

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

## EXPLANATORY NOTES

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

- Delivery (Rate of Delivery) — 1 = Slower, 5 = Faster
- Evidence (Amount of Evidence) — 1 = Little, 5 = Lots
- Appeals — 1 = Emotional, 5 = Factual
- Criteria — 1 = Unnecessary, 5 = Essential
- Approach (to Topic) — 1 = Philosophical, 5 = Pragmatic

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

**Experience** — G = LD debater in high school, H = Coach LD in high school, A = Policy debater in high school, D = NDT debater in college, E = CEDA debater in college, F = Coach CEDA in college

Debaters may ask any judge for a brief explanation of his or her judging philosophy prior to the round.

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
<b>ADAMS, JENNIFER</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b> 3	<b>Evidence</b> 3	<b>Appeals</b> 4	<b>Criteria</b> 4	<b>Approach</b> 3	H

### Philosophy Statement

Debate must center on the resolution to win my ballot. Keep your critical arguments and counter plans in CX. Philosophy is refreshing and should be a consideration in choosing a value. Value/criteria are important aspects of the debate and should not be overlooked. Be respectful of your judge and opponent, decorum is a must.

<b>ADAMS, CLINT</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b> 3	<b>Evidence</b> 3	<b>Appeals</b> 3	<b>Criteria</b> 5	<b>Approach</b> 3	H
---------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	---

### Philosophy Statement

Value/Criteria are an integral part of LD debate for my ballot. Debaters must address the resolution.

<b>ADEYEMI, LILLIAN</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b> 3	<b>Evidence</b> 4	<b>Appeals</b> 4	<b>Criteria</b> 5	<b>Approach</b> 3	
-------------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--

### Philosophy Statement

Value Debate  
 Clash  
 Big Picture  
 Ok with spreading but it needs to be clear.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
ALDERSON, LINDA	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	HADF
		4	4	3	5	1	

## Philosophy Statement

LD debate is first and foremost persuasive communication. Ethos and a balance of logos and pathos is necessary. Organization is necessary as well. You must signpost and follow formal rules of outlining. Good, logical thinking is also required. I expect a value (with evidence to say that it is a value) from both the affirmative and the negative. I expect a criterion (not another value) that weighs the achievement of the value from both debaters. I expect contentions that support the debater's position that are demonstrated to support the value and to flow through the criterion. I expect the affirmative to uphold its case throughout the round and to argue the negative's case and refutation. The affirmative must not allow the negative to determine what is debated in the round. The negative is expected to fulfill the same requirements as to the negative case and to refute the affirmative case arguments. Both debaters need to crystallize the round and give clear voters. I expect a contrast of the specific philosophies represented in this resolution. I want good debate. Debaters should do the work. Don't yell "interventionist" when you make me decide where to flow arguments and how to weigh them. Do not call me "Judge." I have coached and/or judged LD since it became a UIL event in the 1980s. I view myself as a critic of argument. Plans are not acceptable.

ALFORD, BRIAN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	HA
		3	3	3	4	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I am an old school LD debate judge. I like a good case that ties back to the value. I am not one for the "new" style of LD where plans CPs are ran...this is value debate, not policy. If Aff and Neg have the same values (which is unlikely with this topic), there needs to be much emphasis placed on the criteria. Clash is important. WEIGH THE ROUND. Give me voters during your last speech and be persuasive.

ANDERSON, JOHN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GHA
		5	3	5	1	3	

## Philosophy Statement

Very line-by-line. Anything can be a voting issue but it needs warrants. Use logic to tell me what you have done to fulfill your burdens (why the resolution is true/false, etc) this topic is a proposition of fact so I don't think a value/criterion framework is necessary but of course will listen to it; if you use one, PLEASE use it as a voter: winning V/Cr does not necessarily win you the round, so explain why it matters that your value is important. I'm fine with you conceding to your opponent's value and providing reasons you uphold it better. Pre-standards and theory are voting issues but do the work on them. I'm more inclined to buy less-than-persuasive arguments when they are dropped by the opponent, so cover key arguments that you think can win your opponent the round. I pay close attention to my flow and love extensions and cross-applications. Speaker points are based on both presentation and argumentation.

ANDERSON, SHANNON	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GHA
		4	3	3	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I prefer debates and debaters who tell me why their arguments as a whole are more persuading. I encourage the use of philosophy as long as it is used correctly. I will not judge based on minor drops. Unless something crucial has been dropped, it needs to be mentioned briefly, then the argument as a whole extended. I flow the entire round, but if crucial drops are not pointed out, they will not necessarily be voters. I judge based on clarity of arguments and extensions. Make sure to uphold the VC throughout the round, give an analysis of any evidence read, and provide clash.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
<b>AZBILL-SMITH, DAWN</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	
		2	3	5	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I will accept just about any argument as long as it is argued well. I want Ks to link directly. No "big box." I think that LD is about communicating clearly and good argumentation, so I expect conversational speed and tone. Quality of arguments over quantity.

<b>BEARD, PERRY</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GH
		4	5	4	5	4	

## Philosophy Statement

I like a clear standard or framework with which to weigh and filter arguments. Whichever debater can present and justify their framework (value/criterion) better than their opponent and link an offensive argument to that framework is likely to win.

<b>BRENNER, KYLE</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GH
		4	3	4	4	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I want students to remember that ultimately debate is about education. I enjoy debates where students demonstrate that they have learned about the topic, the art of persuasion, and how to speech clearly and effectively.

