**PFRR Judges**

[Ahl, Candice 1](#_Toc475227679)

[Berch, Emily 2](#_Toc475227680)

[Berggren, Jacob 3](#_Toc475227681)

[Blume, Kassidi 4](#_Toc475227682)

[Carra, Chuck 5](#_Toc475227683)

[Clarke, Aaron 6](#_Toc475227684)

[Fisher, Charles 7](#_Toc475227685)

[Fitzpatrick, Jeremy 8](#_Toc475227686)

[Freeman, Victoria 9](#_Toc475227687)

[Johnson, Nate 10](#_Toc475227688)

[Krell, Adam 11](#_Toc475227689)

[Meyer, Jesse 12](#_Toc475227690)

[Murray, Brian 13](#_Toc475227691)

[Scheffler, Tim 14](#_Toc475227692)

[Schurevich, Aarron 15](#_Toc475227693)

[Ucman, Tiffany 16](#_Toc475227694)

[Vanderpool, Amy 17](#_Toc475227695)

[Warenik, Tori 18](#_Toc475227696)

[Wilson, James 19](#_Toc475227697)

# Ahl, Candice

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Unaffiliated |
| Event History: | LD, PF, Congress |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take notes of all of the speeches. |
| Flow Use: | 9/10 |
| Speed: | 4/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will consider any argument that is unaddressed in this speech as a conceded argument. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to establish the main arguments in the debate, not every single argument in the debate (big picture). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it must be present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | If the evidence relies upon its date to be valid, it must be read. |
| Decorum: | In extreme cases, I have voted/may vote on demeanor. |
| Topicality: | There are plenty of unique arguments within the topic, so even unique arguments need to be resolutional. |
| Plans: | I don’t want to hear a plan in Public Forum, but if it is mishandled, I’ll still vote for it. |
| Kritiks: | I don’t want to hear a kritik in Public Forum, but if it is mishandled, I’ll still vote for it. |
| Other: | N/A |

# Berch, Emily

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Johnston |
| Event History: | PF |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take detailed, organized notes of all of the speeches. |
| Flow Use: | 8/10 |
| Speed: | 10/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I do not expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will not consider arguments that are unaddressed in this speech as a conceded argument. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to establish the main arguments in the debate, not every single argument in the debate (big picture). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it does not have to be in present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | If the evidence relies upon its date to be valid, it must be read. |
| Decorum: | I only evaluate on arguments; decorum is not a factor for decision. |
| Topicality: | In general, an argument must be clearly on topic to be something I'll evaluate, but if a non-topical argument isn't answered, I'll still vote for it. |
| Plans: | I'll evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for rules/norms. |
| Kritiks: | I'll evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for rules/norms. |
| Other: | I'm much more interested in watching a debate where you can highlight your own strengths than one that adheres to my technical preferences. The one thing that is important to me is quantifying and weighing impacts in the final focus. As far as arguments, I prefer to exercise my beliefs in my own academic ventures and keep my judging on the flow. I won't vote on decorum, but I will (and have) docked speaks to the point of a low point win if I feel like teams become unprofessional. I ultimately believe debate is about growth, and if my RFD is unclear at the end of a round I'm always available to answer questions. |

# Berggren, Jacob

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Unaffiliated |
| Event History: | PF |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take detailed, organized notes of all of the speeches. |
| Flow Use: | 9/10 |
| Speed: | 8/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will consider any argument that is unaddressed in this speech as a conceded argument. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to establish the main arguments in the debate, not every single argument in the debate (big picture). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it must be present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | If the evidence relies upon its date to be valid, it must be read. |
| Decorum: | In extreme cases, I have voted/may vote on demeanor. |
| Topicality: | In general, an argument must be clearly on topic to be something I'll evaluate, but if a non-topical argument isn't answered, I'll still vote for it. |
| Plans: | I don’t want to hear a plan in Public Forum, but if it is mishandled, I’ll still vote for it. |
| Kritiks: | I don’t want to hear a kritik in Public Forum, but if it is mishandled, I’ll still vote for it. |
| Other: | N/A |

# Blume, Kassidi

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Millard North |
| Event History: | PF |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take detailed, organized notes of all of the speeches. |
| Flow Use: | 9/10 |
| Speed: | 7/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will consider any argument that is unaddressed in this speech as a conceded argument. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to establish the main arguments in the debate, not every single argument in the debate (big picture). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it must be present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | All evidence should have a spoken date. |
| Decorum: | In extreme cases, I have voted/may vote on demeanor. |
| Topicality: | I evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for topicality. |
| Plans: | I don’t want to hear a plan in Public Forum, but if it is mishandled, I’ll still vote for it. |
| Kritiks: | I'll evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for rules/norms. |
| Other: | N/A |

