

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

EXPLANATORY NOTES

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

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

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

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

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

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	QTY. VS. QUALITY OF EVIDENCE	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
ABRAHA, WEGAHTA	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	ADE
Philosophy Statement				5	4	5	5	5	5	
tabula rasa is probably the best way to describe it, i default to an offense/defense paradigm unless a different framing is presented in the debate. counterplans and kritiks are great when executed properly, disads are amazing and should always have an IMPACT to weigh against the affirmative. the affirmative should also have an impact, i care VERY little about stock issues EXCEPT for solvency, so always attack solvency on the neg and have an offensive reason to vote negative										
Style & Delivery Preferences										
It's UIL, that being said, I don't mind speed as long as it's clear. if it's not, i'll yell 'clear' once, after which, if you're still unclear speaker points will be deducted, and i won't be able to hear your arguments										
ADAME, HECTOR	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	AD
Philosophy Statement				3	5	1	4	4	1	
I am a Stocks judge, but don't let that fool you into thinking I'm a basic run of the mill judge. I believe that stocks and the debate structure of the round gives the debater the framework to showcase their analytical acumen and their ability to coherently present their arguments. While I think stocks are key I also take into consideration the policy that I'm asking to vote for or against. Does the plan have an agent? Does the plan have actionable items? How much will it cost? What's the net benefit when compared to any drawbacks. Debaters that can do this will do well with me. Things that don't work well with me are Counterplans (b/c most don't know how run a mutually exclusive plan) and Kritiks. K's belong in L/D. I'm not an L/D judge. In the absence of structure in the round I will go based on the team with the most ground gain.										
Style & Delivery Preferences										
Speed is not appropriate for an activity designed to train young minds on how to analyze and present. You speed. I don't flow.										
ADAMS, WALKER	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	A
Philosophy Statement				5	1	4	4	4	4	
I'm going to come into the round with a totally clean slate. Feel free to run anything you want to, however it is going to be a necessity that you provide warrants to all your arguments. K's for both sides are fine, but provide specific links that aren't vague in nature. If the K doesn't have a specific link, I won't vote on it. The same goes for links for DA's. I'll rarely vote on topicality, don't allow it to become a timesuck. As most T arguments will only drag down the quality of the debate. I view debate as a constructive learning exercise for both sides. Communicate your points well, and if you do spread do it clearly, in order that everyone in the round can understand the speaker. Lastly, debate is supposed to be a formal exercise, so don't be vulgar in language and stay composed throughout the round.										
Style & Delivery Preferences										
Spreading is fine, as long as delivery is clear to the point where all sides in the round can understand the speaker.										

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
ALDERSON, LINDA	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills	<input type="radio"/> Quantity	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	
	Critic of Argument	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues	<input type="radio"/> Quality	4	4	1	5	1	1	

Philosophy Statement

First and foremost, I expect the debaters to debate domestic surveillance since that is what was chosen as the topic for this year. I like case arguments in the 1n with da's in the 2. I do not like an Emory switch. I like a good negative division of labor with a lack of duplication of arguments in the constructive and 1nr. Aff. Must be prima facie in 1ac. Aff. should carry case throughout round whether neg argues or not. CX is binding. As an educator, I will evaluate the round based on the best job of argumentation. Delivery should be of a communicative nature rather than information processing. Do the work for me in signposting and applying arguments. If I have to do the work, then you holler "interventionist" when you failed to do your job and made the judge make the decisions. DO NOT CALL ME, 'JUDGE.'

Communicative and persuasive; no rapid fire

Style & Delivery Preferences

ALIM, MOHAMMAD	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills	<input type="radio"/> Quantity	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	A
	Default policy	<input type="radio"/> Res. Issues	<input type="radio"/> Quality	3	2	4	5	5	2	

Philosophy Statement

Tabula Rasa, will default to policy. Don't necessarily like Kritiks but will listen if presented well and explained well. T isn't a voter unless there is an actual violation of the topic.

Speed is fine, but MAKE SURE I CAN UNDERSTAND YOUR TAGS. That is a pet peeve of mine when tags aren't clearly stated.

Style & Delivery Preferences

ANDERSON, JOHN	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills	<input type="radio"/> Quantity	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	AB
		<input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues	<input type="radio"/> Quality	5	5	5	5	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

There are no issues that do not have the potential to be a voter, and no arguments that are necessary (regardless of the disadvantage ranking that indicates otherwise.) I feel that it is the job of the debaters to tell me why they have met their burdens -- proving the resolution true or false -- and demonstrate how they've done so. I evaluate K but expect framework debate. I enjoy topicality very much but if you can't debate standards and voters do not invest time on that issue. I default as a policy-maker when no other framing is given so if you are going for policy options I highly recommend an impact calculus. Clash is the only necessity: please respond to your opponent's arguments. However, if there is a drop, it is NOT an automatic win; it is your job to explain why it is a concession and how it impacts the round. I don't plan on doing any work for you, so tell me why it matters.

Speed is fine, just keep in mind that this tournament does have conventions and be mindful of these. Argumentation is always more important than delivery to me. Offensive remarks (sexist, racist, homophobic) don't make me happy and while they won't lose you the round, I will dock speaker points heavily if you are being blatantly obtuse.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

Almost any kind of case goes as long as you prove that you are right and your opponent is wrong. Convince me that your case is the right one. You will do this by hitting voters and any attacks your opponent has made, and by proving your opponent is wrong in every part of his/her presentation.

CX Debate is formal argumentation. It should be conducted as such. A good debater does not need to be either rude or obnoxious to prove his/her case. Speed is fine as long as I can understand what you're saying. If I don't understand what you're saying, I can't judge it.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a policy judge who also appreciates stock issues for structure. I will vote on the team that provides me the best world after the resolution is, or is not passed. I want both teams to show me why their world is superior to the other team's world. Impact calcs in rebuttals are a huge bonus and can win you then round if done properly. I will listen to stock issue arguments but need to know why they are impactful. For all argument so need to hear why I should weigh them and how much weight they carry. Don't run Topicality without violations or voters, don't run kritiks or counter plans if you don't know what your doing, give me a clear outline of your diads planks, I like a substantive questions in the cross-ex, I don't time roadmaps so please do them, lastly and obviously, be respectful of each other and me.

Style & Delivery Preferences

DON'T SPEED/SPREAD! I can listen and flow a faster speaker but if I can't understand what your saying then it will be very hard to flow your arguments. Make sure I know and understand your arguments by giving me a summary of the attacks you make.

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

Philosophy Statement

I believe that the crux of the case relies on the quality and support of the presented evidence.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Traditional delivery, no rapid fire.

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

Philosophy Statement

I believe it is the job of the debaters to determine my decision making process. As a result it is crucial that debaters offer a decision making calculus to help me in my decision. If this is not done I will default to an offense-defense paradigm, simply because it is the easiest way to decide objectively.

I am comfortable with any argument as long as there is a warranted explanation of how it clashes with the opponents arguments. The strongest debaters will not only win the arguments they need to win the debate but they will begin their final speeches explaining how their strategy makes it impossible for the other team to win.

If you want more detail about how I look at specific arguments check out my debate wiki page <https://judgephilosophies.wikispaces.com/Barnes%2C+Sebastian>

If you have further questions feel free to ask!

Style & Delivery Preferences

The strongest debaters are concise and clear. As long as you are both expect high speaker points. Additionally I am fine with speed. Some things to watch out for that would negatively affect your speaker points:

- Being rude
- Explaining cards immediately after reading them
- Reading superfluous cards when not sure what to say

The strongest debaters are concise and clear. As long as you are both expect high speaker points.

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a huge proponent of civility and the value of dialectical learning in debate. Respectful discourse and interaction is an imperative for high speaker points. I competed at Winston Churchill High School for 3.5 years. The team's collective argumentative style for CX erred towards heavy critical debate, in order to fight on a more even ground with schools that had more resources for their debate programs. A lot of K debater's eyes light up when I share this paradigm in round. However, because I am so familiar with the literature and its application in debate, I have a high threshold for its execution. And while this was the case, I also thoroughly enjoyed getting deep into the policy on policy merits of cases and evaluating the nuances of great counterplan/disad debates. Essentially, as a judge I am a blank slate, tabula rasa if you will. I check my personal views and values at the door and await instruction. The debater's who have the easiest time picking up my ballot are those who tell me how to vote, who tell me the significance and substance of their argumentative positions AND how they interrelate with the opponent's positions in the debate, and who give me good impact and solvency stories. For theory, I like to see these issues engaged in substantively. Not just rushed through to potentially score an easy ballot. I like to see in round abuse stories explicated sufficiently, and when potential abuse is a concern I'd like a full story on how the abuse might negatively impact the greater pedagogical and competitive value of the activity. For topicality, I don't like seeing debates where multiple t's are read as a timesuck.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Again, civility and respectful interaction come first. These provide the foundation not just for debate but for democratic discourse. While I typically competed in faster debates, for UIL I would like to see a more slowed down and deliberative style.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

Affirmative is generally assumed correct after 1AC, the burden to disprove lies on the NEG. That said, NEG can employ any tactic that can logically show why the AFF plan should not be passed.

Spreading is okay, but clarity is essential. I deduct points for rudeness.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I focus on stock issues, but would be considered also a policy maker. Although I do try to go into a round with no preconceived opinions or ideas. I listen to each argument and want each argument dealt with. You must have clash throughout the debate. I seldom settle with a topicality argument for a decision, but if its solid, it will win the round. It must have all elements necessary to run a T. I like to hear DA's as long as they are case specific. I am certainly not partial to generic DA's but in the same since, they have won many a round. DO NOT spend an entire debate complaining about an argument being abusive. You might point it out, but then kick the argument and move on. Yes, you can bring up new evidence in rebuttals ...not new arguments! DO NOT BE RUDE !!!! You are debating an issue/resolution not a person.

1. Speed...I'm way to old to try to listen to a horse race announcer. I expect obvious speed but you must communicate.
2. This is a persuasive speaking event. Let me see your eyes. I don't enjoy looking at only the top of your head. Especially when using a lap top. You never know when I might roll out and be gone a little while.
3. Need to be able to hear and understand you.
4. Professionalism at all cost. You are making political and policy decisions. You are baby lawyers, persuade me.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

Debate is a speaking event and should be regarded as such. I feel your plan and evidence should support your talking ability. I do not think you should ramble off so fast that no one can fully comprehend what is being said. I realize there are strict time limits and you may speed up a little to stay within that time, but I want to hear your thoughts and plans. Do not have so many arguments that the only way to get through is by spreading.

Read your card and explain, I want to know you understand what you are saying and trying to solve.

Style & Delivery Preferences

BLANKENSHIP, MISTI	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills	<input type="radio"/> Quantity	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	
	Games Theorist	<input type="radio"/> Res. Issues	<input type="radio"/> Quality	4	4	3	5	2	4	
		<input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal							

Philosophy Statement

This game - CX debate - is an educational event whereby the limits, procedures and protocols are to be determined by the players themselves. This means I will interpret the round as a tabula rasa judge but allow the debaters to show me why their world view, their version of the game, is favorable to the opposition. Many times this type of clash is present in the extension of topicality voter blocks, theory regarding counterplans, and applicability of generic versus specific kritik links.

As long as I can understand you, I have no problems with speed v. clarity. I will say "clear" if you're not communicating the content of your speech to my liking.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I don't want the winner to have won due to a net benefit or an impact calculus in the rebuttals: I'm looking for the winner to show me they understand the implications of how the debate ought to be weighed, how this affects their position in the debate and why the opposition doesn't hold up throughout their cluster of argumentation.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I believe should be an educational process. Students should learn from each round and work to improve. I judge based on the quality of debate as well as the parameters set forth by UIL.

If I cannot understand because you are speaking too fast, I will not flow it, and therefore cannot judge it.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

Professionalism is expected at all times. It is an honor to compete at the state meet and students should demonstrate respect for that. Stock issues are the foundation for my voting philosophies. Negative should identify arguments by the correct stock issue. Affirmatives must resolve all negative concerns to win a round. Evidence is important, but logic is acceptable on occasion.