<b>CADE, CALEB</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GH
		3	5	3	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I am a "traditional" LD judge. Debaters must show that their value is the highest, and provide a weighing mechanism or criterion that achieves that value. Contention level arguments should be used to support the framework and show how the criterion achieves the value.

I prioritize framework when evaluating a round. I will also consider clash. Without clash, there is no debate. Debaters merely talk around each other. Debaters must provide impacts to their arguments. There cannot be just claims and warrants. Debaters must show how these claims and warrants impact the debate, the resolution, and their framework.

Debaters should rely on analytical, philosophical arguments as well as empirical evidence to support their claims.

Debaters may speak quickly, but should not spread. If I cannot understand an argument because of speed, I will not flow it. I prioritize clear communication in a debate round. Debaters should clearly sign-post when presenting arguments. I should not be left guessing where to place an argument on the flow.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
CALDWELL, JANICE	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		3	3	4	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

Value/criterion analysis important. Voters a must. Just because you make an observation does not mean I will vote for it. I look at contentions and evidence to support ideas. Analysis of evidence and ideas very important to me. Communication is very important also. Would prefer to hear fewer arguments with strong analysis and good communication skills.

CANNON, LACY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GH
		2	3	3	5	2	

## Philosophy Statement

LD Debate is Value debate. Make sure to remember that. I would like everything to link back to the value and for the value to link to the resolution. Don't get so caught up in the details that you forget the big picture.

Make sure that you listen to each other. Really listen. Often debaters simply respond to their opponents and don't really address what they said. Make sure to listen and connect your responses back to your position.

CLAESON, TAMMY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		3	4	4	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I appreciate persuasive speech, rhetorical appeals with a lack of rhetorical fallacies, and a good solid framework. I do not want to listen to a round that is so fast the average person can't easily follow along. Debaters should remember the origins of LD were to discuss the issues, not play gotcha with an opponent.

CLARK, MEGHAN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GH
		1	3	4	5	1	

## Philosophy Statement

I am, above all else, a flow judge. I am looking for a debater who can extend his/her arguments successfully and can clearly point out dropped arguments, clashes, etc. in ways that support his/her own case. Since this is not policy debate, I emphasize a philosophical rather than a pragmatic approach, although I find pragmatic support for philosophical frameworks acceptable. However, the primary emphasis of the debate must be philosophical.

I adamantly oppose overly rapid delivery styles, and will penalize debaters' speaker points if I cannot understand or flow their arguments due to excessive speed. Since debate is essentially a form of communication, debaters must modify their speed in order to communicate effectively with the judge and with their opponents.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
<b>CORNISH, NICOLE</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GHA
		1	3	3	3	3	

**Philosophy Statement**

I am open to most arguments in LD debate. Be sure you include voters to summarize why I should vote for you at the end of the round.

<b>COUNCIL, NATHANIEL</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GHADEF
		4	2	4	5	1	

**Philosophy Statement**

LD is philosophical, and while line by line argumentation is vital, in the end I will vote for the student who does a better job of advocating that their philosophical position is superior to their opponent. Clash is key and at the top of the list is the clash between the value and criterion that each debater sets out. Observations and contentions exist to support the core philosophy of the case. In close rounds contention and observation debate may win you the round, but only if the philosophical underpinnings of both sides is equally well advocated and defended. I prefer a speaking rate slightly faster than conversational.

<b>COWDEN, PATRICIA</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	H
		4	3	3	3	3	

**Philosophy Statement**

I view myself as a mildly conservative judge, however, I am open to any argument as long as it is fully developed, has clear examples and philosophy, and clearly links to resolution. As far as speaking goes, I am looking for clear articulation and smooth speaking patterns. I want to be able to understand what you are saying. Convince me that you are the winner.

<b>DENAR, OBINNA</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GD
		4	4	5	5	1	

**Philosophy Statement**

ask any questions needed before the round - they will be answered

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
<b>DIMMIG, BRENDEN</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	HADE
		3	3	3	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

You set the parameters for the debate. My only inclination is that whatever you go for in some way, shape or form be offensive. If not, I'll default to the individual making offensive arguments. Gonfor whywver you want: F/W, contentions, an off case position, ect. Finally, being technically correct will get you far. If you have any questions, let me know!

<b>Do, HANH</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GHA
		3	3	3	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I am a very traditional LD judge. Please do not run any kritikal affirmatives or Ks. Theory and Framework are fine as long as you let me know at the top of the flow this is what I ought to be adjudicating first prior to any other issues I ought to be reviewing. Please keep in mind, you as a debater, MUST do all the work. I will not intervene provided the debate is clean and well organized. You need to tell me the links and analysis as well as why your advocacy should be prioritized. I am not looking for a card throwing contest like in CX. If you are specifically looking at literature, you need to provide me the information on the literature because it is never the judge's obligation to research the topic. Just stating, "Maslow does not believe in this" is not a refute to the literature. I need impact calculus as well (if it deems so). Signpost and let me know where you are going on the flow but ALWAYS, weigh the round for your judge(s). DO NOT SPEED. IT IS NOT NECESSARY. The first reason why I will vote anyone down is because of failure of burdens. Aff has burden of proof and neg has burden to clash.

