

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

## EXPLANATORY NOTES

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Philosophy Statement

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. The contentions should be used to demonstrate a real-world example of the framework in action. For any point made during the entire debate, you should have evidential support. During the rebuttal speeches, don't limit yourself to stating you don't agree with opponents stance. Give specific reasons why and provide supporting evidence. Give me clear reasons to vote and explain why those reasons are preferable to your opponent's. I can't vote on what I don't hear or can't understand. So watch rate of delivery. If it's important, make sure to explain it clearly during your speech. I am a traditional LD judge. This means the debate should be a value debate and not a 1 on 1 policy debate.

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

### Philosophy Statement

If I have any philosophy it is that I am more Value oriented and Presentation Style focused. I am not familiar with new styles of LD debate.

<b>ALDERSON, LINDA</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b> 4	<b>Evidence</b> 4	<b>Appeals</b> 3	<b>Criteria</b> 5	<b>Approach</b> 1	HADF
------------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	------

### Philosophy Statement

LD is value debate. This topic is a value premise. I like a good value that is evident in the resolution and is supported with evidence. The criterion must have a weighing mechanism in order to show me how you have achieved the value through the contentions. Neg. must have a case as well as refute the aff. case in order to have offense. I will evaluate the round on the quality of argumentation. Each debater needs to crystalize the round while identifying voters in the rebuttals. Persuasive communication is key.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

I like a traditional LD round. Value/Criterion need to be clear and weighted throughout the round. I like good, outside of the box argumentation. Do NOT come in with plans and counterplans.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I want the debaters to identify specific voters and tell me why these are sufficient to give them the ballot. I try to avoid bringing my own biases and expectations into the round and will do my best to adapt to the competitors, but I still expect to see good quality extensions, warrant comparison, and responsiveness/clash. I will vote on dropped arguments if a) you do the work of actually extending the argument, not just telling me it was dropped; b) you impact it out and tell me how it proves the resolution true/false. Beyond that I'd like to think I'm open to anything, but please feel free to ask me any questions before we begin the round. I love to see energetic, impassioned delivery, but this should not cross the line to become disrespectful or unnecessarily aggressive. I do not care to see teenagers being mean to each other, and I'll happily dock your speaker points if you're being immature or unprofessional.

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

## Philosophy Statement

Tab. Will vote on pretty much anything. Framework is important for filtering offense in the round, but not a reason to vote aff or neg on its own. Speak at whatever rate you feel comfortable.

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

## Philosophy Statement

Background: I currently compete for the UNT debate team, mostly in NPDA and NFA LD In high school I competed in Lincoln-Douglass debate.

I am Tabula Rasa.

I am fine with anything but in terms of what I weigh with each individual argument here is how I view each of them:

K - If you run a K I want to know the specific role of the ballot and why the alt will solve for the problems manifested within the K.

T - Standards and voters in terms of the real world are how I vote on topicality. If there is ground loss but you do not talk about why that is a voting issue, I am not going to vote for it. For example if the topic is on climate policy the t shell should tell me why it's important to debate about in regards to our world and lives.

DA - Big on impact calculus, make sure to weigh the impact of DA's vs the advantages of the aff. Generic links aren't as persuasive as links based in specific policies.

CP - I need a flushed out method on why the Net Benefit of the CP should outweigh the case.

Speed - I am fine with speed, if you go to fast or your diction isn't keeping up with your speed I'll say clear

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

When judging LD debate, I am looking for a debater to utilize their value and criterion throughout the debate. I am also looking for good speaking skills, strong arguments, and strong CX skills.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I believe that the center of every debate should be a clash of values and philosophies. Debaters need to have strong values that are supported by evidence for each individual component of the argument. I want to see clash between each item in the debate and I want to see debaters focus on the values at stake in each speech and portion of the round.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I am an LD and speech coach, so I want you to tell me why you win the debate. Be clear with your road maps, listen to each other and provide good clash. I believe that LD is more philosophy debate rather than evidence based, so I want you to leave the "cards" for CX debate.

<b>BRANDON, CHUCK</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	HADF
		3	3	4	4	3	

## Philosophy Statement

**BACKGROUND:**  
 Have been involved in debate as a student, high school debater, college debater, high school coach or a college coach since the Nixon administration. Yes I actually cut Watergate cards. So pardon my smile when asked how I feel about speed etc.

**PHILOSOPHY**  
 Try to be Tab as much as possible. But like all judges I have some personal preferences listed below:

**TOPICALITY**  
 Is a voter, don't usually vote on it unless it is mishandled or extremely squirely. Make sure to have a violation, standard and voter in shell. Haven't previously voted on a RVI on T.

**SPECIFIC LD THEORY:**  
 Ok with progressive or traditional. I do believe that UIL LD should follow the traditional format in that you need a value, standard/criterion and contentions. Also on speed for UIL I believe that it should be slower to keep with the spirit of UIL rules on speed and communication.

