressive than most judges who would call themselves a stock issues judge. I will listen and flow all arguments that are presented in the round as long as they are run correctly. Primarily, I like to see good clash throughout the entirety of the round.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Try not to spread. I am okay with a little speed as long as the taglines are read clearly and emphasized. I should be able to clearly hear all arguments presented so they can end up on my flow.

Judge	Paradigm	Comm./Res. Issues	Ev. Qty./Qual.	Numerical Rankings						Experience

Jordan, Rick — Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ○ Equal
Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

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

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issue coach. I will listen to counter plans but I need direct attacks in the first negation. I like a direct clash. I value a clear communication style.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I do not like spreading. I like good communication. Speed is ok only if it does not interfere with the arguments.

Keeling, Cail — Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal
Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

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

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

Topicality:

I will not hesitate to throw away a perfectly good affirmative plan if the T is not correctly addressed. At this point of the year, there should've been substantial practice against the viable T arguments and I believe T arguments are necessary for negative grounds.

K's:

I prefer not to have K's read against me simply because I do not have enough experience with them.

DA's + CP's:

I have no unusual preferences for these arguments.

In general:

As long as you can argue it well, and make it topical, I am willing to vote for anything.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I prefer clarity over speed. I'd highly recommend that negative off-case arguments never exceed 4-5 with higher exceptions doable for multiple T's. Make sure to provide roadmaps for any speech after the 1AC as well as signpost (slow down for taglines and authorship). Lastly, I highly recommend flashdrives for flashing and I prefer to be involved in the flashing process.

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

KNAUPP, VICTORIA

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg	Kritiks
2	5	4	5	3	1

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

Do NOT spread. If you choose to read quickly, you MUST be clear.

General: Signpost and Voters. I will diligently flow the round but, you must tell me where to put it. I debated in high school and college. Now I have been coaching and judging for over ten years.

CX: I am a policy maker who loves a good Topicality. You must demonstrate clear and concise links to accessing your impacts and provide an analysis of magnitude, timeline, and probability. I can flow, you just need to tell me where you want me to flow the arguments, so make sure you sign post. Don't run a K or theory argument unless you are out of other options.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Do NOT spread

KOMIRE, SHREYA

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg	Kritiks
4	5	5	4	5	4

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I have a traditional/progressive mix, but I am not someone who lived and breathed progressive/K debate.

I am a tab judge, but default policymaker unless told otherwise. Tell me how to view the round and how to vote in the round: write the ballot for me. Keep the debate organized, muddied rounds make everything more complicated than it should be for both me and your opponent(s), so signpost, slow down on tags, say "and" between cards, etc. I flow on paper, so speed is fine, but don't overdo it.

Few more important general things:
1): explain the claim, warrant, and impact to every argument- this helps me evaluate a round as effectively as you want me to
2): be clear in your position, I debated a lot, but that doesn't mean I know/understand every argument in existence: I'm confident in voting for politics DA's and common T's, CP's, and K's (ie. USFG T, States CP, and Cap K), but for something that is a nuanced case-specific DA, T, or CP, please explain.
3): a comparative analysis is important, that's how I can weigh your argument
4): persuasion and passion matter too, it's easier for me to vote for you if you are truly convincing me to do so because debating includes speaking as well
5): tell me how to vote in your rebuttal speeches especially, and tell me how and why you win
6): please mark your own cards, and send the doc if asked to do so

My Tabroom has a full detailed paradigm, just search up my name: Shreya Komire

Style & Delivery Preferences

I did a number of speaking events and found lots of success with it. In policy debate, I hardly ever walked out of a room with under 28 in speaks, and always went for 30s (and I found a lot of success with that, with both speaker awards and even sometimes breaking merely because of high speaks). That doesn't mean I want you to live and breathe being a perfect speaker, but I take importance in clarity of speech. I will evaluate speaks with as much rigor as I evaluate the actual debate part of the round. Although I won't sit here and tell you debate is a communication event, learning and improving your speaking ability is what is most important in the real world, outside of debate, no matter what you are talking about.

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

KOSHAK, JACOB

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	3	5	5	4	5

Experience: ABD

Philosophy Statement

I'm a very tab judge that will look at the content of the debate and weigh the impacts

Style & Delivery Preferences: No preference, just be clear

KWAKU, BRONSON

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

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

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I am a Stock issues judge. I'm heavy on impact calc and line by line card placement. I will focus on DA's more than T's and CP's but will weigh all of them if they are flowed and argued well.

Style & Delivery Preferences: CX is about convincing me, which means speaking well and articulating well. If you spread be good at it.

Judge	Paradigm	Comm./Res. Issues	Ev. Qty./Qual.	Numerical Rankings						Experience

Landry, John

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	1	5	5	5	3

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

Communication is the forefront of our society. In the need to further the future competition speech leads those tosuccess in their futures by allowing students to focus their skills and grow.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Clear, organized, and methodical.

Langston, Audra

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

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

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I'm a policy-maker at heart. Decisions will be flow-based focusing on impact calculus stemming from the question of the resolution.

If I'm not flowing, I'm either not buying your current argument or not appreciating your speaking style.

Play offense and defense; I should have a reason to vote FOR you, not just a reason to vote AGAINST your opponents.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Yes, manners. Good debate is not rude or snarky. Do not let your primal need to savagely destroy your opponent cost you the round. Win with style and grace or find yourself on the wrong side of the ballot. You've been warned.

I prefer the adjustment to UIL standards and no spreading-know what you are arguing not just reading me cards that you don't understand

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

LeMasters, Candace

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues:
- ○ Comm. Skills
- ○ Res. Issues
- ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
- ○ Quantity
- ◉ Quality
- ○ Equal

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

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

Although I do pay attention to stock issues, I consider myself a policy issues judge. I think that it is important to cover the stock issues, but I don't necessarily consider these to be voters, unless the NEG runs a counterplan that is similar to the AFF plan.

I am not a big fan of Ks. I like to hear a well constructed cases that deals with the resolution.

Style & Delivery Preferences

No spreading. If I can't flow your round, I can't follow your argument.

Leonard, William

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues:
- ○ Comm. Skills
- ○ Res. Issues
- ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
- ○ Quantity
- ◉ Quality
- ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	3	5	5	4	3

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

When judging a debate round, I tend to lean towards arguments that are easy to follow and provide quality source information. Debate rounds sometimes have the tendency to become messy or stray away from the resolution. I will take note of this and award points to the team that can provide me with a logical interpretation of the topic and defend their interpretation. I will look for teams to clearly and concisely provide a reason as to why I should vote for their ballot and the disadvantages of voting for the opposing ballot. I believe in a strong framework. I will evaluate each team's plan/counterplan and weigh the advantages/disadvantages accordingly.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Persuasiveness is key. I don't like speed. I believe a strong argument is one that is reasonably understandable and easy to flow. Speaking clearly and confidently is key to winning my vote. Confidence shows that the speaker understands the resolution and is passionate about their position on the policy. I will also award points to speakers who present themselves in a professional and cordial manner.

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

LESSLEY, SAVANNA

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	5	5	5	4	2

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I will vote for the negative can prove that the affirmative creates worse outcomes than the status quo. I will also vote neg on topicality issues if it goes down to that and debated properly. I will vote for the affirmative if a policy option it proves that improves or is better than the status quo or if the neg can't prove that it harms the status quo. This is generally how I evaluate rounds. If teams choose to debate in a more kritikal style, I will adapt to that.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I like organization like signposting, overviews, and clear extensions.

LEVY, JUSTIN

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

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

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

Policy debate should be about whether policies are beneficial or not, that is the ultimate aim of the Affirmative team. That is what I want to hear debate on, is the policy good or bad, or here is a better one. I think everything else distracts from the important issues, but I will listen to your theory and kritik arguments, I just might not vote on them. Speaking ability and debate skills are not intrinsically linked, so I will do low point wins if I believe the arguments from the less polished team are winning arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Debate is meant to be communicative, it should be accessible for everyone. Therefore, I think speed is a negative in rounds and is ultimately used to overburden the aff. If both teams are speeding and I can keep up, I will begrudgingly deal with it, but your SPEAKS WILL BE AFFECTED. Speaks are based on speaking ability, part of which is clarity and persuasion.

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

LEWIS, JULIE

Stock issues

- ○ Comm. Skills
- ○ Res. Issues
- ◉ Equal

- ○ Quantity
- ◉ Quality
- ○ Equal

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

ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I like to follow the rules of debate. I want stock issues clearly defined. I want arguments such as topicality, disadvantages, and counterplans ran correctly. The debaters need to link their arguments to the case and specific stock issues. I expect professionalism and courtesy.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I can flow spreading as long as the words are enunciated and controlled.