<https://judgephilosophies.wikispaces.com/Do,+Hanh>

<b>EDGIN, GLENNA</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	H
		3	3	3	4	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I have been involved with LD Debate for the past 25 years as a judge and 15 years as a coach. I have had several students make it to Regionals and have taken students to the state level as well. When it comes to judging, I expect to hear sincere argumentation, well-built cases, and evident knowledge of the case being argued. I do expect debaters to flow clearly and give proper attention to all aspects the opposing case. Understanding the link between value, criterion, and contentions should be evident at this stage. Cross examination should be used effectively and not wasted by asking for information that should have been written down while the other debater was presenting his or her case. In short, my expectations are for both debaters to debate with sincerity and knowledge of both debate as a form and the resolution. My vote is justified by which debater upholds his or her case best and is best able to undermine the opposing case in a respectful yet effective manner.

<b>FIGUR, ASHLEY</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	G
		2	3	3	4	3	

## Philosophy Statement

LD Debate is a value based and philosophy based debate and I think that upholding the value and being able to loop it back through the case is vital. I generally want to see debaters link their value (value loop) through their contentions and really use their criterion as a weighing mechanism. I judge based on a summary of the main arguments made in the round, and weigh who did a better job of supporting their case with their value and criterion, as well as providing sufficient attacks on their opponent's case. It should be a balance of supporting one's case well and refuting their opponent's just as well.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
<b>GARDINER, DAVID</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GHAD
		3	3	4	4	3	

## Philosophy Statement

LD is shifting to a more policy style. I am not a fan of policy debate taking over LD and PF these days. I will try to keep up with the speed but if you go to fast I will just get what I can. LD should focus on the morality of the issue but I expect real world situations to have a place in the round.

<b>GOBER, KENNETH</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	G
		2	2	3	5	2	

## Philosophy Statement

Speaker points and style are as important as substance. However eloquent yet empty words score no points. I'm not impressed by a debater who speed reads pre-scripted responses. A debate should be approached dynamically. I believe that the goal and benefit of a debate program should be to educate and hone the student's ability to think logically and respond artfully in a way that compels the attentive listener. Ultimately a debater who demonstrates having learned those skills would be judged highly.

<b>GRAVES, VICTORIA</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	HA
		3	5	3	4	3	

## Philosophy Statement

Type of Judge: Flow/Noninterventionist judge-Only evaluates what is said by the debaters.  
 Rate of Delivery: Between typical conversational speed and rapid conversational speed-I believe debate should provide training for good public communication. It is essential that I be able to understand your arguments and your supporting evidence. I will make a commitment to listen carefully, but I expect you to make a commitment to speak clearly.  
 Value and Criterion: Must be able to measure your value-While not my primary means of deciding the round, it is a factor depending on how it is used.  
 Rebuttals and Crystallization: Line-by-Line with voters-Indicate which arguments to "extend," "cross-apply," "turn," "drop," etc.  
 Evidence: Always Necessary-Evidence should be used empirically and analytically.  
 Theory: Make it make sense.-I'll vote on it if it is reasonable. Please tell me how it functions and how I should evaluate it. The most important thing about theory for me is to make it make sense. I would like for the debates about the debate to be interesting.  
 Kritik: No Preference-Don't be general. Germane and provide alternative not a rejection. Will give more credence to the most logical or realistic argument will be accepted.  
 Kicking: No Preference Do be clear about what you are kicking and remind me in 2AR and 2NR or I will count it as a drop. Don't kick something unless it is necessary. I expect you to run arguments that you plan on keeping, not time wasters.  
 Flow: I only note key arguments.-Be clear on tags and citations. If you want me to flow something, signpost it. Good round mapping and clear sign posting provides for clear analysis of the round.  
 Reason for Decision: Most persuasive with key arguments.-I will not vote for the better speaker, or the most arguments.  
 Additional Comments:  
 • I will not disclose. Do perform with professionalism-Don't be rude, don't use profanity, and don't be disruptive during someone else speech. Do stand during cross examination and speeches. Do offer resources and materials that are being utilized in the round.

<b>GREEN, KERRY</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	H
		3	5	4	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

My philosophy is that LD is a value first, criterion second debate. The value and supporting criterion must make sense. Next there must be evidence, both of the philosophical type and the pragmatic type. If you use historical context/events/evidence, be accurate. I will weigh the evidence brought to support your value/criterion and decide who proved through evidence their value was the best. Clashing is fine, but it needs to be over evidence or criterion not just a clash for the sake of clashing. If you can prove your value includes the other or that your value is superior then I am more likely to vote for you. However, inaccurate evidence nullifies your argument. I want to be able to understand you. I don't mind talking fast as long as it is intelligible. I dislike application of CX terms/concepts; this is not about the viability of proposed policy but rather what have we learned from existing policies (supported by evidence).

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
GREENWOOD, ALICIA	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GHADEF
		3	3	4	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I am a traditional judge. I believe the criterion is one of the primary means in making decisions. I like to see Value/Criterion clash and good argumentation. I lean towards the winner of key arguments.

HAMILTON, SUZANNE	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		3	3	3	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I look for good thinking and speaking skills in a LD debate. I want a well organized plan that I can follow. My decision results mainly in the value/criterion clash.

HARVEY, MIGUEL	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	HA
		4	4	5	1	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I am, in the general sense, a tabula rasa judge. I believe that it is the debaters' job (rather than the judge's) to set the framework for the debate, and that interference by the judge should be avoided when possible. I will accept any argument, but place great priority on sound analysis and reasoning. Contradictory arguments, unless properly justified as hypotheticals, do not sit well with me. Speed is not a problem, but I will respect the UIL rules and debaters' preference. I enjoy "traditional" LD debates focused on the resolitional statement, values, and criteria, but I'm also fine with impact-oriented debate, theoretical arguments, kritiks, policy options (both affirmative and negative), etc. Do what you want, make sense, and be respectful to each other. Lying and rudeness are bad, bad things in my book.