**THEORY:** Tend to look at in round abuse.

**KRITIKS:** They are fine, but make sure you understand the literature, spend a lot of quality time on the link and have a clear alternative.

**PRESENTATION:** Speed is ok as long as you are clear. If you are not clear, I will say "clear". Make a clear distinction between your taglines and and your cards.

**OTHER ISSUES::** Will vote you down for being rude or sarcastic. Proper decorum is a must. I will vote against sexist, racist et al. arguments.

**CONCLUSION:** I was fairly succinct on this paradigm, so feel free to ask me specific questions before the round. Also debate should be fun. A sense of humor is always appreciated.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

I'm pretty close to tabula rasa. I'm not going to tell the contestants what to say to persuade me; it's up to them to come up with that. If contestants weigh arguments, I consider the relative weight they assign when evaluating the round.

I do have some preferences, though. I prefer real world topical arguments to fanciful ones (e.g., Harry Potter DA). I prefer resolution based arguments to theory, though I understand that sometimes theory is useful. I tend not to vote neg on topicality unless they can show aff's case is clearly abusive. I will vote on what is presented in the round, though, not based on an idea of what I think debate should look like.

I also have some preferences regarding structure. Signpost, signpost, signpost! Refer to arguments by which points and sub-points they fall under, as well as the sources of the cards.

I have no philosophical objection to speed, but if you speak to quickly for me to flow, you won't get credit for all your arguments. Word economy is preferable to speed.

My competition background is in LD. I have been judging LD and PF for about 8 years now. I also judge WS, but not CX (except for an NCX round once in a blue moon).

Ask me anything else you would like to know; I'm very approachable.

<b>CLARK, BRAXTON</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	ADE
		3	3	4	4	4	

## Philosophy Statement

I judge exclusively on clash and argumentation. Whoever develops, carries, and addresses arguments the best wins. Any strategy is viable as long as its executed well.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I will entertain any type of argument as long as it is well explained and topical.

All arguments should be impacted back to the standard (or should tell me why it doesn't have to be). This includes extensions. "Extend it across" by itself is insufficient, re-explain briefly why it matters.

Any framework arguments should probably be handled as an overview to keep a clean flow.

Watch your speed, don't go faster than I type.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I am generally a Tab judge. I will evaluate the round as you direct it. You should not expect me to advocate positions in the round that you don't take. I will first evaluate the winner of the Value and Criterion debate that will influence the final decision in the round. The winning philosophical or other framing will heavily influence which issues are substantive in the evaluation of the round. I have no problem with any type of argumentation in LD including LARP, plans, K, theory or any other position. However, you must be able to competently understand the position you are advocating. You SHOULD NOT read too fast. I will ignore any argument made while spreading. I can keep up, but UIL is a forum for communicative debate not technical. You are welcome to read at a faster than normal pace but unintelligible words (including cards) will not make my flow. DO NOT SPREAD

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

Overall I am Tab Judge I like to focus on the mechanics of debate more than I do communications as I feel it gives students the ability to do what they want with the round. With that being said this is your debate round, I need to adapt to what you are wanting to do. I just need to see lenses and weighing mechanisms for me to look at the round, otherwise I will default to impact framing. With the exception of the criteria I put a 3 on the paradigm question to let you know I am cool with either approach to LD, again, I feel I need to adapt to you. I put such an emphasis on criteria because I feel it is a good lens you can give me to view the round through, although, you can argue for another lens and I will look at that.

For any further questions here is my paradigm list from Tabroom, always feel free to ask specific questions before the round starts:

I am a Tab judge and ok with any style of LD, whether it is progressive or traditional. With that being said, please tell me where I need to vote and spend time telling me the impacts of said voters. I like to see strong substance when it comes to showing how your opponent links into a particular argument. Thus, if you cannot put in the work on a particular link, it would benefit you to go on to another argument. When it comes to theory or any sort of topicality or observational argument, I consider this to be procedural, and I put it at the top of the flow; of course, you do have the opportunity to tell me why the argument is not procedural, you will just need to put in the work. When it comes to K's or any Kritik based arguments, I am good with those; again, just make sure you have a strong link. I would rather opponents not read Kritik based position when competing against someone unfamiliar with these arguments; while it might be an easy win on the flow, you are most likely not going to walk out of the round with good speaks. I am cool with C.P's and D.A's and really have no stipulations, but would remind you to garner the impacts you want from them and let me know what I need to vote on by the NR. When it comes to a more traditional debate style, I am cool with anything you choose to run as framing. I view impacts through the lens of what your framework says is good; however, if you want to tell me why I need to view impacts through something else, I will vote there. Besides that, you are free to do what you would like, I just need to see voters so I know what to vote on.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I would consider myself tab. I would prefer debaters establish what I should vote on and how to weigh the round. I believe it is important for the debaters to tell me why arguments are important and why they are winning it. I will vote on anything and I will not vote on anything all at the same time. It's important for you to tell me where to vote. I do not like hearing arguments that are completely squirrel of the topic. Feel me to ask questions if you have concerns or questions. I would prefer speakers to adapt to the organization they are competing in when it comes to clarity and speed.

