

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — 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
ADAMS, JENNIFER	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 4	Evidence 3	Appeals 4	Criteria 3	Approach 3	

Philosophy Statement

LD should be philosophy based, in a theoretical/philosophical realm. I do not want to see plans or counter plans for solving a problem, rather a discussion on the merits of the idea. IS intervention justified?

AGHO-OTOGHILE, CLEMENT	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 4	Criteria 3	Approach 2	G
-------------------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	---

Philosophy Statement

Forensics is a speaking competition in which the art of rhetoric is utilized - speaking effectively to persuade or influence [the judge]. My paradigm of any round is derived from: CLARITY!!! All things said in the round need to be clear! I am simply placing the burden on the debater to debate; it is his or her responsibility to explain all the arguments presented. Any argument has the same criteria; therefore, clash, at the substantive level, is a must! First and foremost, I follow each debate league's constitution; therefore, there is to be no rapid speaking, for this is UIL. Secondly, general information is as follows:

Case: I am a tab judge; I will vote the way in which you explain to me to do so; thus I do not have a preference, or any predispositions, to the arguments you run.

Set a metric in the round, then tell me why you/you all have won your metric, while your opponent(s) has lost their metric and/or you/you all have absorbed their metric.

The job of any debater is to persuade the judge, by way of logical reasoning, to vote in his or her favor, while maintaining one's position, and discrediting his or her opponent's position. So long as the round is such, I say good luck to all!

ALDERSON, LINDA L.	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 4	Evidence 4	Appeals 3	Criteria 5	Approach 3	HADP
---------------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	------

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.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

I approach each round of debate tabula rasa. From the moment I meet the competitors, I begin to formulate my impression of each individual. From the conduct of each opponent, I gather information about professionalism, courtesy, and gamesmanship. From the first words spoken in debate, I evaluate each person's communication style and organizational abilities.

Content:

I appreciate clarity and in-depth analysis. Present a clear thesis within the first 30 seconds of your presentation. I want to hear well-researched arguments that follow a clear line of reasoning. K's are valuable, but should not be overtly malicious. I like to see a lively debate, but I don't want you to crush the other person under your heel, so be a good citizen to each other. When you find their weakness, point it out, but avoid repeating it incessantly without exploring other weaknesses.

Presentation:

Debate must necessarily be a passionate exercise. I want to see enthusiasm for the topic, no matter what side you're on. Additionally, I prefer clear enunciation and clear speech instead of an inundation of material that I can barely understand. Take a deep breath, emphasize the important phrases. Clarity is key.

Let the best one win!

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

Philosophy Statement

While LD is based on a value structure, I like to see a balance between the use of evidence, reason and the value criterion. Another important factor is clash. While it is important for debaters to be respectful and courteous with each other, I expect them to refute all arguments brought up by their opponent. In other words, addressing all questions is important, and dropping arguments will count against you. I will vote for the debater who makes the most compelling arguments without ignoring his/her opponent's case. Good arguments are based on evidence and reason, and they address the bigger picture of the LD topic, not just technicalities.

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

Philosophy Statement

Value Framework debate, ok with contention level debate, traditional style is requested but will deal with progressive styles. Debater should be thorough will be concise so that easy to understand in arguments.

Respect the event and rules !

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

Philosophy Statement

When it comes to LD debate, I need to see a real clash of ideas. Each argument needs to be supported with practical claims. Debators should use their CX time effectively and should ask questions that they will use to strengthen their respective arguments.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

I prefer a typical conversational style of speaking - no spreading. I enjoy a lot of clash in the round, but keep it classy. I place a high value on well organized and arguments - please crystalize everything you are saying. Make sure you have evidence to back up your claims. I tend to vote on the most pragmatic arguments.

BRAWN, BARBARA	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 2	Evidence 4	Appeals 5	Criteria 3	Approach 2	G
-----------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	---

Philosophy Statement

I will judge based on whatever arguments are presented, without a preconceived agenda. However, I do prefer real-world, plausible arguments to fanciful ones. (Each debater must answer his opponent's arguments, no matter how off-the-wall, but plausible arguments will be given more weight.) Values and criteria, if used, are important tools in deciding a round. In rebuttal speeches, I like to see competitors clearly label voting issues. I don't object to rapid delivery, but the faster debaters talk, the more I might miss on the flow.

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

Philosophy Statement

I'm looking for a debater to persuade me thru the use of their value/criteria that their side of the resolution is the best in that particular round. I enjoy competitive rounds full of clash. Please remember to be respectful of your opponents.