CX Debate is first and foremost a communication event. Students should be sure to always be aware that the judge understands their arguments and that they are using persuasive techniques to win a round. Speaking fast interferes with understanding and persuasiveness. Rudeness also interferes with both.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I like to hear a good debate. I do count off if the individual talks to fast and I cannot flow his/her speech. I like to hear a good clean argument. The individual debating needs to be able to answer the cx questions as ask without having to look at their notes. I look for the best argument and the evidence presented to support that argument.

Not talking too fast.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I believe CX debate is an important activity for enhancing communication skills. Therefore, I believe that I should be able to clearly hear and understand all of the arguments from both teams. I believe that pathos, ethos, and logos are an important foundation for a winning teams success.

An effective speaker uses appropriate speaking ergonomics and clear enunciation. Emotion is appropriate for the portions of the arguments.

A team that effectively presents a winning case will use appropriate resources to enhance the teams "original" language.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I base debate over stock issues and clash of stock issue. I like brief roadmaps. I prefer voters. Please face the judge during cx time.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I do not mind speed speech as long as it is clear. I want to you know you know what you are delivery to us.

CLARK, MEGHAN

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

Philosophy Statement

Policy debate is most helpfully defined as an exercise in the creation of public policy. The affirmative is responsible for articulating and developing a clear and well-substantiated public policy. The negative is responsible for opposing that policy with arguments and evidence that successfully prove that the affirmative plan is incapable of being put into effect without lasting harm/damage. Although I have no objection to creativity in arguments (such as kritiks), I would prefer for them to have at least some marginal basis in real-world topics and cause-effect relationships.

Style & Delivery Preferences

A reasonable speed of delivery is paramount—please do not read/speak so quickly that you are difficult to understand. Inability to comply with this requirement will result in a significant loss of speaker points. Furthermore, civility towards one's opponents is expected at all times. Discourteous behavior towards the opposing team will be penalized.

COWDEN, PATRICIA

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

Philosophy Statement

I like to see logical arguments brought up with Stock-issue clash. I believe that Debate is used as a tool for education, and without creating conflict and discord it's educational aspects are lost. As the Negative you should be responsible for providing clash and the development of arguments. As the Affirmative I believe that you should have enough evidence for your case to support and refute your arguments with your supporting materials. If you want to win you must cover (or destroy), topicality, solvency, harms, significance, and/or inherency. I believe that as a policy debater your job is to evoke emotion, and not just speed read mindlessly through 50 pages in 8 minutes. Use a colorful vocabulary that pushes me to change and persuades me to flow in your favor, of course by using logical argumentation for this appeal. Remember that at it's heart debate is communication exchange. Look at the emotions of the audience. For this I'm referring to Impact calculus. Show me harms, of the affirmative, or the harms if I chose not to vote for the affirmative. Impact-calc is important for me as a judge because I want you to understand the effects of my ballot aside from the win or loss you receive. I want you to convince me of the impacts of my vote. Cross Examination- Use this time to set the framework for further arguments, as well as rebuild your case. If you have a question that will make me think about the topic from another perspective do it. Raise questions that should create dissonance for me as a judge.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I have no preference in style and delivery as long as your speech is clear and precise.

CUELLAR, JOSE

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issue judge. The affirmative must be topical and has the burden of prove and must have Prima Facie evidence. It must be significant and prove harms. The affirmative team must prove inherency and provide solvency. The negative must clash and defend the status quo or provide a counter plan. The style and delivery are very important. I also look at advantages and disadvantages.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I do not like rapid fire. I must be able to understand what the debater is saying. The speeches must be clear and the delivery must be understandable. The speaker must always be facing the judge and not his opponent.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
DAVIS, COLIN	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	A
				4	5	3	4	4	2	
Philosophy Statement										
Policy is a major voting issue for me; however, the policy needs to satisfy the stock issues. Regarding the negative, I will vote on K's and CP's, but they need to be ran and argued adequately. I flow everything and expect arguments to be pulled across or else I'll consider them dropped. While I understand that debates can become somewhat hostile, I consider this event a communication event and like to see professionalism.										
Style & Delivery Preferences										
CX is a communication event. I'm fine with some speed, but the delivery needs to be clear. I especially like when contestants "talk" and explain their arguments instead of simply throwing evidence out.										
DAVIS, LARRY	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	B
				4	3	4	2	2	2	
Philosophy Statement										
I tend to frame my decisions in stock issues. I find the paradigm is effective in providing concrete, objective criteria.										
Style & Delivery Preferences										
I see debate as a public speaking competition; therefore, the oral communication skills of debaters are at least as important as the resolution of issues.										
DAVIS, RICHARD	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	ABE
				3	4	4	4	2	1	
Philosophy Statement										
I am an extremely "flow oriented" stock issues judge. While I indicated below that I will vote on arguments such as T or on a counter plan, such things must be run correctly. I expect any and all arguments made in a round to be applied by the debaters to the round, if I am to give them any weight in making my decision. Speakers of each team have certain responsibilities. To be successful in winning my decision, you must meet those responsibilities. Any argument introduced into the round should have an impact in the round. If it can't be applied directly to the round, don't go there.										
Style & Delivery Preferences										
If a speaker delivers his or her case in such a manner that I cannot flow it, it is as if it never happened. You must communicate effectively to receive my vote. I also expect debaters to conduct themselves in as respectful and courteous a manner as possible. Rudeness, sarcasm and, or personal attacks will not be tolerated.										
DAVIS, STEPHANIE	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	A
				4	4	2	3	4	3	
Philosophy Statement										
Very big on stock issues. Prefer clash over regurgitated useless information. Communication and a strong resolution of substantive issues are equally important.										
Style & Delivery Preferences										
Dislike - spreading.										

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a collegiate parliamentary debater, and I am familiar with debate terms as well as basic CX tactics. I did some CX and Lincoln Douglas debates in high school, so this means that you will best persuade me not by fancy terms of critiques but by logical, case-specific arguments. My main request is that you speak clearly and at a good speed where I can understand you. I am most comfortable with/likely to be persuaded by policy debate. Use your cross examination time on case, and please be respectful of your partner and other team by not interrupting. I judge based on HOW you argue (behavior) in addition to your arguments, so I ask that you bring respect into the round. I am all about everyone understanding the resolution, so spend as much time as you need to in your speech explaining to me what your plan or counterplan does so that we're all on the same page. I've seen too many debates go awry because of small misunderstandings that could have been avoided had debaters explained their terms and plans.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Anything as long as I can clearly understand you. I highly prefer policy over critiques!

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

Philosophy Statement

I am primarily a stock issues judge, meaning I want to hear debate on the significance, inherency, harms, solvency, and topicality. Topicality is not something I will hinge the whole round on, however, I will definitely consider it. Disads are a big deal, but must be run, or refuted, correctly. CPs I will listen to but it needs to be run right and explained well. In the end, while I am a stocks judge, I do want to be told what you feel should and should NOT be the key deciding factors in a round, as well as what yields more harms/benefits, status quo or aff world. Evidence is great, but analyticals here-and-there are fine too as long as they have a clear, logical basis and connection to the round.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is not an issue unless you can no longer be understood. This is a contest of communication so you must show you can effectively communicate the point(s) you are trying to make.

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

Philosophy Statement

I like to see arguments that are backed up by credible facts and I do not like crazy claims. I have heard teams make claims that a certain plan will cause a Zombie Apocalypse and I didn't like it. It ruins the credibility of their arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I like a conversational style. Spreading is not my favorite, but I don't mind it as long as I can clearly understand you.

DELEON, ROSENDO ROSS	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	
	Communication skills and stock			3	5	2	4	4	2	

Philosophy Statement

I believe that debate is communication event. I believe that there needs to be evidence to support the debater's claims. I feel that what whens the debate is not only presentation of the evidence but reasoning and applying that evidence to support the claim. I also feel that there should be structure and organization in the debate. Clashes and rebuilding are important aspects of the debate presentation.

Style & Delivery Preferences

The style of the debate in not to see how much evidence you can get into it. The importance is to communicate the message to the judge and the opposing side.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a tabula rasa judge. I am clean slate. I expect the debaters to establish the parameters of the round. Tell me what to weigh and how to weigh it. Tell me where you want the arguments on the flow. Tell me how to vote. If you fail to weigh the round, I will default policymaker.

Communication is key. If your speed gets so fast I can't understand you, then I will put my pen down. If that happens, nothing is making it onto my flow.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a huge stock issues judge and I judge heavily on the flow of arguments. For example, if a team drops a key argument (topicality or solvency) and the opposing team picks that up and properly argues it, I will can sometimes decide the round on that.

I do not mind speed as long as I can understand everything.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

Debate should be inclusive and accessible to all people regardless of race, religion, sex, gender identity, sexuality, disability, age, or economic status. Anything you might do to undermine that (particularly hate speech) will lose you the round. Besides that, I have very few pre-conceived notions about how a debate round ought to go. Although, for the sake of full disclosure: I have a pretty high threshold for topicality.

Debate in the style that you are most comfortable with, and run the arguments you enjoy running. I would prefer for the debaters to present their own framework for evaluating the round, but if none is presented I will default to traditional "policy" framework of comparing offence vs defense and weighing post-fiat impacts on a timeframe/magnitude/probability schema.

Have fun and good luck!

No preferred style or speed. Being clear, economical, and well-organized will win you speaker points, but not the round.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I believe that the AFF has the burden of providing a clear solution to solve the resolution, not just presenting a problem with no real method to solve it. The NEG should run TOPICALITY in the 1NC, but not as a time suck. I will only vote on a generic DA if it is applicable to the AFF Case. Application of argumentation is key to win my ballot. Don't rely on the evidence alone to do the work for you. It is your job to explain why that evidence applies and why the judge should vote on it.

I firmly believe that this is a communication event. If at any point your speed of delivery hinders your ability to effectively communicate then you will not win my ballot.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I consider myself a policy-maker/stock issues judge. I want to see a plan from the affirmative. I expect the affirmative to be able to explain and defend their plan. The affirmative does have the burden of proof but I also believe in affirmative fiat. I like to see clash. I believe a plan must be topical but do not want to see minor word topicality argument round. Do not continually reread evidence to soak time. You must have quality evidence. I like to see a weighing of the evidence from the debaters.

Debate is communication exercise. I must be able to understand you. I am not impressed with rapid fire. If I cannot understand it to flow it I cannot judge it.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I judge the debate that is presented before me. Covering and arguing the stock issues is very important to me. Debaters should know the stock issues and be able to relate these to their case. Debaters should explain arguments and how they relate to the case/plan. (don't just throw an argument out there). I want debaters to challenge each other. I expect debaters to be courteous to each other. I do not like rudeness. Debaters should use their time to build case, explain arguments, and especially in Rebuttals..summarize the debate and how they win.

Since CX is a speaking event, I expect debaters to communicate well. I do not like rapid fire..I want to be able to understand what you are saying. Have eye contact, use persuasion, be organized with points, and speak clearly are things I judge on.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

Interpretation and connection of evidence is key. While some arguments are not my favorite, I will flow anything you give me and anything you can explain well. It is your job as the debater to provide clash. Please don't expect me to do the work for you. I am okay with new arguments in the 2NC but please don't abuse that by presenting a very short 1NC and then trying to overload the aff in the 2NC. Voters are crucial in the final rebuttals. Walk me through everything!

If my pen is down, I'm not flowing (I can keep up fairly well). Rudeness will result in a severe deduction of speaker points. Make sure evidence is on a flash drive BEFORE speaking. Don't try to waste your opponent's time when saving info.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I look for a well-rounded AFF plan and seek the NEG to disprove that plan. I don't particularly care for debating dates, petty definition arguments or T-violations. I prefer Clash, as any debate judge does, but discourage 1-upping during Cross-Examination time. If I do not feel the stock issues are lining up, I default to tabula rasa paradigms. I want students to get their points across effectively in the time constraints they have and to debate through to the last rebuttal.