LEWIS, SLOAN

Stock issues

- ○ Comm. Skills
- ○ Res. Issues
- ◉ Equal

- ○ Quantity
- ○ Quality
- ◉ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	5	4	5	3	3

ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I like logical arguments that connect to the topic. Don't just read a card to me. Tell when which argument the card relates to and how it relates. Cover your stock issues completely.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Stay professional and speak clearly.

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

LIN, IVAN

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ○ Res. Issues / ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ○ Quality / ● Equal

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

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

Do you what you do best. I mostly read policy arguments in high school. If you are a K team spend the time to explain the lit that you almost definitely know more than me about. Be nice and have fun. No one wants to spend their Saturday feeling bad about themselves.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is fine, clear on taglines, authors, and analytics

LOVELL, RYAN

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ○ Res. Issues / ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ● Quality / ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	4	3	3	3	1

Experience: B

Philosophy Statement

CX is still a communication event. Speed that inhibits communication will not be rewarded on the ballot. Impacts should be clear and should be logical.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I prefer medium speed.

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

MARTIN, KINSEY

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

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

Experience: ABEJK

Philosophy Statement

I'm a tab judge who defaults to policymaker if you do not give me any other framework in the debate round. I do require debaters to give me voters and impact calculus otherwise the round becomes messy as I judge the debate on the things that happen in the round.

I do not tolerate racist, sexist, or otherwise offensive arguments or behavior in-round, including being disrespectful or condescending to lesser-experienced teams. Additionally, I have no tolerance for male teams who belittle women who are being aggressive. I do not care how far ahead you are on the flow; I will vote you down if you engage in this kind of behavior.

Also if you post-round me expect me to edit your speaks for them to be dropped as well.

Questions? Just ask.

Email Chain: kmartin08@gmail.com

Style & Delivery Preferences

You do you but high rates of speed are not my specialty anymore. If I can't understand you I'll make sure to yell clear.

MCGEEHAN, KYLE

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	1	4	5	5	4

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I treat debate as a competitive sport with strict rules and guidelines. I do not judge based on my own personal sentiments, but on the efficacy of the competitors' strategic choices. I value clash and the ability to avoid dropping arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I value clarity over speed.

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

MCHATTON, CHRIS

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
	5	5	5	5	3	1

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

Tabula rasa judge. I will vote on stock issues if well presented. I do not like K or Framework as I feel it turns this policy debate into an LD round. If a team insists on running that, it must be delivered with lots of explanation.

Style & Delivery Preferences

This is a speaking competition so fluency and clear delivery is a must! Speed/spreading is okay if intelligible.

MCKENZIE, RORY

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

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

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I have my full paradigm on Tabroom.

Please make sure to be respectful and try to remember as much of the big picture as possible. What arguments are more important than others? Why? If you win the argument that you're talking about at a given moment, does that mean you win the round? Why? How?

As you are debating, don't forget to explain how the argument functions.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Organization is helpful. Passion is helpful, but not a replacement for good argumentation.

Judge	Paradigm	Comm./Res. Issues	Ev. Qty./Qual.	Numerical Rankings						Experience

MELIN, ERIC

Paradigm: Other / No preference - do what you do

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ● Res. Issues / ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ● Quality / ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	3	5	4	4	5

Experience: ABD

Philosophy Statement

Please see the paradigm linked here for more complete information. I find answering the questions below, even to the best of my ability, leads to weird inconsistencies. Deciphering these paradigms is always a joy.

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=5146

Style & Delivery Preferences

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=5146

Debaters should conform to UIl rules/norms and not spread. Speaking somewhat quickly is fine.

MENEFEE, MELONIE

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ● Res. Issues / ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ● Quality / ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	4	5	5	4	3

Experience: ACDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I am a policymaker judge who appreciates strong speaking skills and good analysis. I believe in the educational value of every round of debate. I will vote for the side that presents the best solution for the maximum number of poeple. All arguments are acceptable as long as they are formatted properly and are clear. Specific arguments are preferred above generic, but as long as the connections are clear and the analysis is strong, everything will be considered. I like a strong framework and an impact calc.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is fine as long as I can understand what you are saying. Taglines and analysis are the most important.

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

MENEFEE, COLBY

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	5	5	5	5	5

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

Full, much longer and more helpful paradigm statement here: https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=103845

Ignore the numbers -- I do not think that a numeric scale is a meaningful way of discussing how I evaluate individual types of arguments. Instead read my paradigm on Tabroom (linked above) or if you have a specific question feel free to ask me before the round.

Tab judge, default to offense/defense heuristic. Please debate in the way that you feel is best for you -- my goal as a judge is to adapt to the round I'm given, not for the round to adapt to me.

Being racist/sexist/homophobic/transphobic/classist/otherwise mean to other people in the round WILL result in low speaks (25) and in egregious cases may result in a loss.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Debate at whatever speed you feel comfortable with -- I'm equally OK evaluating slow and fast debate. Pen time for taglines and standards (the stuff that isn't the body of the card) would be nice but is not necessary. In my view, spreading can be a very valuable form of technical communication.

MILLER, FLYNN

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	5	4	5	1	4

Experience: ABD

Philosophy Statement

I'll vote on stock issues, DAs, counterplans, Kritiks but you need to know the correct procedure for running them. I WILL NOT VOTE ON EXTREME, ODDBALL, OR "funny" arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Be polite to your opponents. Dress appropriately.

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

MILLS, KOLBAN

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	3	4	5	2	2

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

Im an experienced debater. I competed at nationals and tfa state three straight years in pf debate. In cx I competed at UIL state three out of four years, making it to semifinals and winning third in two of those years. I'm open to any argument as long as you have a clear link, get creative!! .

For email chain, Kolban.mills@gmail.com

general debate tips

1. line by line is so important and how i'll be following the whole round. more so in the rebuttal and final focus Clash is very important, the less clash the less I'm going to listen to you. Use your time effectively, don't consistently repeat yourself.

2. impact calc is so important, show me what I have to weigh in the debate and why i should vote you (magnitude, timeframe, etc)

3. time yourselves

4. be nice to one another, I will destroy your speaker points.

5. if you are gonna read a framework please use it during the rest of the debate also. If you are not gonna use it dont read it, but if you do read one its usually where I start when looking to make a decision

Style & Delivery Preferences

I don't want to watch a card dump round. No spreading will be flowed, I'm okay with speed on case reading however

---

MITHANI, ALY

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	4	5	4	4	4

Experience: ABDE

Philosophy Statement

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=6660

Seond portion

Style & Delivery Preferences

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=6660

Last portion

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

MOORE, RYLIE

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

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

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I want the flow to be covered. Dropped arguments are an indication that you agree or don't understand an argument and that heavily weighs on my decision. I also want arguments to stay topical.

Style & Delivery Preferences

First and foremost, this is a communication event. I want the arguments to be logical and understandable. Good speaking skills and professionalism is a large factor.

MORRIS, JAN

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	4	4	5	3	2

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I'm a policy maker judge. With reasonability being what I look for the most. Because this is UIL of course stock issues matter. Speed should never impede clarity and my ability to flow should determine your speeds. I do not argue around for you and expect for you to point out any drops and to give an exceptionally good roadmap so that I'm able to place your arguments where you want them to go on the flow.

Style & Delivery Preferences

As this is a speaking event, Clarity of speech without speed and pairing it is essential.

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

MORROW, CODY

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues:
○ Comm. Skills
◉ Res. Issues
○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
○ Quantity
◉ Quality
○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:
Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	4	5	5	3	4

Experience: BCDE

Philosophy Statement

Congratulations on competing at the UIL State Tournament, good luck! I typically begin the debate as a policymaker trying to determine what is the best policy choice at the end of the debate. If you want me to view the debate differently then you need to establish how. I will vote on Topicality I have voted on competing interpretations/more limiting interp is better and I have voted on reasonability/a few more cases is better. I like to hear all kinds of counterplans, but you must be prepared to defend them theoretically. I think infinite conditionality is not so good for debate and I can be persuaded that only one counterplan is not fair on the negative. I do think there is a difference between conditionality and dispositionality if explained properly. If you want to speak fast then I expect to hear every single word clearly including all of the evidence. I like to hear disadvantages which need to be unique and I do understand that uniqueness is somewhat difficult to establish on this topic. If the negative proves that the affirmative does something that is currently happening in the status quo then that is likely not a reason to vote negative. I do think the affirmative has to prove that NATO member states say yes to affirmatives that require a consensus vote to occur. The affirmative does need to prove that NATO is good if the negative claims that NATO is Bad. Please don't just say a claim without explaining why that claim is true. I will listen to critical arguments but I am not a fan of high theory arguments because I have not read much of that literature. If you have any questions please ask them. Good Luck!

