UIL State CX Debate School Judge Information Form 2023

Judges will need a laptop or desktop computer to access electronic ballots, and will need to register in the Tabroom tournament system.

This form is for CX judges fulfilling a school obligation judging on behalf of a school.

If this does not describe your role, please select the appropriate form here.

Judge Contact Information

First Name*

Last Name*

School Phone

Evening Phone

Mobile Phone *

Preferred E-mail Address *

Alternate E-mail Address

Do you have any mobility issues?*

○ Yes ○ No

If the school qualifies 2 teams but advances only 1 to the elimination bracket, are you the "Designated Judge" that will judge rounds as long as the school is in competition?*

○ Yes ○ No

School/Debater Information

UIL District Number *

Conference *

○ 1A ○ 2A ○ 3A ○ 4A ○ 5A ○ 6A

School City *

School Name *

DEBATERS

First Name **Last Name**

First Name **Last Name**

Any debaters have mobility issues?* ◯ Yes ◯ No

Please specify whether you are the coach for this school or only fulfilling judging obligations.*

◯ **Coach** ◯ **Fulfilling Obligation**

Coach Contact Information (If judge is not the coach.)

First Name* **Last Name ***

School Phone **Evening Phone**

Mobile Phone* **Fax**

Preferred E-mail Address* **Alternate E-mail Address**

Does the coach have any mobility issues?* ◯ Yes ◯ No

CX Debate Experience

Please summarize your CX experience in the box below. Be as detailed as possible. *

Specific Experience *
(Please provide specific details of your debate experience where applicable.)

Policy debate in high school

Where?
When?
Year graduated?

Policy debate (NDT) in college
Where?
When?

Policy debate (CEDA) in college
Where?
When?

LD debate (NFA) in college
Where?
When?

Policy debate (NPDA) in college
Where?
When?

Coach policy debate in high school
Where?
When?

Coach policy debate in college
Where?
When?

Judge policy debate often? ○ Yes ○ No

Number of tournament rounds judged this year on this topic *

Number of tournaments judged this year *

List a minimum of 3 tournaments where you have judged on this topic: *

CX Debate Judging Philosophy (All philosophy information is required.) *
In the space below, please provide details of your CX judging philosophy. This description should cover specific details of the criteria you use to evaluate CX debate rounds; it should not merely be a restatement of the checklist items further down the page. Elaborate. Also, please do not include style and delivery preferences in the philosophy box; use the separate box provided.
IMPORTANT NOTE: The comments you submit will be made available to tournament participants, so think carefully about what you write and proof for typing errors!

Philosophy Statement (Please be concise. 300 words max.)
If necessary, you may include a link to a lengthier statement.

Style and Delivery Preferences (100 words max.)
If necessary, you may include a link to a lengthier statement.

Questionnaire

1. Which best describes your approach to judging policy debate? (check only one) - For clarification, see the current UIL CX Debate Handbook.

- ◯ Policymaker
- ◯ Stock issues
- ◯ Tabula rasa
- ◯ Other

2. Which best describes your priorities in judging policy debate? (check only one)

- ◯ Communication skills are more important than resolution of substantive issues.
- ◯ Resolution of substantive issues is more important than communication skills.
- ◯ Communication skills and resolution of substantive issues are of equal importance.

3. Which best describes your philosophy concerning evidence in policy debate? (check only one)

- ◯ Quantity of evidence is more important than quality of evidence.
- ◯ Quality of evidence is more important than quantity of evidence.
- ◯ Quantity of evidence and quality of evidence are of equal importance.

4. Indicate your preference toward the following items (check one number for each item):

A. Preferred quantity of arguments: ◯ 1 ◯ 2 ◯ 3 ◯ 4 ◯ 5
(Range - 1=Limited quantity, 5=Unlimited quantity)

B. Topicality arguments: ◯ 1 ◯ 2 ◯ 3 ◯ 4 ◯ 5
(Range - 1=Rarely vote on, 5=Vote on often)

C. Counterplans: ◯ 1 ◯ 2 ◯ 3 ◯ 4 ◯ 5
(Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable)

D. Disadvantages: ◯ 1 ◯ 2 ◯ 3 ◯ 4 ◯ 5
(Range - 1=Not Essential, 5=Essential)

E. Conditional arguments: ◯ 1 ◯ 2 ◯ 3 ◯ 4 ◯ 5
(Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable)

F. Kritiks: ◯ 1 ◯ 2 ◯ 3 ◯ 4 ◯ 5
(Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable)

G. New Arguments in the 2nd Negative Constructive: ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5

(Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable)

List any schools or teams you should not judge due to current or prior affiliation (within 5 years). Include all schools or debaters you have coached, conducted workshops or clinics with, etc. If none, enter "none."

Important: include their UIL conference 1A-6A following each school you list below.

IMPORTANT: Please scroll back through and verify that you have entered all required responses and all information correctly AND completely **BEFORE** clicking **Submit**. You will not be able to make further changes after you click **Submit. You are advised to save a copy or take a screenshot for your records.** Please click **Submit** only once.

After hitting submit please be patient and wait for the confirmation page.
******** DO NOT HIT THE BACK BUTTON******

If you hit the back button and resubmit, it will create a false record and we will not receive your information.

The confirmation page states specifically that your form has been submitted, and stamps the date and time of submission. **Print this confirmation for your records and file it in a safe place.** If the confirmation does not list your correct first and last name at the top, the form has not been successfully submitted.

If you do not receive a confirmation, we have not received your form. Review all required fields and try again.

Submit form