While I understand the time constraints put on debaters, I discourage spreading or rapid delivery which interferes with proper communication. I encourage eye contact and a smooth delivery. If I cannot flow the debate, you are not doing your job.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

My philosophy is based on stock issues; however, I am open to all arguments that are presented well and backed up with evidence. I think debate is a communication contest; therefore, spreading is not acceptable in my rounds.

I think debate is a communication contest; therefore, spreading is not acceptable in my rounds.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

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

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

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

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

I prefer clear communication of your arguments and will reward good organization and presentation over increased speed. I prefer quality over quantity of arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

It is a persuasive speaking event. Your main goal should be to communicate your position in a clear and concise manner at a speed that is understandable. Remember that persuasion is more than just what you say it is how you say it, how you look while you're saying it, and who you look at while you are saying it. I much prefer on case arguments and DAs that tie directly to an action within the plan. The topic is about domestic surveillance not debate theory.

Good persuasion cannot happen at high speeds. Spitting while speaking too fast is unattractive and in no way persuasive.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

Absent argumentation that convinces me otherwise, I will default to policy making as my decision making paradigm. That means stock issues will be the filter for your arguments and I will cast the ballot based on the net benefits. Debaters over authors. Evidence is a persuasive tool, but your analysis and application of the cards is what I want to hear. Development over claims. Do not expect me to vote for a claim that is not developed into a valid argument. Support your analytics with cards and prove that you have a point by creating detailed, well-explained arguments.

Speed is not the issue:clarity is! Do not sacrifice the elements of good speaking trying to spread. Clarity and efficiency are key. Also, be a time manager. In a speaking event your organization and presentation matter. Come to the podium ready to speak and don't expect to use my time for a "mini-speech" instead of a clear, concise road-map.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a Tab judge so I will listen to just about anything except kritiks. I need structure to any argument or case presented to me. I want to hear "uniqueness, link, internal link, impact" or "violation, definition, standards, and voters". If I do not hear those words, I have to try and figure out if you covered all the components of the argument. I am really into impacts so if you present a DA and are able to prove to me that your impacts out weigh that of the Affirmative's, then there is a higher chance that I will vote for you. Also, I really appreciate impact calculus so if you provide that at the end of the round that's great. When it comes to Topicalities, do not run them as a time suck. If you realize that that argument isn't your strongest one, kick it early on so you can go more in depth with your other arguments. Make sure there is a clear violation and make sure to carry through your voters or else I cannot vote on it. Like every other argument, I want Counter Plans to be structured as well. I need to see a clear net benefit to the CP and how it out weighs the AFF's harms. I am ok with conditional CPs but do not abuse it. On Case arguments are good but I need to be told which card or section each argument will be referring to or I do not know where to put it. Splitting the block is fine with me as long as it is on case arguments and not off case. If anything wasn't clear or I did not cover something, please clarify before the round.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I am good with speed but it needs to be clear. If you have a weird breathing pattern while reading, then read normally. I need tag lines to be clearer than the body of the card and I do not write down the author's names while flowing so when referencing back to cards keep this in mind. Lastly, don't just say, "extend". I need you to tell me what to extend and why.

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

Philosophy Statement

I vote based on which team best attacks/defends their point. Speaking skills play a part in this decision but I am more interest in who defines the argument as a whole. For example, if Aff is a great speaker but Neg clearly lays out the argument and provides a logical response, then that argument would flow Neg. I do flow analytical arguments but only when the evidence truly supports and the logic is sound

Style & Delivery Preferences

I value a good structured speaker. While information is vital to an effective case, unless you can communicate the relevance your data is useless. Explain what you mean, do not just read me a card and expect me to draw the intended conclusion. I do not like speed. Professionalism is key to high speaker points.

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a policy judge and will vote on most types of attacks. I'm looking for the most pragmatic approach to the resolution. I expect impacts to be weighed and extended throughout the round. Most importantly, I hope to see students be polite and respectful to their opponents.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I'd prefer for the round to be understood clearly and effectively. I will flow the round no matter the speed but I want to really see you utilize your persuasion skills.

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

Philosophy Statement

I think debate's as much of a game as it's about education. I'm as "tab" as I think anyone can possibly be. I've been doing debate since 2009 and there's not much I haven't heard. For me, the debaters set the rules of each round and what the ballot means.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Just be clear. Keep in mind that this is UIL and there is a certain expectation about methods of delivery. That being said, I judge on the TFA/TOC circuit and have some college debate experience, and you won't speak faster than I can flow.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

Stock issues judge. I base my decisions on a combination of effectiveness of delivery, skill in analysis, use of evidence, validity of argument, and clarity of organization. I value analysis and critical thinking over a rapid fire approach with generic evidence. Looking for the traditional "link-brink-impact" analysis and direct clash. In terms of my judging paradigm, I will be more impressed with clear, reasoned arguments than with arguments that rely solely on technical jargon.

Comfortable with counter-plans and comparative analysis style of debating. I am less comfortable with Kritiks - I understand them, but will listen to hear that debaters understand them and are not just repeating something someone else wrote. Signposting and clear organization helps comprehension and improves clash in the debate. I will be receptive to any well-formed argument you run if you lay the foundation. Slow down to make sure I understand your argument.

I appreciate cross-examination as a time to see where you may be going next or to prepare the groundwork for your partner (or your own) speech. Arguments should have a logical flow to them. Use constructives to set up your final analysis for rebuttals. Have fun and be professional/polite. Don't be afraid to think on your feet and persuade me.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I prefer a pace and volume that is comprehensible and can be flowed. Argument quality and strong cross-examinations are important. Rapid delivery is acceptable if you are able to do it well and maintain clarity, but most are unable to do this. Be kind to your opponent.

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issues judge. I want to see good arguments on the issues. This is a communication event so persuasive speaking is a must. I need to see the logical progression of the arguments throughout the debate.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Professional style and speaking is preferred. Speed is usually a detriment.

HANKIN, JONATHAN	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	AD
				4	3	4	4	4	4	

Philosophy Statement

I am Tabula Rasa, this does not mean that I do not bring certain biases to the debate stage. But it does mean that I strive to be as fair an arbiter over the round with as few preconceived opinions as possible.

I could give you a few situations and specifics, and how I have ruled but that would only confuse you as every round and circumstance is different.

So I will save the time and give you one rule I govern by,

ARGUE WELL.

Convince me both on a substantial number of points and more importantly the larger core parts of the conversation, and you will win the round.

Focus on reading off a sheet and parroting stuff your coach told you and I will be less likely to be convinced.

I tell you this not only because it is my Philosophy but it is ground into the decision making of even the most technical debater. BE CONVINCING. If your arguments are consistently clearly stronger than your opponents arguments you will win, in my book in just about every case. Best of luck.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Fast evidence reading is fine, but emphasize the main flow points, giving links throughout.

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

Philosophy Statement

SIGN POST! I'm tab, however if you don't tell me exactly how to frame the ongoing debate I will default policy maker; depending on round argumentation that may or may not work well for you. You must tell me where everything belongs in the round; if you don't I'm not going to search for its place. JUSTIFY ALL arguments for me please! You need offense and defense to win a round. I firmly believe AFF has the burden of proof! SIGN POST! If I even have to consider shuffling through my flow to find an argument's place I am probably missing key points in your speech. For all that is good in the world NO NEW IN THE 2!!! I am completely fine with rapid fire, however if I cannot understand you I WILL NOT FLOW! I am a flow judge...what is on my flow is what was in the round. You had better tell me what to put on my flow and WHY. CLASH PLEASE. I enjoy CPs IF they are run correctly. I absolutely will NOT vote on Ks...if you run one I will under no circumstances put it on my flow or in my brain. Analytical arguments have a happy home in policy debate! However, they do not make a happy home alone! (They will not win a debate by themselves.) SIGN POST! If you do not sign post...well...insert Bryan Mills (Liam Neeson) quote here. Please don't be rude. Debate is fun, so have fun with it! Trust me the educational value of debate will help you for years to come. Feel free to ask me any and all questions you have before the round starts!

Style & Delivery Preferences

Spreading is completely fine AS LONG AS I can understand you. If you are gasping for air chances are you are not being very clear. If I cannot understand you or you haven't told me where to place an argument on my flow...I WILL drop my pen, cross my arms, and stop flowing. Please sign post! Quality over quantity, so please don't race to fit in as many arguments as you can.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I consider myself a stock issues judge, but I am open to most ideas presented in the round. I stand by the statement that debate is a speaking and listening contest, so you must listen to your opponent. Organization is important in a debate round as well as clarification and analysis of ideas. Please be considerate of your opponents during the round. Politeness and respect are important to me.

NO excessive speed in the round! Your speeches need to be articulated well and delivered confidently.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

Organization is very important in CX. If arguments are being thrown in every direction, it is hard for a judge to follow along. Make everything clear and precise. Also, tell me where and why I should vote on your argument.

Try not to drop arguments in the rebuttals. If they make it that far and then are dropped, they probably weren't strong arguments anyway. Don't waste your time; it is very precious.

If you know you have won an argument, don't spend a lot of time on it. I will most likely know you have won the argument as well. Spend a couple of seconds on it and move on to something else.

I am not a fan of an kind of theory. However, I will hear arguments. Make sure they are done right and easy to follow.

I prefer when the negative team splits the block in the constructive speeches.

Please be courteous to your opponents.

Congratulations on making it to state!

If I put my pen down, you are going too fast.

Style & Delivery Preferences

HARRISON, CRYSTAL	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	B
				4	4	4	4	4	1	

Philosophy Statement

Follow all UIL rules, be professional and courteous. I don't like rapid fire delivery. Provide a road map and be organized. Be confident and impress me.

Communication is most important. I am the official time-keeper so please be respectful of that.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I am basically a tabula rasa judge. However, the debate format/information is important, and debate is still about communication. Solid communication skills are extremely important. I look for well-reasoned, well-presented, and proper evidence-based arguments, taking into consideration all "valid" issues. There must be "clash." Negative: counter plans ONLY will not work! You must debate the affirmative case/plan.

No Rapid Fire! If I cannot understand what you are saying, I will not flow your case/argument. Firm, confident, organized presentations without rudeness is essential!

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I will judge with a stock issues philosophy. I look for arguments being run properly, such as a topicality argument containing definitions, standards and voters. I look for solvency, I want to here how the affirmative plan will solve.

I have no preference for style and delivery other than avoiding excessive speed reading.

Style & Delivery Preferences

HERRERA, JONATHON	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	A
	Critic of the Argument			4	5	5	5	4	5	

Philosophy Statement

I prefer both teams establish the framework for me to evaluate the round. I am willing to accept most arguments as long as the team is able to articulate the argument well. I prefer the last rebuttal to focus more on the big picture compared to going line-by-line on every argument. 2NR should never go for every argument and I prefer Neg always split the block.

Speed for the sake of speed is not good, every speaker should know their limits.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I'm pretty open minded when it comes to any approach to the topic. My 3 big areas however are good organization, proper structure, and signposting during speeches. Jumping around the flow is fine but I want it clearly said where each argument should go. I also prefer a team not go for every argument but make smart strategic choices to win the round. Quality and not quantity is the ideal. Being bold in the 1AR is especially welcome since that's where one has to be most strategic in what they should cover to properly address the prior Neg block.

Be as clear as possible. Also speak up and by that I mean don't yell but also don't whisper either.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I grew up with Stock Issues judging, but now find myself weighing rounds in a Policy Maker way. I like good clear arguments and explanations. I like very clear signposting along the way--make sure I know what kind of argument you are presenting. I will consider all kinds of arguments, but they must be applicable and explained. I do not like speed for speed's sake and will stop flowing if it's out of hand.

