JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2019 — 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

ACEVEDO, MANUEL

- ◯ Communication Skills
- ◯ Resolution of Issues
- ⦿ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	4	4	4	3

Philosophy Statement

I am a traditional LD judge. Framework of the debate is of the utmost importance because it will force me to evaluate your impacts before the other team's impacts and nullifies most, if not all, of the other team's offense. Sufficient evidence is needed for any claim made during the entire debate. Give me clear reasons to vote for you and explain why those reasons are preferable to your opponent's. Make sure that during the delivery, you speak clearly in order for me to hear all of your points and watch rate of delivery. I can't vote on what I don't hear or can't understand.

ADAMS, JENNIFER

- ◯ Communication Skills
- ◯ Resolution of Issues
- ⦿ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	3	4	2	4

Philosophy Statement

I will try to adapt to you if you have a clearly defined framework. That being said, I appeciate "traditional" LD, I prefer to see rounds dealing with competing ideas of should/ would with a philosophical basis. I do not care to see plans, solvency, K...

AILSHIE, ZACHERY

- ◯ Communication Skills
- ◯ Resolution of Issues
- ⦿ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	4	3	4	4

Experience: GHADEF

Philosophy Statement

My philosophy is that the student must be able to prove to the judge why their case is the strongest. They can do this through persuasive stats, presentation, and organization.

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE

ALDERSON, LINDA

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

EXPERIENCE: HADF

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	4	3	5	1

Philosophy Statement

LD is value debate. The value must be supported with evidence as to how it is a value. The criterion must have a weighing mechanism and not be a second value. Values, criterion, and contentions must be linked. The debaters should establish a value hierarchy for the round. LD is persuasive communication. That is the primary responsibility of the debater in the round. DEBATE THE TOPIC--NOT DEBATE THEORY. This is not one man cx debate. All arguments need to be pertinent to the topic.

The aff. should define terms as needed.

ALFORD, BRIAN

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

EXPERIENCE: HA

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	4	5	3

Philosophy Statement

UIL is not the place for progressive LD. Traditional cases with value and criterion statements are preferred at this tournament. Competitors must weigh arguments and framework. Fast delivery is frowned upon.

ANDERSON, JOHN

- ○ Communication Skills
- ● Resolution of Issues
- ○ Equal

EXPERIENCE: GHA

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	4	4	2	3

Philosophy Statement

I need specific reasons to vote for you and against your opponent. By default I interpret this resolution as necessitating the aff prove the benefits of AI outweigh the harms, and the neg proving the harms outweigh the benefits. I am open to listening to your alternative interpretation and I will vote on those if they are well warranted and extended properly. I err towards "improves" meaning we are only discussing presently occurring effects but I am partial to framework that demonstrates this is bad for debate and that we ought to look to future implications as well, so long as good reasoning is given for doing so. I usually find myself voting for debaters who demonstrate better technical skills, rather than pretty speakers or "gotcha" arguments in your constructive that don't get followed up on. I don't care about your value or criterion if you don't have offense underneath that framework. If the 2AR is three minutes of "I have the better value so vote aff" you're probably losing my ballot. Win your framework, and then apply that framework and show me how, using it, you have proven the resolution true/false. Ask any specific questions. Speed is fine but don't flex for me at the expense of clarity because I will dock speaks.

ATKINSON, JOSIAH

- ○ Communication Skills
- ● Resolution of Issues
- ○ Equal

EXPERIENCE: GH

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	5	4	1	4

Philosophy Statement

When it comes to debate I'm completely Tabula Rasa. For value debate specifically I tend to vote off impact calculus in my rounds.

For specifics to high I weigh argumentation check out this link on tabroom.

https://www.tabroom.com/index/paradigm.mhtml?judge_person_id=25976

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE

BLAIN, ROBERT

Comm. Skills vs. Res. of Issues:
- ○ Communication Skills
- ◉ Resolution of Issues
- ○ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	4	4	5	4

Experience: H

Philosophy Statement

Speed - Speed does not compensate for a lack of skill. A faster speed should only be used because a debater genuinely has many points to state and reinforce. The burden of comprehension is on the speaker to make himself/herself understandable to the trained ear. If I miss an argument, the speaker didn't make it and it will not be weighed.

Dead Time - Both debaters should be ready to begin cross or their next speech upon completion of the prior speech, unless utilizing prep time. Transition time from speech to speech should be natural and not slowed/extended to create extra mental planning time. Prep Time - All prep is "running prep"

Arguments - Directly address the opposing arguments. The best case wins on both the AFF and NEG frameworks. Also, do not throw countless contentions out and then assert the other side only addressed 45 of 50 (so to speak) in rebuttal- 3-4 contentions is plenty.

Evidence - Give me specifics from your evidence of what your contentions will do (or what the opposing case will do). Theoretical arguments don't flow, if the other side has stats of why you're wrong.

Burdens - AFF and NEG have equal and opposite burden of proof. Because of limited time, this can be difficult to both prove your case and disprove the opposing case. The stronger weight will always be FOR your case over AGAINST opposing case.

I have judged enough rounds of this topic that I've heard a lot of evidence on both sides. Do not leave holes in your case that a novice could attack. At UIL State, the case should be polished and tight. I have a background of a business degree (economics/finance focus). Making wrong economic arguments can hurt you.

BRENNER, KYLE

Comm. Skills vs. Res. of Issues:
- ○ Communication Skills
- ◉ Resolution of Issues
- ○ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	3	3	3

Experience: G

Philosophy Statement

I enjoy rounds where both students know that material that they are arguing. I favor deep debates wtih big stick impacts. Please do not hesitate to ask questions prior to the round

BROWN VAN HOOSE, LOIS

Comm. Skills vs. Res. of Issues:
- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ◉ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	4	4	5	3

Experience:

Philosophy Statement

* SPEECH ORGANIZATION & SIGN POSTING CONSISTENTLY ALONG THE WAY IS IMPORTANT IN TAKING YOUR ARGUMENT INTO FULL CONSIDERATION

* I EXPECT THAT A COMPLETE ARGUMENT CONTAIN CLAIM, WARRANT, & DATA & DEBATERS CLEARLY SHOW HOW EACH ARGUMENT EITHER SUPPORTS OR NEGATES THE RESOLUTION

* IN CLOSING THE DEBATE I EXPECT CLEAR SUMMARIZATION & PRIORITIZATION OF ARGUMENTS AS TO HOW THEY AFFIRM OR NEGATE THE RESOLUTION

* I DO NOT PRIORITIZE ARGUMENTS FOR YOU - I JUDGE THE FLOW AS IT IS PRESENTED

* LAST BUT NOT LEAST LET'S NOT FORGET TO HAVE FUN & BE ENGAGING - FOR THAT IS WHAT THIS EVENT CAN BE AT ITS GREATEST!