Style & Delivery Preferences

I am willing to flow and listen to teams who like to go "fast" and teams that prefer to speak conversationally. I do not think that teams going faster are more likely to win my ballot. If you choose to go fast I expect perfect clarity, I want to understand every single word that you read during your speech, including all evidence read. If you choose to go fast and run your words together or mumble then it will show in your speaker points and I will not read any evidence after the round that was not read clearly during speeches.

MOSS, DAN

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues:
○ Comm. Skills
○ Res. Issues
◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
○ Quantity
○ Quality
◉ Equal

Numerical Rankings:
Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	4	2	3	2	2

Experience: ABDE

Philosophy Statement

Tend to be a more traditional judge. I can flow, it may not be up on all of the nuances on the circuit. Tend to only judge CX policy for UIL, it have done so almost every year.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Delivery easy to follow. Faster pace in rebuttals s is fine as a defense tool. Inarticulate is not.

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

MUSGROVE, STEELE

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	5	5	5	5	5

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=56445

Don't pay attention to numbers - they are controlled to 5.

Style & Delivery Preferences

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=56445

NAKAMOTO, RINA

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

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

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I am a brand new CX coach, my experience is limited to LD debate.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is ok, but I will stop flowing if I can't keep up:)

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

NAVA, VICTOR

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues:
- ◉ Comm. Skills
- ○ Res. Issues
- ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
- ○ Quantity
- ◉ Quality
- ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	5	4	5	4	3

Experience: AK

Philosophy Statement

   I tend to be more of a traditional policymaker judge (though I was initially coached by a stock issues coach). Affirmatives should have clear presentation for me to flow their entire position and plan. My preferred negative strategies are disadvantages, topicality, and counterplans (in order of preference). I will vote on kritiks if they can be clearly enunciated and applied to the advocacy in round, but I find that they can get overly technical and rely too much on policy theory which I may not subscribe to.

   As a teacher, my ballots focus more on education (both on the topic itself and individual debate skills). Debaters should approach each round as an opportunity to both practice and grow. I will ultimately welcome any strategy you may have practiced throughout the year, just know how to read my nonverbals when I have no idea what your approach is (I've found over the years that I do tend to give away my train of thought throughout the round).

   Above all, debaters should have fun with this activity. Congratulations on making it to state!

Style & Delivery Preferences

I prefer a more traditional UIL presentation style. I am not a fan of spreading, though speakers who possess the delivery skills to clearly enunciate and highlight key taglines or evidence throughout the round can sometimes get away with it. When judging speaker points I take into consideration many criteria such as eye contact, gestures, radiation of confidence, mannerisms, posture, emotion, and level of respect towards your opponents.

NEWTON, SETH

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues:
- ○ Comm. Skills
- ○ Res. Issues
- ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
- ○ Quantity
- ◉ Quality
- ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	5	5	5	3	4

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I tend to weigh heavily on solvency. I will vote for the plan that solves the potential issues from the topic. In terms of stock issues, inherency and impacts also weigh heavily when determining the efficiency of solvency in the round. Counterplans can be effective if shown that they solve better than the other team.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Spreading is acceptable as long as speakers are aware that they are held liable for any information the judge does not hear.

Judge	Paradigm	Comm./Res. Issues	Ev. Qty./Qual.	Numerical Rankings						Experience

NUGENT, GAGE

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues:
- ○ Comm. Skills
- ○ Res. Issues
- ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
- ○ Quantity
- ● Quality
- ○ Equal

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

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I will listen to and weigh any argument as long as you tell me how it links back to the round and why it leads to a winning ballot. Links are the most important thing! If you don't tell me how your argument links back to the round, I won't know how to flow it. In rebuttals, weigh impacts and sum up the round in a way that convinces me to vote for you. Your best chance for success will be if your 2R matches my RFD. I want to be told precisely how I should vote and why. Be very clear about what I'm weighing and should value.

Overall, I'd like to see less focus on reading cards and more analysis. Evidence is important, but every argument should also have some kind of analysis. If you spend most of your time reading, you are probably not communicating your framework or giving me reasons to weigh your arguments. Signposting is vital; tell me what you're responding to and show me the clash. The more work I have to do for you, the less likely the round is to go how you want it to. Also, I think reading new arguments after the block makes for bad debate and is generally not a good strategy.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Debate is a communication event, so you should be clear and communicate with me. But I will flow speed within reason. It's important to me that education is prioritized in the round. I consider roadmaps off time for clarity, signposting, and separating cards or positions within speeches important. Be fair during CX on both sides. Also, I don't know every obscure acronym or fact; if it's crucial to the round, explain it!

O'BRIEN, CHRIS

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues:
- ○ Comm. Skills
- ○ Res. Issues
- ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
- ○ Quantity
- ● Quality
- ○ Equal

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

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I am tab but default to policymaker if not given a clear alternative evaluative framework.

The most important thing is that you give me the easiest path to the ballot. Tell me how to vote, on what, and why. Other than that, give me overviews, keep the debate organized, and please extend things correctly.

I will try to evaluate rounds to the best of my ability based on the information I am able to flow from your speech. There should be clear extensions from the 2AC to the 1AR/Block to the 2NR and 2NRs/2ARs should be going for a specific strategy that is writing my ballot. I ask that 2NR's collapse down to one or two positions rather than going for the entirety of the 1NC.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is fine, but since this is a communication event you should never be using it to abuse your opponents. Technical debating ability determines your speaker points in large part, unless there is reason to dock speaks for hate speech/immoral arguments.

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

OCHOA, BLAKE

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

COMM./RES. ISSUES:
- ○ Comm. Skills
- ◉ Res. Issues
- ○ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.:
- ○ Quantity
- ◉ Quality
- ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	3	5	3	4	5

EXPERIENCE: AB

Philosophy Statement

Run whatever you want and as long as you do it well I will vote on it.

I try to be as close to true tab as possible.

Full paradigm- https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=42865#judging

Style & Delivery Preferences

I care a lot more about strategy than I do about delivery style. Speaks are based on strategy but being polite is a side constraint. Speed is fine up to about 350 wpm.

OKUNLOLA, NELSON

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

COMM./RES. ISSUES:
- ○ Comm. Skills
- ◉ Res. Issues
- ○ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.:
- ○ Quantity
- ◉ Quality
- ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	4	5	4	4	5

EXPERIENCE: AD

Philosophy Statement

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=37382

Open to anything as long as it is explained and justified by debaters.

Don't assume I accept certain norms.

Most things are up for debate (except speech time, prep time etc)

Don't be rude.

Have fun.

Style & Delivery Preferences

You can go as fast or as slow as you want but you must be CLEAR.

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

OMORUYI, ADESUWA

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues:
○ Comm. Skills
○ Res. Issues
◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
○ Quantity
○ Quality
◉ Equal

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

Experience: ABK

Philosophy Statement

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=53104

Style & Delivery Preferences:
https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=53104

OTRADOVSKY, DAVID

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues:
○ Comm. Skills
○ Res. Issues
◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
○ Quantity
◉ Quality
○ Equal

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

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I am open to a wide variety of arguments. Watch the spreading. Talking fast is fine but make sure your tags are clear. I can usually keep up but if something you said does not make it onto my flow, I cannot consider it in my decision. Ere on the side of caution. Framework arguments, while a good tool should not be the go to or main argument to try and win the case easier unless there is a clear framework violation. Debate the evidence and then throw in a framework argument if there is one. Be polite to each other. If you argue a K, make sure you have clear detailed links that are not vague and up for interpretation. I love a good session of direct clash in Cross Examination. This is where your ideas become clear to me and helps me tremendously when making my decisions. I believe quality of evidence is more important than quantity. I love it when you summarize long pieces of evidence to make it crystal clear. Counter plans are good but it must be proven to do what the Aff claims, and more. Above all I am looking for the case which can prove to me that it is the better option to vote on. This is done with solid evidence, plausible links to advantages or disadvantages, and definite answers to questions about your case.

Style & Delivery Preferences:
I have to be able to understand you. Watch your speed.

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

PALMER, KYLIE

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ○ Res. Issues / ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ○ Quality / ◉ Equal

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

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

Absolutely love topicalities but hate a definitions debate so pick the superior one and move on. Love counter plans, especially when ran with lots of disadvantages because it's impressive to show how affs plan is harmful while simultaneously upholding the resolution and the advantages. All in all a traditional judge who takes into account all STOCK issues with topicality as the biggest one I vote on.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Strongly dislike when ill prepared people attempt to spread. If you're going to do it, make sure you know how to properly although UIL frowns upon it to begin with. No one wants to hear a mumbled 1AC with no distinction or enunciation. Keep the roadmap and flow clear to avoid arguments being dropped. I don't want to guess how many Ts, DA's, CP's, etc. are being ran, I want to know beforehand. Don't just blindly read cards, reiterate to show you actually know what you're talking about.