HARWOOD, HUNTER	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GHADEF
		5	5	5	1	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I'm a pretty tab judge. I judge the round on an offense-defense paradigm. I judge a lot on the Dallas local and the national circuit. I judged at the TOC last month. Speed is fine. I'll say clear. Run whatever types of args you feel like running. I will evaluate the round based purely on the flow.



# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
HAYNES, TIMOTHY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		3	4	4	4	4	

## Philosophy Statement

Communication Skills are essential along with this being a value/value criterion debate (especially with this resolution).

While I enjoy progressive debates, I expect the debaters to clearly establish their cases and clash on several levels.

HENDERSON, DOMINIC	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	AE
		4	4	5	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I prefer to judge LD on a comparative world approach, but I allow the debaters to define the parameters of the round. It would be best to do what you do in front of me because you will do that the best and the best debate is what I would prefer to adjudicate. I would claim to be progressive, but I am more easily persuaded to give flexibility to 1AR debaters dealing with multiple off case arguments that suffer from NC development.

HENNESSEY, RYAN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GHE
		3	3	4	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I am a former LD competitor and am now an LD coach. I coach a very diverse team that has a lot of debaters and IERs, and I coach it all.

Some things you should know about me as a critic:

I consider myself to be a tab judge judge with common sense. I will buy almost any argument as long as it is well warranted and explained well unless it is patently ridiculous.

I am ok with speed as long as it is clear, but it is not my responsibility to tell you to be clear. (Please also remember that this is UIL and I would prefer UIL Speed). If you think that your clarity is being sacrificed, slow down. It is far more important to me (and valuable to you) to make smart arguments as opposed to lots of blippy arguments.

Standards and Framework are important and most of the time are the key to determining who wins the round for me. With that said, if you don't tell me what I should be voting on in the round, I will decide on my own (and you may not like what I decide is most important).

As far as speaker points are concerned, discourtesy is the easiest way to get docked a lot of speaker points. Be polite, enjoy yourself, and have a good time.

If you have any other questions, feel free to ask before the round.

HENSON, GRACELYN DOSS	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GHADEF
		4	2	3	5	4	

## Philosophy Statement

My judging philosophy is a blend of confident and smooth delivery of information that connects the philosophy backing the case with concise, accurate information the supports the topic. An effective Lincoln-Douglas round includes clash with arguments that prove why one moral stance outweighs the opposition. I feel that it is important for each speaker to maintain composure and respect, while attacking opponents and upholding his/her case. Correct information should be valued as well. Voters are especially important to close the round.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
HESTER, RON	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		1	3	3	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

Over the past three decades I have seen the birth of this event move from a philosophical approach to more of a policy style. Although I see the need for events to follow trends, I am more of a traditional philosophy driven judge. I do want direct clash by the negative on all contentions and sub points. Clash on the value/criterion must also happen. Communication by both debaters is paramount and integrity of the event needs to be maintained. I want both debaters to talk to me instead of read to me and I need for them to interpret their data. Use of CX questions and time is critical in my RFDs and use of all prep time is essential to getting maximum speaker points. At the end of the round, I want both debaters to enjoy the moment as I will watching them perform.

HOLLAND, ROBEY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GHA
		4	4	5	4	2	

## Philosophy Statement

I'm a tab judge. I'll flow the round you put in front of me and do my best to adapt to the debaters in the room. In regards to my preferences for the debate, I tend to prefer offense over defense on the contention level. I look at framework as a way to evaluate which arguments are most important when deciding the round. Be technically sound- extend/ cross apply your arguments correctly, signpost throughout the round, etc.

If you have questions before the round feel free to ask!

JOHNSON, RENITA	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		3	3	3	4	3	

## Philosophy Statement

My approach to LD is traditional. It is a value debate so I want to hear value clash and use and acknowledgement of the role of the value criterion. Showing that your value, within the context of the resolution, outweighs your opponent's value is important. My preference is for line by line clash with use of evidence as needed. A reasonable amount of published, supporting evidence should be used throughout the debate. While content outweighs communication skills, I view debate as a communications event. So, delivery matters.

JORDAN, JASON	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	HA
		5	5	5	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I don't evaluate speaking skills as part of my decision. I use the heuristic of offense/defense to compare arguments. I'm open to all types of arguments/debate styles.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
KIRKSCEY, RUSSELL	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	HA
		4	4	4	4	2	

## Philosophy Statement

I believe that Lincoln-Douglas debate should use a discussion of framework (values, criteria, standards) and contentions that affirm or negate the resolution. Value debating should emphasize the debater's ability to attack and defend logically with well-linked arguments. I would rather hear resolution of substantive issues than theory debate, but I will vote on it if debaters make that a salient issue in the round. I believe that it is my position to write an educational ballot that supports my decision. I bring few predispositions to the round and judge only on the argumentation provided.