CLARK, MEGHAN

Comm. Skills vs. Res. of Issues:
- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ◉ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
2	2	3	2	1

Experience: GH

Philosophy Statement

I prefer a philosophy-based case and round. Debaters should provide evidence for claims made in their cases/rebuttals, but should rely on a strong value/criteria/contentions relationship rather than merely an overwhelming volume of evidence. Demonstrating clash is essential - debaters must emphasize value and criteria clash (or absorption) in order to prove the primacy of their case.

I also prefer a moderate rate of speed. Communication skills are essential to debate, and debaters who fail to communicate effectively with their opponent and their judge cannot expect to do well in their round. Clarity and connection should be prized over speed in the round.

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE

COLLATOS, JOSEPH

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	4	3	4	3

Experience: GHADEF

Philosophy Statement

In a one sentence summary I am a Traditional Tab judge. LD debate is unique and therefore different than policy. I do not wish to see a maverick round of policy debate. Considering Value and Criterion are the literal first things a judge is introduced to in your case you must uphold your VC throughout the round, if your opponent can show how you do not meet or they better meet; it puts you in a difficult position to win the round. Quality OVER quantity, I would much rather hear a round over one argument that is well developed and articulated than twenty weak arguments that are essentially just warrants with no impacts, aka do NOT card dump. If your speed becomes an issue for me, I will not flow your arguments, and it is ultimately the judge's flow that matters in the round. I expect debaters to stand their ground without becoming disrespectful to their opponents. Affirmative you have the burden of proof so if you have not proven to me the resolution you will not win my ballot. Negative if you do not clash with the Affirmative then you fail to uphold your burden and will not win my ballot. Lastly, as I mentioned I am a traditional judge, so if you wish to run a K, that is your choice, but I would not, unless it truly applies, and you have it 100% developed.

COMPTON , KRIS

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	4	3	3

Experience: H

Philosophy Statement

*Clash

*Philosophy is a plus

*Organization is essential

*While speaking style is not the utmost important in LD, if I can't understand what you are saying, I can't consider your arguments.

*Have clear distinct links between ideas

*Decorum in the round is of utmost importance; if you are arrogant and rude to your competitor you will lose the round.

*Extend clearly

*Not a fan of K's, however, I have voted on K's if they are argued well

COOK, DALTON

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	3	4	5	2

Experience: GA

Philosophy Statement

Upholding and substantiating the value and criterion should be the highest priority in round, and is my number one voting criteria. I will accept any and all arguments with an open mind as long as they are well executed and communicated. Civility and professionalism in round are also of great importance.

COSIO, JAKE

- ○ Communication Skills
- ● Resolution of Issues
- ○ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	4	4	3	4

Experience: H

Philosophy Statement

I'm pretty good with most arguments as long as they are clearly impacted in the round and demonstrate that why I should vote on them. You can check my Tabroom paradigm. It has most of this info and probably more.
The 4 on speed is meant to be interpreted as I can probably keep up with your speed, but you want to slow down on your tags.
I generally will not vote on arguments that are made about what types of arguments are allowed in LD. I will listen to anything. If you think something your opponent is doing is unfair, you need to do more than call it abusive - you will need to prove how it is abusive, why that is bad, and why I need to vote on it.
If you want to do value/value criterion framing with contention level offense I'm good with it. Make sure that you are linking your offense back to the framework. At the end of the debate you just need to show me why I should vote for you under the framework that is shown to be most effective in the round.
If you would prefer to take a more policy type approach (DAs, CP, and case) I am fine with that as well. Not sure how that really fits this resolution, but if you figured it out then go for it.
I will say that I am rather weak on judging Kritiks. It isn't that I don't like them or won't vote on them, I just find in a large portion of rounds I do not understand them (this is particularly more likely with jargon heavy Ks). If I can't understand it, I won't vote on it. Therefore, I would highly discourage you from running a K if I am judging you.
If you want to run theory/topicality, go for it. I default competing interps, but will evaluate competing interps vs. reasonability as argued in the round. I have voted on RVIs when well warranted.

| JUDGE | COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES | NUMERICAL RANKINGS | EXPERIENCE |

COUNCIL, NATHANIEL

COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES:
- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ◉ Equal

NUMERICAL RANKINGS:

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	4	4	3	2

EXPERIENCE: GHADEF

Philosophy Statement

I believe that debaters should be allowed to set the terms for the debate. I will listen to all types of arguments that are run properly. Students should abide by the UIL speed guidelines when competing at UIL. To me this means that students may speak faster than conversational if they are proficient at be communicative whist doing so.

D'ENTREMONT, CATHY

COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES:
- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ◉ Equal

NUMERICAL RANKINGS:

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	3	3	4

EXPERIENCE: HA

Philosophy Statement

I am a traditional . Debate is persuasion. It is your job to use arguments and style to persuade me. Evidence is important, but without analysis it is hard to give it credit. Both sides should address the on balance issue. I vote for reasonable arguments which are valid in a real world context. Obscurity won't kill you, but it will take more masterful argumentation to win with it.

Speed. If it impairs my understanding or makes more work for me to understand, it is going to hurt you. Fewer arguments clearly and throroughly developed ususally have more impact than drive-by throw as much out as you can presentation.

DARBY, BRIAN

COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES:
- ○ Communication Skills
- ◉ Resolution of Issues
- ○ Equal

NUMERICAL RANKINGS:

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
2	3	3	4	3

EXPERIENCE: GHADE

Philosophy Statement

I believe in a traditional rounds where priority goes with the value and the value criterion.

I believe that impact calculus, value, and standard comparisons are very important to gaining access to my ballot.

I prefer a slower paced more methodical round.

I believe that every word in the resolution is in there for a reason.

DEBORD, LOGAN

COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES:
- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ◉ Equal

NUMERICAL RANKINGS:

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	4	5	3

EXPERIENCE: A

Philosophy Statement

I like to see debaters engage with each other on both the value/criterion and substantive side of the flow. How does your criterion allow you to access, or uphold, your value? How does your opponent's fail to do so, or, why is your value to be preferred? Use your value/criterion as a lens to view the round and impacts of artificial intelligence as presented in your case. I'll be impressed if you demonstrate an understanding of philosophy. Please engage with the specific warrants in your opponent's evidence and not just the tag lines. Be clear with your interpretation of AI. Give me voters, as I tend to base a decision on one or two direct quotes from your final speech.