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

Philosophy Statement

I believe debate is still a communication event where true argumentation and clash occur. I want a value/criterion debate, not policy debate.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

I never competed, but have judged LD a lot on the TFA circuit. I'm willing to hear both traditional and progressive arguments. I'm not the biggest fan of the influx of policy-style debating in LD (particularly the extinction arguments), but I will still hear it out. I'm not perfectly well-read or up to date on the latest trends of LD debate, so be sure to explain arguments well and cleanly. I usually prefer framework over contentional, but that doesn't mean I won't vote on the contentional level. I don't like policy spreading, but am okay with speed generally. I like for you to be clear. I will say clear once, and then put my pen/pencil down if you're still not clear. Be sure to clearly say every card author (I highly suggest you slow down when reading it). I will vote on most anything as long as it isn't too ridiculous (and if it, it needs to logically make sense). Drops don't necessarily mean you lose the round. Give very clear voters at the end.

Basically, you need to hold my hand and give me a step by step as to why you're winning the round. It doesn't matter how complicated you get, just make sure I am able to follow.

CLARK, SCOTTE	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 3	Approach 3	HAD
----------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----

Philosophy Statement

First, LD debate is a speech event where I am judging speakers using logic and analysis to persuade me on their position.
 Second, LD debate is a value debate where the philosophical arguments must be sound, and the clash of ideas clear.
 Third, LD debate is a debate where the conflict is the basis for judgment, and the value/criteria/contention is carried through rebuttals.

COOK, TIM	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 4	Evidence 4	Appeals 3	Criteria 3	Approach 3	HAD
------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----

Philosophy Statement

Comparative justification. Debater that best warrants arguments will win. Weigh in rebuttals

CRAWFORD, DAN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 2	Evidence 5	Appeals 4	Criteria 5	Approach 4	H
----------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	---

Philosophy Statement

I am a traditional values, philosophy judge. I detest spreading/speed talking and the policy/CX influence, terms, and tactics that have crept into LD debate.

LD should be about:

1. Value/Criterion clash
2. Excellent Expository oratory
3. Analysis, argumentation of foundational philosophical principles.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

I believe in solid, logical arguments and would like to see a lot of clash in the round. A well developed value and criterion are essential in upholding your case. While I think it is nice to see a philosopher presented in your case (since LD Debate is philosophy debate) it is not detrimental if you do not have one. I look for clear, concise speakers who can both thoroughly attack their opponents case and defend their own.

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

Philosophy Statement

I will vote for the debater who convinces me that his or her philosophical position on the issue in question is the more preferable of my choices by relating their stance on the issue directly to their value position using their criterion as the weighing mechanism for me to make my decision. In other words, whoever offers and holds the superior philosophical position based on the values offered and criteria used in the round will win. Clash is expected on the issue(s) developed but I will vote against a debater who is disrespectful to, rude to, sarcastic about, or in any way insulting toward his or her opponent.

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

Philosophy Statement

You must have both a value and a criterion. Aim to strengthen your own while undermining those of your opponent. I really enjoy debates where you demonstrate knowledge of a philosopher's position and engage with your opponent's theory. If you're going to use historical examples, apply them creatively. Uphold your value through the round and tell me why it's the most significant. My vote will likely be based on a direct quote from your final speech.

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

Philosophy Statement

I feel that LD debate is a form of communication. I want to see a debate based on philosophy and with plenty of clashes. I want to see debates that are based on value and value criteria.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

I believe that LD debate is centered around the value/criteria, but that evidence and good argumentation are also key to winning the round. Clear, concise arguments are a must. I also love to see impacts clearly stated. I will listen to any argument as long as it is thought out and defended well.

DO, HANH	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 3	Approach 3	GHAE
-----------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	------

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.

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

Philosophy Statement

I look for solid contentions that support both the criterion and value. I expect debaters to identify flaws in opponent's case, emphasize value clash, and use solid evidence to support and argue cases. I feel that rebuttals should be specific, focused, and thoughtful. In addition, I think CX time should be used to clarify, identify, and gather information useful to the debate, not merely to restate arguments.

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

Philosophy Statement

I listen for clearly stated values with criteria that supports and upholds the case/stance being defended. I value a good balance of evidence with reasoning and analysis. Even with evidence presented on both sides, I lean towards the side that lays out the strongest reasoning for why their value is superior- making statements and thought flow easy to follow.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

I like focus on the framework. Use the contention level to prove your framework true. Impacts are welcome. Please provide voters in the last set of speeches. Tell me how I should be voting. Finally, be clear where you want me to flow an argument.

GLADSON, ARNOLD	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 4	Evidence 3	Appeals 4	Criteria 4	Approach 4	AD
------------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----

Philosophy Statement

Lincoln Douglas LD Debate Paradigm

I prefer to have debaters clearly express their values in a communicative style that is easy to follow. I prefer a slower speed and shorter more-to-the-point evidence rather than rapid delivery of too much side material.

I look at how well you support your position on the resolution and refute the opponent's position.

I judge how successful you are at persuading me to see your point of view and the values you adhere to.

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

Philosophy Statement

I look for a direct connection between the case and the value and criterion. Examples and evidence can be very helpful as long as they serve to illustrate the points connected to value. I do not wish to hear a policy debate in an LD round. LD debate should be focused on a perspective that weighs values and ideas one against another. All cases and arguments should link back to a basic value premise.