KOPPLIN, HAYDEN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	HA
		3	3	3	4	3	

## Philosophy Statement

Communication is essential. Affirmative has the burden of evidence, and negative has the burden of clash. Arguments should be thoughtful and pointed. Affirmative must outline a value and criterion, and then explain how they work in tandem. I heavily weigh value and criterion debate. However, I am not removed from pragmatic arguments and what will work best in terms of practicality within our society and government. Make sure that you include voters, and be sure to write the ballot for me at the end of the round. Explain why I should vote for you, and why which arguments should be deciding factors in the round.

LOVE, EBONY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		3	4	4	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I believe in having a good old fashion debate where the students create lots of clash. By clash, I mean that students should argue each contention of their opponent along with any sub points or any hidden meanings. Additionally, the students should be rebuilding their case as they continue on and placing unique attacks on their opponents case. The value and criterion should be unique or at least presented in a way that moves away from the norm and shows the time that they put forth towards the topic. There needs to also be factual evidence that supports the contention and delivered in a manner that is understandable to both the coach and opponent.

LOVELL, RYAN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GH
		4	3	5	5	5	

## Philosophy Statement

Focus on the value and criterion debate. Make your impacts clear.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
<b>MARKHAM, JAMES</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	HA
		3	3	3	4	3	

## Philosophy Statement

The main thing I want to see in an LD round is intelligent clash between the two debaters. I prefer a more traditional style that focuses upon philosophy and morally determining the value of the resolution. Please avoid off-case arguments and "One-Person CX" during the debate, as I believe these have no place in LD Debate. Lastly and most importantly, please adequately communicate your points with the room. If everyone in the room for a debate does not understand what is happening, then it is not a debate.

<b>MARTIN, JEFFREY</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GA
		3	3	3	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

Traditional Value/Value Criterion Philosophy. I will consider other observations and framework as a round dictates. Apply arguments where you want them as I cannot do that for you. Remember this is professional communication event. A fast conversational speed is acceptable. If you have a philosophy question, then please ask it before the round begins.

<b>McKINLEY, JONATHAN</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	HA
		3	3	3	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I am somewhat open as a judge. If you present arguments in a logical pragmatic way with evidence I will weigh it in round. Tell me why you win in rebuttals and respect each other.

<b>MEARS, ERIC</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GHADEF
		3	3	3	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I prefer a comparative worlds approach to LD Debate. I believe that both sides have the obligation to have independent advocacy that is uniquely "vote for me" offense rather than relying on a simple "don't vote for them" stance. I am willing to be intrigued by an argument that I may have never considered before, but it needs to be within the realm of feasibility and logic and have significant depth the first time I hear it. Developing arguments through cross-x and rebuttals is part of the debate, but if I have to wait until the 3rd or 4th run through to "get it", it's not to your advantage.

At the end of the round, I prefer to vote big-picture inwards rather than construct a maze of contention-level arguments leading to a holistic decision. Like most judges, I will take the easiest way out—meaning the simplest decision to explain is the one that will prevail.

Finally, debaters would be very well served by keeping in mind the audience only gets one shot. You have spent months on the research and development and you know the intricate details of your 2nd subpoint on your 3rd contention. We don't. And the time limits don't allow us to, really. It's not a discussion. We don't get to ask questions until we are satisfied with the depth and scope of your argument. Go through your case and really examine "does this make sense to someone who doesn't know the topic?" Many times, the simplest arguments are the best arguments because they don't rely on a lot of nuanced knowledge about the subject to digest in this format.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
<b>MILLER-WYATT, LYDIA</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	H
		3	3	3	4	3	

**Philosophy Statement**

While solid communications skills are necessary, I also prefer well-constructed cases on both sides, with well-supported value, criterion and contentions. Refuting the opponent's arguments is also necessary, so following the flow and providing warrants is critical. Spreading for the sake of spreading is not desirable; solid points must be made.

<b>MILLS, SCOTT</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GHA
		2	2	2	3	2	

**Philosophy Statement**

I want to see debaters strongly support their cases and persuade on why their Value/Criterion is more important than their opponents. Interesting and deep analysis that causes important clashes within the debate are very important to me, those who can decipher cases and persuasively argue those points get my ballot.

<b>MORRIS, JANET</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GHADEF
		4	4	5	4	4	

**Philosophy Statement**

LD debate should be well linked down the flow. Value/criterion must link. Criterion need to be measurable to be used as a weighing mechanism. Contentions must support the value/criterion. Quality of argumentation is a must. I will take some outside the box value and criterion provided the link. Speed is OK as long as clarity is not sacrificed. I don't argue the round for the students. They must place their arguments on the flow where they are to go.

<b>Moss, DAN</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GHADEF
		3	4	3	4	3	

**Philosophy Statement**

I am more of a traditional judge, prefer arguments that are more germane to the nature of the resolution. I listen critically and can flow.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
<b>MUNDT, MICHAEL</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	H
		3	3	5	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

(1) I evaluate arguments that link to the established frameworks in the round.  
 (2) I will not vote on floating offense or random arguments that have nothing to do with the framework.  
 (3) New in the two will not be weighed and will likely jack your speaker points.  
 (4) Speaking of speaker points, I award based on quality of arguments and trying to be persuasive or passionate is not impressive. I want a debate, not competing oratories.  
 (5) Clarity is far more important than rate of speed.  
 (6) In the end, I expect a coherent story to be presented in the last rebuttal speech.  
 (7) Finally, I have no interest in debaters throwing a bunch a spaghetti at the wall and seeing what sticks. One cogent argument beats 5 underdeveloped arguments every time.