<b>DIMMIG, BRENDEN</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	HADE
		3	3		3	3	

## Philosophy Statement

I believe that you should control the debate. if you want the debate to be about framework, that's fine. If you want the debate to be centered around contentions, that's also fine. I think deeper philosophy debates probably necessitates that you explain the phil in which you're leveraging. Going in depth and explaining throughly your position on framework, if that's what you go for, will help you win the debate. If you have any questions, please ask. Good luck!

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

## Philosophy Statement

Morality of issues can be upheld with proper criterions. Both must be upheld throughout the round. I feel that debaters should significant emphasis on the importance of the value throughout the round without relying heavily on evidence cards. Delivery should include clarity and speed as well to demonstrate the importance of the value as an effective orator. Simple goes a long way in Lincoln-Douglas.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

I like for debaters to frame the round for me regarding how they believe the round should be evaluated. The contention level debate should be viewed through the lens of their framework. During rebuttals, spend a little time explaining a path to vote for you.

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

## Philosophy Statement

My judging philosophy is to weigh which debater made a comprehensive argument, submitting their value and contentions clearly, while defending their contentions. Do they state the claims and impacts clearly? Do they concede arguments made by their opponent or address them?

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

## Philosophy Statement

It's up to the competitors to convince me of their arguments by telling me why.

Also, I am more interested in hearing arguments about the topic, not arguments about debate.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I am a flow judge which means I'll follow all of the arguments presented by each side. I expect each debater to cover all of the arguments brought up by their opponent. I also think that each debater should contextualize their arguments within their value/criterion. All of the arguments made by each debate needs to be backed up with factual evidence.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

It is my belief that it is the primary responsibility of the aff to uphold the topic and the neg must provide clash to successfully negate. I prefer traditional Value/Criterion approaches rather than alternative Framework approaches, but I will vote on well connected and explained argumentation. I prefer clear communication rather than quantity. I expect you to provide me with clear voters. Tell me what to vote on and leave it to me to weigh the substance and viability of the voters provided by each side.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I expect debaters to demonstrate that their value carries the debate. I like to see clash, and I will vote on value.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I look for clash with the Value and Criterion. I focus less on evidence and more on philosophy. Speaking style is important, but at the end of the round I go for the best argumentation. I do not like excessive speed in LD.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I strongly prefer a more traditional style of debate.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

I am an "old school," traditional judge. LD is a value debate using philosophy instead of a policy centered style. I will not vote on counter-plans, kritiks, or other progressive approaches to the event. I know LD has morphed into mini CX in some areas of the state, but that has its place in TFA, but not in UIL. Debaters must tell me why their value is more important instead of just reading evidence and asking me to fill in the blanks. Talk to me and make direct eye contact. I'm not getting any younger so please keep your pace at a slower rate. Negative must go line by line on their clash. Debaters must be polite and avoid confrontational interactions in CX. Always focus on the value, value, value. Have fun!

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

## Philosophy Statement

I am a bit of a traditionalist when it comes to LD debate. I expect to hear a Value and a Criterion on both sides and clash at that level. I will listen to more progressive arguments but I prefer a more value-based debate for this event. That being said, I do expect to hear evidence to support arguments AND I expect to hear a clearly cited source for evidence -- it should be clear where the evidence ends and your analysis of the evidence begins. I do not appreciate rudeness and your speaker points will be affected. I can judge speed although I do not think spreading is appropriate in LD debate. If you have any specific questions on what I do or do not want to hear in round, please ask.

HOFF, ROXANNE	<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 love Lincoln-Douglas Debate!

Communication: Articulate, Clear, Expressive, No Spreading

Content: Pertinent to the case, evidence supportive of valid points, quality over quantity

Use persuasion and logic to convince me who has the best Value, supported by the most apt Criterion, backed by the most valid Contentions and case arguments.

Enjoy!

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

## Philosophy Statement

First, congrats on getting to UIL State! If you're interested in my more extensive paradigm, feel free to look me up on tabroom.com. However, here are some details that germane to this particular tournament:

Respect The Forum- Remember that this is UIL LD State. While I'm comfortable flowing the K/Theory/Policy Args, this isn't the tournament for that. I will be line-by-line and technical in my determination of who wins the round, but I still want to see a Framework + Contentions debate.