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

Philosophy Statement

The value/criterion clash should be foremost in the debate round. I like to see good speaking, good thinking and good analysis. I should be able to follow the contestants fully and flow the round. The cases are important, but the debater should convince me of all the arguments.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

I judge debaters by their professional demeanor, their clear presentation of the subject matter at hand, the relationship of their speech to the topic, and their evidence as presented.

HAVRON, CINDI	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 2	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 5	Approach 1	H
----------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	---

Philosophy Statement

This is value debate not policy.

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

Philosophy Statement

I prefer relatively straight-up argumentation. If the case is weird or complicated I expect the student to hold me by the hand to explain and convince me. I prefer a clear weighing mechanism for evaluating competing claims. I like arguments to be signposted. I prefer the student stand when they have the floor. I prefer appropriate business dress and I want to see their faces. My paradigm is simple, there is nothing I will refuse to evaluate so long as it's compelling and well-warranted. I will assign speaker points in a manner consistent with tournament norms.

HERTEL, LINDSEY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 5	Criteria 5	Approach 2	GHA
------------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-----

Philosophy Statement

As far as speed is concerned: If I can flow it, it's fair game. Clarity is much more effective a tool for argumentation than speed, but I have no issue with it. Distinctly titling and differentiating Value, Criterion, Observations, and Contentions will allow speeches to be both quick and clear. I will vote for theory when they facilitate clear, constructive, original, and educational debate. I am far more likely to vote for a passionate speaker, as well as one that introduces ideas that spark the most compelling and original debate, but at the end of the day I am a sucker for organization and professionalism. Signpost your constructives, preflow, USE YOUR PREPTIME, and give me voters.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

I expect LD debate to be different from CX debate. In other words, it should not be as fast-paced and should focus on values rather than policy. Having said that, I am aware that some topics (like the current Spring topic) lend themselves to more policy-oriented debate. Still, the bulk of the debate should revolve around whether or not we should do something rather than how we would accomplish it. I do expect to hear a value and criterion from both sides and I expect at least some clash at that level. Other than that, I am pretty open in terms of types of arguments presented. I will vote on things like framework and theory if you give me a good reason to do so. If you have any specific questions, just ask :).

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

Philosophy Statement

As a coach, I feel that Philosophy utilized in a LD Debate case is a way of examining and justifying ideas that are entrenched in beliefs about human nature. A successful debater understands the philosophical concepts and conveys them to the audience using either political or moral ideas.

As a judge, I try to determine if a debater can defend their own case by using the information contained in their value, criterion, and contentions as well as their ability to question the philosophy and supporting documentation of their opponents' case.

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	5	3	

Philosophy Statement

I prefer to see strong framework clash in the debate round. If you're losing on the value debate it is unlikely you'll pick up my ballot.

I determine the winner of contention debate by determining who has the most offense in tact by the end of the debate. To that end, case turns weigh heavier on my flow than case defense.

Observations should be clearly articulated and defended throughout the debate round.

If you group arguments make sure you're signposting that in your speech. Don't expect me to group arguments for you.

If you have questions please feel free to ask before the round.

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

Philosophy Statement

I believe communication and presentation are key. Factual evidence is extremely important, too, however. The opinion of the speaker should show through during the argument, but there should be enough factual evidence to back the opinion up. Use of criteria is essential, and I prefer both a philosophical and pragmatic approach to the argument.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

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.

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

Philosophy Statement

Ld debate is a value debate. Upholding your value is critical to the round as well as attacking and defending every argument.

KERR, DONNA	<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	

Philosophy Statement

I write down the key arguments throughout the round and prefer to keep a clean-well-organized flow chart which means that I enjoy listening to well-organized, outlined arguments, with taglines, in which both debaters know their stuff--both their philosophical values and their pragmatic information—the two should clearly tie together. I prefer a conversational speed that allows me to hear everything. I expect both debaters to clearly target their arguments throughout their opening statements, refutations, and rebuttals. Debaters need to follow the rules and realize that LD is not a one on one CX debate; the value is important, but it is not ALL. Balance is important to me. I don't tend to favor philosophy over pragmatism, factual over emotional or any combination thereof. I want a well-balanced presentation of evidence and analysis that demonstrates sound reasoning and consistently valid logic. I also prefer well-mannered, mutually respectful opponents who win with clearly articulated arguments rather than seek a win through intimidation tactics of excessive speed, volume, or overly dramatic gestures or distractions. Finally, I like a closing statements that enumerate and illustrate why the speaking debater should win the round.