Some speed ok, but if I can't follow taglines and the gist of your arguments, I won't vote for them.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

Although I now consider myself a "policy maker" judge, I have a strong background in stock issues and they are still important issues to address within the round. Even though I judge and have my teams compete at TFA tournaments, I prefer UIL style of debate. I do not tolerate rudeness and your speaker points will reflect that! I expect to hear signposting (labeling) of arguments – and "and" is NOT a signpost or a label. I tend to flow arguments more in your favor if you provide me with adequate structure and good, clear warrants and analyses. I try not to intervene on the ballot unless you leave me no choice because you don't tell me what issues on which to vote (by the way, don't tell me how I HAVE to vote, just what issues there are on which to vote). I expect off-case in the 1NC and on-case in the 2NC. If you are going to run topicality, it should be the FIRST thing you run on Neg. and it should have a clear structure with standards and voters. If you are going to run K, run K the whole time. Don't kick it in the 2NR. Also, make sure your arguments don't conflict. I don't like conditionality (as in multiple-world arguments). This is state! Have fun but debate well :).

I can flow speed, but that doesn't mean that I like it, especially when it's done in a way that seems abusive. Debate is a COMMUNICATION EVENT! Communication is primary and I am not happy when your speaking style hinders that. Be nice! You must always face the judge when speaking. Remember, you are trying to convince the judge, not your opponent.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I see CX debate as persuasive argumentation between affirmative and negative teams driven by logical reasoning and evidence. I like for debaters to focus most of their time on the main voting issues (topicality, harms, inherency, significance, and solvency) and use their persuasive skills and evidence to aid in my determination of which voting issues are the most pertinent in the round. I like the idea of affirmative and negative staying focused on this year's resolution and generating clash through that, so I am not very fond of counterplans or kritiks.

I enjoy a good debate between teams of debaters who are good communicators familiar enough with their cases to have good eye contact, pronounce words correctly, and be able to breathe normally through their presentations. I like to be able to hear and understand what is being said.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

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.

Debate is a communication activity, so professionalism in rounds is valued.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

For my general paradigm, I consider myself tab. There are no arguments I do and don't like. I will judge the arguments presented in the round and I don't want to impose my own beliefs or arguments into the round. You have to tell me why the arguments made in the round matter. If you fail to give me a way in which to evaluate the round, I will default to a policy maker. Being a policy maker, I am looking for the negative team to run disadvantages, counter plans, kritiks, and anything else. As a policy maker, I am looking for you to terminalize your impacts. Why specifically is nuclear war bad? Does it kill millions of people? Just saying dehumanization or nuclear war is bad isn't an impact. I will gladly listen to counter plans, theory arguments and Kritiks. My only advice on the k is to tell me what the role of the ballot is. Why is my ballot key to your alt?

I am fine with any style of debate that you want to debate. Speed is fine, but be clear. I will call clear if I need you to slow down.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Topicality/Theory

I will vote on T when there is proven abuse. I need to see in-round abuse for me to pull the trigger. I think T is a legitimate tool for a negative team, but I strongly urge the team that goes all in for T to make sure they can prove in-round abuse. If the aff is just failing to make arguments on the T, I will vote for it, but my preference is for in-round abuse to be occurring.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I will entertain any argument in the round, but my ballot comes down to whether or not the plan as a whole has been proven feasible or unfeasible. I don't necessarily care if the argumentation goes in a more analytical or traditional direction as long as there is quality clash. Prove to me that you put in the time to research ahead of time; One-size-fits-all- arguments won't get you far with me. Try to avoid spending the round on debating rules unless there is a substantial amount of ground being lost to actual abuse. Above all, I will be judging in accordance with UIL CX handbook, please make sure you are familiar with these rules.

Although I do not prefer spreading, I will allow it under the condition that taglines and other signposts are clearly enunciated. Please avoid setting up laptops in a way that prevents you from making eye contact with the judges.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I am prototypically tabula rasa. In high school I primarily debated the K, however I am comfortable as a policy maker. Please DO NOT run critical arguments if you are not comfortable/familiar with the material in attempts to cater to my preferences, that almost always leads to sloppy debate. Debate whatever you are comfortable with. Enjoy yourself. Go as fast as you want or as slow as you want. At the end of the day I will flow what you give me and the best team (NOT the best delivery/style/argumentation type) will win. Blank slate.

You do you. If you go slow, go slow. If you spread, don't sacrifice clarity and be careful to maintain articulate delivery. However, what I greatly appreciate if you are a team that spreads is an adjustment if your opponent does not. It is highly unsportsmanlike to spread your face off if your opponents are not comfortable doing so. Kindness and professionalism go a long way in debate.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I place a great deal of value on debaters that can make and defend logical arguments. Debate offers a unique opportunity for students to hone the skills of persuasive communication like no other activity. Displaying an ability to listen, reason and productively argue during a debate is as important as following a strict adherence to a previously developed case.

The key to genuine debate is an ability to communicate and persuade. I absolutely do not believe that speaking at a speed that makes communication difficult is a valid form of debate and will deduct penalize a team that relies on that delivery method.

Style & Delivery Preferences

KIRKSCEY, RUSSELL	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	AB
	critic of argument			4	1	5	4	4	4	

Philosophy Statement

I really dislike intervening. I'll just allow arguments to go away if neither team does a good job advocating or answering them. (That seems to happen a lot with topicality). For the most part, 1NC guides the direction of the debate. If they're framing the round in stock issues, I'll vote on those. If they're advocating a DA/CP/K position, then I'll vote on those. Or I'll vote on any combination if the debaters give me a rationale. I see topicality as an independent issue. However, I need a lot of work on the standards debate. With DAs, I need to hear a cogent story with internal links. Affirmatives must give offensive arguments on DAs or prove that no link exists. I don't like to vote on drops, but I will. 1AR needs to keep everything in play. Everyone needs to impact drops. Rebuttals really win—and lose—rounds. Tell a good story and weigh the round for me.

Everyone in the room needs to understand the arguments. Pay attention to me, and I'll pay attention to you.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I learned a very traditional style of cross-examination debate, and still believe in the merit of traditional cross-examination arguments and speaking style. However, I am familiar with all types of arguments, and will accept most. Courtesy and respect are non-negotiable, and both must be exercised during a round. I most frequently identify as a policy maker, but if a team can provide ample and persuasive reasoning why I should weigh a round based on other arguments and scales I will gladly consider doing so. At the end of a round, be sure to give a proper overview and impact calculus, and be sure to "write the ballot for me". Tell me how I should vote, and why I should vote that way.

I expect all debaters to be courteous and respectful. I do not expect, and will not flow, rapid fire delivery.

Style & Delivery Preferences

KRIM, CHELSEA

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a mix when it comes to my judging but I fall under the stock issue and policy maker judge type.

Stock issues: In order for the affirmative team to win, their plan must retain all of the stock issues, which are Harms, Inherency, Solvency, Topicality, and Significance. For the negative to win, they only need to prove that the affirmative fails to meet one of the stock issues.

Policymaker: At the end of the round, I compare the affirmative plan with either the negative counterplan or the status quo. Whichever one is a better policy option is the winner.

This is a UIL competition so I do NOT want to see any spreading in the round. I focus a lot on how you present your arguments and your speaking style, so make sure you are clear!

Style & Delivery Preferences

KULAK, CYNTHIA

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

Philosophy Statement

I consider myself a policy maker with a stock issues background. Stocks are ok, but you don't need them to win. Every argument is fair game, but there are some arguments that I prefer over others. I will listen to new arguments in the 2NC and I would like to hear an impact calc at the end. Please give roadmaps and stick to them as best as possible.

Speed isn't a problem as long as you are still understandable. Please act professional.

Style & Delivery Preferences

LAWLESS, SHELBY

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a policy maker. I love a good clash, as well as a strong topicality argument.

Relaxed, and mature, but I want to have fun watching you debate as well.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

On the whole, I would consider myself a Policy Judge. I do enjoy listening to great, "real" world arguments, followed by up to date evidence, and adequately warranted. Signposting is always appreciated. Clash is vitally important during the round. This is where the fun lies with response to arguments, fallacies identified, and rational reasoning supported by good, solid evidence. I will flow during the round, even the cx, and hope that you give me lots of voters. Be forewarned, I don't like Kritiks, especially, affirmative. I want a case and plan that shows really solvency and supports the resolution. Please, argue the resolution.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Debate is public speaking. If I can't understand you; you never look at me, and you have no emotion in your voice, you're not a very good speaker. I want the whole package - great arguments and a great speaker. That's why there are speaker points.

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

Philosophy Statement

I am basically a stock issues judge. I want to hear the stock issues addressed with evidence and argumentation. I do not like to hear the same evidence used over and over in each speech. Debaters need to have the same arguments, but new evidence to back up their position. I like to hear several arguments by the negative, not just one or two. Affirmative teams should know their case well, and be able to defend it and support it. I want debaters to prove their positions and arguments with evidence.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I like to see professionally dressed students who conduct themselves professionally and show respect for their opponents. I also look for students who speak clearly and students who do not speak too fast. UIL CX debate is a speaking event and students should speak at an acceptable speed.

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

Philosophy Statement

For me debate is an educational tool to build critical thinking, writing, speaking, and analyzing skills. I consider myself to be more of a traditional or conservative judge that looks for the stock issues in a round but also expects direct clash or refutation in a round. I do not want to see debaters who are not listening and flowing the constructive speeches but merely hearing a case and then digging for a brief to read. I will base my decision for the round on how well each team supports its arguments. The affirmative truly has the burden of proof and must substantiate the harms that its case will solve because the status quo is not. In turn, the negative must refute the case, not just offer a rote disadvantage without a link to the affirmative specifically and with no real impact based on the affirmative plan. If the negative wishes to offer a counterplan, the burden of proof lies on the negative as well: negative must prove another, better way to overcome the status quo that is non-topical as far as the resolution. My decision for a round will consider all the key issues and how well each was defended or attacked. Basically, the strongest, clearest argument will win. Once again, I look for direct confrontation and analysis, not just the reading of a brief.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Each debater should be understood. If rapid fire delivery gets in the way of my flowing of the debate or my understanding of what is said, points will be deducted. Communication requires audibility, clarity, and coherency. Don't sacrifice any of these just to get in more information between ragged breaths. Both teams should be courteous to one another, whether speaking or preparing. Rudeness is not acceptable, nor condescension towards an opponent. Try not to hide behind the screen of a laptop.

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

Philosophy Statement

Stock issues are important in a debate round, so they must be well-constructed and upheld. To both the Affirmative and Negative teams, arguments need to be concise and relevant--so do not just read cards without explanation. Affirmative team should have a well-constructed case, and should state their plan clearly--do not rush through it. Negative team, Topicality and DAs are to be presented in the 1NC, formatted properly, explained, and upheld throughout the round. Please give a road map before you start constructives and rebuttals.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Focus on getting your point across clearly and concisely--so do not spread. Please be courteous to your opponents.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a Tabula Rasa judge.

Style & Delivery Preferences

No rapid fire

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

Philosophy Statement

I like to say that I'm a Policymaker judge with a basis in Stock Issues. I believe that the fundamentals CX was founded on, Stock Issues, are very important and should be followed. At the same time the policy is also very important and must be utilized in-round. Because of this, I'm more fond of seeing on-case args, DAs, and theory. I don't mind CPs, but only if they're run correctly. I'm not a fan of Ks and Critical Affs, as I believe that it's easy to fall down the rabbit hole and lose track of what's actually important in the round; therefore making me believe that the educational value of these arguments is rather low. Other than that, just provide me some clash, be courteous to your opponents (rudeness will be penalized), and most importantly have fun!

Style & Delivery Preferences

Ultimately, Debate is a communication event, so whatever you do make sure you are clear and concise when speaking to the room. I don't mind speed, as long as you are understandable and not "putting on a show" like the people giving auctioneer speeches or sounding like you're about to pass out.

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

Philosophy Statement

Tell me how you want me to evaluate the round. Tell me why you win the round if I choose to evaluate the round that way. In the case that you do not specify how I should view the round, I have a few paradigms to which I default.