# Carra, Chuck

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Evanston |
| Event History: | LD, PF, Speech |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take notes on the outlines of cases. |
| Flow Use: | 6/10 |
| Speed: | 3/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I do not expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will not consider arguments that are unaddressed in this speech as a conceded argument. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to establish the main arguments in the debate, not every single argument in the debate (big picture). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it must be present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | I don't need to hear dates on evidence. |
| Decorum: | In extreme cases, I have voted/may vote on demeanor. |
| Topicality: | I evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for topicality. |
| Plans: | I'll evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for rules/norms. |
| Kritiks: | I'll evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for rules/norms. |
| Other: | N/A |

# Clarke, Aaron

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Evanston |
| Event History: | LD, PF, CX, Congress, Speech |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take detailed, organized notes of all of the speeches. |
| Flow Use: | 9/10 |
| Speed: | 6/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I do not expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will not consider arguments that are unaddressed in this speech as a conceded argument. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to address every argument in the debate (line-by-line). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it must be present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | If the evidence relies upon its date to be valid, it must be read. |
| Decorum: | In extreme cases, I have voted/may vote on demeanor. |
| Topicality: | I evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for topicality. |
| Plans: | I'll evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for rules/norms. |
| Kritiks: | I'll evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for rules/norms. |
| Other: | N/A |

# Fisher, Charles

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Millard North |
| Event History: | PF, CX |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take detailed, organized notes of all of the speeches. |
| Flow Use: | 8/10 |
| Speed: | 5/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will consider any argument that is unaddressed in this speech as a conceded argument. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to establish the main arguments in the debate, not every single argument in the debate (big picture). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it must be present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | All evidence should have a spoken date. |
| Decorum: | In extreme cases, I have voted/may vote on demeanor. |
| Topicality: | I appreciate a topically grounded debate, but am VERY open to creativity. Check: Neg has full viability to run Topicality Shells in front of me and have them voted on. |
| Plans: | Plan-lite is generally okay and can be checked with topicality and good impact analysis if it gets overreach-y or overspec'd. |
| Kritiks: | Run a kritik all you want, but do it well and in a complete format or you end up with a pile of nonspecific, half-analyzed garbage that I'll ignore and then tear you apart for running. |
| Other: | If you come across as a snarky, dismissive jerk hellbent on proving your superiority, I'll probably drop you. Snide "comedy" at the expense of your opponent, that's a droppin'. I'll flow everything until my carpel tunnel is aflame to give you better feedback post-round, but don't expect me to be a blank calculator for your bogus 'terminal-defense'. Basically: watch PF finals from NSDA 2016 on youtube and emulate NOTHING that was presented there. I'm here to help you become a better academic investigator, not pad your resume and ego. Make smart choices on what the round is about in the summary, establish a core narrative, focus on comparative analysis, and everyone will be happier. |

# Fitzpatrick, Jeremy

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Johnston |
| Event History: | PF, Speech |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take notes on the outlines of cases. |
| Flow Use: | 6/10 |
| Speed: | 3/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will consider any argument that is unaddressed in this speech as a conceded argument. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to establish the main arguments in the debate, not every single argument in the debate (big picture). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it does not have to be in present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | If the evidence relies upon its date to be valid, it must be read. |
| Decorum: | In extreme cases, I have voted/may vote on demeanor. |
| Topicality: | There are plenty of unique arguments within the topic, so even unique arguments need to be resolutional. |
| Plans: | I don’t want to hear a plan in Public Forum, but if it is mishandled, I’ll still vote for it. |
| Kritiks: | I will not vote for any Ks, because they are against PF rules/norms. |
| Other: | N/A |

# Freeman, Victoria

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Unaffiliated |
| Event History: | LD, PF |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take detailed, organized notes of all of the speeches. |
| Flow Use: | 8/10 |
| Speed: | 10/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will consider any argument that is unaddressed in this speech as a conceded argument. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to establish the main arguments in the debate, not every single argument in the debate (big picture). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it must be present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | If the evidence relies upon its date to be valid, it must be read. |
| Decorum: | I only evaluate on arguments. |
| Topicality: | I evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for topicality. |
| Plans: | I don’t want to hear a plan in Public Forum, but if it is mishandled, I’ll still vote for it. |
| Kritiks: | I don’t want to hear a kritik in Public Forum, but if it is mishandled, I’ll still vote for it. |
| Other: | N/A |