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

Philosophy Statement

In Lincoln-Douglas debate I like to see clash. Many times LD debaters will roadmap a number of items that they plan to present, when because of lack of attention to time restraints, they end up simply wasting time extending too much on their own case, and clash has been completely overlooked. I have a problem when something is roadmapped and then not presented, I also like to see argument labels referred to according to where they fall on the flow, such as, "In her Contention I, my opponent stated that. . ." It is more important that you clash on all points rather than extend on the obvious. I also like specific voters from both sides at the end of the round. Speed is fine as long as I can flow important tags easily.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — 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 4	Evidence 4	Appeals 5	Criteria 4	Approach 2	HA

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 the judge's position to write an educational ballot that defends his decision. I bring few predispositions to the round and judge only on the argumentation provided.

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

Philosophy Statement

Clash is essential. Good communication skills are needed. Should use sound philosophical principles.

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

Philosophy Statement

- Speed is not an issue.
- I don't like when people overly emphasize drops and lose sight of important arguments.
- Line-by-line argumentation is preferable.
- In CX, person being examined should not use bloviated answers as a time suck.
- Debaters should focus on the debate, not their opponents.
- Overall, the person who will win the ballot is the person who focuses on the value and criterion and how its upheld in their case.

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

Philosophy Statement

LD is about persuasion. Take time to explain the impacts of your arguments and give me clear voters.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

Impact comparison is very important to me and should feature strongly in the final rebuttals.

Accordingly, you need to establish which framework through which the judge should evaluate impacts.

I'm fine with plans/counterplans/policy arguments IF THEY MAKE SENSE.

The proliferation of theory arguments in LD doesn't make too much sense to me. I guess I would say I have a high threshold for voting for theory arguments besides conditionality bad.

Because I debated in policy in college, I am fine with speed. I will say clear if I can't understand you. I have found that I have some more difficulty flowing LD debates than policy debates so make sure that you are clear when you are transitioning between arguments.

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

Philosophy Statement

I judge on whatever the debaters tell me. I don't like making arguments for them. I want it to be very clear how I should vote. I don't like making assumptions, if there's a severed link I don't want to "assume" the link back if that makes sense.

I don't have anything I won't vote on. However, if you want to *appeal* to me. Not really a fan of unnecessary theory, and I love heavy framework debate. I think framework is crucial to setting up how I should evaluate you. Typically, I like more of a deontological approach. I'm not picky though, that's just what I always ran. FW was usually 3-4 minutes on AC and then ran 1-2 minutes case.

But, my paradigm really isn't hard to understand. Just know, nothing is assumed. If your opponent makes an argument AND YOU DON'T ANSWER IT, I will not make the argument for you no matter how intuitive. And I'm willing to vote off of anything, *just tell me what I'm voting for*.

Also, if you don't have a V/C, that's fine, but you still need to tell me how I should be evaluating the round in whatever way that may be.

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

Philosophy Statement

I am considered more of a traditionalist in LD Debate. I look for a solid value and value criterion linked case. I do listen to well-defined framework and definitions as a means to adjudicate a round if the Value and Criterion are muddled. Please apply arguments where you want them. I cannot do that for you. Arguments presented in CX will not be used unless they are brought up in a speech.

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

Philosophy Statement

I debated LD debate throughout high school, and was the 4A UIL LD State Champion in 2012. I also placed 6th in the nation in Public Forum Debate in 2012 at the national tournament in Indianapolis. After graduation, I competed for one year in Parliamentary Debate at Texas Tech University. I have helped coach for both Northwest and Byron Nelson High Schools for several years, as well as judging at many invitational tournaments.

In terms of what I look for in a debate round, I believe this should be left up to the debaters in the round. I am fine with either philosophical or empirical approaches to the debate topic so long as they are well warranted and impacted in the round. I cannot stress how important clash and impacting of arguments in a debate round is, and this is something that seems to be a problem for many debaters.

I don't have a problem with speed, since I often judge policy, however, with that being said, this is UIL LD so you should not full on spread. If I have trouble understanding you, I will say "clear" out loud, but I won't do this more than 2 times in a debate round. If after the 2nd time I still cannot follow you, you will see me stop flowing until I can understand you again. This is not usually a problem though.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a more traditional judge for the TFA Circuit. At UIL State, I expect a good UIL Style of debate: slower without a lot of National Circuit argumentation. I prefer to evaluate the round through the Standard and have arguments impact to the standard. A good debater will weigh impacts. I am open to other arguments, but the debater must justify the reasons for non-traditional arguments. Feel free to ask any specific questions.

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

Philosophy Statement

While debaters try to win individual arguments and winning each single line is likely important, I prefer to adjudicate on a more holistic approach. Using the lines that you are winning to create a narrative and a "comparative worlds" situation in the closing moments of the debate.

I'm not terribly interested in solvency, but would rather focus on the "why would we do this" aspect of the debate. If the debaters would like to talk about solvency, disadvantages, or otherwise, I will consider it, but I prefer a top-down approach to the ballot, meaning I start with the value / criterion and work my way down until there is a compelling winner of the debate.

I am not "traditional" and I'm not "progressive." I am intrigued by creative and compelling arguments, but do not appreciate outlandish or "gotcha" argumentation. The topic exists to be discussed by both debaters and sets the box in which we are expected to stay. You can do any imaginative argumentation you desire, but it must link to the topic, the value debate, and the criterion debate.