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE

DECKER, ALEXANDER

○ Communication Skills
○ Resolution of Issues
◉ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	4	5	5	2

GHADEF

Philosophy Statement

Lincoln-Douglas is, at it's core, a value based debate. To that end I prioritize weighing of framework, and prefer to see a strong value-criterion debate. I'm open to progressive debate styles, but I don't believe that simply throwing a dozen arguments at your opponents qualifies as meaningful debate. I'd rather see strong clash, backed by substantive evidence, on the topic. Voting is made substantially easier if you give me a mechanism by which to weigh the round, so I do also give preference to that.

If you run it I will always flow it and weigh it. Just happy to hear good debate.

DICKSON, CHRISTOPHER

○ Communication Skills
○ Resolution of Issues
◉ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	3	3	3

HADEF

Philosophy Statement

I'm a tabula rasa judge. I expect the debaters to determine how the round should go. It's the debaters responsibility to establish the weighing mechanism for each argument. It is also their responsibility to tell me where and how to vote.

DONALDSON, MICHAEL

○ Communication Skills
○ Resolution of Issues
◉ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	4	4	3	3

HA

Philosophy Statement

I am willing to adapt to any stylistic approach that a debater wants to take in the round. I look for LD-ers to keep an organized flow with direct clash with one another. One of my biggest pet peeves in LD rounds is to watch students neglect their opponent's case or positions. Remember that your case/advocacy does not exist in a vacuum. I like to see arguments pushed towards a plausible, real world impact, but I'm also totally fine with looking at things in a more abstract lens. Just tell me how to frame the round. I am okay with speed as long as you slow down for taglines and emphasize key points. Please don't hesitate to ask me specific questions before the round. You won't hurt my feelings!

EHRESMAN, KATYA

○ Communication Skills
◉ Resolution of Issues
○ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
5	4	4	3	3

GH

Philosophy Statement

I am open to all styles of debate and will listen to any argument so long as it is respective & not morally repugnant. Regarding technical preferences, make sure to win a framing mechanism for me to evaluate impacts under and then qualify which impacts matter most - this doesn't have to be a value/criterion, rotb or rotj work too but make sure to tell me which is the preferred metric if there are competing types of frameworks. Other preferences are to warrant and impact drops & extensions - I have a higher threshold than most on this. Also the topic is a starting point, I am a big fan of debaters using debate to facilitate conversations that they want to have so do with that what you will.

I am fine with any style or type of arguments, I did (and now coach) mostly K and Larp style but will vote on anything so long as you tell me why I should.

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE

FEROSE, CATHLEEN

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	4	3	5	3

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I am a traditional LD judge, believing that the framework for this form of debate is distinctly different from other forma of debate. The value and criterion should be the weighing mechanism for the round and what each case is structured around.

I believe debate is a communication event and the essentials of a strong delivery should be clearly evident in a debater.

I am a strong believer in civility. I will drop speaker points for debaters who are rude, abrupt, or dismissive of their opponent.

The use of evidence is important to me and debate rounds. I will call for cards if I think evidence is not being used properly or to clarify something. I don't want to be included on chains because I am watching the round, not just reading.

I do tend to flow a lot. I even will flow cx if I believe it will matter to the overall picture of the round.

I do try to be clear and specific as to who won and why.

FLORES, ROBIN

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	4	5	3

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

I look for clash of arguments. I like when debaters really listen to each other and debate/argue on the issues presented. I expect debaters to fully understand their value and criterion and be able to prove why their value is superior. Debaters should be able to explain and uphold their arguments to support their value.

Debate is also a speaking event, so I look for a debaters ability to analyze the information and to speak clearly. I do not like "rapid fire". I judge more on clarity, analysis, and overall argumentation during the round. Debate is persuasive, so in the end, it is the debater that has persuaded me, through their argumentation, that their case and value is the best.

FORBIS, DONNA

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
2	4	3	4	3

Experience: H

Philosophy Statement

LD is a speaking contest. I expect speaker to be courteous and professional during the round. Speak at normal pace and clear. Recent evidence to support case is preferred.

GALINDO, ALEX

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	3	4	4	4

Experience: G

Philosophy Statement

LD is a value debate. I love to see philosophy interwoven into arguments but it is not necessarily the only way to prove something is valuable. I want to understand what you are saying and expect you as the debater to make links for me. At the end of the day I will judge what arguments the debaters bring up.

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE

GLENN, THOMAS

Comm. Skills vs. Res. of Issues:
- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
5	3	3	3	3

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

My take on LD debate is that is has the opportunity to adhere to either a tangible policy relay, or an existential perspective on the impacts of the debate. My primary role has always been a policy debater; furthermore, I see my self as a tab judge in that role (progressive in LD terms). With this in mind just tell me how I need to evaluate the round, and establish CLEAR voters at the end. I will take a moment to note that I'm fine with speed, but know that if it doesn't make it on my flow, this is ultimately a result of poor communication (I will NOT say clear).

GREEN, AMBER

Comm. Skills vs. Res. of Issues:
- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	2	4	4	3

Experience: HA

Philosophy Statement

My personal prejudices on the topic are not a factor; I want to hear your arguments/logic/philosophies. The person who makes the best argument wins. I am a speech/debate coach, so I like good clear presentation and speaking skills. When it's close, that will factor in. If you want to win the round offer crystallization points and sell me.

Each debater should uphold his/her value. Don't mention it and never connect to it. If you establish a criterion for a case, you should use this criterion to measure the value. Point out the connection. There has to be a clash, and someone has to win it for there to be a clear vote.

GREEN, STEPHEN

Comm. Skills vs. Res. of Issues:
- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
1	3	3	4	1

Experience: GHADEF

Philosophy Statement

At its core, LD is value debate. I want to see how any logical or empirical impacts uphold a value, and why that value is more important than the opponents value. To say that differently, the contention-level framework should support the VC framework and why that trumps the opponents case. The affirmative and negative should be aware of the burdens that UIL and the debate format places on them. However, I will not impact out arguments for the debaters. They must lay out what the impacts are, why they are important, and why they uphold the overall value. I also do not flow CX, but will listen. Anything brought up in CX should be argued and extended throughout the NC and/or rebuttals. As debate is a public speaking event, there should be 0 spreading whatsoever. While I know the mechanics of debate, this isn't about data dumping. I want good arguments but also to hear debaters provide thoughtful analysis in a convincing way that would persuade a layman if they were in the room. In addition, I would much rather hear a debate focusing on the WHY we should do something, rather than HOW (this isn't policy, people). I also tend to prefer arguments that are more broad/philosophical than evidence only focused on the status quo, but I will absolutely consider both.

