Unified Schools, Diverse Paths: One Quest for Excellence!

UIL District CX Debate Packet

LOCATION

Calvary Baptist Church
410 N. Marshall Street, Henderson, TX 75652

DATE

Thursday, January 30, 2024

SCHEDULE


Debate Schedule
CX DISTRICT
District 16-4A
2024-2026
Unified Schools, Diverse Paths: One Quest for Excellence!
30TH JAN
8:30 AM COACHES' MEETING
9:00 AM ROUND 1
11:00 AM ROUND 2
12:45 PM LUNCH
1:15 PM ROUND 3
3:15 PM COACHES' VERIFICATION
3:30 PM PARTIAL QUARTER FINALS
5:30 PM SEMI FINALS
7:30 PM FINALS
Note: Will accelerate schedule where possible
CALVARY BAPTIST CHURCH,
410 N. MARSHALL STREET, HENDERSON, TX 75652

JUDGES

Kenny Adcock
Keasha Barnes
Anna Coppedge
Autumn Ellgass
Nikki Faircloth
Colin Hodgkiss
Will Honea
Carrie Langham
Pam Lattin
Michael Mattis
Kaden Phinney
Jennifer White

JUDGE PARADIGMS tO FOLLOW:

JUDGE: KENNY ADCOCK

Experience? Please provide your experience with policy debate or speech & debate in general. *

Have been coaching over the past ten years.

CX Debate Judging Philosophy (All philosophy information is required.) *

I LOVE direct clash, so if you can ensure that your arguments are responding to what's been presented in the round, then that will certainly be reflected in the speaker points for the round.

I prefer roadmaps to be short and concise. They do not need to be exaggerated, simply such as off-case then on-case, or off-case: 1T, 2DA, 1CP then moving to on-case. Throughout the round, I have always encouraged signposting. It ensures that your arguments end up on the flow where you want them to go, if you do not do this, then you run the risk of me putting it where I think it should go, and this could work against you. Take control of the round. Do not let me do this simply by signposting the argumentation throughout your speech.

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

https://www.tabroom.com/user/judge/paradigm.mhtml

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

I will warn you to watch me or my pen. If I am not flowing the round, then there is a high probability that I am not following along with you, and the only saving grace for you is the speech drop, file share, or email chain if there is one. Please be present in the round and observant that it could be the difference in your win or loss, simply because I could not understand your attempt at spreading. Again, this is not to say you can't, but I would for sure slow down on taglines/claims. Pop the source or card information before going full howitzer in the warrants of the evidence.

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

Stock Issues

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

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) *

Quality of evidence is more important than quantity of evidence.

4. Preferred quantity of arguments: (Range - 1=Limited quantity, 5=Unlimited quantity) *

3

5. Topicality arguments: (Range - 1=Rarely vote on, 5=Vote on often)*

2

6. Counterplans: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

2

7. Disadvantages: (Range - 1=Not Essential, 5=Essential) *

5

8. Conditional arguments: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

3

9. Kritiks: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

2

10. New Arguments in the 2nd Negative Constructive: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

2

JUDGE: KEASHA BARNES

Experience? Please provide your experience with policy debate or speech & debate in general. *

I have been coaching Speech & Debate for 15+ years.

CX Debate Judging Philosophy (All philosophy information is required.) *

see below explanation

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

- I want good speaking/explaining. Don't just read to me for 8 minutes with no explanation of what you read or how it links to the case.
- I want you to outline it for me in the end. Give me good voters going down the flow along with impacts and net benefit. Don't assume I know.
- I want to hear clash.
- organization, speaking quality, and quality of attacks are more important to me than the number of attacks. Continue to flow it across the board and extend/elaborate on it.
- I lean more stock issues. I will definitely flow a DA & a CP. I am not opposed to K or Theory; however, my ballot will not normally come down to just the K or Theory
- I do not time roadmaps as long as they are brief
- I am ok with speed but I need to be able to flow it

- signpost

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

I want good speaking/explaining. Don't just read to me for 8 minutes with no explanation of what you read or how it links to the case

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

Stock Issues

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

Communication skills are more important than resolution of substantive issues.