# Johnson, Nate

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Unaffiliated |
| Event History: | LD, PF, CX, Congress |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take detailed, organized notes of all of the speeches. |
| Flow Use: | 9/10 |
| Speed: | 8  /10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will consider any argument that is unaddressed in this speech as a conceded argument. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to establish the main arguments in the debate, not every single argument in the debate (big picture). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it does not have to be in present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | All evidence should have a spoken date. |
| Decorum: | In extreme cases, I have voted/may vote on demeanor. |
| Topicality: | An argument does not have to be clearly on topic to be something I’ll evaluate, but I’ll give the opponent substantial ground to argue against its topicality. |
| Plans: | I'll evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for rules/norms. |
| Kritiks: | I'll evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for rules/norms. |
| Other: | Don't be blatantly disrespectful. I can do speed, but after certain point, it can limit my ability to understand the round. If your opponent cannot understand you then you will need to slow down. |

# Krell, Adam

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Dowling |
| Event History: | LD, PF, CX, Congress, Speech |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I may or may not flow on my laptop but be warned, I do not miss anything in terms of arguments. Just because I don't flow doesn't mean I haven't heard every argument. |
| Flow Use: | 5/10 |
| Speed: | 7/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will consider any argument that is unaddressed in this speech as a conceded argument. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to establish the main arguments in the debate, not every single argument in the debate (big picture). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it must be present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | NSDA rules require Author and Date. If you don't give me that I’d be glad to hear and evidence violation shell. |
| Decorum: | In extreme cases, I have voted/may vote on demeanor. |
| Topicality: | There are plenty of unique arguments within the topic, so even unique arguments need to be resolutional. |
| Plans: | I will not vote for any plans, because they are against PF rules/norms. |
| Kritiks: | I will not vote for any Ks, because they are against PF rules/norms. |
| Other: | N/A |

# Meyer, Jesse

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Cedar Rapids Kennedy |
| Event History: | LD, PF, CX |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take notes on the outlines of cases. |
| Flow Use: | 8/10 |
| Speed: | 8/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I do not expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will not consider arguments that are unaddressed in this speech as a conceded argument. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to establish the main arguments in the debate, not every single argument in the debate (big picture). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it must be present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | All evidence should have a spoken date. |
| Decorum: | In extreme cases, I have voted/may vote on demeanor. |
| Topicality: | There are plenty of unique arguments within the topic, so even unique arguments need to be resolutional. |
| Plans: | I will not vote for any plans, because they are against PF rules/norms. |
| Kritiks: | I'll evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for rules/norms. |
| Other: | N/A |

# Murray, Brian

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Unaffiliated |
| Event History: | LD, CX |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take detailed, organized notes of all of the speeches. |
| Flow Use: | 9/10 |
| Speed: | 10/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will consider any argument that is unaddressed in this speech as a conceded argument. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to address every argument in the debate (line-by-line). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it must be present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | All evidence should have a spoken date. |
| Decorum: | I only evaluate on arguments. |
| Topicality: | I evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for topicality. |
| Plans: | I'll evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for rules/norms. |
| Kritiks: | I'll evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for rules/norms. |
| Other: | N/A |

# Scheffler, Tim

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | James Madison Memorial |
| Event History: | LD, PF, CX, Congress, Speech |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take detailed, organized notes of all of the speeches. |
| Flow Use: | 8/10 |
| Speed: | 7/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will consider any argument that is unaddressed in this speech as a conceded argument. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to establish the main arguments in the debate, not every single argument in the debate (big picture). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it must be present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | If the evidence relies upon its date to be valid, it must be read. |
| Decorum: | In extreme cases, I have voted/may vote on demeanor. |
| Topicality: | An argument must be clearly on topic to be something I'll evaluate, but the opposing team must establish why it is non-topical and should not be considered. |
| Plans: | I don’t want to hear a plan in Public Forum, but in a broad resolution, offering something as likely or probable is not a plan. |
| Kritiks: | A topical, ideological K is a valid policy consideration, and in-round misconduct is fair to call out. |
| Other: | N/A |