- I will evaluate the round based on a criteria of net benefits; being time frame, probability, and magnitude of impacts.
- I will evaluate T and Theory debate based on competing interpretations; meaning that if you win your theory argument on the flow, you're coming out on top of that particular debate
- I will not prioritize traditional theory shells above framework claims, or vise versa, unless told to do so.
- I will consider permutations tests of competition.

I'm ready to drop all of these defaults the moment that you engage in a debate as to why I should. Overall, what enjoy the most is good argumentation. Whatever style of debate you feel like you are best at, go for it. Yes, even stock issues. Just be ready to defend reasons as to why that debate should be evaluated that way

Style & Delivery Preferences

Cut down in the neg block. This makes it easier to evaluate the round, and is generally just better debate.

Pop your tags. Speed is fine, but its very helpful for me if you pop your tags and separate each card with 'and' or 'next' or something of the sort.

Keep my flow clean. Most of the time this means sign posting more than you probably feel is necessary.

Be respectful.

I prefer that rebuttals go for fewer arguments with deep analysis.

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

Philosophy Statement

When judging at UIL State I use Stock Issues with a policymaker default. Please apply where you want them to be applied, I cannot due that for you. Clash is important for a successful Debate round. most of philosophy on argumentation is considered Traditional. I do listen to them all to keep an open mind. Kritiks are not my favorite arguments by any means , but I have been known to vote for one if it proven and meets the standards need for one. Ask questions before the round starts for clarification.

Style & Delivery Preferences

A fast conversational pace works for me. Speed is not encouraged. Clear communication wins out over volume if speech is not clear.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I'm fine with most arguments. I default to an offense over defense paradigm, so be aware that defensive arguments are never really round winners. Topicality - I'll vote for the team that proves they have a better interpretation of the resolution. If this is going to be a significant part of the negative strategy, spend some time here making diverse reasons I should vote for topicality. Ground arguments, clever "topical version of the aff" arguments are imperative. Disads - Impact calculus is important. tell me why this outweighs the aff and how the disad turns the aff. Counterplans - like them. Read them. Kritiks - I'm familiar with most critical theory that's been popularized in debate. This should not preclude you explaining the intricacies of the kritik, particularly how it interacts with the aff (i.e. internal-link/impact/turns the aff portions). Other things - Be respectful. Doesn't matter if you're going for a disad or a kritik, explain all parts of your argument. Side-note about a structural thing I've seen a few times at this tournament - I'm pretty lenient on new 1AR arguments that respond to brand new arguments made in the 2NC. This may surprise you, but it shouldn't. Yes it is a constructive, but it is structurally impossible to predict/preempt the infinite number of arguments that could be made in the 2NC that weren't in the 1NC.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I'm fine with speed. If you're debating a team with not much experience debating at a fast pace, trying to outspread them will probably result in low speaker points.

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

Philosophy Statement

I tend to lean towards traditional arguments and stock issues. Maintaining an accurate flow, and following it, is very important to me. I don't enjoy frivolous arguments and time sucks. Stick to the basics. I like clear extensions, tell me why the argument or point you are presenting is important to the round, is it a voting issue or a key link to the impact. Please do not give me the same argument over and over again.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I believe Debate is a public speaking event so I deduct heavily for speed that hinders your ability to be understood or impacts your ability to speak clearly. I don't like rudeness in any form.

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

Philosophy Statement

Let me just state my philosophy by quoting Steve Clemmons: "I am persuaded by real world explanations. Humor is always appreciated and rewarded, although that alone is not enough to get my ballot. I weigh arguments as my above policy indicates. Not having evidence is not a reason not to make arguments. There is a difference and I hope that you realize that." Ken Sherwood: "I am an argument critic. Do not expect me to vote for any claim that is not developed into an argument. You must develop a complete argument including warrants, not just assertions."

Style & Delivery Preferences

Stylistically, I am probably one who should not critique others' style... but please avoid mean, nasty debate (why, oh why, must we dehumanize each other? Speed is not the issue, clarity is. Also, "I'm up" does not mean that I will automatically stop prep.

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

Philosophy Statement

I deem CX debate first and foremost a speaking event. The debate round should exhibit good communication, persuasion, and passion. The debaters should be courteous and follow UIL procedure. It should be obvious that the debaters are familiar with the case presented; therefore, terms, cards, names, and all words should be pronounced properly. The grammar of the presenters should be immaculate. The clashes should be clearly presented, and each debater should be prepared to present attack both the case and the stock issues; the round should include on case arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I prefer that the round not include excessive speed. It is essential that I be able to understand the presentation. If I can not understand the case, it will be very difficult to flow. As in all speaking events, the volume should be appropriate. There is no place in CX debate for sarcasm or insults. A good debate includes accurate evidence and good argumentation.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I want to be convinced of all points and counterpoints.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I need to hear all of the words being said.

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

Philosophy Statement

Debates should be focused and concise. It should be a careful analysis of real world issues. Evidence is obviously important in a CX round. However, careful interpretations of that evidence is of equal value to me. Debaters need to have a conceptual basis for the arguments they are making.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I still believe this is a speech contest. I do not like speed. I feel it takes away from the educational value of the debate.

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issue judge. I will base my decision on stock issues primarily. Counter plans can be used as well. The flow is blank until the arguments are out forth and at the end of the round I base my decision on what was argued. I do not like for the debate to begin in the 1N. I like for the negative to base their arguments on the affirmative case that was presented. I look for sound argumentation that is supported with evidence. I do not like for debaters to stand and read to me for 8 minutes and expect for me to link the arguments. I like for their to be argumentation with analysis. In the rebuttals, I believe that debaters should address the most important arguments in the round and extend them.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I do not judge a lot so I am not quick with the pen. The round should be at a moderate pace.

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a relatively straight forward Stock Issues judge. Topicality needs to be very specific but can be a voter for me if it outright nullifies the affirmative. I believe in solid discussion and argumentation revolving around evidence that correlates directly to the stock issues. I do have an open mind that leans towards policy-making if it is tied to solvency and is structured as such. Comparative advantage cases are welcomed. Kritiks are acceptable to me, however direct links are important.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I respect clarity and significant communication skills rather than advanced speed skills. Having a clearly defined set of arguments trumps having a muddled approach with many shallow attempts to negate or prop up positions.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
MORTON, JOY	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills	<input type="radio"/> Quantity	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	B
	Go With The Flow	<input type="radio"/> Res. Issues	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality	4	3	2	3	3	2	
		<input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Equal							

Philosophy Statement

First and foremost I believe that communication is an extremely important aspect for any speaking event. Supporting evidence needs to be clear and "on the mark". If everyone in the room for a debate does not understand what is happening, then it is not a debate.

Connect with the judge by establishing and maintaining eye contact.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I want you to tell me why your arguments matter. Make an impact calculus and walk me through each functioning part. Your arguments mean nothing without impacts. I generally do not buy kritiks, so if you read one it will likely not convince me. Also, pick your battles. That is to say, when it is appropriate for the NEG to drop an argument (assuming there is no offense on the flow), you should drop it and focus on the arguments you are winning when you get to the rebuttals. Explain your arguments briefly after you present evidence to enhance understanding of the root of your argument. I love analytical arguments, bring them on. The most important thing you need to do in order to win your debate is convince me that the AFF plan does or does not make the world a better place.

Articulation is superior to speed in most circumstances. Be polite to both your partner and opponents or your speaker points will suffer. Don't stare at your paper the entire speech-- have confidence!! You made it this far, so now have fun and enjoy today.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

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

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

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I am generally a stock issues judge, but I am open to other styles. Generally the affirmative plan must fulfill all burdens for change. The negative is charged with proving the affirmative is lacking on the issues. I need clear articulate presentations in an organized fashion. Arguments should be clearly related to the current topic and supported by strong creditable evidence. Debate is and always has been a speaking event so speaking skills are highly valued.

I do not like rapid fire speeches. The judge and the opposing team deserve to hear clear and understandable the speeches.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I believe that you should debate the way you want to debate. However, I have some preferences. I have a strong stocks background, but I do like when students weigh out the implications of their plans/disadvantages. I look for actual argumentation in rounds. Tell me why your case outweighs. Debate theory is fine with me if you can explain it well. I believe that counter plans should be mutually exclusive. I'm fine with T arguments, especially if a plan is truly non-topical. I'm also okay with "new in the 2" if you limit your arguments to on-case in the 2nd constructive. I'm not a fan of critiques. Ask for clarification, etc. pre-round.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I want to be able to understand you. Emphasize those tag lines. Be polite to each other.

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

Philosophy Statement

I consider myself a policymaker; meaning I always opt for the best policy option in-round be it a plan or the status-quo.

Both teams should be looking to "make the world a better place."

Impacts should be big, (specific) links are vital.

Kritiks are fine so long as they have an alternative that is semi-tangible.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speed is fine, I'm a great flow.
I'll give 3 clears.
Speed should never affect clarity.

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

Philosophy Statement

I have evolved from a mostly stock issues judge to more of a policy-maker. I do flow the stock issues in a round, but ultimately, one of the teams will convince me that they are offering the best policy option. I am not a fan of theory debate, but am open to reasonable counter-plans. I do not like kritiks. I look at debate as an evidence-driven event where credible proof by well-qualified authors is needed. I will vote on properly-structured Topicality if the affirmative cannot defend its definitions with a properly structured response. I like well-organized speeches with road maps and sign-posting.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Debate is ultimately a speaking event, and speaking skills are important to me. Communication is important; rapid fire that interferes with that is discouraged.

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

Philosophy Statement

I am an impacts judge who came from a stock issues background. I started out as a very conservative debater but through my appearances at state and my college debate moved to impact weighing. I will cover almost any argument in the round as long as the debaters weigh it for me. I do not weigh any arguments for my self. A topicality and an inherency argument are the same for me till a team tells me otherwise. Teams should run the arguments they are comfortable with, but be sure to weigh them. On kritiks I like to have an alternative or there is no way for me to weigh the impact.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I like clear speakers that can explain the cards they have read. Speed is ok but if a team finishes the 1ac with 2 minuets left they should have added to or gone slower. Always be polite. I will punish teams that are rude.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a policymaker judge who does not ignore the stock issues. Do not run topicality unless the AFF plan is truly non-topical. If you start telling me it is technically non-topical, I'm going to quit listening and I might not tune back in when you get to a real issue. Well-thought out analysis and evidence of DAs will be essential to winning a NEG ballot. Extinction arguments don't usually sway my vote. Impact calculus will sway me—tell me why the harms/advantages outweigh the disadvantages, and vice-versa. Don't claim abuse on a technicality and don't spread because I am not sympathetic and I think spreading is abusive.

I believe that CX is a form of communication, and that excessive and distracting speed, as well as rudeness, has no place in the competition. If you go too fast and I can't flow it, I won't vote on it. If you're rude to your opponent, I will be distracted and be much less likely to vote for you, no matter how convincing you may think you are.

Style & Delivery Preferences

PEEK, SANDRA	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	ABE
				4	4	5	4	3	4	

Philosophy Statement

I try to be a policy judge unless as team warrants why the judge should use a different framework for decision making. I prefer impact-based debate. I believe stock issues are important but will not vote on them simply because they are traditionally used as voters. This also means that saying you solve for war is not enough. I want the chain you use to get there to be warranted. Explain to me why your arguments matter. Why should I vote on topicality? Why is security more important than privacy? Why would I prefer your framework over your opponents.

I am not a huge fan of break neck speed. Some speed is okay but I want to understand the cards. I want to flow every argument so be certain to signpost as you go. I also expect debaters to be polite and respectful.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I would classify myself as a policy-maker judge. I want the affirmative team to present a solid case that aptly puts the resolution into action. Likewise, the negative team should attempt to invalidate the affirmative's plan by highlighting its defects. I would expect disadvantages and counterplans. However, I also believe that the affirmative is obligated to uphold the stock issues. If a negative team can demonstrate that the affirmative's stock issues either fail or are non-existent, I will vote negative. I don't mind Ks as a negative strategy, but I am not a big fan of Kritikal affirmatives.