Again, I prefer comparative worlds as a mindset for the round.

MILLER-WYATT, LYDIA	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 3	Approach 3	
----------------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--

Philosophy Statement

While solid communications skills are necessary, I also look for well-constructed cases on both sides, with well-supported values, criteria 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.

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

Philosophy Statement

This is a moral debate. I can/do judge on framework debate and value debate. Impacts only matter to me in the context of the morals involved. I look for well linked, well supported cases down the flow. I do not argue the round for the debater.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
MOSS, DAN	<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	3	4	

Philosophy Statement

It is a value debate event which I judge on the basis of persuasion and argument superiority. Tend to be more traditional than cutting edge. Arguments which are germane to the topic tend to have more weight in my decision.

O'BRIEN, CHRIS	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	A
		3	3	4	4	3	

Philosophy Statement

Comparison of criterion using your contentions is the most persuasive thing you can do to win my ballot, especially if you are able to impact them out for me and explain why they matter in the comparison. The line by line debate is also very important to winning my ballot. Dropped arguments are not losses, but they definitely weigh in on whether or not you win that contention. I would prefer value debates not make up the entirety of the round, unless more evidence is provided to back up claims made about the philosophies. Make sure you also have a good understanding of what your value does in relation to both your criterion and the resolution in the round. With a policy debate background, I am fine with faster styles of debate but give me more pen time on the more nuanced arguments so that I can not only flow them but also so I may actually think about what you are saying. And as always, be professional.

ORR, BERNA DETTE	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	A
		3	3	4	5	1	

Philosophy Statement

I like a good Value/Criterion clash. I do not appreciate spreading in LD debate at all. I am fine with you giving me an "impact statement" as long as you show how the value endorsed could affect or lead to future policy decisions. I love you giving me voters telling me why I should vote for you. I, however, do not like the increased trend I've seen of using CX terms in LD. For me, it makes no sense to argue that your case "solves" for human rights when your case has no plan. I believe the job of LD is to advocate a philosophical approach to a situation, not a specific course of action. With all that said, I'm not the one debating. Argue what you want. I will listen. The above is just my philosophy.

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

Philosophy Statement

Paradigm: I am a mostly traditional judge in all debate events. My students would tell you I am "old school" I tend to think I will listen to most any argument, but I probably lean mostly to the Stock side for CX and Traditional for LD. LD is a value debate. You must show me how your contentions uphold your V and VC. Aff does not have to provide a "plan" to implement - the question is "should" we implement the debate topic

Speed: I don't like it - I am a "by the flow" judge. What that means is that I flow what you say - if you are speaking at speed that you can not enunciate, communicate, or be understood I can't write down what you are saying. I won't finish arguments for you or write down what I think you meant to say or what I think you should have said. If you must read through your evidence quickly SLOW DOWN AND BE CLEAR WITH YOUR TAG LINES.

Kritiks: I will listen to K's BUT they have to be logical to the round. I will not vote on a performance K - I really won't even listen to them. K's still have to be arguable and give ground for both sides of the debate.

Style: I look for clarity, being polite with your partner and your opponent, clear arguments that are linked to your resolution, no eye rolling or extra sounds during your opponents speech.

CX: Control your CX time, but be polite - no need to be rude. In Policy Debate - open CX is ok if the tournament is ok with it and both teams agree on it before hand. It is not ok for one partner to answer all of the questions

Arguments: Need to be clear. Give me a road map. Sign Post - tell me where you are - which argument you are rebuilding or refuting. Give me voters in your last speech

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

I like an easy to flow debate with strong signposting. I look for the debater to prove or disprove the resolution by using a value/criterion or some other defended framework. I believe evidence is necessary, and I value actual arguments over delivery. I detest rude debaters and strongly prefer a professional approach.

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

Philosophy Statement

LD is a philosophy driven event, therefore, everything is grey. The result is that I must have a weighing mechanism to judge and rhetoric is important.

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

Philosophy Statement

I am tabula rasa and will evaluate whatever is debated in the round. I am fine with more progressive debate (kritiks) or theory. I am fine with a philosophical round.

Speed is not an issue, as long as I can understand you

If no one argues differently, I will default to a typical value/criterion round.

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a flow judge and will keep track very closely off all your arguments if you work down the flow. I like clarity and professionalism in your mannerisms/communication, and expect you to conduct yourselves according. A strong round should include evident links throughout to value and criterion that are backed with ample evidence. Don't just tell me, but sell me on why IT (whatever your argument may be) matters and why IT is relevant within the frame of the resolution. I'm very familiar with philosophy and like to see it incorporated in your arguments if understood and presented correctly.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

I believe that debate is shaped by the debaters. I am more adapted to listening to traditional LD rounds, but I will follow anything. In the end I believe that it is the debaters job to prove the validity or invalidity of the resolution.