Framework- Speaking of Framework, how you utilize your value & criterion is important to my ballot. Use your framework to amplify the significance of your impacts, mute the significance of your opponents impacts, etc. Please don't tell me you win the debate because your value is better. Framework is a tool for you to establish what offense matters at the end of the debate.

Weigh- Weigh your arguments. Weigh early, weigh often. Make sure your weighing is comparative.

Sign Post- In rebuttal speeches make sure that you're clear where we are on the flow so that everyone is on the same page. Similarly, when you're extending arguments in rebuttal be sure to give a full extension, including author and warrant.

Collapsing- It's usually not a good idea to go for every argument in the 2AR/2NR. Make strategic decisions heading into the back half of the round about what argument(s) you need to win to win the debate then focus your time on those positions.

Generically speaking, a good way to pick up my ballot in UIL LD is to A)leverage framework, B) win the link into an impact from your case, and C) read and win turns on your opponents case. I'll answer any questions you might have before the round. Good luck, have fun, and be nice!

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

I tend to judge LD in the same way I judge CX/Policy, meaning I weigh offense/defense to decide which debate solves for or avoids the biggest impact. I won't reject any argument or style of debate out of hand, but I have a preference for debates that focus on the actual topic. I don't require that you use traditional LD terminology, but I expect that you will at least offer some kind of standard for evaluating impacts. Otherwise, I will likely default to util. I'm probably not the best judge for complex kritiks or old school phil/social contract stuff. I'm also probably not good for contrived or arbitrary theory interps that don't relate to topicality. Even though I could possibly be convinced to vote on one, I don't like RVIs.

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

## 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.

HUMPHREY, CHELSEA	<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	4	2	

## Philosophy Statement

I flow a debate when I judge. If I am unable to hear/flow your arguments, then I am unable to judge their merit on the round. I believe that LD is a value-based style of debate, so you need to clearly identify your value/criterion framework and hold it strong throughout the round. I love pragmatism and supporting evidence, but at the end of the day, it will be the quality of your analysis that has the greatest potential to sway me to your side. Do not deviate from the resolution into emotional appeals! I want to see a respectful debate between two well-researched individuals.

HURLEY, DUSTIN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GH
		3	1	5	5	2	

## Philosophy Statement

I will evaluate the round however you tell me to. I like to see a more traditional LD round with a philosophical focus on the value criterion. Framing the debate is important for me. If you can win the interpretation I will use your lens to view the debate. The value is the most important issue. If you do not win your value especially on the aff you will not get my ballot. Voters are super important. I do not flow card names. I do not like speed.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

I like to start off judging LD rounds with a blank slate and be convinced by the debater of which value/criterion to prefer. The debater telling me why his/her value & criterion are superior and giving the most real-world examples of superiority will win the round.

Prefer a "big picture" approach. As in never lose sight of values in this value debate. I don't care about nitty gritty details behind contentions (this isn't policy debate), unless you can use them to support or negate - they must link specifically to value/criterion or they will get lost on my flow.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I'm good with however you want to approach the topic! I don't mind phil or tricks, or Kritik debating I however tend to have a very high threshold on voting teams down on theory.

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

## Philosophy Statement

When judging, what I care about the most is how effective debaters are at supporting their value throughout the round and at attacking their opponent's value. This gets at the heart of LD debate and I appreciate when debaters consider their values in their contentions, CX, and rebuttals. Often times, I see debaters move away from them and not mention them outside the 1-2 minutes of their constructive speech. While facts and sources are important to support your arguments, you should be able to tie it all back to your value.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I view LD as a true values round. I do not like to see plans or counterplans presented. Avoid the CX jargon as much as possible. I expect every side to have a value and a criterion in there case. Don't just state one to meet this requirement. Have your case develop around the value/criterion established. I prefer a moderate form of speaking and a good amount of clash. Lack of clash will cause a loss ballot!

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

Please be organized and provide clash in the round.

Weigh the round.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I am a Speech and Debate Coach. I consider debate a communications event.

Please present your arguments using a professional and conversational style.

I am a "flow" judge, so if I'm not flowing, you are not clear – Be sure to roadmap and signpost. I prefer a traditional style of debate and am big on speaker clarity. I'm okay with a speaking pace a bit faster than 'normal' conversation, but avoid monotone speaking and inhibited breathing!

Better evidence is more important than more evidence. Sources matter! Evidence isn't an argument; it should support arguments. Be sure to extend your arguments, especially after they've been attacked. Take advantage of Cross-ex to set up arguments for the rest of the round.

Topics reflect concerns in our society, so take it seriously and do not waste my time with case approaches that do not consider the framers' intent. My vote is based on the arguments you and your opponent present.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I am a tab judge and will do my best to let the debater frame the round. I default V/C.