PETERSON, KYLE

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ○ Res. Issues / ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ◉ Quality / ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	4	4	4	3	1

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I am very traditional and for the most part am a Stock Issues judge. If your plan does not maintain the stock issues, then you'll have to work hard to convince me. That being said, I do also go into each round as a clean slate. I want you to be able to convince me through the QUALITY of your arguments not the QUANTITY of them.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I prefer a slow speed of delivery. If I cannot get what you are saying onto my flow, then I consider it dropped. The event should be able speaking and clear argumentation, not just about speed.

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

PHELPS, RUSSELL

Paradigm: Policymaker

COMM./RES. ISSUES:
○ Comm. Skills
● Res. Issues
○ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.:
○ Quantity
● Quality
○ Equal

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

EXPERIENCE: ABCD

Philosophy Statement

I prefer to be a non interventionist policy maker. Will hear about anything though. I have added a caveat to this so pay attention. If you do not tell me why I should vote for you as a policymaker and you allow the neg to say I should be a stock issues judge and vote neg on a lack of total solvency, I probably will. That is the non interventionist part. Please tell me why to vote for you. On the argument side I am not a funding is super essential person. I believe it begs the question and harms research, which still matters to me.Impact it. CX is binding. roadmaps dont contain arguments. they are simply offcase and case or case then disad. If your roadmap contains an argument time will start. I will click the timer. you will know. I like nice people. I enjoy well thought out positions. Good luck to you and congratulations on making it here.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I don't have a preference beyond be comprehensible. I don't care what you wear stylistically. If you have a preferred pronoun let me know.This is your space which means you share it. everyone feels comfortable in this space and we make sure that this is an educational experience. Too much exclusion, not enough inclusion. Have a good time.

PIOTROWSKI, BRYCE

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

COMM./RES. ISSUES:
○ Comm. Skills
● Res. Issues
○ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.:
○ Quantity
○ Quality
● Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	4	5	4	5	5

EXPERIENCE: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

My full paradigm is on Tabroom.com under "Bryce Piotrowski" - the short version is I am fine to judge whatever debate debaters want to have. I will flow carefully.

Style & Delivery Preferences

No large preference on style or delivery.

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

PULCINE CARRAL, ALEX

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	3	5	5	5	5

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

Do what you do best, I will evaluate anything you present and I will do my best to adapt to the debaters.
T: Can either be pretty interesting or really really boring. Not saying don't read T, just saying that a meaningful standards debate and proof of in round abuse will go a long way. T is a voter and RVIs are probably not the best idea in front of me.
Theory: probably reject the argument unless condo. I don't like the 3 second ASPEC blips or ASPEC hidden in the word doc with no verbatim heading.
DA: I don't need really specific links, just contextualize it to the aff. I think that disad turns the aff is convincing as well as a good impact calc. Feel free to read politics or generics but specific disads are always neat. Using aff evidence, cx, and strategic choice of other off to get links for a disad is impressive and can be good strategy (just insert rehighlighting dont read).
CP: Same thing as DA's, generic is fine, specifics are cool. Make sure your cp text is specific and says the part of the aff that cp does.
K: They can be fun with good debating and understanding of the argument. I am not going to know as much about the K literature as you do, debate accordingly. Specific links can be convincing but contextualization of any link to the aff is a must. I think long K overviews don't help my understanding as much as you would think / as much as they might for other judges. I would much rather a shorter overview and more explanation in the line by line.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is fine with me. Make sure to sign post well so I can stay organized. Fine with speed slow down on analytics if I dont have them. Please please please please please read prewritten blocks slower than you would read a card. I'll give more leeway on this if what you're reading is in the doc but if not please slow down.

PYATT, MEGAN

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	1	5	5	3	2

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I tend to be more traditional, but have heard everything. I don't tend to vote on Topicality so long as the case is reasonable. Ks aren't my favorite, but I will listen to them, and vote on them if the link correctly. They must be specific to the aff case, not just any aff case. More specifics are on Tabroom

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is fine, so long as you're clear. Be VERY clear with sign posting throughout all speeches.

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

RAMIREZ, LORENA

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ○ Res. Issues / ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ○ Quality / ● Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	1	3	3	1	1

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

Offense versus Defense. I prefer clash and impact debate.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Clear taglines. UIL delivery preferred.

RECKER, NOAH

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ● Res. Issues / ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ● Quality / ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	3	5	5	2	1

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

Policymaker judge in most rounds. I do default to stock issues if the round is messy. Please follow a flow. Make it clear where you want me to place arguments. No spreading.

Style & Delivery Preferences

No spreading.

Judge	Paradigm	Comm./Res. Issues	Ev. Qty./Qual.	Numerical Rankings						Experience

Remaley, Mason

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	4	5	3	5	5

Experience: AK

Philosophy Statement

Tab, do whatever you do best. Comfortable with all arguments. I seek to minimize judge intervention. Impact comparison is incredibly important for my ballot. Absent a framing mechanism I default to Utilitarianism. I do not need an abuse claim to pull the trigger on T and Theory. My default is to consider them through the lens of modeling. I don't back fill warrants nor arguments. For example, a T and Theory require an explicit interp violation standards and voters. Commonly, non-extinction death impacts are not quantified, please quantify these arguments. For example, if your impact is a pandemic that doesn't lead to extinction, please tell me how many deaths per year. This makes it much easier for me to reach a decision at the end of the round without intervening. Please ask me any questions before the round you think might be relevant to your strategy.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Good with speech. In delivery, organization and clarity are virtues.

Ritz, Howard

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	2	3	5	1	1

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I have been Judge, Debate Coach for 26 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 but Kritiks and counterplans must be directly linked to the Aff Case. 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.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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 but Kritiks and counterplans must be directly linked to the Aff Case.

Make sure you read your case in such a way and slow enough that I can flow your arguments. If you spread you will be in danger of losing the round because i did not get all of your tag lines.

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

ROBINSON, TERRI

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	5	5	5	3	5

Experience: ABD

Philosophy Statement

I am a retired speech and debate coach. I coached almost all the events. I was a policy debater in high school and college (a long time ago). 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.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed: Slow down on tags and authors (and anything else you want on my flow). I don't care how fast you read evidence.

RODRIGUEZ, DAVID

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	1	3	5	3	2

Experience: AE

Philosophy Statement

I believe that the Aff has the burden of proof and the Neg has the burden of clash. The Aff must answer all arguments of the neg and neg must attack all of the case. Aff do not get caught up on little arguments. Both debaters please answer the arguments and move on no need to repeat the same argument.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Please be clear and concise with your speaking style.

Judge	Paradigm	Comm./Res. Issues	Ev. Qty./Qual.	Numerical Rankings						Experience

ROETS, MICHAEL

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

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

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I am a tab judge. I'm good with just about any argument and I am fine with speed. Make sure you're isolating impacts, doing impact calc, and weighing your arguments. Find a path to the ballot.

My standard for T varies; I'm okay with voting off of theoretical abuse, but it's preferred that you demonstrate actual abuse in the round when possible.

Ks are fine, but I'm not completely up-to-date on the literature; don't assume I automatically understand every author - explaining is a good idea.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is fine. If you're spreading, share cases. (We should probably share cases always anyway).

ROMERO , OSEAS

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
	3	5	4	4	3	2

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

Make sure to always discuss harms, inherency, and topicality. Make sure that your argument addresses the stock issues and if an argument is made, address it. If you do not address it in an informed fashion opponent gains point.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Spreading is okay as long as its understandable. Don't spread if you'r not actually good at it.

Judge	Paradigm	Comm./Res. Issues	Ev. Qty./Qual.	Numerical Rankings						Experience

Rousseau, Danielle

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

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

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I believe in a debate that relies more on content than it does flashy tactics. Being able to think and respond appropriately, while picking up on the little details of the opposition's case so that those errors/flaws/vagueness can be countered is the sign of a proficient debater.

Please present your case with confidence. Please present your case with confidence. Please present your case with confidence.

Also, don't apologize. Present your case with confidence.

Part of debate is acting. Know your role and don't break it. I tend to lean favorably towards cases that are presented with individuality and some sort of distinction from the rest of the debaters I see with their noses in their cases. Have a personality. Be confident. And for the love of Bob, DO NOT treat your opponent as if they are subhuman in comparison with you. A haughty attitude doesn't prove you're superior in a debate any more than playing with a slug makes you the owner of a flea circus. Please know the difference in confidence and cockiness.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Slating is impressive, but only if it is understandable, precise and has the markers that make the case easy to follow. Trying to confuse your opponent doesn't help if it makes the judge unclear about your stance.