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

Philosophy Statement

Do not spread. Avoid the use of policy terms in LD. This is a value driven debate and the achievement of that value through a criterion is essential. Observations are acceptable as long as they are not abusive. Please give voters in final rebuttals. Don't just point out drops. Impact them.

ROHRBACH, KENNETH	<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	5	3	

Philosophy Statement

LD debate is first and foremost a debate of competing values and criterion. I expect to hear a value and criterion from each debater. Do not run a "counterplan" at me – it has no place in LD debate, as the affirmative does not advocate a plan. Make sure and signpost – tell me where to place arguments on the flow. I expect to hear voters in the final speeches.

ROOTE, LAUREN	<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 am a traditional LD judge, who likes to see lots of value/criterion clash. I am open to any type of argumentation, whether it be analytical, philosophical, empirical, etc, as long as the argument is well-supported, logical, and developed. Arguments should also affirm or negate the resolution directly and specifically. When I judge a round, I look at the big picture. I do not appreciate when debaters fixate on minute points of contention.

Spreading or speed-talking is unacceptable. It is abusive and has no practical application in the real world. I will warn speakers once if I cannot understand them. If the debater refuses to slow down, I will not continue to flow. Speak at a normal pace and place proper emphasis on key points.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

LD Debate should be a clash between two values - each debater should attempt to show why they have a superior value. Key to the value debate is the criterion - how does it measure whether or not the value has been achieved. Each debater should attempt to undermine the criterion of the other debater. Whoever wins the value / criterion clash should win the round in most cases. However, each debater should also be able to support their own supporting contentions and undermine and/or discredit their opponents contentions. Unaddressed contentions will tend to have a great effect on who wins the value / criterion clash.

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

Philosophy Statement

At the end of the day the person who wins the round is the one who has the most significant impacts that can be weighed and linked back to an overarching concept. So no one can win without at least some of all components of their case intact. I can handle speed fine, but do not sacrifice clarity or persuasiveness for it. Know your limits and you'll be fine. I value evidence and logic, but at the end of the day try not to forget that you're talking to a human being. I'm fine with philosophy, but in a debate that has real world impacts you need more than pretty ideas, you need results. You can use complex arguments, but I dislike pointless jargon and set ups that can be said much quicker and more efficiently in layman's terms. Use your medium to your advantage and don't waste anyone's time. Beyond this, the debate is in your hand and I'll judge based off what I'm given.

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

Philosophy Statement

LD Judging Philosophy
 I would describe my LD Judging Philosophy as traditional.
 The contestants understanding of vocabulary, wordplay, and semantics are essential to their success.
 Lincoln Douglas debate is Philosophy debate, it is not about policy. While one can use policy for example purposes, the fundamental idea is the defense or attack of a principle.
 Lincoln Douglas debate should be delivered at a conversational speed, understandable to common spectator and expert judge alike.
 Value and Criterion are fundamental to LD argument construction. Strength of evidence is important. However, novel evidence is not inherently good.
 The new phenomenon of applying Kritiks to Lincoln Douglas debate is an abuse of the debate process, where it allows one contestant to leave the resolution completely. This is analogous to going out of bounds in sport and will be treated accordingly.

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

Philosophy Statement

I like to see a lot of clash in the round. I am looking for cases and refutations that uphold the value and criteria addressed in the round.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE SKINNER, KATRESE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES <input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	NUMERICAL RANKINGS <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Delivery 3</td> <td>Evidence 3</td> <td>Appeals 3</td> <td>Criteria </td> <td>Approach 2</td> </tr> </table>	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 	Approach 2	EXPERIENCE GHAE
Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 	Approach 2				

Philosophy Statement

I love value debate. I like clash. I consider myself a traditionalist as far as where LD is concerned. I believe that Affirmative has the burden of proof, but it is Negative's job to clash. I do not feel that speed has a place in LD unless it is in the 1AR.

JUDGE SLOANE, KIMBERLY	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES <input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	NUMERICAL RANKINGS <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Delivery 3</td> <td>Evidence 4</td> <td>Appeals 3</td> <td>Criteria 5</td> <td>Approach 3</td> </tr> </table>	Delivery 3	Evidence 4	Appeals 3	Criteria 5	Approach 3	EXPERIENCE HA
Delivery 3	Evidence 4	Appeals 3	Criteria 5	Approach 3				

Philosophy Statement

Debate is a persuasive professional event. Debaters should maintain professional behavior throughout the round. While arguments should be logical, they should also be backed up with evidence unless extremely common logic. Assumptions of knowledge should not be made.