A good debate can only occur if both teams (and the judge) are able to understand all of the verbal arguments. To this end, it is imperative that debaters speak clearly and audibly. Spreading is fine, but sacrificing enunciation and clarity for speed is never wise. I'd always prefer depth over breadth. Additionally, I believe that gesturing and sarcasm should be kept to a minimum.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I'm at tab judge at heart. I don't really have a preference for what arguments are ran in a round as long as they are topical and are up-to-date evidence wise. I like rounds to be organized and speakers should be clear with what arguments they are running. I like to see good clash in a round, but no bullying. I believe that there is a fine line between being confident and cocky and if you cross it, you may get the loss. Tell me, in your own words, why your argument is superior. Don't spout off evidence with no explanation. Ultimately, I vote on top speaker, who ran the better arguments, and who has the most emotional appeal.

Please! Do not spread! I have no idea what you're saying when you spread. If you see me stop flowing, it's probably because you were talking too fast for me to understand what your argument is. I love analytical arguments when they are logical and delivered well. I tend give the highest speaker points to those who are well organized, polite, have emotional appeal, and know their evidence inside and out.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I'm a tab judge. I want the teams to run the round how they want to and then give me voters. Without voters, I will default policy maker.

No preference.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I determine the winner of the round based on the net advantages of the affirmative vs. the negative. In rebuttals I want to hear how I should evaluate those impacts. Give impact calculus. Compare and extend warrants rather than just authors. I evaluate offense vs defense. Narrow down the debate in rebuttals. Give me a role of the ballot.

Be clear and enunciate. Signpost and label/number arguments. I prefer a faster round.

Style & Delivery Preferences

On Topicality, I default to competing interpretations.
 I won't vote on Inherency unless it can be proven the actual aff plan is already in place in SQ. I don't care about inherent barriers. Either the plan is happening or it isn't.
 I am not entrenched in most kritik literature. Please slow down and clearly explain those arguments. I expect a clear alternative that actually advocates action.
 I will vote on competitive counterplans. Absent a theory debate, I will vote on topical counterplans. I don't feel it is fair for the negative to run counterplans that link into their own DAs/Ks/Solvency arguments.
 I feel disadvantages are essential for the negative to run. It gives an impact to weigh against the affirmative case.
 Please no new in the 2NC. It's not strategic. Split the neg block.
 Be specific on your flow. If not going line-by-line, tell me how to group arguments. I don't time roadmaps or flashing evidence, but will if I feel you are being abusive and trying to steal prep time. Please maintain professional decorum.
 If you have any more specific questions, please ask before the round begins.

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

Philosophy Statement

I believe that the burden of proof falls on the negative team. The negative team must provide evidence against the stock issues of the affirmative team.

Medium speed preferred.
 Rapid fire discouraged.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speaker points carry much weight in my judging criteria.

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

Philosophy Statement

I've always told debaters that I'm somewhere between being a stock issues judge and a policy maker. Stock issues typically take a precedence for me because I believe it's the duty of the AFF plan to be as air tight as possible. If your plan is already happening in the squo, I shouldn't vote for it. If your plan has no solvency, I shouldn't vote for it, etc. But, I may sometimes overlook minor stock issues problems in favor of solid policy making. As far as NEG is concerned, I am open to all T's, DA's, CP's, and on case arguments. I'm not particularly keen on kritiks, and you'd have to work prodigiously hard to sell me on them. You'll more than likely be wasting your time, though. Clearly label and list all arguments. Impact calculus is a must for each team. Good debates are decided in the last two speeches, it's your job to convince me why you should leave the room victorious.

I like when debaters are clear and brisk. It keeps the debate moving and ensures everyone is getting concise information. There is a clear difference between speaking briskly, and spreading. In the reality we live in, our daily and profession lives, spreading is not an actual or credible speaking style. Likewise, it is not in my debate rounds. Your job as debater is to adjust to your judge, not the other way around.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I consider myself to be a policymaker judge before anything else. I like to evaluate the policy aspects from both the aff and neg side while also weighting the impacts from both sides. An impact calculus is very important and should be brought up in the rebuttal speeches. Splitting the block is encouraged. I definitely support and encourage new arguments in the 2NC. If a Kritik is ran, I will not flow it or vote on it.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I am good with speed just as long as you are clear enough. Do not be rude to opponents. Please give a road map before your speech.

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

Philosophy Statement

I tend to vote mainly on stock issues but I will vote on tabs on the round if need be. Without proper stock issues the affirmative team does not have a proper case which should not be debated. The main stock issues I vote on are topicalities and solvencies. If your case isn't topical it shouldn't be used and if it doesn't solve for anything then there is no point of running that case. If I see that tab arguments seem to be overweighing the round then I will most likely vote on tabs. If I see that the arguments presented are back and forth between the teams, I will take into consideration persuasiveness of the speeches and how the arguments were presented. You can have the best evidence for a case but if you can't prove to me why it's the best then there's an issue there.

Style & Delivery Preferences

If you decide to spread be sure I can clearly hear what you are saying. If I put my pen down it means I cannot understand you and that you need to speak more precise rather than worrying about speed. Being rude to get a point is across is fine but being rude just because you think you can is not okay.

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

Philosophy Statement

I believe that debate is first and foremost a communication event. Secondly, I believe that integrity and decorum are an integral part of good debate. Debating is a fundamental part of our democracy and should be practiced in good form by our youth to ensure the integrity and future of our nation. To that end, I believe that debate is a sacred practice. I would prefer for debaters to take the event seriously and not try to trick, deceive, or dodge. Please investigate, challenge, and intrigue me with your analytical abilities and application of evidence, theory, and rhetoric to succeed in this tournament. I'm always looking for what stinks, and so should you.

Have fun!

Style & Delivery Preferences

I am not a fan of "old school debate" nor "progressive debate". I rather favor "communicative debate". So don't try to wow me with your profusion of saliva, or crossing your "t"s with strict stock issues. Anything over 350 words a minute is too fast. (Yes, I do know how fast that is.) Just state/defend your case and refute your opponent's, and we'll all be happy.

ROBERTSON, REMINGTON	Other Games Theorist	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	A
				4	4	5	4	3	4	

Philosophy Statement

The games judge views debate as a contest with arbitrarily imposed rules. He also believes that any rule has the potential to hurt one side or the other of the round. So he rejects all rules except those that the debaters ask for before & within the round.

In terms of theory, this is identical to the tabular rasa position: the judge will adapt to any theory that both sides seem to agree on.

Rounds conducted before game-playing judges can be very liberating: debaters are treated as free-willed entities best able to decide what debate should be, fully able to choose the structure, theory, and substance of the debate round. Other debaters use the lack of fixed structure as a license to plunge the debate round into chaos. The games paradigm has unique risks and rewards. You have been cautioned!

Style & Delivery Preferences

As long as I can understand you, I have no problems with speed v. clarity. I will say "clear" if you're not communicating the content of your speech to my liking.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
ROBINSON, TERRI	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	AD
Philosophy Statement				3	4	5	4	2	5	
I don't believe anyone is truly tabula rasa, but I am open to many types of arguments. I default policymaker but critical arguments are fine.				Style & Delivery Preferences			I can't physically flow high rates of speed. Slow down for tags, source cites and anything you want to be sure gets on my flow. Please treat each other with respect.			
RODRIGUEZ, JESUS	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	A
Philosophy Statement				4	4	4	5	3	2	
I am a Stocks Issues Judge, when I judge I go in the room with my mind not made up at all. I will flow Aff until Neg provides good and well structured attacks that the Aff drops. Evidence is an essential tool. Do not like when debaters forget that there is a judge and go off and basically argue with each other in an unprofessional matter. Not big on speed, if the speech can be said at a good pace and is easier to understand.				Style & Delivery Preferences			Confidence and eye contact are a big deal for me, I want the debaters to be comfortable with their speeches. I love to hear road maps, it helps the flowing to not be all over the place.			
ROWE, DANIEL	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	ABDEK
Philosophy Statement	Debates with plans are about			5	5	5	5	4	5	
I evaluate debates based in an offense vs. defense paradigm where-by i weigh the relative risks and benefits associated with a ballot rendered in any direction. This does NOT mean "risk of a link" type args are necessarily getting you anywhere. I believe you can win 100% defense to arguments, although that can be difficult. I believe that debate is game. It is a game that also serves a lot of wonderful purposes for all sorts of people. A lot of debate these days come down to differences in philosophy regarding debate itself and how debates should occur. I am open to these debates and evaluate them like I evaluate all arguments. I am flexible to a great degree and am open to persuasion.				Style & Delivery Preferences			I think style and delivery are only relevant if there is a relationship between your style and delivery and the content of your argument. Or if your style of delivery impedes effective communication in rounds. I prefer fast, clear debaters. Clarity outweighs speed every time. I am not sympathetic to complaints about speed unless there is a legitimate medical or physiological condition that requires accommodating.			
RUDOLPH, TAYLOR	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	BK
Philosophy Statement				5	5	5	1	3	5	
You can view my paradigms here on Tabroom: https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?search_first=Taylor&search_last=Rudolph				Style & Delivery Preferences			Look towards paradigms above. Don't matter. I will say clear once then stop flowing if I can't understand you. I have an extremely high tolerance for speed, no one has ever outspread me... but you have to be good at it.			

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I evaluate debates by determining which team has won the best reasons for why the plan is a good or bad idea. I am open to any argument that is clearly warranted. Stock issues are only a voter for me if it is explained why they outweigh other issues in the round.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I prefer a style that focuses on the substance of the round over rhetorical flair. The heavier the focus on evidence, the better.

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

Philosophy Statement

I like for the debaters to set the style of the round. I am usually a Tab judge. If the debaters debate stocks or policy, I follow their lead. If the round is muddled, I usually vote policy style

Style & Delivery Preferences

I like for debates to be clear. I can handle speed, but you must be clear in order for me to flow the round.

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

Philosophy Statement

I believe that this is a learning experience, and everyone must always remain respectful within all rounds. I also want clear and precise information. Speed reading is okay, as long as it can be understood. If at any point I can not understand what you are saying, I will not flow, thus, it will not be considered. I also want information within the arguments, not just time killing information.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Be clear and precise on information that is given. Don't speak so fast that I can't understand you, but speed reading is okay. Also, know what you are saying, and talking about. Remember it is a speaking event. Look at opponents and judge, not just hiding behind a piece of paper.

Counterplans and DA's are acceptable. Please make sure that the Counterplan is ran correctly, as well as your DA's. I also believe that Kritiks are a waste of time. We are here for a debate, so do not throw any well that's just not a good plan. Debate it. Tell me why it is, or it is not a good plan.

Most importantly, have fun! Good Luck to all!

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

Philosophy Statement

Debate is meant to be a professional persuasive event. Debaters should be courteous and professional at all times. This is UIL State and debaters should adhere to UIL rules. While I am a primary stock issue judge, I do have some policy beliefs as well. Remember that debate is a persuasive communication event. Rapid fire could interfere with this if excessive.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I can flow speed, but debaters should be aware excessive speed will impact speaker points as it does interfere with your persuasiveness. Rudeness is unacceptable in all situations.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

First and foremost debate is a communication event. Communicate with me. I am a tabula rasa judge. I will vote on any issue run properly that is given weight in the round. Explain why your arguments matter. Explain why I should care about your arguments. Tell me what to write for the reason for decision. I enjoy topicality discussions when they are well constructed and not time sucks. I believe kritiks are almost never run properly by high school students. It is ok for negative to kick arguments, but not for them to waste whole speeches. Arguments should be important or do not run them in the first place.

Debate is communication. While debaters have to talk faster than everyday communication, debate is not a contest to see who can talk the fastest. Do not spread. Do not talk faster than you can enunciate. Look at the judge and make eye contact as much as possible. If you are talking to fast, I will put my pen down. If you do not look up, you will not notice that.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

STOCK ISSUES ARE KEY TO DEBATE
 (Significance, Harms, Inherency, Topicality, and Solvency)
 Plan text is also critical for debate.
 Topicality arguments must include all parts for me to consider them. (Interpretation, Violation, Standards, and Voters)
 I expect all parts of Disadvantages to be stated and argued. That includes Uniqueness, Link, (Brink when available) and Impact. Please weigh the impacts.
 No ad hominem attacks please.