Rowe, Russell

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

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

Experience: ABD

Philosophy Statement

Debate is a communication activity and clear communication is required. CX Debate is a structured activity and stock issues are therefore important. CX Debate is also designed to weigh the pros and cons of policies so impact calculus is also important. I prefer debates to actually have clearly presented policy options proposed which meet the stock issue requirements and which can then be considered for adoption. I accept that most debates will devolve into generic arguments which will not directly address the specific policy proposed but I can dream. I find topicality and Kritik arguments to be so far away from actual consideration of proposed policies that I tend to dislike them but I will not reject them out of hand and do accept that they have value in some specific instances. The closer you can come to presenting me a real world policy option to be considered, the more I like it.

Style & Delivery Preferences

If I can't understand you, you lose. I accept that modern debate requires fairly rapid speaking but I still need to understand what you are saying. Its isn't oratory but should include some speaking style, especially in final speeches.

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

RUTLEDGE, MICHAEL

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	3	2	4	3	1

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I am a traditional judge who believes in stock issue analysis, I vote on T (but not as a sole issue unless the offense is egregious), and I weigh impacts at the end of the round. I do not like speed and prefer to focus on the quality of AN argument(s) rather than the quantity of arguments overall.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I am a traditional judge and prefer a traditional round. I believe you can win a round but lose a judge.

SANDOVAL, NERI

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ◉ Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	5	5	5	5	5

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

As such, my approach to judging could be described as a synthesis between a policy making judge and a tabula rasa judge. When deciding a round I try to put myself into the shoes of a national legislator who must vote for the best policy offered in the debate, focusing on the AFFs plan and the NEGs ability to clash on the feasibility implementing the AFF. And I like to adopt the posture of a tabula rasa judge because it is unfair for judge's to vote based on their own knowledge of the issues and/or their own politics.

I leave it to the debaters to demonstrate gaps in the opponent's plans, contradictions of values, or to extend each others timelines, minimize each others magnitudes, break link chains, etc. Your rebuttals are key for giving me a path to voting for your plan, so be sure to flow the debate, and give your most strategic clashes.

And whatever you say under your timed speech always already enters the record as grounds for the debate, I do not strike out previously made claims if you happen to lose on those grounds later on in the match.

Also, I really appreciate it when students argue in good faith about the resolution as opposed to when students choose to argue about the rules of policy debate instead.

I mean, it makes sense. Students should not introduce new evidence in rebuttals and if something like that occurs, then I am flexible to hearing your claims. But if the entire argument is about the technicalities of CX policy debate then I feel like we are wasting our time / avoiding the actual topic.

Final note: debaters must use evidence ethically, quoting with integrity to the source. If your evidence gets called into question and it is clear that the evidence says the opposite of what you claim, or does not exist, then this may impact the way that particular argument is evaluated.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I have no preferences to style and delivery. I try to adapt my judging style to the debaters in the room. I can follow someone who spreads.

Judge	Paradigm	Comm./Res. Issues	Ev. Qty./Qual.	Numerical Rankings						Experience

Satish, Srikar

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues:
○ Comm. Skills
◉ Res. Issues
○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
○ Quantity
◉ Quality
○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	5	5	5	4	5

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=119456

Style & Delivery Preferences

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=119456

Schwerdtfeger, Eric

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues:
○ Comm. Skills
○ Res. Issues
◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
○ Quantity
○ Quality
◉ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

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

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

You can find my thoughts on debate by searching my last name under the "paradigms" tab on Tabroom.com

Style & Delivery Preferences

You can find my thoughts on debate by searching my last name under the "paradigms" tab on Tabroom.com

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

SERNA, JOSE

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ● Res. Issues / ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ● Quality / ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	4	4	5	3	5

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I'm from a pretty lay circuit but I am pretty much open to anything you wanna run. My strat in high school for neg was solvency + Offense on the DA's so I find that pretty persuasive. If you wanna run a kritikal one go for it. Besides that if none of the teams run framing in the round then i default to util. So if you are going to run soft left args or kritikal args PLEASE run framing with it.

Issue Areas:

Conditionality and Topical CPs: My least favorite arg is probably a topical CP, I just think it's not a good argument or a strategy. Plus, I believe you give a lot of theory ground to the Aff when you run a topical CP. I have no bias on 50 state fiat, so debate it out!!! Conditionality is fine by me but you best be ready to face theory in the 2ac (which i could vote on)

Theory: Theory is pretty cool. 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. Even if I don't vote on it, still run it. You can use it as leverage in the round and it overall just makes you look like a proactive team. 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: Clearly define your alt and be prepared to defend it though. I enjoy identity politics and am good with performance cool.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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. If you really want to speed though, just flash me the evidence or start an email chain.

SHEFFIELD, BRYCE

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ● Res. Issues / ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ○ Quality / ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	4	5	5	4	5

Experience: ADE

Philosophy Statement

My overall judging philosophy is to remain as unbiased as possible. I will evaluate all arguments as I am instructed to on the flow, unless they are clearly bigoted(slurring, hate speech, white nationalism, etc.). I prefer for debaters to go for arguments they are most comfortable with presenting. The 2nr won't hurt my feelings whether it's PTX, or T, or a kritik. This goes equally for affirmative strategies. Present your best arguments, and I will always try my best to evaluate them on the flow with respect to the debate (impact framing, framework, rob, etc.).

https://www.tabroom.com/index/tourn/postings/judge.mhtml?judge_id=1947619&tourn_id=25981

Style & Delivery Preferences

Give me a 8/10 for your personally fastest speed. I'm deaf in my left ear, so it might be a little hard for me to keep up sometimes. Don't be scared to go fast though, I will say slow or clear if I'm having any issues. My goal is to flow your arguments in the most accurate way possible, so I will intervene if necessary.

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

SIBLEY, REBECCA

Paradigm: Policymaker

COMM./RES. ISSUES:
○ Comm. Skills
○ Res. Issues
◉ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.:
○ Quantity
○ Quality
◉ Equal

NUMERICAL RANKINGS:

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

EXPERIENCE: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I look at stock issues when judging a round, framework, and rely heavily on advantages v. disadvantages.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Extreme spreading is NOT ok and I will only ask you to slow down one time. Fast is ok. Breaking the speed of sound with words flying out of your mouth is not. Be nice.

SIVAMANI, VISHAL

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

COMM./RES. ISSUES:
○ Comm. Skills
◉ Res. Issues
○ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.:
○ Quantity
○ Quality
◉ Equal

NUMERICAL RANKINGS:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	5	5	5	5	5

EXPERIENCE: AE

Philosophy Statement

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=94719

Style & Delivery Preferences

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=94719

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

SKILLMAN, VANESSA

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ○ Res. Issues / ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ● Quality / ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	3	5	5	4	1

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

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

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

SMITH, JOSHUA

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ○ Res. Issues / ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ● Quality / ○ Equal

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

Experience: AJK

Philosophy Statement

General philosophy: Feel free to read whatever you feel most comfortable with, I am familiar with every kind of argumentation either through having read it or having debated it. It is UIL State though, so I will adjust my paradigm as such. I will work with you, but given that the game is traditionally played differently here, you should adjust as well. Read slower, read evidence with warrants and impacts, and explain your arguments to a higher and more simple degree than you usually would at a usual TFA/TOC tournament. If you have any questions about your argument and whether or not I'd be receptive to it, it's better to ask than be bothered by my ballot.
Comments:
Tech>truth. A dropped argument isn't assumed true without an extended and weighable warrant.
Depth>breadth. Especially in UIL
Evidence quality is really important and if you throw that out of the window just to throw the other team off, your speaks will reflect it. Comparing evidence quality is a great way to turn the tide in your favor in debates in front of me, as I will do my absolute best to evaluate only what was said in the round.

Tabroom Paradigm (take it with a grain of salt): https://www.tabroom.com/user/judge/paradigm.mhtml

Style & Delivery Preferences

Statement above clarifies this. It is UIL State, so you should prioritize engagement with your opponents, educating them and me regardless of what is happening in the debate.

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

SMITH, CHRISTOPHER

Paradigm: Other / Debaters determine the

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	5	5	5	5	5

Experience: ABE

Philosophy Statement

I try to stay out of the way in the round, so I need you to tell me what the most impactful arguments in the round are. If you say it (put it on the flow), you can prove it (with logic and/or evidence), and you apply it (tell me why it matters); I'll buy it. I will vote on everything from stock issues, counterplans, and critical arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I need you to be clear. I need you to impact your arguments. Speed is not an issue, if you're being clear.