JUDGE SMITH, JIMMY	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES <input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	NUMERICAL RANKINGS <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Delivery 3</td> <td>Evidence 3</td> <td>Appeals 3</td> <td>Criteria 2</td> <td>Approach 2</td> </tr> </table>	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 2	Approach 2	EXPERIENCE H
Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 2	Approach 2				

Philosophy Statement

Communication first. You must uphold your value to win my ballot

JUDGE SMITH, RHONDA	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES <input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	NUMERICAL RANKINGS <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Delivery 4</td> <td>Evidence 5</td> <td>Appeals 4</td> <td>Criteria 4</td> <td>Approach 4</td> </tr> </table>	Delivery 4	Evidence 5	Appeals 4	Criteria 4	Approach 4	EXPERIENCE HA
Delivery 4	Evidence 5	Appeals 4	Criteria 4	Approach 4				

Philosophy Statement

Make sure all overviews, underviews, disads, etc. link back into the standard. My highest priority is impacts in the round. Having said that, I expect clear warrants that substantiate the impacts.
 I like big picture debate, but I will vote on specific arguments if they become a priority in the round.
 I'm pretty straightforward. I want debaters to tell me HOW to adjudicate a round, and then tell me WHY, based on the arguments they are winning and the method of adjudication. The HOW part would be something like a standard, or burdens. The WHY part would include the warrants and impacts/link story for the arguments being extended. I am not at all particular about HOW you go about accomplishing those two tasks, but without covering those components, don't expect a W. I need a clear framework, so I like it when some time is spent laying the groundwork at the top of the case.
 I'm not a big fan of theory, but if a true abuse exists, I will vote on it. Keep in mind that if your opponent has a unique argument for which you are not prepared, that means you are not prepared, not that abuse exists in the round. I am also not a big fan of K debate, but if it is done well, I will vote on it.
 I want to see clash from the negative.
 I fundamentally believe that the resolution is a proposition of truth and that if a truth claim is made, the burden falls on the person proving it true. Having said that, I'm totally open to other articulated strategies.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

I do not like when the styles of debate are blurred between LD and CX. I respect philosophy, good speaking skills, and proper rate and speed for LD. I love a round where there is great clash. I also demand respect among debaters and will deduct from speaker points for abusive debate tactics and this may possibly cost the contestant the round if it is too abusive. Please watch circular reasoning I will not give you the win using this technique. I want empirical proof for your argument. I require an intrinsic value to win the debate; the criteria and contentions must hold up the value proving it's superiority to get the win.

STEWART, LORY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 4	Appeals 5	Criteria 5	Approach 1	H
----------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	---

Philosophy Statement

My philosophy is that LD debate is a debate of value and persuasion (and I refer to guidelines set forth by the NFL).
 The better debater proves his/her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle.
 The winner to me is the one who proves their side of the resolution as a general principle and clashes with their opponent in their rebuttal.
 I believe communication/persuasive skills play heavily and "spreading" should be discouraged. I will ask myself:
 Who has proven their side of the resolution more valid?
 Who had quality and depth of argumentation (not mere quantity of argumentation or insignificant dropped arguments)?
 Who established a clear and cohesive relationship between the argumentation and the value structure?
 Who better presented arguments with logical reasoning and appropriate support?
 Which debater best addressed the central questions of the resolution?
 Clash is one of the MOST important issues I consider.
 Who attacked their opponent's case and defended their own the best?
 Who was the best communicator (persuasive, clear and professional without sarcasm, not overly emotional or aggressive)?

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

Philosophy Statement

I don't typically judge LD. In that respect, I typically evaluate the round on an offense/defense paradigm. You obviously need a value and criterion, and this framework is more important than the contention debate. I will buy off-case arguments when relevant to the topic.

SULLIVAN, SUE JANE	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 2	Appeals 3	Criteria 3	Approach 3	HA
---------------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----

Philosophy Statement

Stay true to the fundamental difference between LD and CX debate: emphasis on value rather than policy. At the state level of competition, it is fair for a judge to expect fluid delivery, sharp analysis, and wise use of time.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
SULLIVAN, SUE JANE	<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

Always important for debater to clearly convey a thorough understanding of the topic--whether it is on a philosophical level or one more practical.

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

Philosophy Statement

I believe LD debate is a communication event. So, I think it is the job of the debater to explain arguments clearly and communicate to the judge. I do not like excessive speed. I don't like "theory" arguments (overly grounded in obtuse philosophy) where I feel an individual is trying to trick or deceive their way to a win. I really like for AFF and/or NEG to give me clear voters why they should win the round.

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

Philosophy Statement

I prefer a more traditional approach to LD with a VVC structure with supporting contentions. I prefer more pragmatic arguments as compared to pure philosophy.

TRIPE, HALLI	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	ADEF
		4	4	4	3	4	

Philosophy Statement

My judge philosophy can be found at: <http://judgephilosophies.wikispaces.com/Tripe%2C+Halli>

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

LD Debate is value debate. Focus should be on the value. Criteria and contentions should link back to the value. It is extremely important for debaters to listen to each other and directly respond to arguments made. Often debaters just react and do not directly respond.