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

## Philosophy Statement

LD is not policy debate. Please keep the debate philosophical in nature. Know who your philosopher is and what he/she believes. Tie your criterion and value together. Also, tie each of your contentions to your value and criterion. I am a traditional LD debate coach. Please do not argue disadvantages or other policy arguments in an LD round.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

There is no set format or style you should adhere to. Do what you do best. For me, you can run any argument whatsoever if you explain/warrant, analyze, and contextualize it. Though, I evaluate arguments and vote around comparative analysis through a lens of offense/defense and impact calculus. Arguments consists of claim, warrant, impact. I vote close to how I flow. Assume you know your literature and arguments better than I do during the debate. Strategic extensions and explanations are important. I look for specificity, line-by-line, warrants and impacting out arguments. I'm okay voting for any argument under any framework you explicitly put me in. Typically, I evaluate tech over truth.

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

## Philosophy Statement

For me, LD is very much about communication. I value argumentation the places the value and criterion in context, and which centers argumentation around the VC debate. I also want debaters to clearly explain the importance of cards rather than just reading cards. I also value a clear line-by-line refutation.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I am more of a traditional LD judge. I look for a value and criterion and clear weighing of the issues. I will vote on philosophical arguments but like to see them supported with real world examples. I am not adverse to progressive arguments but want clear standards provided for voters

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

## Philosophy Statement

I judge LD based off of who provides the best communication and clash throughout the debate. Remember, this is value debate and determining which side is the best course of action is the entire point of this style of debate. I can handle some speed, but I don't believe it's necessary to get your point across. In fact, I'd much prefer to hear a slower rate of reliever with great communicative value than spreading that nobody can understand. Also, I prefer not to hear a "1-person CX" round. I can handle progressive and critical argumentation, but in my experience it rarely adds to the debate. I much prefer evidence and philosophy based argumentation.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

**Philosophy Statement**

I would rather adapt to you than you adapt to me. Do what you do best.

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

**Philosophy Statement**

I tend to view LD through an offense/defense paradigm. I look first to how the framework provided acts as a funnel to view offense. I think that LD functions best when we realize that most values are pretty good (I'm not super persuaded by "my value is better than my opponents"). I'm looking more at the advocacy of the aff/neg position and how that solves the impacts claimed.

<b>MEEK, REBECCA</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GHE
		2	2	4	5	4	

**Philosophy Statement**

Traditional judge, Value, and criteria are a must. The debater should explain how the resolution meets the criteria to achieve the value. Voters are essential.

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

**Philosophy Statement**

As stated above, I have no preference for a specific style of argumentation. Framework is a way to filter impacts, and that should be unbiased so that both sides can weigh under it. Impact calculus and comparison is the most important thing debaters can do to win my ballot. You can find a more detailed paradigm on Tabroom.com.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

Value/Criteria alone will not win you the debate. I need solid clash for a winning ballot. Anything can be a voting issue, tell me directly what you are doing. Do not leave me guessing. And be organized, it is important to me that your speech is fluid and is articulated well. Be respectful to the Judges and your opponent.

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

## Philosophy Statement

School Affiliation: Graduate of Brown University; former competitor from Big Spring High School.  
 Experience: 5-year speech and debate competitor with Big Spring ISD; I was predominantly an LD debater, but I have experience in CX/PF/Congress as well as DX/IX/OO.  
 Speed: Speech and debate is an educational, public speaking extracurricular. While I can handle spreading, I discourage it. There is a difference between speaking quickly to get your arguments on the board and speaking so fast that no one can understand you. If I cannot understand you, I will not flow your argument. To help with clarity, please tagline your arguments with clear markers (i.e. Contention 1, subpoint A, etc).  
 Types of Arguments: I support "traditional" debate in every sense of the word. I will evaluate rounds by how well debaters stick to the resolution and debate the nuance of it using their value and criterion. Consequently, I am not a fan of CX-like argumentation. This includes, but is not limited to, arguments concerning topicality, plans and counterplans, and kritiks. These arguments are almost never persuasive to me. Stick to the resolution, back up your argumentation with solid statistics and analysis, and compare them to your opponents'. In the end, give me voters. That is how you can win my ballot.  
 Speaker Points: As I mentioned with speed, clarity and persuasive argumentation are at the core of this activity. To receive high speaker points, be clear, concise, persuasive, and respectful (both in terms of treatment of others and the language you use). Speed will never add points, but it certainly will take them away if I cannot understand you.  
 Email Chain: I do not want to be added to email chains. The presentation of your case and subsequent points is how I will flow and consider arguments. As a result, communication is key.  
 Disclosure: I do not disclose who won my ballot or speaker points.