SPENCER, ALYSON

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

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

Experience: AE

Philosophy Statement

General Debate: I follow clear line-by-line arguments, I should not have to work hard to follow your arguments or understand what you are trying to prove. Clear extensions with solid analysis will win the round, being rude won't. If your plan to win is to interrupt your opponents and be rude you are going to have a tough time. I'm good with speech, just slow down in tags, dates, and authors. That being said if you don't slow down I won't flow. Just because it's on your doc doesn't mean you read it. If you want me to flow it then slow it down. If you set up an email chain my email is Alyson.neeley@kellerisd.net. I have experience competing and judging in LD, CX, and PF so I know how the game is played. Let me know if you have any questions.

Case: Clear arguments that are well laid out are the way to go. I prefer the quality over quantity. Your goal should be to win because you have a better case not smother your opponent in arguments.

T: This is important. I don't care how much of a positive impact comes from your case, if it doesn't link in it will not win. Proving this sooner rather than later is key.

DAs and CPs: Do it, I'm game.

Ks and KAff: Prove that it's is true and relevant and you got it.

Theory: I don't buy theories that waste my time. If you are going to run a theory make it worth my time and energy.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Spreading is fine but slow down at tags and authors.

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

STANSBERY, ZACHARY

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	5	5	1	5	5

Experience: AK

Philosophy Statement

I consider myself fully tab, I will flow whatever you throw at me, as long as you warrant why it's important and how it affects my view in the round. I value all arguments highly as long as they are warranted as to how they should be weighed in the round. I won't do the work for you. Tell me how to vote, and why it's important to vote that way. If you are blatantly homophobic, racist, sexist or etc. then I will vote you down. Debate is about respect and mutual understanding/education, not just winning so make sure to clash and offer opportunities for everyone to have access to education.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I'm ok with spreading as long as you signpost clearly (that includes the author) Make sure that your speeches are structured and organized and not just a rambling mess otherwise you will lose speaking points. Be respectful and understanding that's the most I'll ask out of you.

STEPHENS, SARAH

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

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

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I am a pretty traditional judge. If you are going off case, your arguments should be well thought out with clear and specific links to the Aff case. Arguments on topicality should be specific and reasonable. I rely on the participants in a round to let me know what they are doing and how they will do it. If you are extending cards or arguments, you need to tell me. If you are splitting the block, you should tell me. Ensure arguments are clearly linked internally and externally with analysis. I rely on participants to provide the claim, the evidence, and the logical reason it matters. Each side should clearly state their position and explain the reasons they should win the round. CX should be a time for quality give and take. Roadmaps, signposting, and structure are appreciated. Name what you are mapping,"Harms" instead of "next on case" or "Spending DA" instead of "next off-case".

Style & Delivery Preferences

I am looking for quality oratory, respectful discourse, along with clarity in your speech and arguments. Spreading is not preferred. Substantive debate is more important than the number of cards read.

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

STOKES, RYAN

Paradigm: Stock issues

COMM./RES. ISSUES: ○ Comm. Skills · ○ Res. Issues · ● Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.: ○ Quantity · ● Quality · ○ Equal

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

EXPERIENCE: AB

Philosophy Statement

Debate is a communication activity first. I want to hear depth of argumentation more then breadth. So spreading a lot arguments will not when the round for me. The stock issues are important and I will vote on Inherency, Topicality, and Solvency. I enjoy good topicality arguments. If the aff can prove some solvency I will usually prefer the aff. If stocks are all resolved, I vote on Impact Calculus. The side that can better prove they win on time frame, magnitude, and probably will be the team that wins my vote.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Spreading is not as impressive as explaining the out the deeper warrants of your arguments to prove their strength.

STONE, TROY

Paradigm: Policymaker

COMM./RES. ISSUES: ○ Comm. Skills · ● Res. Issues · ○ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.: ○ Quantity · ● Quality · ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	3	5	5	5	4

EXPERIENCE: ADEK

Philosophy Statement

Tabula Rosa/Policymaker - I prefer policy arguments. I won't vote for the negative just because the aff isn't good enough. Won't vote on stock issues alone. I'll listen to kritiks but need the argument clearly defined in terms of the role of the ballot and how that works with alternative solvency, and what level the link exists on.

Style & Delivery Preferences

You can spread but be clear, especially on analytics.

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

STUART, HONGNHUNG

Paradigm: Policymaker

COMM./RES. ISSUES: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	4	4	5	4	4

EXPERIENCE: AB

Philosophy Statement

I am a policy maker and always looking for a good link story for every argument (K, DA, ADV). Debaters should have a good balance of tech and truth to persuade me. Each round is different in my criteria because I prefer to allow the round to organically happen. I will read evidence after a round if it is an important aspect of the debate when looking at author qualifications, super-tagging, manipulative highlighting issues, etc (though I would prefer not to have to read evidence because this means that you are leaving it to my interpretation instead of your own). For me, both sides should have strong cases and strategies. I do not like to intervene so I try not to pull dropped arguments unless it is absolutely necessary.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I am okay with speed as long as I can understand you. I would prefer that you stand when it is your turn to speak. Rudeness will lose speaker points. Waiting for cases and cards is part of prep time since I believe that you should be flowing your rounds.

STUBBLEFIELD, DAWN

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

COMM./RES. ISSUES: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

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

EXPERIENCE: ABE

Philosophy Statement

While I spend a lot of time managing tournaments, I am always thankful when I am able to pick up a ballot and listen to students speak. Debate is the art of argumentation and listening. I expect to hear arguments that are cohesive and clearly presented. While I may not be a huge fan of theory arguments, if a team presents the argument well, I am more than willing to vote on it. Debate is about listening and CLASH. Students should flow the round and listen to their opponents. It is the team's job to explain not only why they are the best choice, but also why their opponent is wrong. Have fun in the round, but listen and refute your opponent.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is not always your friend. I would rather have a few well-developed arguments than a large number of incoherent statements.

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

SUMMERS, MATTHEW

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues:
○ Comm. Skills
◉ Res. Issues
○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
○ Quantity
◉ Quality
○ Equal

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

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issues judge.

I flow the debate.

All types of arguments are entertained.

I make decisions based on whether the teams responded to arguments and presented net benefits or strong impact calculus in their favor.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Spreading is allowed if understandable; if I don't understand something, I don't flow it. If I don't flow it, I don't make a decision based on it.

TAGOE, VALERIE

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues:
○ Comm. Skills
○ Res. Issues
◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
○ Quantity
◉ Quality
○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
2	3	5	4		3

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

Debaters should be able to present their argument speaking clearly in their constructive speeches. They should also defend their stance in cross examination and them summarize positions in rebuttals while responding to arguments made by the opposing team. Teams should know their cases and state why their plan has the greatest impact/net benefit.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Clarity over speed. Speaking must be clear and concise.

TATE, TAYLOR

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ● Res. Issues / ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ● Quality / ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	5	5	5	5	5

Experience: BJK

Philosophy Statement

I am good with speed and all arguments as long as you attach a reason to vote for them and they are actually explained. I am not down with judge intervention, so don't leave stuff out unless you want it left off the flow. Everyone be respectful and fun, remember that debate is a game focused on learning. I will vote on all the stock issues, Kritiks, theory, like I said really anything as long as it is done well. Please do not read bad topicality shells in front of me, it will hurt my soul. Give detailed overviews and tell me how many sheets of paper I will need.

Style & Delivery Preferences:

Even if you spread, you should aim to say every word clearly. This will be reflected in your speaker points and round result in extreme circumstances. Of course always share your evidence before the round.

THOMPSON, MAX

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills / ○ Res. Issues / ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity / ○ Quality / ● Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	4	4	1	5	1

Experience: B

Philosophy Statement

As a traditional style judge I believe the resolution was decided upon by a committee, announced far enough in advance of the current academic year, and is substantial ground for the debate I am to judge. Thus I want to see clash on this resolution. I like a solid topicality argument and will vote on T.

Style & Delivery Preferences:

I am a traditional style judge. Communication skills are important to the presentation towards the resolution of the topic, or not.

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

TONEY, MARGARET

Paradigm: Policymaker

COMM./RES. ISSUES: ○ Comm. Skills / ○ Res. Issues / ◉ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.: ○ Quantity / ◉ Quality / ○ Equal

	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
	3	3	5	5	1	2

EXPERIENCE: ABD

Philosophy Statement

I tend heavily toward policymaking, but I do pay attention to the stock issues as they impact the weight of the competing policies. I will not intervene in the ballot - you have to do the work of walking me through the links and analysis. I prefer you to give me a lot of help writing the ballot. I'm fine with splitting the neg block. I will listen to kritiks as long as there is a clear link to the affirmative and it holds together logically. I will not tolerate any kritik designed to shut down debate, or obfuscate the question at hand, and I have no use for performance Ks.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I'm not great at flowing the kind of speed I know CX requires, so make sure you include me on the email chain: margaret.toney@ecisd.net

This is a communication event above all; speed is fine, spreading is not. Aggressive is fine, rude is not.