Some specific things on this resolution I have found strange and advise:  
 (1) I expect to know what democratic ideal is being explicitly harmed by wealth inequality and that needs to be clear in the AC, AR, and 2AR.  
 (2) I believe that the affirmative debater must justify all words in the resolution, not just "wealth inequality is detrimental."  
 (3) Likewise, I believe that the negative has the burden of rejoinder and it isn't sufficient to claim that wealth inequality is not detrimental to xyz when the affirmative states that it is detrimental to abc.

<b>MYRICK, MARILYN</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	HA
		4	3	5	2	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I am open to pretty much any argument you feel comfortable running. You need to create a clear FW in the round for me to vote and weigh the round with. I judge on an offense/defense paradigm.

<b>NESLONEY, LYDIA G</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	H
		4	4	3	4	3	

## Philosophy Statement

The debaters need to articulate cases and make clear transitions in arguments. I want debaters to clearly label warrants in their analysis. Winning debaters must be good speakers and good listeners. All arguments on either side must be closely related to the current topic. I default to a standard paradigm. Debaters should create a clash on the topic and the best argument wins.

<b>O'BRIEN, CHRISTOPHER</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	
		3	3	5	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I am open to vote on any developed and structured argument, as long as you provide the necessary framework to allow me to know how it affects my decision. I will focus my evaluation on what you focus your analysis on, so if you think something is a voting issue, make sure to provide thorough analysis to support, and also defend your argument throughout the debate round. Comparison of both side's analysis and evidence is the best way to get my ballot. Don't sacrifice clarity for speed. Be professional. If you have any other questions feel free to ask before the round begins.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
<b>OLSON, RACHEL</b>	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	H
		3	3	3	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

My basic philosophy is that a speaker should be able to clearly communicate his/her ideas. Spreading to a small degree is okay, but I need to clearly understand the arguments being made. Clash is very important—it shows that a debater is attentive to the details and is present during the round. I appreciate a combination of appeals. Pathos alone makes a weak argument, but Logos alone is dry—I want to see both addressed in an appropriate manner. The debate should be value based and also pragmatic. Be persuasive.

<b>ORR, BERNA DETTE</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	HA
		3	3	5	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I'm one of those die-hard old-fashioned judges that still like a really good value/criterion clash. I still like you to have a philosopher you base your case on, although it is not the absolutely necessary that you do so. I really like frameworks in LD. Tell me how you think I should view/weigh the round. I also like when you extend your arguments/philosophy to real-world implications. For all of this, I'm not the one debating the round. This is just what I like. You should be the ones shaping what I see, not vice-versa.

<b>PEEK, SANDRA</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	HAD
		3	4	5	4	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I prefer strong clash on issues that directly relate to the affirmation or negation of the resolution. I also prefer a moderate speed for LD debate though I will grant a lot of latitude in the 1AR as to speed. I do not enjoy super slow debate. I prefer debaters to be polite to their opponents and speaker points will be lowered to reflect rude or condescending behavior. Evidence should be properly cited with at least the author and date delivered orally, and a full citation available upon request.

<b>PIETSEK, SETH</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GH
		3	3	5	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

LD is a philosophy driven debate that focuses on the should and not necessarily the can. Although I will buy a pragmatic (even to the point of a plan) approach if you convince me that morality is only achieved by your paradigm. I will have to see the value achieved regardless of approach, otherwise I am uncertain how to measure such grey areas.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
<b>PIPPEN, MATT</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	HA
		4	4	4	4	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I competed in CX debate in high school. After graduating, I competed in parliamentary debate at Texas Tech University before coaching debate at Seminole High School.

I am tabula rasa and will evaluate whatever is debated in the round. I am fine with traditional or progressive debate (e.g. plans and kritiks). I am fine with a philosophical round or theory. This is your debate. If no one argues differently, I will default to evaluating framework (value/criterion) in the round.

Speed is not an issue, as long as I can understand you. Signposting is critical regardless of the speed.

I do my best not to intervene. Impacting, analysis/voters, and clash help me to avoid weighing arguments for you.

<b>PURSLEY, LIZ</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GD
		3	3	4	4	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I am inclined to vote off the major arguments on my flow, but you must clarify the round and give me crystallization as to why the arguments you are winning on the flow matter. I can follow the round, but I am not going to do the work for you. Make sure you give me voters and most importantly evidence for the issues you believe have become paramount in each particular round. This is value based debate so spend some time explaining to me which value/criterion I am to use to frame the round. Remember that this is also a speaking event and in being so try not to yell at your opponent, and try to speak as clearly as possible. Don't kick a dog when it's down. You don't have to use all your time if you don't need it.

<b>RADPOUR, DIANNA</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	G
		4	3	4	4	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I think that LD Debate should be a forum for students to explore ways of engaging the topic, and I am a fan when students choose creative methods of doing so. If students offer a way other than value/value criterion to weigh and vote in round, I will evaluate it just like any other argument in round, but otherwise I will default to value/value criterion. I expect debaters to give clear voters. I'm pretty open-minded to anything, and just ask that debaters remain polite and respectful of one another and all arguments presented. Speed isn't an issue as long as debaters are articulating ('spreading' should not be synonymous with slurring!)

<b>RANDOLPH, SHELBY</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GHA
		3	3	3	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I really will flow anything in LD. If you want to go with a straight framework debate then I will listen to that, but really impact it out and explain why I should vote for you. If you would rather go for a more policy style debate then I can follow that as well.



# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
RANDOLPH, NANCY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	HA
		4	3	3	3	2	

## Philosophy Statement

I believe LD debate has to have a value and criteria for the case to be built around. Each debate needs to be able to communicate why this value and criteria outweighs their opponent's and provide clash. They must have evidence in their case but being able to express opinions with evidence and philosophy help provide more clash. communication is a must and the delivery must be where I can understand them and be able to flow the information.

RECKER, NOAH	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GH
		2	3	4	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

LD is a value debate and all arguments should have a link to the value in some way. A criterion is essential to help achieve or measure that value. Don't just point out dropped arguments but impact them. Please give voters. Spreading will result in missed arguments on the flow and could impact the round negatively for that debater.

RICE, COURTNEY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		3	3	4	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

Be certain to provide a clear value and criterion in the round and prove to me why your case is superior to your opponent. I like to see line-by-line argumentation and application of logic and evidence to tell me why your opponent's arguments fail. I am a traditional value debate judge, so plan based arguments may not win me over.

SHAH, SANDEEP	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GHADEF
		4	4	4	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

Value Debate is important  
 Line x Line & Framework  
 Acceptable for all forms of argumentation, but keep it relevant. I do not like strict K's or topicality if you do not have the BASIC structure of a case or position.  
 Narratives are good too.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
SIMS, JOHN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GHADEF
		5	5	4	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

My approach to LD is pretty straightforward; justify some sort of evaluative mechanism and then explain why affirming or negating would be good under that mechanism. I'm generally open to any argument/style that doesn't exclude or harm other debaters.

SLOANE, KIMBERLY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	A
		4	4	3	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

Students should always remember that this is a persuasive event. While I can keep up with those who speak fast, it does diminish your persuasiveness. Evidence is not necessary for all points; however, it is appreciated when possible. Grouping of arguments is acceptable for efficiency, but be sure grouped arguments do relate and that your counterarguments apply to everything you grouped. LD Debate does not require solvency, and I will not vote on the basis that a negative claims the affirmative can't solve the problem. Stick to philosophy.

SMITH, JIMMY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		3	2	4	3	2	

## Philosophy Statement

Communication is key to winning my ballot

STANDIFER, JOHNATHEN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GA
		4	2	5	1	3	

## Philosophy Statement

To start with I'll explain the preferences given below:  
 A. As far as rate of delivery goes, anything short of spreading will be perfectly fine. If you choose to spread or feel the need to spread in order to make your arguments, just be warned that I may not get everything down as it has been a few years since I personally debated.  
 B. In regards to the amount of evidence present, I just want you to have what you need to make an argument. This should only really become an issue if your opponent reads evidence in contradiction to one of your arguments and you have none to reply with, or cannot formulate a logical path around that block.  
 C. I will generally vote on whatever the debate is consisting of; that being said, it is the job of the aff to prove the resolution true, and for the neg to prove the resolution false. Facts are definitely going to do that better with this topic, but if an argument of emotional standing can still affirm/negate the resolution it will be perfectly acceptable.  
 D. I personally don't see a use of standard Value/Criteria necessary for this topic. Of course it will probably be present in most all cases seen, it probably will not be a direct voting issue unless you can show me how it relates to the resolution and how it fulfills your burdens as an aff or neg.  
 E. However you approach this topic, relate it back to the resolution. As long as you can sufficiently explain to me why you should win this debate, I'll consider it a voting issue.

All of that being said, I try to stay out of the way of the debate as much as possible. I ran many different arguments of my own as a debater and I am open to anything as long as you can show that you have an understanding of the arguments you are making and can show their impacts in this round. Be on top of your impact calculus and WHY it is important for you to win an argument.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
<b>STANDLY, STAN</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	H
		3	3	3	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I am very much of the belief that LD must be balanced between philosophy and pragmatics. To have an idea you can support and validate is important within the ideology of LD topics in general.

With that being said; what I have noticed more and more over the last several years has been the tendency to just make claims as arguments, without warrants and impacts. I need to hear the support and foundations for the claims/attacks being made. I need to know you understand and can apply that understanding in your attacks. Then, what are the impacts of these attacks? In-round? Out-of-round?

You must fulfill all of your debate responsibilities, I will not do the debating for you.

<b>STANLEY, ROB</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GH
		2	3	3	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I want good solid arguments run, answered, defended, and summarized. I also want you to stand up straight, look at me, speak in a normal tone, at a normal rate, with vocal inflection. I am a traditionalist and I want to hear a value/criteria combination. For me, the resolution is a blanket statement and it is the job of each debater to explain why I should evaluate the statement according to a specific value paradigm. I will listen to a non-traditional case with theory warrants, but, all evidence and analysis being equal I will defer to "Value/Criteria necessary" argumentation.

There should be a balance of philosophical support, empirical support, and analysis from the speaker. It should not be a war of "cards" but some data must be used to support claims in your argumentation. While topics may lend themselves more or less to pragmatic data and research – the point of LD is to explore the philosophical bases for decision-making so the philosophy is ALWAYS a must. However, I do agree that the point of exploring the philosophical bases is to improve our decision-making so I also value the pragmatic application.

<b>STOLTE, PRESTON</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GHADEF
		5	4	5	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I have coached and judged policy debate for a number of years. I started coaching and judging LD debate at the national circuit frequently this year. That being said I guess I fall on the more "progressive" end of LD judges.

On this topic in particular I think the true/false nature of the resolution means there is some ambiguity in terms of how I should evaluate who is winning/what it takes to vote aff/neg. These are meta level issues that I think debaters should probably address at some point in the debate.