Non TFA Style. Clear and precise. Not Hyper Fast. Not super slow.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

First and foremost all U.I.L. debate rules should be followed. Stock issues should be fulfilled by the affirmative during 1AC. Topicality is a strong voting issue. I usually do not vote Neg because of kritiks or counter plans, but I am willing to consider them. I prefer solvency, disadvantage, solvency, harms, or inherency arguments.
 Please flow the round so that arguments are organized and well presented. Road maps are encouraged. If a debater would like to ask, "Judge ready? Opponent ready? Partner ready?" they may do so, however I feel this is a major time waste in the round. I am always ready and your partner and opponent should be as well. If you have a personal timer, please turn off the sound.
 If you are using a computer, please do not block your face or bend to read from the screen.
 Remember to not just argue the plan but everyone should communicate to the judge why they should win the round.

Remember that cross examination debate is a professional, character building event. Be confident in your case and arguments but do not be abusive or rude to one another in the round. Professionalism and communication to judge are highly important. I do not mind speed as long as communication to judge and opponent is not lost.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

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

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

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I'm not here to tell you how to debate. Run any arguments you want to run, but run them properly and correctly. Don't throw arguments at your opponents if they aren't prevalent to their case. Especially Topicality.

Clear and articulate. Speed is okay, just enunciate and slow down on the tag lines.

Style & Delivery Preferences

STANDLY, STAN	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	B
	Tab with Stock Preference			3	3	3	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I believe in a few things:

1. Signposting is important. You must label information with more than just a number. You should know and say what type of information you are reading.
2. Application of argumentation is important. Do not just read information. Apply it to an attack or defense. Tell me how you want me to use and understand the evidence you are reading. Do not just read a bunch of things and hope something works. If you don't know how something works, and can't tell me, I will not do the debating for you. You wouldn't give me a gallon of paint without instructions on what to paint, so don't give me evidence with out telling me how and where it is used.
3. It is my job to judge the effectiveness of the students debating in the round. It is not my job to debate the round in my head, or to debate you. I will simply evaluate how well you do your job.

Debate is COMMUNICATION first and foremost.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I consider myself a stock issues judge. Address the stock issues that are relative and weigh advantages/disadvantages. I do not like to hear complaints about "abuse" by your opponents. Please be polite and professional. A debater who thinks himself/herself better than everyone and shows it through an arrogant demeanor will lose speaker/style points with me. Please show the flaws in your opponents' arguments. Do not use your entire speech time to read an abundance of someone else's words/prepared arguments. I enjoy pure debate. Use your own thinking and support it with evidence. Explain the impacts to your case or your opponents' arguments. Dumping several generic disads and thinking that they make an impact on the round is a mistake as far as I am concerned. Good luck, learn much, and have fun!

I prefer debaters who are clear and concise in their delivery of arguments. If debaters speak too fast, it does the debate no good. I cannot flow the arguments nor can your opponents argue against them. Being polite and professional carry much weight with me.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issues judge. Address the stock issues that are relative and weigh advantages/disadvantages. Please be polite and professional. Having an arrogant demeanor and not being polite to your opponents can lose speaker points. A speaker who provides no analysis and simply reads someone else's words/evidence is not practicing debate. Please explain the impacts and connections of the evidence you are reading. Please keep all issues live in the round and provide voters in rebuttals.

Be polite and professional during all debate activities. Please practice true debate- do not stand on tricks alone to win rounds. If you speak too fast for me to flow, then the value of the round is lost. I cannot flow the arguments nor can your opponents argue against them.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
STRAUS, ROBERT	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	ABD
				3	3	2	4	3	1	
Philosophy Statement										
Straight stock issues, I expect the aff to prove a prima facie case. Speed(delivery) kills and I do deduct speaker points for it. I must understand what you are presenting both negative and affirmative to vote for you.							Style & Delivery Preferences			In addition to above link your evidence and arguments to voters.
SWEETMAN, KATHERYN	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	A
				4	4	3	2	2	1	
Philosophy Statement										
Stock issues are of the utmost importance.							Style & Delivery Preferences			I should be able to understand everything being said, road maps are preferred when listing evidence.
I do not like Kritiks. Counter-plans should only be run if they are not topical.										
TANKERSLEY, KALEIGH	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	AK
				3	2	2	5	3	2	
Philosophy Statement										
I am a Tabula Rasa judge. I do like to see structure within the debate, but I would rather see debaters arguing the actual ideas that are in the evidence and not the framing of the arguments or the dates on the cards.							Style & Delivery Preferences			I do not tolerate disrespectful debaters. Delivery should be at a comfortable pace.
TANKERSLEY, STEPHANIE	Stock issues	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	B
				3	4	1	5	4	3	
Philosophy Statement										
Stock Issues judge looking for adequate clash between teams.							Style & Delivery Preferences			No speeding or dumping.
Also feel that clear persuasive communication skills are paramount to a good debate. Being able to explain your case and the evidence to support it is crucial to winning my vote.										

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
TEAGUE, KELSIE	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills	<input type="radio"/> Quantity	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	B
	Stock Issues mainly, but I'll	<input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	3	5	3	3	1	1	

Philosophy Statement

I do NOT like speed or Spreading.

I will listen to everything other than Kritiks as long as they are decent arguments and the debaters aren't grasping at straws. Although the best way to win my ballot is to support or defeat the stock issues.

I believe debaters should have well structured arguments that they can support with evidence. I do not think debaters should just read card after card with no explanation of what the card says and means.

I am persuaded by real world explanations.

Humor is always appreciated and rewarded, although that alone is not enough to get my ballot.

Not having evidence is not a reason not to make arguments. Analytical arguments can be just as good if not better than evidence based arguments.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I'm not a fan of speed or spreading, I like to understand the speaker. I like for the speaker to explain his/her cards not just read each card and move on.

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

Philosophy Statement

Read whatever you want, I will flow it. As far as intervention, I only intervene on completely offensive args like rape good, sexism good, racism good, etc.

Kritiks: Make sure to explain the argument and provide in-depth analysis. Additionally, I do not think you have to win the alt in order to win the k, especially if there is a lot of offense elsewhere in the k.

Counterplans: Who doesn't love a god PIC? AoA & AoE CPs generally flow AFF unless you can argue the true merits of the new agent.

Disadvantages: This strategic method should be utilized in most rounds. There are almost always at least 3 or 4 disadvantages to any one plan. Topicality: T debates can be interesting, but that doesn't happen very often. I honestly don't like voting on T because I see it more as a time suck than anything else. Arguing standards and definitions does not allow for an educational debate, but if it is carried across the flow it will have some weight in the RFD.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Debate however you see fit. Different people have different approaches to communication and argumentation. With that said, speed is fine.

Use your cross-ex effectively.

Debate is supposed to be fun. It is for this reason any Star Wars references in the round might result in an extra speaker point.

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

Philosophy Statement

I believe in being a tabula rasa judge. I default to policy. I expect topicality to have structure, likewise with a disadvantage. I will vote on topicality if all components are present and argued appropriately. Critiques, K, are becoming a part of negative strategies. I am not as knowledgeable with K's so I would advise to keep it simple with me. A K needs to be germane to the round. I do not like K affs. I believe in debating the resolution agreed upon for debate this year. If you believe you are fast then you should know how many words per minute you average. If you are going to go fast then you really need to number your arguments. Clash, refutation, is key in the round. Keep the flow clean. If flash time takes longer than 30 seconds then it comes out of the team's prep time doing the flashing.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Presentation and decorum do impact your speaker points. I do not like rudeness from speakers. You can be firm in CX, but don't cross the line to rudeness. When you ask a question in CX, allow the opponent to answer. No open CX. Additionally, this is a communication sport, signpost, signpost, signpost. A roadmap at the beginning is nice, but during refutation you need to signpost where you expect me to flow the argument/refutation you are presenting.

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

Philosophy Statement

When reading evidence it is important that you tell me how you are using the evidence, and where it goes. Do not simply read evidence; tell me how you are using it and why what you are reading is important to the debate round. I will judge the round based off what both teams tell me are the important issues in the round, and why they are important. Don't spend your time making an argument without telling me why it is important. Signposting your speech so I know what arguments you are contributing to is important.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I believe that during a debate you should illustrate that you know how to effectively communicate with your audience.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I am generally impressed by clear arguments and definite clash. I am not impressed by teams that want to "trick" their way into a win. If I don't understand your arguments, I won't vote on them. I believe debate needs to have real-world applications. In making decisions, I often weigh Affirmative's advantages vs. Negative's disadvantages.

Can flow 'some' speed; taglines must be clearly organized and presented during constructive speeches.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

Im here to assess your best. Be sure to offer perspective and well developed arguments that show a total understanding of the topic. How everything relates. For example, articulate the connection between funding and solvency - "if there's no money to pay for the enforcement/products/etc, then it can't work" type of conceptual development. I tend to be a stock issues judge, but lean towards the practicality of policy maker. There should be some sort of evidence to back up a theory, but too much evidence without depth is not enough to win an argument. Really answer the WHYS and the HOWs. I value the speaking style as much as the quality of the material. Speeches should be a convincing presentation, effectively communicating ideas.

Clear, engaging, convincing where everyone in the room is able to absorb the information at the same pace. No arms as metronome, no gasping for air, and unless you're planning a career as an auctioneer or medical warning ad label reader, no spreading.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I consider myself to be about as true of a tab judge as you can get. I will listen to any type of argument or case that is presented in the round as long as it is ran correctly. I want to be convinced that you have a clear understanding of the material that you are reading, so you need to go the extra mile. Don't just read me 8 or 5 minutes of evidence - take the time to synthesize you argument and tell me 1) what the author is saying and how it relates to the argument you are making, 2) where it should go on my flow, and 3) why I should vote on it in your favor. I am a firm believer that the debaters should be the ones to decide which direction the round goes, meaning that I will not judge the round based on what I would have done as a debater - I will judge based on what you present to me and how effectively it works under the given circumstances of the debate. I expect to see a round full of direct and clear clash between the two teams; don't leave any issue out in the open. Do your best to fight to win every single voting issue and please remember that this is a persuasive speaking contest. Sell me your arguments! Give me reasons to prefer your attacks and justify why I should vote on them. In terms of speed, please have clear and understandable diction and remember that you are competing for a UIL state championship. Make sure that you adhere to the protocol set forth by the University Interscholastic League. As a judge, I give you complete control of the round. Do what you do best and do it correctly. If you do all of these things, you'll have no trouble at all!

Make sure to be clear on taglines and speed is determined by UIL.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a policy-maker judge. My preference is to see clash between the Affirmative's advantages and the Negative's disadvantages. With that in mind, DA links need to be clearly demonstrated, and impacts clearly shown if the Affirmative's plan goes into effect. Topicality arguments are fine if (1) they're used strategically or (2) the Negative team truly believes the Affirmative plan is not topical.

I will not flow rounds if the speakers are talking too fast. Speakers should be able to step away from their evidence and coherently connect that evidence to the arguments they are trying to make. Both sides need to be able to strike a balance between evidence and argument.

Style & Delivery Preferences

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I am generally a stock issues judge but will vote on the arguments presented in the round. I like to hear both on case and off case arguments. DAs, topicality, kritiks, etc. are fine, but should not be the only thing the neg. brings up. There should be some direct clash with the affirmative case.

Communication is essential in debate. A little speed is fine, but if you see me stop flowing, you should slow down.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I judge a round on the stock issues of debate: Topicality, Inherency, Harms, Significance, and Solvency. I need the Affirmative to prove that they truly solve the harms that they present.