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

Quality of evidence is more important than quantity of evidence.

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

4

5. Topicality arguments: (Range - 1=Rarely vote on, 5=Vote on often)*

4

6. Counterplans: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

7. Disadvantages: (Range - 1=Not Essential, 5=Essential) *

5

8. Conditional arguments: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

2

9. Kritiks: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

2

10. New Arguments in the 2nd Negative Constructive: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

4

Unified Schools, Diverse Paths: One Quest for Excellence!

JUDGE: ANNA COPPEDGE

JUDGE: AUTUMN ELLGASS

Experience? Please provide your experience with policy debate or speech & debate in general. *

Competed in policy across multiple circuits and for four years during HS. Continued judging and deepening debate knowledge post grad through judging and coaching

CX Debate Judging Philosophy (All philosophy information is required.) *

I am a true tabula rasa judge. I will vote on anything and everything BUT I tend to not vote on T without significant standards and I almost require case options that meet Neg's T world. I appreciate framing in the debate and will prioritize going down the flow. Everything in round will be evaluated but only speeches will be flowed unless stated in cross.

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

Decorum and respect is paramount. The overall goal of debate is education and learning and I will dock speaks for cruel, discourteous behavior in round.

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

Clarity is key in policy (and all debate), speed is necessary for the current development for the event but you should be well adept at debating traditionally and progressively for policy. Speed does not make up for a shaky foundation or lack of functional knowledge in round. With that being said, I can handle any and all spreading.

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

Tabula Rasa

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

Resolution of substantive issues is more important than communication skills

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

Quality of evidence is more important than quantity of evidence.

4. Preferred quantity of arguments: (Range - 1=Limited quantity, 5=Unlimited quantity)*

5

5. Topicality arguments: (Range - 1=Rarely vote on, 5=Vote on often)*

1

6. Counterplans: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

7. Disadvantages: (Range - 1=Not Essential, 5=Essential) *

5

8. Conditional arguments: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

3

9. Kritiks: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

10. New Arguments in the 2nd Negative Constructive: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

4

JUDGE: NIKKI FAIRCLOTH

Experience? Please provide your experience with policy debate or speech & debate in general. *

18 years as a coach, 24 years as a judge

CX Debate Judging Philosophy (All philosophy information is required.) *

Tab judge

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

I want to see a lot of clash. I am fine with counter plans, new in the 2, and most arguments.

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

I am okay with speed, but if you are not clear arguments will not be flowed.

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

Tabula Rasa

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

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) *

Quality of evidence is more important than quantity of evidence.

4. Preferred quantity of arguments: (Range - 1=Limited quantity, 5=Unlimited quantity)*

4

5. Topicality arguments: (Range - 1=Rarely vote on, 5=Vote on often)*

3

6. Counterplans: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

3

7. Disadvantages: (Range - 1=Not Essential, 5=Essential) *

3

8. Conditional arguments: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

3

9. Kritiks: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

3

10. New Arguments in the 2nd Negative Constructive: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

JUDGE: COLIN HODGKISS

Experience? Please provide your experience with policy debate or speech & debate in general. *

4 years experience as a participant in high school, 6 years judging experience

CX Debate Judging Philosophy (All philosophy information is required.) *

I'm a blank slate. Make whatever arguments you want, but please don't assume I know any jargon. The only hurdle you have to jump is covering your bases on the technical aspects of the debate because I am not going to do work for you.

For example, if you don't extend warrants, I'll prefer the other team's evidence if they do. If no one extends warrants I'll have to evaluate competing claims and at that point it becomes very difficult to make an objective decision.

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

I'm a blank slate. Make whatever arguments you want. However, to be crystal clear, this does not mean I will listen to some nonsense like trying to argue that sexism, racism, etc, is somehow good, that will result in my automatically voting for the other team. It does mean that if you want to run a k aff that teeters on the fence of topicality, go for it. If you want to run some crazy theory shell that is arguably abusive to the other team, go for it.