GREGORY, TESSA

Comm. Skills vs. Res. of Issues:
- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	3	4	3	3

Experience: HA

Philosophy Statement

I value the VC debate and feel if you can win this level of debate, the contention level does not matter. With that being said, I do not think the contentions should go untouched. I favor more pragmatic argumentation over emotional and need a clear impact calc given. I believe the debaters should do the majority of the work and tell me what I need to vote on and WHY. Clarification will be given upon request.

| JUDGE | COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES | NUMERICAL RANKINGS | | | | | EXPERIENCE |

HAMILTON, SUZANNE

- ◯ Communication Skills
- ◯ Resolution of Issues
- ⦿ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	4	3	4

Experience: H

Philosophy Statement

LD debate to me is first a speaking contest. I want to see clear communication in the round. The value and criterion are important.

I base my decision on refutation and analysis of all aspects of the debate.

HAREN, DEBBY

- ◯ Communication Skills
- ◯ Resolution of Issues
- ⦿ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	5	5	2

Experience: HD

Philosophy Statement

LD debate should have a value focus, with philosophical argumentation taking the lead over pragmatic concerns. The value/criterion link to the resolution is crucial for a winning debate. Warrants and impacts are very important but must be resolutional and believable. Speed that interferes with communication is not acceptable. The judges can't evaluate evidence that they can't clearly understand due to speed. Try to avoid arguments that are clearly policy. I will evaluate theory and resolutionality arguments, but don't let them take over the debate round.

HARVEY, BILLIE

- ◯ Communication Skills
- ◯ Resolution of Issues
- ⦿ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	3	4	3

Experience: HAF

Philosophy Statement

I lean towards Value and Criterion clash. I will listen to evidence as long as it is relevant and is accompanied by analysis. Don't just read cards. Philosophy is a plus.

HAYNES, TIM

- ◯ Communication Skills
- ◯ Resolution of Issues
- ⦿ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	3	4	3

Experience: GHAD

Philosophy Statement

Prefer value/value criterion debate judge with an open ear to more progressive debate styles if relevant and justifiably linked.

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE

HENNESSEY, RYAN

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Experience: GH

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	4	5	4

Philosophy Statement

I'm like a 7-8/10 for speed in terms of what I can flow. My preference, however, is a 4-5 during case and a 7-8/10 in rebuttal where necessary.

In general, I would say that I am just going to vote on whatever is the path of least resistance on the flow. Make it easy. Write my ballot.

Any other questions, feel free to ask before the round.

HERTEL, CRAIG

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Experience: HA

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	4	4	3

Philosophy Statement

I believe LD is a communication event. Analysis and clash are key to the round, but always with an eye to keeping things clear. I love explanations and a clear organizational pattern. I tend to not be impressed by things that seem tricky. A nice direct approach to the topic generally gets my vote.

HOFF, ROXANNE

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Experience: H

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	3	3	3

Philosophy Statement

Good communication skills and effective persuasive speaking are key. Convince me that you have the best value, supported by your criterion and contentions. Make connections that are logical and persuasive. Be organized and go down the flow, hitting your opponent's value, criterion, and contentions and rebutting any attacks. Enjoy the debate!

HOLDER, AVERIE

- ○ Communication Skills
- ● Resolution of Issues
- ○ Equal

Experience: G

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	2	2	4	2

Philosophy Statement

I believe LD should be a philosophy debate and be weighed heavily on the value/criteria. I believe you should focus more on fundamentals of LD and offer clash rather than drift of into evidence. I'm huge on clash and how you deliver that clash in an organized manner. Value/criteria the most import import thing to me when judging a debate round.

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE

HOLLAND, ROBEY

○ Communication Skills
◉ Resolution of Issues
○ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	4	4	5	3

Experience: GA

Philosophy Statement

You should check my full paradigm on tabroom.com prior to the round.

We're at UIL State so I expect to hear Value/Criterion Aff and Neg cases. Framework determines what offense matters at the end of the round. Be technical in your extension of arguments in rebuttals. Weighing is a critical part of winning my ballot.

HOLMES, DAVY

○ Communication Skills
◉ Resolution of Issues
○ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	4	4	4

Experience: HA

Philosophy Statement

Most of my experience is with Policy/CX. I usually evaluate rounds based on the offense/defense model. I tend to vote for the side that solves or avoids the biggest impact. I think this can be done using either your own or your opponent's framework.

HOUGHTON, ROSLYN

○ Communication Skills
○ Resolution of Issues
◉ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	3	5	2

Experience: HAD

Philosophy Statement

In LD debate, I believe that the framework debate is paramount. The value/criterion relationship forms the basis of every argument. The contentions should be used to demonstrate a real-world example of the framework in action. Therefore, the contention debate is not enough to win alone; it must demonstrate that you also win the value/criterion discussion. I do NOT intervene, so I will not make the leap to that conclusion on my own. You must give me clear reasons to vote and explain why those reasons are preferable to your opponent's. I do NOT believe that plans, counterplans, and other policy issues have a place in LD debate.

HUNT, TERRY

○ Communication Skills
○ Resolution of Issues
◉ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	4	4	3	3

Experience: GH

Philosophy Statement

I am a tabula rasa judge who will allow the debaters to determine how I should evaluate the round. It is important for the debaters to explain to me how I should evaluate the round. I do my best to keep an accurate flow, and I make my decision for each round by how the debaters evaluate the round based on the flow.

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE

HURLEY, DUSTIN

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ◉ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
1	1	3	5	1

Experience: GH

Philosophy Statement

I am a very traditional LD judge. Your case all begins with a solid framework grounded in Philosophy. If your case is not philosophically sound then I will have a hard time voting for it. Next your Value and Criterion must link well. The criterion is a method to achieve the value. The value and criterion is the most important issue in the round. After that the impacts from your case must link to the value criterion debate. I will have a hard time weighing impacts that do not link back to the value and criterion. You have to weigh impacts through the value and criterion. I do not place much weigh on evidence as an argument in itself. I do not flow card tags. When you extend arguments simply saying a last name does not cut it. I will not do any work for you on the flow. You must extend an argument, then impact it and tell me why it matters. If you can find a way to win the framework (V/CR) then you will win my ballot.