Debate is a speech competition. The speed and delivery should not get in the way of your communication. If I cannot flow your arguments, you are speaking too fast.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a tab judge and will listen to whatever you choose to run. I do not, however, like critical affirmatives. One of the most important thing in a round is debaters understand what they are arguing, and for this reason I am less inclined to like a round in which the main argument is surrounding critical theory unless it is well understood by the debaters. I have never voted solely on a topicality, but should a team be blatantly untopical and the neg argue it, I would consider it. In all other cases, T is not generally a voting issue for me. I am fine with DAs, CPs, Ks, and on case arguments. New on case in the 2nd neg constructive is also fine with me. As a tab judge, I will listen to whatever framework is presented in the round for me to use in my vote. I also enjoy teams presenting impact calcs at the end of rebuttals to sum up the round and make your final case as to why you should win. At the end of the round, I will not 'do work' for either team and will only cast my vote based arguments that have been specifically stated. If you have any questions about my paradigm feel free to ask before the round starts!

I am fine with whatever speed teams choose to use, but I also believe a debate should be centered the content of the arguments and not who can outspread who in order to get more on the flow to win the round.

Style & Delivery Preferences

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

Philosophy Statement

I am stock issues judge. I appreciate quality evidence more than quantity. I do not like counter plans. I need to be able to hear and understand each speaker. If I am not able to hear what you are saying, then I am not able to flow your speeches, therefore unable to hear your case. So, it is imperative to speak in a manner and a pace that is suitable for a person to flow your speeches.

As I stated in my philosophy statement: speed delivery should be at the pace suitable for a judge to flow your case.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Remember, you need to make me believe that your case is valid and should win.

Secondly, I expect debaters to be respectful to one another. Remember quality debate, provides quality evidence, excellent structure and explanation.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issues judge at heart. That does not mean I won't stray from my comfort zone. The Disads and Counter Plans have been around for a long time and I don't have issues listening to them or voting on them. The same thing can be said of topicality. The critique is an argument that requires explanation since I am not a student of philosophy. I have to understand what the alternative does or doesn't do.

Cover all of your Stock and Voting Issues. In your last speech, remind me why I should vote for you.

Cross examination - Since debate is a competition, I expect debaters to be passionate and pointed but show respect to your opponent.

Fast speaking is fine as long as you are clear. I do NOT like spreading or rapid fire. If I can't follow I will put my pen down.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Clear and precise. Tell me why I should vote for you. I can follow some speed but I will put my pen down for rapid fire and spreading.

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a stock issues judge and will base my decision on who wins the stock issues. The AFF must win all five stock issues, while the neg need win or cripple only one stock issue to win the round. The 1AC must be prima-facie and their plan must have all five plan planks in the 1AC to be able to solve. I want to see advantages given in the 1AC. I expect the NEG to argue the stock issues and do something more than run disadvantages. Since I will base my decision on the five stock issues, I prefer not to see any counter-plans or kritiks, and I will never vote for a CP or K. If you want my vote on the negative, please do not run a CP OR K.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I expect each debater to speak clearly and pronounce all words correctly with proper enunciation and articulation. I do not like rapid fire delivery. I consider debate a gentleman/gentlewoman's duel with words. I can flow fast, but if words are run together, poorly articulated or mispronounced, then effective communication has not occurred between the debater, his/her opponent, and the judge. If effective communication does not occur because of speed on either side, I cannot vote for them.

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

Philosophy Statement

I follow the tabula rasa philosophy. I expect the affirmative team to present the best possible case in order to support the resolution. Once the affirmative case has been presented I would like for the negative team to address each portion of the affirmative case and refute the case to the best of their ability. The basic idea is present a case and then convince me why or why not. Make your presentation solid.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Debate is a speaking event. I understand you want to present as much information as possible but it must be presented in a manner that can be followed and understood. Please present your case in a normal speaking manner.

WATSON, COLE	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	A
	Educational Advocate			3	1	5	5	5	5	

Philosophy Statement

I believe this event is an educational event which means you, your opponent, any spectators, and myself should be educated during each round. This should sound ambiguous to you, but that's the point. I want you to actually think about debate and how it's benefiting you. How are you promoting education? How are you educating me? How are you being educated through debate? This should also tell you that I am a fan of debate theory and in-round impacts. And if you've read this far, then you'll know that I prefer original theory arguments and original analysis as opposed to pre-scripted, pre-flowed, arguments that your coach gave you. I will circle your team on the piece of paper that the Tab room gives me if you prove to me that you promoted the most education in the round. Debate should be educational. Debate should not be a matter of monotonous arguments that we've all heard time and time again. Challenge the preconceptions of debate and I guarantee you will find a way to win.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I believe this event is a speaking competition, so I expect you to treat it as such. With that being said, don't get caught up being a formal speaker and forget to be a competitive debater. If I can't understand you because you're speaking too fast or speaking poorly then I will not flow nor will I attempt to flow what you are saying.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
WELCH, JULIA KINSEY	Other Hypothesis tester	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	AB
				3	2	1		4	1	

Philosophy Statement

CX debate is preparation for real-world thought and action, so persuasive skills, clear analysis, direct clash, and quality evidence are all important. 1AC should make a clear, well-reasoned, well-structured case, persuasively presented; 1NC should address that case directly, adapting neg stock arguments to the case at hand. Connect the dots for me - never assume I assume. Tell me why each card you read matters and how it connects. Be prepared to show me your evidence. CX should be cordial and collegial, never snarky or dismissive.

Style & Delivery Preferences

CX should be grounded in reality, not a sterile word game for gasping, spitting spreaders. Look up at me. I will put my pen down if you're going too fast to be understood or if you've just lost me.

WHITE, RICK	Policymaker with a little bit of stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	AB
				3	3	3	5	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I'm a policy judge with a little bit of stock issues. I weigh the evidence offered by both sides & the manner in which it was argued to make my ruling.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I prefer a moderate to fast style of speech but no spreading. I treat CX like it's a courtroom where the AFF & NEG are like lawyers & I'm the judge they are trying to convince.

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a Tabula Rosa judge. I want to hear your best arguments. I am fine with whatever speed you prefer to speak, whether that is fast or slow. Do your thing. On Kritiks, I will evaluate whatever you want me to evaluate, but remember that the best Kritik debates are those in which everyone in the room understands what's going on. On CP's and DA's, I want to see all of the component parts of these arguments and I will vote for the best impacts. On topicality, each topicality should have all of its parts and the affirmative team should attack every part of the topicality.

Style & Delivery Preferences

Speak quickly if you want, slowly if you don't or anywhere in between. Just do whatever you are comfortable with.

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

Philosophy Statement

The stock issues are important to the knowledge acquisition about the topic which help prepare debaters to argue definitively on either side. The most convincing debaters will be well prepared, organized, and effective speakers. They should have good manners at all times toward all participants. Debate is direct communication on a diverse topic and participants should be able to convince me for their side.

Style & Delivery Preferences

I believe that debate is communication and should be delivered clearly, concisely, and analytically. There is no need for speed reading in debate. Extemporaneous speeches for all but the first affirmative constructive are preferred.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE	
WILDER, STACI	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	
				3	4	3	2	2	1	
Philosophy Statement										
My judging paradigm is mainly concentrated on stock issues. I prefer to act as a juror who evaluates whether or not the affirmative has satisfied the stock issues in the debate.							Style & Delivery Preferences			I prefer a moderate delivery of the case, with an emphasis on the main points being presented. I am open to multiple arguments, but I am opposed to kritiks.
As far as the delivery of the case, I am not opposed to speed, but I must be able to understand the case. In addition to this, speed shouldn't be such that it is considered abusive.										
WILSON, JAYELLEN	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	B
				3	3	3	5	3	1	
Philosophy Statement										
I expect a debate to be just that - a debate. I am primarily a stock issues judge in that I expect the affirmative to solidly uphold their case and defend the solvency of their plan. The negative team should provide clash for the debate. If you run a DA, I expect it to be well presented and linked. I am open to counterplans, but these, too, must be well run and solidified.							Style & Delivery Preferences			It is imperative that debaters speak clearly and audibly. Speed is fine as long as I can understand you. Sacrificing enunciation and clarity for speed is never wise. There is also a fine line between being assertive and being rude.
I will flow the round carefully and look for analysis with the topic. Debaters should provide the proper evidence to uphold their arguments.										
WITT, MELISSA	Other	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	BEK
	Somewhere between Policy-			3	4	5	3	2	5	
Philosophy Statement										
I enjoy policy debate and do not have a preference between traditional or progressive arguments. I prefer to hear off-case and on-case argumentation. I enjoy stock issues, theory, and kritikal argumentation but I insist on understanding, analysis and application of these arguments in the round. No rudeness will be tolerate and may be addressed via speaker points, a loss, or both depending on the severity.							Style & Delivery Preferences			Organized delivery, signposting that follows your roadmap, underviews are particularly AWESOME! Speaking at an accelerated rate: get louder for me. Really emphasize key points in the cards you read. I should be able to tell where your tag line ends and your card begins. Short tag lines are preferred. Speaker point deductions: disorganized, inaudible, rude.
I HAVE 70% HEARING LOSS IN ONE EAR: high-pitched spreading is heavily discouraged.										
WOMACK, SAMI	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	B
				3	4	5	4	3	4	
Philosophy Statement										
I am a Tab judge that leans heavily toward Stocks. If you are going to run any type of argument, know exactly how that should happen. Know your basics. Speed for the sake of speed is annoying. This is a communications event. Running arguments you knowingly are going to kick is a time suck and ruins the educational value of debate.							Style & Delivery Preferences			Speed for the sake of speed is annoying. This is a communications event. If you are not able to articulate and speak clearly, then do not attempt to spread. I will not flow slurring, muttering rants.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL CX DEBATE STATE TOURNAMENT 2016 — 1A, 2A, 3A

JUDGE	PARADIGM	COMM./RES. ISSUES	EV. QTY./QUAL.	NUMERICAL RANKINGS						EXPERIENCE
WRIGHT, DYLAN	Policymaker	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	A
				3	5	5	5	3	3	
Philosophy Statement										
I am a policy-maker. I am looking for the best policy option. I love case debate as long as it is done well. Topicalities are okay as long as they have all of the component parts, same for DA's. I am okay with Kritiks, but do not expect me to have read everything published by every single author ever, so don't give me something obscure that Agambin said on page 6. I will typically vote for the team that has the most offense coming out of the round.							Style & Delivery Preferences	I am okay with speed as long as it is clear. If I put my pen down during your speech, slow down. Make sure that you, at least, are very clear on taglines.		
WRIGHT, RIVERS	Tabula rasa	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input checked="" type="radio"/> Quality <input type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	A
				3	2	3	3	3	3	
Philosophy Statement										
I enjoy seeing clash in a debate. Dates are not important and if there are arguments about them, they will be the last thing considered. Same thing goes for definitions. I want to see quality content being argued. Arguments against an opponent being abusive will be at my discretion during the moment. I like to see clash, it means that both teams understand the material in front of them and can debate about it well. I am a tab judge so I will judge the round and everything that goes on in that round only.							Style & Delivery Preferences	I don't like spreading. IF the debater talks too fast I will put my pen down and not flow the speech.		
YOUNG, PAMELA	Stock issues	<input type="radio"/> Comm. Skills <input type="radio"/> Res. Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<input type="radio"/> Quantity <input type="radio"/> Quality <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Qty. Arg.	T	CP	DA	Cond. Arg.	Kritiks	B
				3	4	2	4	3	2	
Philosophy Statement										
My judging philosophy in CX is that Debate is first and foremost an exercise in communication. I expect the debaters to speak distinctly and have an organized presentation which is clearly stated and defended with specific evidence to prove their arguments. I am not opposed to analytics, in fact, sometimes they are quite persuasive; however, cases are usually won or lost with evidence. I expect the debaters to use their speaking time to their advantage and also, to utilize their prep time. I consider myself to be a stock issues judge, and I appreciate a strong defense or attack on the stock issues by both sides.							Style & Delivery Preferences	I am not a fan of spreading. I much prefer to be communicated with in a clear voice, so that every word is distinguishable.		