<b>MORRIS, JAN</b>	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Approach</b>	GHAEDEF
		3	3	3	5	3	

## Philosophy Statement

Lincoln Douglas debate is first and foremost a clash of values and of different morality ways of seeing the world. Debate of the topic should be centered around what should exist in the utopian world. If there are impacts to be debated there must be a morality behind the impacts in order to prove that your value is superior. I like a good line by line debate. And also prefer to have contention level debate.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I am willing to evaluate the arguments you advance as fairly as possible. I do not want to dictate what arguments you should make. I am well versed in traditional value/criteria debate, as well as more recent approaches to LD debate. You need to make well warranted arguments that explain the reasons behind the claims you are advancing. I have judged over 180 policy rounds this school year and my judging philosophy for policy can be found on tabroom.com if you are looking for more insights about the way in which I view debate. It is essential that you make comparisons between the arguments you are winning and the arguments your opponents are possibly ahead on. If you have specific questions please feel free to ask me prior to the start of the round.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

Set a good standard at the beginning of the debate. Make it clear who the winner of the debate will be based on whether or not you or your opponent successfully argues and accomplished whatever your stated burdens are.

Speak clearly. Any speed is fine as long as you slow down and read your tag lines and main points very clearly. Give clear indication of when you have reached the burden you set out.

I am a true values debate judge in LD. Tabula rasa judge. Flexible to any kinds of cases and arguments as long as they are respectful. If your case is not topical or abusive and your opponent argues and proves that in their speeches then I am willing to vote based on abuse.

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

## Philosophy Statement

My role as a judge is to evaluate whatever debate the debaters choose to have as objectively as possible. I keep a tight flow and will primarily use my flow to make my decision. I view debate primarily as an academic game that trains debaters to become effective public advocates, and will use my ballot to reward thoughtful, in-depth research, and excellent strategic decision making. I will tend to reward debaters who do not shy away from clash with their opponents' arguments. I have a more complete paradigm available on Tabroom.com, should you have specific inquiries about types of argument or my past experience.

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

## Philosophy Statement

Realistic evidential approach

At UIL you don't need to spread

Criterion based more on logic than assumption

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

## Philosophy Statement

I am a Tab Rasa judge and believe the value should be valued above all arguments.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

I am a coach and teacher of Debate for the last six years. I teach my students the traditional form of debating.

I am a traditional LD judge that wants framework debate. I do not want in spreading or policy jargon during the round. I am looking for claims, warrants, and impacts for every contention. I will not assume anything, so if you don't say it then I can't vote on it.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I have been Judge, Debate Coach for 25 twenty five years now in Texas circuits both UIL, TFA, and NSDA. I did not debate in college but have taught, coached, judged Debate for Rio Vista HS, Burleson High School, Wichita Falls HS, Northwest HS, and Now Mansfield Legacy High School, all in the DFW area of Texas. Have judged outside the area at Harvard U. , Berkley U, and Stanford, as well as colleges in Texas. Taught Policy and LD debate at Cameron University Summer Debate work shop for several years.

My Ld Debate Paradigms fall in the Traditional Debate category. I look for quality of arguments over quantity. Although I classify myself as Value/Clash judge, I am open to some Negative Kritiks and conterplans. I am not a fan of theory based affirmatives or alternate worlds and really hate performance debate. Spreading will cost you speaker points if not the round if I can not understand your case. Make arguments clear. Evidence and cards should be followed by analytics but analytics without evidence is of little value in my book. Show me that you understand what you are reading and not just reading cards. I am not a fan of personal anecdotes, What facts. No common knowledge statements that you cannot substantiate with sources. Just because you think it is common knoweledge does not make it so. Don't be rude, mean or condescending. Vulgarity will cost you the round. I have to vote for someone so give me impact calculus and voters in your rebuttal. Make it clear why I should vote for your position and why your value, value critereon, and contentions outweigh your opponents. Also tell me which arguments were dropped by your opponent and why they are important to the round. Do not make arguements during your CX questioning time. Ask questions only.

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

## Philosophy Statement

L-D is not one man CX. Spreading has no place in L-D. I'm sure that neither Lincoln nor Davis wowed their audience with such speech marvel.

You should be sure that there is clash in the round. Any mastery of philosophy with proper application is greatly appreciated. Remember that first and foremost L-D is value debate. I want to be persuaded that your response to the resolution is a better response than that of your opponent; that it is the right thing to do.

Weigh the round in your final speech. You may be rewarded by discovering that you filled out my ballot.

Have fun and in everything, ...decorum.

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

## Philosophy Statement

Rate and diction are important parts of any speech contest. There must be clash and all drops will recorded. I believe this is philosophical debate and policy holds very limited ground in any LD round.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

**Philosophy Statement**

I prefer traditional LD debate to LD debate with more policy-style arguments, however, in balance. Please consistently weigh the V/C.

Please do not spread. Clear communication and an effective balance of rhetorical appeals are appreciated.

Impact calculus is essential. Please state your voters. Weigh and develop your ballot story.