LATTIN, PAM

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ◉ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
2	5	5	5	3

Experience: H

Philosophy Statement

I am a tab judge. I let the debaters shape the round as much as possible. Value is always of the utmost importance.

LEWIS, JULIE

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ◉ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	4	3	5	3

Experience: H

Philosophy Statement

I am a debate coach and a teacher. I approach judging in this manner. I want you to educate me on your case and why your value/criterion is the best in the round. Communicate in a clear and concise way, explain your stance, and thoroughly prove the superior value. Do not assume that I will finish the arguments for you. Connect the dots for me and tell me exactly why I should vote for you. Refrain from resorting to tricking your opponent. Be straightforward. Please, please, please provide clash on the value/criterion.

LYTLE, GEORGE

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ◉ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	4	3	5	4

Experience: H

Philosophy Statement

I've only judged one time at a practice meet last year. My philosophy in judging LD is based on my approach to coaching LD participants at my school.

As a coach, I focus on criteria development and establishing credible contentions that support and defend both affirmative and negative viewpoints based on the criteria.

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE

MALDONADO, ESMERALDA

COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES:
○ Communication Skills
○ Resolution of Issues
● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	4	4	3

EXPERIENCE: HA

Philosophy Statement

Enjoy more of a value debate. How is your value upheld and supported throughout your case? I want to see well structured arguments that answer this. I want debaters to tell my why their value and criterion is upheld throughout the debate. I want to see clash on both sides of the debate. Don't speak too quickly! LD is about communication, framework, and well structured arguments.

MARKHAM, JAMES

COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES:
○ Communication Skills
○ Resolution of Issues
● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	3	5	2

EXPERIENCE: HA

Philosophy Statement

I'm a lot more of an old school philosophy guy. I can follow progressive argumentation (as long as its communicated well), but please don't let this turn into a one person CX round. I don't mind speed, but if I can't understand you, you're not communicating. If you're not communicating, you've totally missed the point in debate.

At the end of the day, as long as you provide clash, communicate your points, and have fun we'll all have a great round.

MARQUESS, MACKENZIE

COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES:
○ Communication Skills
○ Resolution of Issues
● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	4	5	1	3

EXPERIENCE: GH

Philosophy Statement

I don't really care what style the debate round takes as long as there are warranted arguments. I want you to weigh arguments for me at the end of the round. I base speaker points mainly on the arguments made in the round. Be kind to each other in rounds. I don't want to watch you fight or be hateful. Respect one another.

I can keep up with most speed and I am fine with it, but only if it is necessary (ie. if you are speeding so that you can read 10 underdeveloped arguments instead of just 2 good ones, I will be unhappy). The easiest way to get bad speaker points from me is to be rude in CX, make ad hominem attacks, or be offensive.

I don't like voting on unnecessary theory, show me proven abuse.

If I am not on an email chain PLEASE repeat all important texts (alt, ROB, interpretations, etc.). I want to have them on my flow word for word.

Please don't read a K aff or a K neg strat if you do not understand it/ are unwilling or unable to explain it to your opponent during CX if they ask.

MARTIN, ROBERT

COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES:
○ Communication Skills
○ Resolution of Issues
● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	5	4	5

EXPERIENCE: GH

Philosophy Statement

I consider myself more of traditional Lincoln Douglas Debate judge. I like a good value debate but I want a solid line by line debate that impacts the big picture. You should link all of your impacts back to the value/framework debate.

I will listen to any argument and consider it but honestly I am not a fan of critiques in LD Debate. If one is ran I still expect it to be answered and debated.

Counter plans are fine if you prove the need for it.

Give me voters tell me why you are winning.

I like evidence, examples and good communication skills. I don't mind a little above average delivery but I don't like spreading or excessive speed.

| JUDGE | COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES | NUMERICAL RANKINGS | | | | | EXPERIENCE |

MCFARLAND, LORA

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	5	5	4	4

Philosophy Statement

I like it when they speak clearly and have good solid arguments.

McNAIR, THOMAS

- ○ Communication Skills
- ● Resolution of Issues
- ○ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
2	4	4	4	3

Experience: HAF

Philosophy Statement

I look for a competitive debate with a lot of clash. Evidence based arguments are crucial while analytical arguments are acceptable where logic is present. Communication is key. I favor a moderate speed of delivery and focus on clear articulation.

MELIN, ERIC

- ○ Communication Skills
- ● Resolution of Issues
- ○ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	4	4	4	3

Experience: GHA

Philosophy Statement

I do not have a dogmatic approach to debate. Generally, give me a way to evaluate the arguments in the round. This can be done using the developed criterion or role of the ballot. This also means that policy arguments are fine in debate and kritiks are fine in debate.

Speed should be minimized at UIL as there are rules specifically about it. So do not spread and keep with the explicit rules and spirit of the competition. I think it is fine to speed up during the 1ar if the negative made a bunch of small arguments.

I strongly believe clash is essential for debaters to develop portable education skills.As such, line-by-line analysis rather than large overviews are preferred. Don't talk past one another!

If an argument is dropped, you still need to extend the argument rather than just say it is dropped. An extension includes restating the warrant and then developing its impact back to the standard/criterion/role of the ballot.

Rudeness will not be tolerated. Your speaks will be downgraded substantially if you do not treat one another with respect. Debate is supposed to be fun and at its best when it is welcoming to kids of all skill levels and style and argument preferences.

MORRIS, LEVI

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
2	3	4	3	3

Experience: GHA

Philosophy Statement

Since this is LD, I tend to view this more as a philosophical debate, and not hard evidence based like CX. However, if there is a good argument made with factual evidence mixed in as well, I will not penalize a debater for that. I am open to most arguments as long as you can make it work. Above all, please remain professional. Do not be rude in the debate.

| JUDGE | COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES | NUMERICAL RANKINGS | | | | | EXPERIENCE |

MOSS, DAN

Comm. Skills vs. Res. of Issues:
○ Communication Skills
○ Resolution of Issues
● Equal

Experience: GHADEF

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	4	3	4	3

Philosophy Statement

I judge on the basis of argument superiority and persuasion.

MUSGROVE, STEELE

Comm. Skills vs. Res. of Issues:
○ Communication Skills
● Resolution of Issues
○ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	5	3	3

Philosophy Statement

A more expansive version of my paradigm is available on tabroom.com

The most important thing to do to win my ballot is to prove why your framing is good, and then win offense under that framing. The former will not suffice for a W, so don't do ONLY value debate in the NR/2AR.