# Schurevich, Aarron

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Millard North |
| Event History: | LD, PF, Congress, Speech |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take detailed notes more often than not, but I do appreciate the different way I see debates when I flow cases and listen to rebuttals. |
| Flow Use: | 8/10 |
| Speed: | 3/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will consider any argument that is unaddressed in this speech as a conceded argument. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to establish the main arguments in the debate, not every single argument in the debate (big picture). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it must be present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | If the evidence relies upon its date to be valid, it must be read. |
| Decorum: | In extreme cases, I have voted/may vote on demeanor. |
| Topicality: | An argument must be clearly on topic to be something I'll evaluate, but the opposing team must establish why it is non-topical and should not be considered. |
| Plans: | I'll evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for rules/norms. |
| Kritiks: | I'll evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for rules/norms. |
| Other: | http://judgephilosophies.wikispaces.com/Schurevich%2C+Aarron  See my full paradigm for more info and feel free to ask any questions you might have pre-round. Far warning: the more specific your question, the better the answer I can provide. “Do you have any preferences?” is the single most worthless question debaters ask judges. If you want to know something specific, ask something specific. |

# Ucman, Tiffany

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Unaffiliated |
| Event History: | PF |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take detailed, organized notes of all of the speeches. |
| Flow Use: | 7/10 |
| Speed: | 10/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I do not expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will not consider arguments that are unaddressed in this speech as a conceded argument. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to establish the main arguments in the debate, not every single argument in the debate (big picture). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it does not have to be in present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | If the evidence relies upon its date to be valid, it must be read. |
| Decorum: | In extreme cases, I have voted/may vote on demeanor. |
| Topicality: | There are plenty of unique arguments within the topic, so even unique arguments need to be resolutional. |
| Plans: | I will not vote for any plans, because they are against PF rules/norms. |
| Kritiks: | I will not vote for any Ks, because they are against PF rules/norms. |
| Other: | N/A |

# Vanderpool, Amy

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Unaffiliated |
| Event History: | PF, CX |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take detailed, organized notes of all of the speeches. |
| Flow Use: | 6/10 |
| Speed: | 10/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will consider arguments that are unaddressed in this speech as conceded arguments. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to establish the main arguments in the debate, not every single argument in the debate (big picture). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it must be present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | If the evidence relies upon its date to be valid, it must be read. |
| Decorum: | In extreme cases, I have voted/may vote on demeanor. |
| Topicality: | There are plenty of unique arguments within the topic, so even unique arguments need to be resolutional. |
| Plans: | I'll evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for rules/norms. |
| Kritiks: | I'll evaluate the round as it's presented to me without external concern for rules/norms. |
| Other: | N/A |

# Warenik, Tori

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Cyrpess Bay |
| Event History: | LD, PF, Speech |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take detailed, organized notes of all of the speeches. |
| Flow Use: | 6/10 |
| Speed: | 4/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will consider arguments that are unaddressed in this speech as conceded arguments. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to establish the main arguments in the debate, not every single argument in the debate (big picture). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it must be present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | All evidence should have a spoken date. |
| Decorum: | In extreme cases, I have voted/may vote on demeanor. |
| Topicality: | There are plenty of unique arguments within the topic, so even unique arguments need to be resolutional. |
| Plans: | I will not vote for any plans, because they are against PF rules/norms. |
| Kritiks: | I will not vote for any Ks, because they are against PF rules/norms. |
| Other: | You can look on tabroom for my full paradigm |

# Wilson, James

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BIO** | |
| RR School Affiliation: | Unaffiliated |
| Event History: | PF |
| **PREFERENCES** | |
| Flow Ability: | I take detailed, organized notes of all of the speeches. |
| Flow Use: | 7/10 |
| Speed: | 6/10 |
| Second Rebuttal: | I expect/require the second team's rebuttal to address both side of the debate and will consider arguments that are unaddressed in this speech as conceded arguments. |
| Summary: | I expect the Summary to establish the main arguments in the debate, not every single argument in the debate (big picture). |
| Final Focus: | In order for me to vote on a Final Focus argument, it must be present in the Summary speech as well. |
| Evidence Dates: | If the evidence relies upon its date to be valid, it must be read. |
| Decorum: | In extreme cases, I have voted/may vote on demeanor. |
| Topicality: | There are plenty of unique arguments within the topic, so even unique arguments need to be resolutional. |
| Plans: | I don’t want to hear a plan in Public Forum, but if it is mishandled, I’ll still vote for it. |
| Kritiks: | I will not vote for any Ks, because they are against PF rules/norms. |
| Other: | Regarding topicality, I'm not too strict- as long as you can establish some reasonable link to the resolution that your opponents can't easily dispute, I'm perfectly willing to listen to strange and wacky arguments. |