Please be reasonable though. I'm trying to encourage creative and unique argumentation that picks at everyones critical thinking skills, I will not listen to how the aff should win because they screamed louder, for example. If you have something, but are concerned about whether I'll listen to it, feel free to run it by me first.

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

Go whatever speed you want, but please slow down a smidgen on tags and enunciate.

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

Tabula Rasa

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

Resolution of substantive issues is more important than communication skills

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

Quality of evidence is more important than quantity of evidence.

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

3

5. Topicality arguments: (Range - 1=Rarely vote on, 5=Vote on often)*

3

6. Counterplans: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

7. Disadvantages: (Range - 1=Not Essential, 5=Essential) *

1

8. Conditional arguments: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

9. Kritiks: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

10. New Arguments in the 2nd Negative Constructive: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

JUDGE: WILL HONEA

Experience? Please provide your experience with policy debate or speech & debate in general. *

Policy Debater for 4 years @ Athens HS. Parliamentary Debate 2 years @ Texas Tech University. Coaching speech & debate for 4 years with a focus on policy debate.

CX Debate Judging Philosophy (All philosophy information is required.) *

Please have specific questions about my paradigm if curious. Just asking, "what is your paradigm" is too broad of a question and we don't have time before a round to run down every little detail about how I feel about debate.

Speed - I think there is a place for spreading, I have judged and debated against some of the fastest debaters in the country. I think in any type of debate slow down for tag lines and key analytical arguments, especially voters in the rebuttals.

Analysis of the Circuits: I have come to develop a philosophy that between UIL & TFA/TOC CX debate; they are not doing the same event entirely. The best way I can describe the split is; UIL is focused more on eloquence & persuasion and TFA/TOC CX debate is the best representation of debate being a "game". When teaching students the difference I always compare TFA/TOC to a version of chess. The pieces represent the arguments, the first constructive's goals are to get as many pieces on the board as they can. That's why spreading exists. Then they commence a technical game of moving pieces, absorbing the other side's, until one side remains supreme. That being said, I believe there is immense value in learning to do both versions at a high level & will always encourage debaters to practice the skills needed to do both.

IP Topic Specific: I still believe the debate is yours and I will evaluate it how you tell me to. However, its disingenuous to deprive you of my subconscious opinions about the topic. I have found many of my debate opinions challenged by argument availability on this year's topic. On a general level I think process cps. multiplank cps, & the use of conditionality should be restricted in debate. HOWEVER, I have become a lot less adamant about that given the lack of good generic disad ground on this topic. For T debates, interps that are contextual to the topic area are preferable. If you're reading a hyper restrictive interp please be ready to answer case list questions. Especially because I don't think there is an aff currently on the topic that can meet T-Penalties.

TLDR:My overall judging philosophy can be boiled down to, I am going to take the path to the ballot that takes the least amount of judge intervention. I don't want to do any work for you, that means any warrants analysis/extensions. You do what you do best, I am pretty familiar with just about any argument you want to read. I will make my decision based on a metric established by the debaters in the round.

Policy -

Affs - Read one..... I'm probably better suited for affs with a plan text but you can decide that based on my analysis below on K affs & performance. Advantages need to materialize into impacts. Saying "This collapses the economy" cannot be the end all to your advantage. Explain why that matters. Whether it's war, structural violence, etc.

K Affs - The K aff needs a point. Don't just read one to try and throw your opponent off their game. I like K affs and have read them a lot in HS/College. The aff should always have some FW/Roll of the Ballot for me to evaluate the round on. Also, if your kritiking the World, Debate Space, Topic, etc. explain the utility in doing so rather than taking the traditional route of reading a policy aff with a state actor.

Performance - I haven't judged much performance at all in the last 2 years, so I'm not up to date on the deployment of it. However, I did defend identity

performances in high school & college. Don't just read you poem, play you song, or do a performance at the beginning and then forget about it for the rest of the round. Tell me why you doing what you did has significance in this debate and how it should shape my decision making calculus.