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

**Philosophy Statement**

My philosophy is largely tabula rasa, but I default to emphasizing V/C debate absent compelling argument to the contrary.

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

**Philosophy Statement**

LD Debate is value debate, not policy. Please stick to traditional UIL framework. Evidence can be nice, but is not always necessary; do not depend on only logic though in a tight round. Please remember first and foremost, you are trying to persuade your judge. Spreading is not persuasive.

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

**Philosophy Statement**

Communication is the key to winning my ballot.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

**Philosophy Statement**

Game Theory Judge -- I want to see debaters play the game of offense and defense in argumentation and do it well. I'm open to most articulations of the resolution excluding any potentially harmful interpretations.

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

**Philosophy Statement**

I do not mind speed, but I should be able to easily flow your case and arguments. I do not find roadmaps to be necessary for L.D. but feel free to provide one if that is what you are used to doing. Please do not let the virtual format hinder your communication skills. I still feel like delivery and style elements such as eye contact matter. I like a philosophy-based value/criterion clash that is supported by facts but I try to keep myself open to different styles and constructions. Be polite and professional during cx periods.

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

**Philosophy Statement**

Claim, Warrant, Impact.  
 I will not debate you or debate for you.  
 Support your ideas. Support your logic.

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

**Philosophy Statement**

a blend of pragmatic and philosophical value debate with emphasis on values/criterion--I do not support policymaking in an LD round. Communication skills/clash impress me.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

I prefer values and value criterions to provide a clear framework for the round. Do not spread. Make sure you speak very clearly. Arguments will be evaluated only if they have clear and developed warrants. Please weigh the most important arguments for me. Be kind to your opponent.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I am a value judge. Debaters should be organized and provide adequate interpretations and analysis.

I expect the competitors to define the debate's spectrum and emphasis.

Competitors who make an attempt to resolve the problems posed by their critics receive more points.

It's critical to back up your claims with proof, reasoning, and other methods.

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

## Philosophy Statement

Debaters should be able to effectively prove, beyond any doubt, that their value should be a higher priority than their opponents. 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.

They need to encompass the whole resolution and not just parts of the resolution. They also need to back up every claim/rebuttal with evidence and impacts.

I decide debates by figuring out 1. framing issue 2. offense 3. good defense 4. if the evidence is as good as you say it is 5. deciding which world /side would result in a better outcome. I appreciate clear analysis of why you should win in the final rebuttals

Not only do they need to focus on the content of their cases and rebuttals, they also need to focus on their communication skills. Please keep your delivery slow and clear. I cannot vote for you if I cannot understand you.

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

## Philosophy Statement

Debate is a communication exercise. I must be able to understand both what you say and what your arguments are. You must persuade me that your side is better, not just rely on your evidence.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

For reference I usually judge progressive LD - Below is my copied paradigm from Tabroom. I will adapt to the stylistic preferences of the debaters given this is UIL.  
 TLDR- I like most arguments. I read mostly critical positions but would prefer you to just read whatever you are best at- persuasion is important to me because i don't want to be bored. no excuse for being late to online debate - log in and keep you mic off while u prep- speaks will suffer if this doesn't happen  
 Speaks-They start at 28.5. I will evaluate speaks based on strategy but also ethos and knowledge of your position. I'll also index to the quality of the pool and if you keep me interested the entire debate I will reward ++++. I'm not going to disclose them-- chill you infomaniacs.  
 K affs and T FW-I like them but I'd prefer them to be grounded in some way to the topic. I don't care if you are sketchy initially but please make the 1ar overview or something clear.  
 Judging vs T FW-- I have no biases here, but would prefer substantive engagement with a c/i or something in addition to impact turns. Also, impact turns need to be fleshed out and specific. If your reading T fw im more persuaded by fairness arguments and a TVA.  
 Policy args--These are fine, I never really read these. But I can prob judge them fine, just don't assume I understand the intricacies of the topic. Also please weigh. I believe in 0% risk. I don't like dumb perms. Please collapse.  
 K's--Read what you like. I am familiar with a lot of the lit but will just go along with whatever your spin/interpretation is. the 1NC needs to answer in some capacity preempts in the 1AC. Good debates here are what will get the highest speaks.  
 KvK-I have found myself judging a lot of these debates so I added this section. I like big-picture overviews that are clear. These dont need to be very long but i want to clearly be able to identify the tension point of the debate. I also want synthesis in the 2nr- this means i want you to not just extend particular parts of your critique but explain them in context with 1ar args-- implicit clash will only go so far.  
 Theory--default - DD, CI, no rvi. Weigh in the 2NR/ar. I was never in love with theory debate and am probably not the best judge for multiple shell debates. I will evaluate k first args but default to theory first.