Speaks are based on strategy and argument quality, not presentation. To quote Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart "I don't know what [a 30] looks like, and I won't attempt to define it here. But I know it when I see it."

I don't have any preference on style of debate. If you want to do traditional LD with value/criterion go for it. If you want to make it one-person policy go for it. When civilizations clash please defend your model.

NAVA, VICTOR

Comm. Skills vs. Res. of Issues:
○ Communication Skills
○ Resolution of Issues
● Equal

Experience: GA

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
2	4	3	5	4

Philosophy Statement

I am more responsive to the "traditional" style of LD debate which emphasizes a "whole" affirmation or negation of the resolution as well as leaves "policy" and theory style arguments to the realm of policy/CX debate. I respond best to a clear value and value-criterion identified in the AC and NC.

I feel that LD debate should have more of an emphasis on speaking style and expect to see debaters who command attention, yet present arguments in their simplest, most relatable forms. Though I believe spreading doesn't have a place in LD debate, I can see the need for a faster rate in certain speeches (such as the shorter 1AR). However, I feel effective communicators would find a way to do this both stylishly and tastefully.

Rebuttals are key to LD debate as they should take the time to describe the world-view which each side of the resolution advocates for and strategically draw my attention to key "voters" which each debater feels should impact the ballot.

Though I know LD is the most appropriate forum for philosophical discussion, I prefer that the complexity of philosophy be presented in a way that any person observing the debate would be able to understand (being an expert on Kant, Rawls, Rousseau, etc doesn't do much for your ethos if I can't follow your train of thought).

O'BRIEN, CHRIS

Comm. Skills vs. Res. of Issues:
○ Communication Skills
● Resolution of Issues
○ Equal

Experience: G

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	3	3	3

Philosophy Statement

I primarily focus on the heuristics of offense/defense in order to make my decision and weigh effectiveness of argumentation. Your job is to establish the framework you wish for me to weigh your contentions/offense through, whether that be in a Value/Criterion format, truth-testing, a standard, observations, etc. and give me voting reasons why you are fulfilling your burdens per your side in the debate.

I consider myself tech over truth in terms arguments, so flow mechanics are very crucial in order to secure my vote. I will be expecting clean extensions, cross-applications, and round implications be explained when making these decisions on the flow. Ex: Tell me what it means now that you extended your criterion after refutation.

Theory is a place for me to vote, but without good fleshing out of the standards in the rebuttal, I won't be looking there to vote if possible. I will flow theory spikes at the bottom of the AC, just let me know before you start.

I award speaker points based first on technical skill in the round, then I will look to speech performance, although as long as you are effectively communicating for me, that shouldn't matter as much. Speed is fine, just be clear and don't use it as a tool to get the ballot.

Feel free to ask any questions before round.

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE

PANELLA, BRENDA

○ Communication Skills
○ Resolution of Issues
● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
1	3	3	5	3

Experience: A

Philosophy Statement

Quality of evidence is more important than quantity of evidence. Be clear in your argumentation. I expect debaters to provide tough analysis of evidence presented in the round and may miss it if you choose to spread. I prefer you do not spread. I am a traditional debate judge. I favor a case structure that includes value, criterion, and supporting contentions following the basic claim warrant impact. Don't just state that you don't agree with opponents stance or that there is no link, give specific reasons why and if possible provide supporting evidence. Debaters really need to show they understand their subject matter. With cards, I want to hear an explanation of why one card outweighs the opposing team. Don't just say "cross apply". I want to hear the argumentation even if you are repeating yourself. The negative side has the burden of clash, and in the event that the negative fails to provide clash to the affirmative case, I will default affirmative. Kritiks and counterplans should be competitive and have a clear, well-explained advocacy. I do not vote on a round based on Theory, but I will consider it when Aff uses it as a counter on a CP or K.

PANZER, SHELBY

○ Communication Skills
○ Resolution of Issues
● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	5	3	5	1

Experience: G

Philosophy Statement

The debate round should be value/criteria based with a strong focus on clash. I look for evidence from blocks that support cases in addition to contentions and blocks that negate opponents. It is very important to not have any drops, and proceed at a rate that is bearable to the audience and effective enough to carry out your intentions.

PATRIDGE, ELAYNE

○ Communication Skills
○ Resolution of Issues
● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	4	5	5	4

Experience: H

Philosophy Statement

I love LD debate because it requires critical thinking and effective speaking skills. On this topic, debaters must show an understanding of the complex issues of AI. I like to hear arguments that go beyond the usual "AI is bad" or "AI will destroy the world" or "AI is the answer to all human problems"...arguments that make me ponder the issues. On this topic, evidence must be timely and credible. AI's impact changes almost daily. There are many people who consider themselves to be experts but perhaps are slanting the evidence to support their existing philosophy. I don't pretend to have the scientific knowledge to really understand all the complexities, but I have done enough research to spot evidence that is not credible. I try hard not to debate students on my ballot, but to judge the round presented...as I see it. Value and criteria are essential to my judging, but I also consider the application of value and criteria in the arguments presented. I like to see real clash, but not aggressive clash. To me, a round with no clash in value or criteria, much less arguments presented, is a waste of time. However, I will choose substance over style every day.

PAUL, STEVE

○ Communication Skills
○ Resolution of Issues
● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	2	5	5	4

Experience: H

Philosophy Statement

Good clash and arguments the make sense. I want to see the criteria support the value as well as a value and criteria that is well defined in the round. Negative must provide clash with the Affirmative.

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS	EXPERIENCE

POWELL, MICHAEL

- ○ Communication Skills
- ● Resolution of Issues
- ○ Equal

Experience: HA

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	3	4	5	1

Philosophy Statement

I'm listening for a straight line of logic from the contentions through the criteria to the value and landing on the resolution. I expect the winner of rounds I judge will have proved their side of the resolution with contentions that uphold their value and a criteria that measures their value, as well as show how their value either is better of swallows up their opponents value.

PUSTEJOVSKY, ERIC

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Experience: H

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	4	4	3

Philosophy Statement

I want you to talk to me and not just read to me. Show me that you understand your topic and can explain it to me in your own words. Tell me why your value is better than your opponents.

RANDOLPH, NANCY

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Experience: HA

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	3	3	4	3

Philosophy Statement

I believe ld debate gives students the opportunity to develop a stance on issues in society. They have to take a position on the issue and do research to support their stance. They read, study and learn about ethics and morals by learning about philosophy and the ideas of philosophers in history. A strong debate occurs when debaters are able to clash on their positions.