TONEY, WILLIAM

Paradigm: Stock issues

COMM./RES. ISSUES: ○ Comm. Skills / ○ Res. Issues / ◉ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.: ○ Quantity / ○ Quality / ◉ Equal

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

EXPERIENCE: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

First, I expect that debaters will speak with poise and precision, that they will connect with their audience, and particularly that they speak to persuade. Second, I expect to see solid critical thinking on both sides of the debate. Third, I expect to see debaters both learning from their research on the debate topic and educating others in the room on all aspects of the subject being debated. To that end, I expect to see that debaters are able to articulate an understanding of the evidence cards they use and effectively explain how that evidence either supports their case or refutes their opponent's case.

Some things that I dislike as a judge include: a) Spread - It defeats the purpose of good persuasion. If I can't hear it or if it is not shared with me electronically, I don't flow it. b) Excessive jargon - My standard is that if a layperson (non-debater) is observing the round, they will understand the debaters clearly. If they flood their speeches with excessive jargon and insider debate terms, I will assume that is an effort to obfuscate, to confuse, and to avoid an honest debate. c) Formulaic or "gaming" approaches, which I would define as efforts to win a round without actually debating the subject at hand, and d) Making it personal - Debate is a contest of ideas and issues, not personalities. Efforts to intimidate, bully, vilify or demean anyone in the room have no place in this arena. I expect debaters to show courtesy and civility to their opponents, their judge, and anyone else attending the round.

In short: a) communicate clearly; b) think critically; c) educate your audience; d) play fair; e) show good sportsmanship, respect, and courtesy to your opponents and to your judge

Style & Delivery Preferences

I dislike spread as it defeats the purpose of good persuasion. I prefer that debaters speak at a normal rate of speaking so that they may be understood. Debaters should be speaking to persuade, which means that a) they connect with their audience; b) they meet their audience on the level they are at; and c) they explain the issues clearly and convincingly. I expect professional decorum from debaters during a round. No matter how heated the round may get, debate is a contest of ideas and issues, not personalities.

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

TREVINO, SETH

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

COMM./RES. ISSUES: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
	4	3	4	5	2	4

EXPERIENCE: AB

Philosophy Statement

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=237076

Style & Delivery Preferences

I don't mind speed as long as it is enunciated.

TURNER, MICHAELA

Paradigm: Policymaker

COMM./RES. ISSUES: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
	4	3	5	5	5	5

EXPERIENCE: A

Philosophy Statement

As a policy maker, I will vote on whoever can create the better world, either through the squo and negative alternatives or the Aff plan. This also means I like to hear a lot of impact and significance debates. Disadvantages/advantages are the easiest way to win my ballot but there aren't any arguments I won't consider. I'm not a huge fan of topicality arguments mostly because people often don't have all the necessary parts. Just remember that the argument must include standards and voters in order to hold any real weight. Organization is key to ensuring clash so label and number your arguments, transition effectively and always communicate where on the flow you are applying evidence.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is fine as long as you are confident you can be clearly understood. Make sure you slow down on tag lines. Arrogance, attitude and bullying will seriously affect speaker points. Be kind and professional. The best speakers are controlled, relaxed and natural.

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

VALDEZ , MICHAEL

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	5	5	5	3	5

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

Framework and a clear topical plan matter a great deal. However I do welcome topical kritiks when linked properly. The most convincing team wins.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Anything goes, I can handle speed or traditional delivery

VILLARREAL, CHRISTIAN

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

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

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

i'm a tab judge so I'm open to anything. My only thing's that I'm big on is if you run off case, you should 1. have good links. 2. if it's T, you need to have voters and a clear violation. 3. If you choose to run a K then the alt needs to have good solvency or your links should be phenominally specific.

Style & Delivery Preferences

If you spread then there needs to be clarify and sign posting, if you can't do it clearly then don't spread at all.

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

WALKER, SKYLER

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills · ● Res. Issues · ○ Equal
Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity · ○ Quality · ● Equal

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

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

For my general paradigm, I consider myself a tab judge. I'll listen to any arguments that you want to run as long as you're doing the work and telling me why they matter. I don't think it's my job to tell you that you can or cannot run certain arguments. (I shouldn't have to say this but I also expect a level of civility in your arguments, i.e. no racist, sexist, or any other blatantly offensive arguments will be tolerated). At the end of the round, I would like you to make the decision for me; meaning you should be telling me how to vote and why. However, if need be I will default to policymaker. Speed is okay with me as long as you aren't sacrificing clarity. If I can't understand you I will stop flowing. Please keep your own time. As for how I feel about certain arguments, feel free to check Tabroom.

https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.tabroom.com%2Fuser%2Fjudge%2Fparadigm.mhtml&data=05%7C01%7C%7C65c0a74a84b04104b23b08db110c2ec7%7C31d7e2a5bdd8414e9e97bea998ebdfe1%7C0%7C0%7C638122516251502370%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=zX0lrmGjp6PtRPssHpMtIvIE4uLvA2ihclPJRxbaO0U%3D&reserved=0

Style & Delivery Preferences

Argumentation over presentation. Speed is fine but only if you're good at it. I should still be able to understand you.

WALLACE, JASON

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills · ○ Res. Issues · ● Equal
Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity · ○ Quality · ● Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	1	2	4	4	1

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

Framework/Role of the Ballot: I will evaluate and weigh the round through any framework that the Aff or Neg presents to me. I will only make my decision on how each are warranted and impacted out in round and will never insert my own beliefs. If no one tells me how to frame the round, I tend to fall back to evaluating the round through the lens of net benefits. When impacting out why you win a policy debate, please frame your impacts through lenses like timeframe, magnitude, probability, reversibility.
Framework is important! You win the framework if you provide me clear warranted arguments for your position, and impact out why your framework is best.
Theory: I will evaluate theoretical positions the same as others. The interpretation will frame how I evaluate the position. Additionally, I will evaluate the interp/counter-interp debate based on the standards/impacts presented. You must justify why I should frame theory through either.
Counter Plans/Alts/Perms: I view counterplans or alternatives as a test of competition against the affirmatives advocacy. I believe that counterplans/alts can compete based on impact prioritization, functional competition, or textual competitiveness. I have no predisposition towards one type of competition. Teams must justify why I should vote on the competitiveness or lack of in the CP or Alt debate.
Speed: Go as fast as you want but please be clear!My priority is getting everything you say on my flow so sacrificing clarity for speed is not advisable. Additionally, I have voted on speed arguments a few times when teams use speed as a bullying technique. So be conscious of how you use speed within the round. If you can beat a team without going fast, its a win-win for both teams.
Kritical Arguments: If you are running something new or obscure, dont assume I understand the literature. Regardless of the K, I will listen how your frame, impact and weight the FW and Alt/Alt solvency.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Please consider this is a UIL contest, not TFA while speed reading is sometimes necessary for the delivery of the case and arguments, it is not helpful to the judge when flowing arguments.

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

WHISENHUNT, TOBY

Paradigm: Policymaker

COMM./RES. ISSUES: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
	3	3	5	4	5	5

EXPERIENCE: ABE

Philosophy Statement

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 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.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I am fine with speed if it is clear.

WHITE, CALEB

Paradigm: Policymaker

COMM./RES. ISSUES: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
	5	4	5	5	4	4

EXPERIENCE: AB

Philosophy Statement

I'm mostly a policy maker with a little tab.

I am fine with topicality, disadvantages, counterplan, theory, and mostly fine with critical arguments but I don't have the most in-depth knowledge. I will still considering specificity of the links and uniqueness arguments on kritiks.

I generally weigh the round in a cost - benefit or offense and defense paradigm.

I have really strong knowledge on the topic and like recency of evidence and specificity of case arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I'm fine with speed as long as it doesn't interfere with your delivery. I would rather the speech doc be shared before you stop prep.

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

WILLIAMSON, LAUREL PAIGE

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	4	5	5	5	5

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

Open-minded to many ideas for debate, but my favorite style is the S.H.I.T.S. Speaking style and delivery plays a large part in some decisions, If I am unable to understand an argument it will not be flowed. I look forward to watching the debates.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Please speak clearly and with purpose, watch tone with others, and do not speak faster than Eminem can rap, I will stop flowing.

WILSON, ROBERT

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

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

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I believe it is up to the AFF to prove their case. I do not bring my outside knowledge of matters into a round, so if a team misses an opportunity to challenge a hole in their opponents' argument, that is a missed opportunity. I will however, draw logical conclusions from the information presented. (Example, I won't bring information I learned obtaining my masters in political science into a round, but I will remember what federalism is concerning whether or not a federal or state government has certain authorities.)

The NEG's job is to show the AFF is either unworkable, or not needed. The burden of proof therefore belongs to the AFF.