T- I default that the aff is topical. The neg has the burden to prove otherwise. I default to competing interps weighing offense in the standards level debate. I often find that competing interps and reasonability require essentially the same amount of judge intervention. Competing interps relies on a judges individual metric for "how much offense" is needed to win an interp, this is mirrored by "how much of a we meet" is needed to throw out T. Fairness is my favorite impact, I think education that is specific to debate can only be generated when both sides have equitable access to clash.

FW - Policy FW against K affs can be a useful strategy to have. However, I often find debaters constantly reading generic standards like Ground, Predictability without any in depth impacts to those standards. Have specific warrants about why reading their K aff in that instance specifically is bad. You probably have little risk of winning a collapse of debate impact. K's have been read for decades and yet, here we are. Probably should go for a more proximal, in round fairness lost scenario.

DA - The more intrinsic the better. I will not evaluate links of omission unless it goes completely dropped. While I like intrinsic/specific disads i also recognize the utility in reading generics and will vote on them.

PTX - By the time I'm at a tournament again, the election will have passed. I think congress is back in session so maybe some rider da or agenda politics might be relevant. Please just update your evidence; I'm tired of judging politics debates with uniqueness evidence that is multiple months old.

CP - I like counterplan debate. I have come to accept that planks are going to be a circuit norm nowadays. I guess I'm fine with them, the only thing I ask is that if you're reading more than 4+ planks and forsee it being the 2nr, you need to start collapsing in the block. Make sure you pair it with a net

benefit AND solvency deficits to the Aff plan. Additionally, spend time explaining how the CP resolves the deficits you say the aff solvency has. The CP needs to AVOID the link to the net benefit, not SOLVE it. If the CP solves the link, the permutation probably does as well.

K's - I am not as well read on k lit as I used to be. When I debated it was a lot of Cap, Baudrillard, Queer Theory, & Trans Rage literature I found myself delved into. My teams usually stay pretty basic with Cap, Security, other basics. This year I have a debater learning to read Afropess so I have begun reading that lit base to understand it better. In all K debates I will always start on the fw level to decide if they get to weigh the aff. Also, don't be afraid to kick the alt and go for it as a disad if they have good alt defense. Too many debaters ignore this as the strat and I won't evaluate it that way unless you tell me to. Not a fan of the Mehrvand evidence, but again, you do you, debate is a technical game.

Theory - I have voted in and debated some of the wackiest theory positions. As long as you have good warrants as to why your interpretation is better than you should be good. Please do interp comparison between you interp and your opponent's. That being said don't get too out there with you theory positions. I feel like you and/or your coaches should know what is a winning theory position and what is hot garbage.

Condo - I will evaluate the condo debate objectively through an evaluation of the standards argumentation. If your going for it in front of me, you have a better chance of winning it if you read a perf con standard. I've had interesting conversations with people about what it means to be "going for" an argument. Does it mean you can't kick it? Does it mean it has to be the position your staking the round on? If you could clarify this in your interp that would be great.

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

I believe UIL debate is the perfect combination of persuasive elegance and strategic deployment of arguments. I will make my decision strictly off of the technicalities of my flow. I will listen to speed, however, we should not sacrifice clarity or smart arguments for it.

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

Spreading is fine. I think the nature of UIL means you should not be going your fastest, but conversational can get boring.

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

Policymaker

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

Resolution of substantive issues is more important than communication skills

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

Quality of evidence is more important than quantity of evidence.

4. Preferred quantity of arguments: (Range - 1=Limited quantity, 5=Unlimited quantity) *

5

5. Topicality arguments: (Range - 1=Rarely vote on, 5=Vote on often)*

5

6. Counterplans: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

7. Disadvantages: (Range - 1=Not Essential, 5=Essential) *

5

8. Conditional arguments: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

9. Kritiks: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

10. New Arguments in the 2nd Negative Constructive: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

2

JUDGE: CARRIE LANGHAM - CEDILLO

Experience? Please provide your experience with policy debate or speech & debate in general. *

10 years coaching and judging experience UIL

CX Debate Judging Philosophy (All philosophy information is required.) *

Stock Issues

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

Connect your arguments on the flow. Don't fill the flow with junk just to waste time. If you run a T, be ready to commit to it.