ROBERTSON, JONATHAN

- ○ Communication Skills
- ● Resolution of Issues
- ○ Equal

Experience: H

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	2	4	3	3

Philosophy Statement

1. L-D is not one man policy debate.
2. Clash is a necessity. (flow)
3. Philosophy is a good thing.
4. The V/C should be used to evaluate the values.
5. I will flow Kritiks, but I consider them lazy debate.
6. Good humor is a sign of intelligence.
7. Decorum must be exhibited at all times.
8. I have noticed that some debates on this topic have gone very heavy into definition debate. I can understand that defining AI is very important; however, I will not be happy if one of the debaters utilizes strictly definition debate.
9. Fill out my ballot. Tell me why you win. Communicate.
10. Have fun!

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE

ROBINSON, TERRI

- ○ Communication Skills
- ◉ Resolution of Issues
- ○ Equal

EXPERIENCE: HAD

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	4	3	3

Philosophy Statement

I'm pretty open to a lot of different types of arguments. I generally look to the framework debate and offense/defense to decide the round.

I physically can't flow speed. Slow down for tags, authors and anything else you want to be sure is on my flow.

Feel free to ask me any other questions you might have.

ROWE, RUSSELL

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ◉ Equal

EXPERIENCE: HAE

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	4	5	3

Philosophy Statement

The primary responsibility of the aff is to uphold the topic and the neg is to provide clash, with a secondary responsibility being to negate the topic. I prefer traditional Value/Criterion approaches rather than alternative Framework approaches but I will refrain from outright rejection of other approaches. I prefer clear communication rather than an emphasis upon quantity of content. I generally want to see a clear impact associated with values and criterions. I need each debater to provide clear voters. Please don't make me decide what I should vote on - tell me what to vote on and leave it to me to weigh the credibility and impact of the voters provided by each side.

RUIZ, KASEY

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ◉ Equal

EXPERIENCE: G

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	4	4	5	2

Philosophy Statement

LD is a philosophy debate that is based on value and criterion. Because value and many philosophers' insight are timeless, it is imperative for debaters to make criterion that shows progress to something unobtainable. By incorporating current opinions, facts, and statistics, one can create viable arguments. I also believe using CX time to properly question to built attacks and rebuttals teaches versatility in thinking.

RUIZ, RAUL

- ○ Communication Skills
- ◉ Resolution of Issues
- ○ Equal

EXPERIENCE: H

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	4	4	3	4

Philosophy Statement

I am a traditional LD judge. I will vote for progressive arguments, if they are aligned to the resolution.

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE

SIMPKINS, RICHARD

- ◯ Communication Skills
- ⦿ Resolution of Issues
- ◯ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	5	5	4	3

Experience: GHAD

Philosophy Statement

I'm essentially a tabula rasa judge in that I will listen to justifications for any paradigm that you can convince me to hold That isn't to say I don't have biases, but I can be convinced to vote against them if you set up standards, win them, and meet them. One bias that I do hold (and it can be overcome) is that I default to seeing myself as judging the resolution up or down. That is to say, if you affirm the resolution, I vote affirmative. So, if you want to, say, run a topical PIC from the negative, you need to tell me why I should write "negative" on my ballot for something that is affirming the resolution.

Speed is fine so long as you are not skipping syllables or slurring your speech. Too many debaters have a tendency do this to gain speed. If you want to go faster than you can anunciate, you do so at the risk of losing me. Slowing down on taglines and citations is always a plus, because I tend to organize my flow around cards (unless you get very theoretical, in which case, I'll switch to line numbers...so number your arguments in this case). It's also a good idea to get louder (and clearer) on phrases within the card that you especially want me to hear. Doing this will ensure your argument gets on the flow in context. Most judges like to hear cards and not just taglines, so we can evaluate source indictments.

I'm evolving on flashing. I once disliked it because I noticed that it made teams stop flowing, and resulted in less line-by-line rebutting. This is an unfortunate habit. I still allowed it because were some teams who managed to handle it just fine. I think reading clarity is also sacrificed when flashing, because there is not the added pressure of having to be understood by your opponent. But you still have to be understood by your judge! Email chains are no better than flashing, by the way, and differ only in that judges are sometimes included in the chain. I tried this once, and I realized that *I* stopped flowing! It's not to say that I don't like being in on an email chain (so I can look at it during prep), but if you send me briefs, I will still not flow with them.

On the other hand, teams who flash look more critically at their opponents' evidence and are less likely to accept the tagline as an accurate description of what the card says. Even though all of the above problems are real, this new critical way of assessing evidence makes it worth it to flash. So, flash away, but don't let that stop you from flowing!

Specific to LD: I am sympathetic to suggested paradigms that flow from the resolution. For instance, if a resolution includes a call to action, a plan makes more sense. If it doesn't, then not so much. I can be convinced to shift this bias, but you must tell me why.

SMITH, JIMMY

- ◯ Communication Skills
- ⦿ Resolution of Issues
- ◯ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	2	4	5	3

Experience: H

Philosophy Statement

Communication is key to winning my ballot. Neg must attack the value and crit of aff in order to win. MUST be clash! Neg must have a difference value or there isn't clash.

SMITH, RHONDA

- ◯ Communication Skills
- ⦿ Resolution of Issues
- ◯ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	4	4	5	3

Experience: HA

Philosophy Statement

I expect a strong framework that sets up what I should consider in evaluating the round. Contention level arguments should be warranted and impacts should be linked to framework. The last few minutes of the last speech should clearly explain voting issues.

I tend to be a truth-testing judge, but I will consider other methods in round if a compelling argument is made to persuade me.

SOUDER, NATHAN

- ◯ Communication Skills
- ◯ Resolution of Issues
- ⦿ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	4	3	5	3

Experience: GH

Philosophy Statement

Lincoln-Douglas is a value/criterion debate and as such are the most important voting issues for the round. I prefer students to deliver their speeches and rebuttals at a rate that effectively conveys their ideas and that they are able to support their stance with sufficient evidence for each argument made. I will value quality over quantity in terms of number of arguments, but enough arguments need to be made to convince me that your side is the proper decision in the round. At the state level, students should be able to signpost and give voters/drops. I will not assume any information not expressly given by debaters. My explicit list of deciding factors for round results are:

1-Value/criterion clash

2-Ability to address arguments (includes refuting Contentions)

3-Quality of delivery (good time management, effective use of language, rate of delivery, gestures)

4-End of round analysis (voters/drops, summarization of key points)

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE

STANDLY, STAN

○ Communication Skills
○ Resolution of Issues
● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	3	3	3

Experience: H

Philosophy Statement

Debate is a communication event. You need to uphold your value and criteria. All claims must have a warrant of some kind. I am more traditional than progressive.