I am mostly Tabula Rasa. However, I am judging a debate on topics. I dislike judging a round where the UIL rules become weaponized and it becomes a debate of terms rather than a debate of topics.

I also judge on speaker presentation, articulation, clarity, and body language. For this reason, I tend to view the cross examination portions as the telling make/break moments. I look for organic dialogue rather than what tends to happen, the prepackaged boiler plate questions that are asked 1000 times.

Rebuttals are there to attempt to answer unanswered questions or reinforce unchallenged statements.

Style & Delivery Preferences

answered above

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

WILSON, JOSEPH

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

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

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I consider myself a stock judge. I prefer arguments that are clearly articulated and are grounded in real world policy initiatives. I do vote on counter plans and K arguments. But I like them to be clearly articulated. Topicality arguments are important, but I dislike arguments that are solely built around topicality.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I prefer road maps and I prefer summations of critical evidence.

WINN, BRYAN

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	4	3	5	3	1

Experience: ABD

Philosophy Statement

Primarily a Stock issues judge but am open to most arguments. I like a clean flow and signposting throughout the debate. If you are on neg, you must link your arguments to the AFF case/plan. Not a bog fan of K's. If you run one you need to explain how it relates to the Resolution and howw it applies to your opponents arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

This is a public speaking event. I can handle spreading to a degree, but prefer a more traditional style. Speak to me, do not just stand there and read cards. analysis is just as important as the evidence.

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

WINN, ANGELA

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

COMM./RES. ISSUES: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

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

EXPERIENCE: A

Philosophy Statement

Clash is extremally important on all sides of the debate. If something was drop in the round I will not vote on it unless it is pointed out in the round. As for things I vote on, it depends on the round and how the debaters frame the round. I will vote on pretty much anything as long as the debaters explain clearly what they are arguing and how it links. If you run a K, need to be able to explain it in your own words, as well as links and impacts are important.

I will not vote on something said during CX unless it is brought up during a speech.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I do flow the whole round, so please give off-time road maps, and sign post during your speech for I know where you are on the flow.

WITT, MELISSA

Paradigm: Policymaker

COMM./RES. ISSUES: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ● Equal

EV. QTY./QUAL.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ● Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	4	5	5	2	5

EXPERIENCE: BEK

Philosophy Statement

I am an avid fan of CX Debate and thoroughly enjoy the education it provides about the resolutions we debate and the way we debate them and the way we think about resolving societal problems. I enjoy different styles and types of argumentation including more traditional arguments and formats (I'm not a stranger to a 5-plank plan) as well as more progressive arguments including Kritikal argumentation (on the aff and neg) and theory argumentation.

Arguments should be well crafted and supported and I prefer to see strong on-case AND off-case arguments from the negative. Affirmative teams should be well-versed in extending their cases throughout the round in addition to answering on-case/off-case argumentation.

I do not want to see rudeness toward opponents or the judge(s) in the round. It is inappropriate to dismiss the work others are doing in this event or discount it because it doesn't look like the work you are doing. Everyone is at a different level of experience, training, and mastery.

Style & Delivery Preferences

COMMUNICATIVE. Speaking quickly is acceptable, hyper-spreading requiring large gulps of breath and an abnormally high or whispered pitch/tone - not so much. ORGANIZATION. Look at me, sign-post arguments, and make sure I know when you are moving from one argument to the next and where you are attaching attacks on the opposition's flow.

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

WOMACK, LAURA

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ○ Quality ◉ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	3	5	4	5	3

Experience: AB

Philosophy Statement

I am, for the most part, a Policymaker judge. I will default to passing the affirmative plan unless the negative team can give me a reason not to or a better alternative.

I have eleven years of experience in policy debate and really enjoy this year's topic, so don't be afraid to run "progressive" arguments. I believe the primary goal of debate is to educate yourself, your opponents, and your judge over the topic. Any type of argument is permissible in the round, as long as it pursues that goal and fits within the bounds of policy debate.

That being said, I do expect your arguments to be run well--so if you aren't confident in your ability to run an argument, consider running something else.

Style & Delivery Preferences

My biggest pet peeve regarding delivery is when debaters sacrifice their decorum and kindness in a round in favor of seeming "right" or winning. It is possible to discuss an argument without resorting to passive aggression and condescension. I expect that you remain, at the very least, polite to one another for the entirety of the round.

YORK, VERONICA

Paradigm: Other / I like Policy with some stock.

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	4	2	2	2	1

Experience: B

Philosophy Statement

Personal preference is for performances over spreading however I understand the need for the evidence to be presented. I appreciate all arguments being articulated so that I can understand especially since I am a devout Oral Interp coach.

Overall, I am a policy maker judge. Counterplans can be effective if executed correctly. Overall, I don't like K arguments. I really like for you to lay out the voters, I may be more keen to vote that way. I do appreciate attacks on Stock Issues. However, a debate spent arguing nothing but a T-violation is a waste of a debate.
Quality and quantity of evidence are of equal importance.
I do like to see clashes from both sides. Can you adequately argue against your opponent while upholding your plan?

Present voters and tell me why your side should win the debate. You should be telling me why I prefer your arguments
over your opponents and why that means I vote in your favor.

I keep score on arguments answered and dropped which in the end could make the RFD.

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. Signposting is very helpful and makes me happy.

I award speaker points based on my preferences. I like polite debaters who appear to enjoy the activity and I reward that.

I am the judge make sure I know why your team is better.

YU, HARRY

Paradigm: Tabula rasa

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	1	5	5	3	4

Experience: ABD

Philosophy Statement

Mostly debated Kritiks in college, and been coaching policymaker-style policy recently. I have a high threshold for topicality and conditionality arguments. I rather vote on big picture and impact. I like Ks, but generally defaults to affirmative if the link and alt are not really clear. Presumption is a good argument.

More details can be found on my Tabroom paradigm

Style & Delivery Preferences

I rarely ask for cards, and will stop flowing if you're not clear. I can handle pretty fast, just not really fast.

ZARRO, SHELBY

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ● Res. Issues ○ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ● Quality ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
5	5	5	5	5	4

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I believe that debate should be focused on offensive clash and impacts. I will evaluate the round through a policy making lens if no other option is given to me.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Be respectful of the forum, tags need to be clear, and clarity shouldn't be sacrificed for speed.

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

ZEIGLER, ANDY

Paradigm: Stock issues

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
3	5	3	4	3	2

Experience: ABCDEJK

Philosophy Statement

I am a Stock Issue judge. I prefer to see the Neg directly clash with the plan by taking out Significance/Harm, Inherency, or Solvency and also discussing the workability of the plan. I do not tend to believe that Fiat inherently means every aspect of the plan just happens without planning or discussing the specifics. This means that if your plan costs money, prove that the USFG can afford it. Prove that the agency can accurately enforce the action and that no other oversight is needed. This is Policy Debate and I expect to have a well written policy to test. I enjoy Disadvantages that directly link and have a clear link chain. These should not jump from "China bad" to Nuclear War with no work-up done in the Internal Link chain. Avoid using I tend to flow Plan Inclusive Counterplans Aff unless the Neg can prove that there is a substantial reason that the Aff cannot solve and the PIC is needed. Solvency for Counter Plans must be unique to CP. This is Policy Debate, and this is UIL, know your audience and know your organization. I do not like Kritiks or K theory and will assume Aff can Perm a K unless there is a specific reason why they cannot. NO K AFF. Impact Calculus is the most important here, guide me through the round, let me know what flows where, I do not like judge intervention so make me intervene as little as possible on the flow.

Style & Delivery Preferences

This is UIL, speed is not only disliked, but punishable. Be communicative, be cordial, and be articulate. If I cannot hear the evidence, I will not flow it.

ZHENG, NEON

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues: ○ Comm. Skills ○ Res. Issues ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.: ○ Quantity ◉ Quality ○ Equal

Numerical Rankings:

Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks
4	4	5	4	5	5

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I have my paradigms on Tab.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Spreading ok, slow down on tags

Judge	Paradigm	Comm./Res. Issues	Ev. Qty./Qual.	Numerical Rankings						Experience

Zumar, Dawn

Paradigm: Policymaker

Comm./Res. Issues:
- ○ Comm. Skills
- ○ Res. Issues
- ◉ Equal

Ev. Qty./Qual.:
- ○ Quantity
- ◉ Quality
- ○ Equal

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

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I see CX Debate as a chance for students to increase their skills in critical thinking as well as communication. Therefore, I judge rounds based on how well teams both evaluate their opponents' arguments and respond to them. Debate should be as realistic as possible. Debaters are, after all, debating real issues that exist within our world today. I think understanding impacts and the results of arguments is of the utmost importance in a round. I also like to see that teams are actively listening to their opponents, providing effective clash that moves the debate forward.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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.