I think theory arguments or frameworks need to have offensive justifications. To that extend I probably view all or most arguments through an offense/defense lens.

<b>TABOR, TY</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GH
		3	3	4	5	1	

## Philosophy Statement

Appearance and rapid speech are not as important as quality of speech along with a solid criterium and value. The ability to clash is important in the debate process.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
<b>THOMAS, KATHY</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	G
		4	3	3	2	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I am an adaptable judge. I do not have a preference for any particular style and as a result of my background I am comfortable with both traditional and progressive approaches. I am comfortable with many styles of debate and as a result I don't mind critical frameworks, policy approaches or empirics. Theory is fine just make sure there is abuse if you run it. I believe there will always be a need to weigh an impact / criterion that is easily measured and evaluated but I don't decide based on quantity or arguments won but based on the quality of the arguments.

Having said that, I believe the affirmative has the burden to prove the resolution and I believe the negative has the burden of creating clash. Each debater is responsible for more than defense. If offense is not provided I don't believe you have done your job. To achieve this, the affirmative must provide a value and criterion that should act as a mechanism to evaluate the issues in the round. I see the criterion/standard as the means to achieve the value or goal.

I believe it is your job to point out voters to me to evaluate. Issues of fairness and education should be evaluated as voters.

<b>TOBES, RACHEL</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	G
		2	3	3	5	2	

## Philosophy Statement

I'm interested in understanding the connection between your value and criteria, HOW and WHY they are different from Aff/Neg (True clash.), and WHY your logic allows the flow of contentions to support your V/C connection.

<b>VICE, JOHN</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	
		4	3	3	4	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I am a fairly traditional judge. I like to see philosophy in a round, but it is not requires to take the ballot. I tend to focus on the value and 2-3 clashes to determine a winner. I want debate, not just a well organized discussion or presentation of cases. I appreciate strong voters and a debater who can summarize exactly where he/she is winning each point.

<b>WALTERS, JANET</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	H
		2	4	5	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

Both affirmative and negative debaters must focus on the resolution, presenting a value that has great worth and that will be protected by either the affirmation or the negation of the resolution. The criterion should provide a philosophy or a belief system that supports the chosen value and that will be linked to the debater's contentions. Throughout the debate, each debater must show how his or her contentions will support his value.

Both debaters must show the flaws in their opponent's case and skillfully defend any attacks on their own.

The debate should end with each debater summarizing the debate and giving the judge "voters."

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
WHITE, NEAL	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GHADEF
		4	5	5	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

<https://judgephilosophies.wikispaces.com/White,+Neal>

WIENECKE, CASSIDY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	A
		5	5	5	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I will vote on offense. Run the arguments you run best, not the ones you think I want to hear and I will adapt to you.

WILLIAMS, LINDSEY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		4	3	5	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

For starters, LD is a Value/Criterion debate and I treat it as such. I want to see a clear link between your value and criterion, and I want to know how they link through your case. After that, I judge you on making logical, cohesive arguments and did you do your job in both attacking and defending arguments. Overall I want to see good clash and a well executed building, attacking, defending and refuting of arguments across the board. If you make a claim during argumentation you need to back it up either with logical reasoning, philosophical merit, or clear evidence. Drops can weigh heavily in my decision making process, so in short: attack all parts of the case presented to you and defend/refute all attacks made against you.

In regards to philosophy: I am very comfortable with philosophy, but I don't necessarily prefer it over more pragmatic cases. What I'm looking for is this: did you build a case appropriate to the resolution, and whatever format you chose, did you argue your points fully in a logical and consistent manner. I do not believe one type of case is better than the other nor do I believe that one type of case automatically trumps the other.

In regards to observations: I believe they should be used as a means of clarifying the resolution or the scope it provides for a fair and reasonable debate. Beyond that, I do not lend a great deal of weight, if any, to observations.

In regards to frameworks: The resolution in conjunction with your value and criterion and the rules set out by UIL for LD debate are the framework of the debate.

WILLIAMS, SHELLEY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	HA
		3	3	4	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I want to hear the clash in a round.

Presentation of the information is important in determining speaker points.

I love a road map because it helps the debater maintain organization and thus allows for more opportunity for clash.

Without clash, there is not a debate.

I try to maintain a balance between communication and the issues.

I determine the winner of round based on whether or not there is a value-criterion relationship and whether or not the contentions uphold the value-criterion.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2016 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
WILSON, JAYELLEN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		3	2	4	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

LD Debate is VALUE debate. I evaluate the round based on whether the debater has used value and criterion to support or negate the resolution. Using persuasion techniques, the debater must argue and clash with his/her opponent, and use evidence and reasoning to support his/her claims. I do flow the round and will be able to recognize dropped arguments. LD debaters should complement quantity or evidence with other equally persuasive appeals. Persuade me that your position is the most important one . . . refute, clash and do well! Congratulations to you on a job well done on making it to state!

WILSON, LAUREN	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	A
		3	3	3	3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I believe communication skills are vital in judging debate. If students are not clearly understood, then their case suffers.

WITT, MELISSA	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GHADEF
		3	3	4	4	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I enjoy both the philosophy and the pragmatic argumentation offered in LD Debate. I enjoy traditional value/criteria models as well as more progressive kritikal argumentation. The non-negotiables are politeness in-rounds and outside of them; full arguments with impacts and logical progression; and offense on the opponents case.