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

## Philosophy Statement

Fundamentally I see debate as a game. I think it is a valuable and potentially trans-formative game that can have real world implications, but a game none the less that requires me to choose a winner. Under that umbrella here are some specifics

1. Comparative analysis is critical for me. You are responsible for it. I will refrain from reconstructing the round, but I may read relevant cards and expect the highlighting to be clear. Your words and spin matters, but this does not make your evidence immune to criticism.
2. The affirmative needs to engage the resolution.

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

## Philosophy Statement

Presentation is huge for me - if I cannot understand you, I cannot judge fairly. Confidence indicates knowledge of subject and well researched evidence which is now familiar. I want to believe the debater believes what they are saying. I watch closely for drops.

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

## Philosophy Statement

The debate round is up to you to decide what you want to go for. Speed is perfectly fine with me, as long as you are clear and signpost to let me know where I should be on the flow. Organization is key, and can definitely make or break a decision. I enjoy V/C debate, but have voted off of solid contention level debate before. Take the time in the rebuttals to explain how you're winning and why, and that makes voting for you that much easier

Congratulations on qualifying for state!

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

Since Lincoln Douglas is value debate, the value premise with supporting criteria and evidence is paramount. I believe that the affirmative has the burden of proof and the negative should provide direct clash. Debate should have structure and cohesiveness. Debaters should have a conversational style, passion, and believability.

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

## Philosophy Statement

Your value/criteria should link to you case. You must prove why your case is more important than your opponent's and eye contact is important. Speed if fine at whichever rate you go.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I am only going to judge on what you say in the round, so make sure you address everything you think is important, even if it's common sense. I will not be doing any work in this round. Draw it out for me. Make it clear why I should vote for you. Draw clear links, make extensions, provide impacts, etc. Signposting is a must! When doing rebuttals, warrant your arguments and explain your reasoning. Be responsive to what your opponent is saying. There's nothing I hate more than judging a round where the debaters pass right by each other's points.

I don't like speed, I prefer pragmatic reasoning to philosophical but I can work with either, and I'm generally more interested in the meat of the case than the framework. I will vote you down if you are disrespectful.

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

## Philosophy Statement

The main thing I look for is clash, on both the contention level as well as the value-criteria level of the debate. I debaters should frame the round and tell me why they have won the round. Off time road maps are ok as well as please sign post during your speeches. I will be flowing the round so its your job to let me know where to flow your arguments. If something for drop in the round, I will not vote for it unless you point it out. CX is only for questions, so please keep it civil. Besides that I am up for anything you want to throw at me as long as you explain it well.

# JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL SPEECH STATE MEET 2021 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

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

## Philosophy Statement

I like a mix of philosophical and pragmatic argumentation. I have a BA in philosophy focusing on ethics and political philosophies. I don't have a preference for traditional or progressive, I enjoy both types of argumentation. I also don't mind theory arguments.

I do want to hear full arguments including impacts. Evidence needs to be well-sourced.

While I do enjoy progressive arguments, I don't enjoy "progressive" delivery. I need to be able to hear you, understand you, and flow you. Sign-posting, clarity, eye contact, and pacing are all critical in this process.

Things to avoid if you want my ballot:

1. Hyper-spreading - my hearing impairment will kick in and you will lose me.
2. Power-tags - I do actually listen to the evidence you read.
3. Rudeness/condescension - whether aimed at your opponent or me has no place in the round.
4. Accusations of cheating - Do not present baseless accusations of cheating.
5. Dropping arguments - be organized and cover the flows.
6. Impact turns - be careful here - "racism good/rape good/etc," there are just some arguments I'm not prepared to listen to. EVER.
7. Undercovering the value/criteria or Framework - if I'm supposed to weigh your value/criteria then you need to set it up to withstand scrutiny and you better give me decent arguments as to why the opposition's is deficient.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I lean to more of a traditional approach to LD. While I do enjoy progressive arguments, I want them to be approached within the framework of the philosophy being used to support the value/criterion. A complete pragmatic approach to the topic is not appreciated. I want to hear your voters. I want to know why you think you have won the round. Do not assume that I have followed your line of thinking as you approach arguments. Make the links and be clear in all of your communication. Whatever rate of speed you decide to speak at, make sure that you can be understood. If I can't understand you, I will assume that was an active choice on your part because you wanted the argument to be dropped. If you wanted it to count, you would communicate better.

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

## Philosophy Statement

In my opinion on, every round is a learning experience. As a previous competitor, I do my best to outline specific ways in which each students can improve based on what was shown to me in the round. I judge primarily on Value-Criterion clash. but am satisfied by competitors clashing down the flow. I judge based on the technique of each competitor and their ability to create a solid foundation for their case to stand on. If a debater can give me a case and defense that is held throughout the round, then they win in my book.

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

## Philosophy Statement

I am like to flow debates and look for drop arguments. I also like a student that has confidence and is a good speaker.