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

I'm ok with some speed, but we aren't here to listen to auctioneers.

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

Stock Issues

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

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) *

Quality of evidence is more important than quantity of evidence.

4. Preferred quantity of arguments: (Range - 1=Limited quantity, 5=Unlimited quantity) *

3

5. Topicality arguments: (Range - 1=Rarely vote on, 5=Vote on often)*

3

6. Counterplans: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

3

7. Disadvantages: (Range - 1=Not Essential, 5=Essential) *

3

8. Conditional arguments: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

2

9. Kritiks: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

2

10. New Arguments in the 2nd Negative Constructive: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

JUDGE: PAM LATTIN

Experience? Please provide your experience with policy debate or speech & debate in general. *

Many years of coaching and judging experience, including state champions in extemp, and many state finalists in both LD and CX.

CX Debate Judging Philosophy (All philosophy information is required.) *

I'm a tab judge. I like to let debaters frame the round, but I will default stocks if given no reason not to.

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

I do not like Ks, but I will flow them. They have to be run for perfection in order for me to vote on them. I am fine with new in the 2 (It is a constructive speech after all). I will always be looking for clash on what is actually on my flow and not what you might have put in the speech drop that I haven't looked at. Please be respectful to everyone in the round.

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

Debate is, at its heart, a communication event; therefore, I do not like spreading. I can type pretty fast, but if I stop typing, you are talking too fast.

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

Tabula Rasa

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

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) *

Quality of evidence is more important than quantity of evidence.

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

5

5. Topicality arguments: (Range - 1=Rarely vote on, 5=Vote on often)*

3

6. Counterplans: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

4

7. Disadvantages: (Range - 1=Not Essential, 5=Essential) *

3

8. Conditional arguments: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

2

9. Kritiks: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

2

10. New Arguments in the 2nd Negative Constructive: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

JUDGE: MICHAEL MATTIS

Experience? Please provide your experience with policy debate or speech & debate in general. *

23 years

CX Debate Judging Philosophy (All philosophy information is required.) *

Tab

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

I am quite Tab. I want to see what debaters do best. I would rather adapt to the debater than they adapt to me. I will default Policymaker when no other framework is given.

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

Clear and concise. I am okay with speed as long as communication skills are the priority of the round.

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

Tabula Rasa

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

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) *

Quality of evidence is more important than quantity of evidence.

4. Preferred quantity of arguments: (Range - 1=Limited quantity, 5=Unlimited quantity)*

4

5. Topicality arguments: (Range - 1=Rarely vote on, 5=Vote on often)*

2

6. Counterplans: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

7. Disadvantages: (Range - 1=Not Essential, 5=Essential) *

5

8. Conditional arguments: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

9. Kritiks: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

10. New Arguments in the 2nd Negative Constructive: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

Unified Schools, Diverse Paths: One Quest for Excellence!

JUDGE: KADEN PHINNEY

JUDGE: JENNFIER WHITE

Experience? Please provide your experience with policy debate or speech & debate in general. *

30 year debate coach, retired

CX Debate Judging Philosophy (All philosophy information is required.) *

Tabula Rosa

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

I like to see a lot of clash in the round. Make sure you address all of the arguments. I allow new in the 2. I am fine with counterplans and kritiks. Make sure your evidence supports your arguments.

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

I am fine with speed as long as you are clear. If I put down my own or close my laptop you are too fast. Always be respectful to your partner and opponent.

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

Tabula Rasa

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

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 and quality of evidence are of equal importance.

4. Preferred quantity of arguments: (Range - 1=Limited quantity, 5=Unlimited quantity) *

5

5. Topicality arguments: (Range - 1=Rarely vote on, 5=Vote on often)*

3

6. Counterplans: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5

7. Disadvantages: (Range - 1=Not Essential, 5=Essential) *

5

8. Conditional arguments: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

4

9. Kritiks: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

3

10. New Arguments in the 2nd Negative Constructive: (Range - 1=Unacceptable, 5=Acceptable) *

5