STEARNS, JOHN

○ Communication Skills
● Resolution of Issues
○ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
1	4	4	4	3

Experience: G

Philosophy Statement

This is UIL state. Thus my judging philosophy will be a little bit different than it is at a TOC tournament. You can look at my judging philosophy at tabroom if you are interested.

I would prefer to hear a traditional value/criterion debate at UIL state. At the end of the round I will vote for the debater that best argues why the world of the aff or the world of the neg is on balance better.

First I will only evaluate arguments. In my opinion an argument has 3 parts: a claim, a warrant, and an impact. A claim is merely stating or asserting something. Once you make an assertion, you must back it up with a warrant. A warrant is the justification of why the claim is true. Finally you must impact the claim. Impacting is to explain why the claim is important to either the framework or the resolution. Please do not just tell me to extend your first contention of extend your butler 12 card. You must also tell me why this contention or piece of evidence is important to the round and how I should weigh it.

In the final rebuttal I would like some crystallization process that tells me what the crux of the debate is and how and why your arguments are more important than your opponents.

STOLTE, PRESTON

○ Communication Skills
● Resolution of Issues
○ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
5	5	3	2	4

Experience: HA

Philosophy Statement

long version can be found at tabroom.com

Do what you do well: I have no preference to any sort of specific types of arguments these days. Sure, some debates I may find more interesting than others, but honestly the most interesting rounds to judge are ones where teams are good at what they do and they strategically execute a well planned strategy.

This being said, if I am judging you in LD, here are a few things I've realized about myself that you should know: I find myself seeing most 'traditional/phil' strategies to be lacking in offense and largely ill explained; I think bad theory arguments are wildly unpersuasive and generally default to drop the arg; I think 'spikes' (especially when undisclosed) are not arguments and generally give the neg decent amount of leeway to make responses once they actually become warranted arguments.

TABOR, TY

○ Communication Skills
● Resolution of Issues
○ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	4	4	1

Experience: GHADEF

Philosophy Statement

I prefer a value based logical philosophical approach. I prefer the debaters to have a pace that is quick, but not so rapid that they are difficult to follow. The best debater is not always the most polished speaker, but must be adequate at communicating their ideas in a coherent and understandable manor.

If I do not have the experience required for this position I understand. I am very simply the only one at our school that is familiar with LD debate.

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE

TRENT, CECIL

- ○ Communication Skills
- ● Resolution of Issues
- ○ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	4	4	4

Experience: GA

Philosophy Statement

I feel LD should focus on a central value premise and appreciate a big picture approach but I will vote on line by line refutation. I do not feel that LD needs a specific plan or CP, and tend to dismiss theory arguments that draw attention away from the given resolution. Weighing arguments and FW is essential.

VAN HOOSE, JAMES

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	4	3	5	3

Experience: GA

Philosophy Statement

Anything is valid and acceptable, if explained and supported. I want to see clash, I want as much clarity as possible, and I want voters. What's your value, what's your criteria, prove you uphold your value and prove your value is victorious. Voter voters voters :)

WALKER, PHILIP-MICHAEL

- ○ Communication Skills
- ● Resolution of Issues
- ○ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	4	4	3	3

Experience: GA

Philosophy Statement

When evaluating LD rounds, I look to framework before evaluating the rest of the round, after theory obviously. I then weigh your arguments that generate offense through the winning framework. It would probably be beneficial to run arguments on both sides of the framework in case I wind up voting against or in favor of the framework you go for.

With that being said, I don't think it's my job to tell you how you should debate or what arguments you should be running. I think that is the job of the debaters. Please give me warranted analysis that supports your arguments.

WARREN, JASON

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
1	3	3	5	3

Experience: GHA

Philosophy Statement

Make the framework clear- focus on establishing what the big picture issues in the rounds are and link your impacts back to them specifically. You don't have to win your framework to win the round, but you do have to link to the prevailing framework. The V/VC should be the basis for this discussion.

Clear clash with explanations as to why you are right and they are wrong.

Just because someone published it doesn't make it true- scrutinize warrants in evidence and don't assume that because so and so said something is true means that it is.

Speed: don't do it. This should be slightly faster the conversational pace. Anything that resembles speed won't be flowed, and may in and of itself become a voter for me. This is an ORAL COMMUNICATION event, don't expect me to read your case or cards after the round. I very rarely call for evidence or cases.

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE

WHITE, NICHOLAS

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
2	3	2	5	2

Experience: G

Philosophy Statement

I am a tabula rasa judge when I am not told how to vote however I usually lean towards value criterion.

I am a pretty progressive judge however this is UIL and inclusive styles of debate are preferred (No spreading)

WHITTENBERG, GRANT

- ○ Communication Skills
- ● Resolution of Issues
- ○ Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
3	3	3	5	3

Experience: GH

Philosophy Statement

I am a traditional judge who values philosophy and framework-based debate. That said, I do also want to hear evidence as a basis for assertions. I am also open to technical approaches, if they make sense and are persuasive in the context of the specific resolution.

I think that LD and Policy debate are distinctly different, and that those differences should be valued and preserved. For that reason, reliance on spreading, prodigious quantities of duplicative evidence, and disparate arguments shoe-horned chaotically into a framework are not appropriate in LD.

A great speaker is always a pleasure to hear, and this perhaps matters even more in the context of LD. That said, I will recognize that through speaker points. The ballot itself will be awarded based upon superior argumentation. Who has done the best job of listening and flowing their opponent, systematically rebutting, identifying logical and evidential weaknesses in their opponent's presentation and extending across the flow? That is the key question. Low point wins occasionally do happen.

ZIMMEL, ANDREW

- ○ Communication Skills
- ○ Resolution of Issues
- ● Equal

Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach
4	3	2	4	2

Experience: GAD

Philosophy Statement

I like value/criterion debate. Framework is the most important thing in LD debate. I like evidence, but make sure you are actually using the evidence and not just reading stats to me. Tell me what your numbers or quotes me to the debate. if you do not impact your arguments than I can't weigh them in the round. I am good with speed and spreading but make sure you signpost. I prefer the line by line but if you tell me where you are I can follow. Contentions should be used to uphold your V/K so that means there should be clear links between the framework and the rest of your case. Observations are not something I can vote on, they are used to frame the debate for either the Aff or Neg. They should not be argumentive, they should just be telling me what I need to be looking at for the round.