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

Philosophy Statement

I appreciate debaters who present a balanced approach in their cases. I do want some evidence to back up the logic of arguments but I expect to hear logical reasoning behind the use of the evidence. Making use of a criteria is essential to the round. I am an old school LD debater. I should be able to follow your arguments easily and your speeches should be organized and flow logically.

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

Philosophy Statement

Beyond a well-organized and clearly stated case with a strong value, I like to see the case backed by philosophy that runs throughout the case. I look for strong evidence and a sharp mind that is able to turn that evidence against the other side when possible. Often times in a close round it will be decided on a specific clash. I am always looking for those moments. Finally, I do like to see voters or some form of crystallization.

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

Philosophy Statement

The debaters must present a case that includes a value that is directly linked to the resolution. The criterion must support and provide an explanation for the value. The contentions must include quotes and evidence to support the arguments.

The debaters must attack all aspects of the opposing case and respond to any attacks on their own case.

The debaters must recognize and point out any fallacies or irrelevant information.

The debate is won by the debater who presents a well-organized case, creates a clash with the opposing case, and shows how the arguments of the opposition either flow to his own case or fall due to lack of evidence or fallacy.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

I am an LD purist. I firmly believe in the value/criterion debate and judge down the flow. I believe arguments should be warranted and impacted well, and I do not believe in plans, counterplans, or kritiks in LD.

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

Philosophy Statement

I prefer a more traditional style, but okay with a more progressive approach if well done and appropriate to the resolution. Do NOT like spreading. Would rather hear 2 qualitative, strong, and well supported arguments rather than 10 minor points. Must have strong links for arguments. Etiquette in the round is highly important as well.

WILLEBY, KENDRA	<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	4	3	

Philosophy Statement

I am a traditional value debate judge. I will look to the framework debate first and then look on the argument level. The arguments should support the framework of each case. I do not believe that speed has a place in traditional debate.

WILLIAMS, LINDSEY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		3	2	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 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 are the framework of the debate.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

When I judge, I do not like rapid delivery style. If I cannot understand your argument, then I cannot vote in your favor. I appreciate clash. I enjoy listening to a round where both debaters refute arguments. I do not like "canned" arguments. When there is refutation in a round, I am able to determine more adequately who I should affirm as the winner of the round. I need to hear that your case has contentions, criterion, and a value. If the round is equal, I will default to who is the better persuasive speaker. I will look at who was able to provide clear arguments and have extension to those arguments. I love road maps.

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

Philosophy Statement

Congratulations for making it to the state academic meet! My philosophy of LD debate is very simple. This is value debate. You must use your logic, your research, and your presentation skills to convince me that your value is the best for affirming or negating the resolution. I listen well and flow the debate; therefore I expect you to refute, clash, and offer extensions on the arguments presented. Dropped arguments can be detrimental to the round if the opponent recognizes them.

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a true UIL debate judge, with a focus on Analysis, Argumentation, and Presentation. I judge a round based on the ability of a debater to uphold their value and criteria in terms of their own case and in defense of their opponent's attacks. I like to see both philosophical and empirical evidence to show a well-round case analysis. I also focus heavily on presentation, so an overly rapid rate of delivery is discouraged.

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

Philosophy Statement

Value and criteria are necessary for me as an LD judge. I think it is key that the value is upheld within the contentions in the case, and the criteria's link to the value premise is very important and should be explained clearly within the initial constructive for both sides.

Evidence adds credibility to any argument, and it has been my experience that too many debaters tend to make great-sounding assertions, especially in regard to human behavior, that would be much more powerful if it contained evidence.

I make every effort to not mentally intervene in the round: I like line-by-line argumentation if it is delivered at a moderate pace. Clash and clarity are very important.

In rebuttals, I do prefer the "key voter" approach, and tend to prefer examples and reasoning that is key to the topic over philosophical argumentation.

I would like to add that I will also vote on post modern philosophy concepts and if you spread there needs to be a specific reason behind it

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2015 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

Philosophy Statement

I am a traditional LD debate coach and judge although I have not judged many rounds in the last couple years. I appreciate debaters who provide a criterion that frames the round, detailing a way to make the decision and/or how to view the arguments in the debate. Simply, tell me which arguments are the most important in the round, uphold impacts and offer voters. I feel it is the debater's responsibility to connect the criterion case arguments. I will listen to non-traditional arguments; however, it is not in your best interest to deploy "plans" or other specified advocacies that fail to affirm the entire resolution. I appreciate straightforward, classic, quality structure and argumentation. Clash is expected with your opponents' arguments. I believe it is the responsibility of the debater to adapt to the judge and not the opposite. LD debate is a speaking event; clarity is imperative. Speaker points will be affected if you are rude, abusive or insulting; no cheap shots. I will flow the round, but I don't like speed / rapid delivery. Rapid delivery is a violation of UIL rules and all UIL rules shall be followed. I will listen carefully and make the best decision I can. Please understand I will not make connections for you, I will not 'flow' speed, and I applaud when a debater can adapt.