



Illinois High School Association

# Scholastic Bowl Case Manual for Coaches and Officials

Eighth Edition

2011-2012

## The purpose of this manual

The purpose of this manual is two fold.

In the first case, despite being now in its eighth edition, there are still coaches who insist on local interpretations of rules (often because their league plays a particular way), and that this way is the only way to play. This manual arms a coach against such situation in regular tournament or dual team play. While this manual does not replace the rules manual, moderators and officials are strongly advised to pay heed to these recommendations, as this manual is based on many years of experience, and interviews with coaches, officials, and players. Tournament and league directors are strongly encouraged to make it clear to their officials that this document is expected to be used as a guide to their thinking, and that refusing to follow this could lead to confusion and frustration on the part of players and coaches.

The second purpose of this manual is to provide a unified stand on how rules should be interpreted across the state. Thus a team from southern Illinois playing a team from northern Illinois with a moderator from central Illinois sees no disadvantage, because (hopefully) their opponents and the moderator have similar expectations as to how the match should be conducted.

If you have any suggestions for new cases or improvements, contact your representative on the IHSA Advisory Committee.

## **RULE 3: MATCH MECHANICS**

### **3-B. Forfeit Time**

#### **3-B-2: CASE #1**

A match is scheduled to begin at 3:00. At 3:00, Team X is present, but Team Y is not. The moderator leaves the room to contact the local manager. The local manager arrives a few minutes later to find that Team Y has arrived, and is preparing to play.

The local manager, after verifying that Team Y was not present at 3:00, is within his/her rights to declare a forfeit. The manager should NOT declare a forfeit unless it is clear that the team was intentionally attempting to delay the start of the game, or made no clear attempt to appear on time.

It is the responsibility of a Head Coach to arrive early enough to allow for the team to prepare to play, as well as to permit coaches to greet each other and the local manager to communicate important information. It is considered professional as well as common courtesy to advise a host if a team will be arriving late. Failure to do so may result in an embarrassing situation for the team arriving late.

Obviously, if a team is not present because their previous match ran late, that team should in no way be penalized.

### **3-E. Time Outs**

#### **3-E-9c: CASE #1:**

The coach of Team X calls a legal time out. The coach sends in a player who is wearing a top that appears not to be similar to the tops of the other players.

Ideally, the tournament director would have noted this before the match began, and contacted the local manager. If this was not case, the moderator must stop, and contact the local manager for a ruling. If the local manager rules the top to not be matching, then the coach of Team X must send in a player who is wearing a matching top. If this cannot be done, then the substitution will not be allowed. The moderator may NOT assess any penalties without consulting with the tournament director.

#### **3-E-9e: CASE #1**

The moderator asks a Tossup in the category Science/Chemistry:

"Which element, with atomic number 6, is the focus of organic chemistry?"

The printed answer is: "CARBON"

Player 1 on Team X appears to look down on a list of elements that was left behind by the player that she replaced. Player #1 rings in and is properly recognized by the moderator.

Player 1 responds: "Carbon"

The moderator should respond: "Incorrect"

It is the player's responsibility to make sure that there are no possible illegal aides left behind after a time out. This is left up to the interpretation of the moderator. If the moderator feels that the player has been aided illegally, then the answer should not be accepted.

### **3-E-9e: CASE #2**

The moderator asks a Tossup in the category Science/Chemistry:

"Which element, with atomic number 6, is the focus of organic chemistry?"

The printed answer is: "CARBON"

There is a list of elements left behind by the player that Player #1 on Team X replaced. Player #1 never looks down at the paper.

Player #1 rings in and is properly recognized by the moderator.

Player 1 responds: "Carbon"

The moderator should respond: "That is correct."

The moderator has discretion in determining whether or not a player received illegal aide. If the moderator is confident that no foul has occurred, then points should be awarded accordingly. However, no matter what the moderator determines, the moderator's opinion on the matter is final.

## **RULE 4: DURING THE MATCH**

### **4-A Communication**

Rules 4-A-5 and 4-A-6 outline legal communication for coaches. Anything outside of those rules runs the risk of being interpreted as illegal by the moderator.

#### **4-A-7c: CASE #1:**

The moderator reads a toss-up question. Team X rings in and gives an incorrect answer. The coach for Team Y immediately starts to "air signal," in an attempt to get someone from Team Y to ring in.

The moderator should consider this to be illegal communication, as this may be a prearranged signal between coach and players, or at the very least a distraction to everyone involved.

The moderator should not accept any answer from Team Y, and should proceed to the next toss-up. Team Y may answer the next toss-up.

#### **4-B. Answering**

##### **4-B-1c: CASE #1**

A player for Team X rings in, and is recognized by the moderator. The player appears to be thinking. The moderator counts to three in her head, and calls time. A split second later, the player gives the correct answer.

The moderator should not accept the answer.

If the second team can ring in, be recognized, and answer legally, then they earn ten points and control of the bonus. This is NOT a situation where a replacement question should be used. This same procedure applies to answering a bonus question. Players need to learn to be careful in such situations.

##### **4-B-2: CASE #1**

A player for Team X rings in, and is recognized by the moderator. The player begins answering, but is stuttering through the answer. In the moderator's opinion, the player has delayed three seconds, and the player has not completed the answer.

The moderator should stop the player's answer, and inform him/her that they are incorrect. If the second team has not had an opportunity to ring in, they now have an opportunity. Players must be ready to answer when they are recognized. If they begin answering and are unsure, they run the risk of giving out information that might help the other team. Moderators should always automatically begin a 3-second count when a player is recognized. Never assume that an answer is imminent.

On the other hand, moderators should be warned that there are players who may be afflicted with a condition that does not allow them to speak so quickly. Coaches are strongly urged to identify such players to the moderator before a match begins. Moderators should use good judgment in accepting answers from these players, realizing that attempting to answer under a handicap is not the same as intentionally delaying.

##### **4-B-3: CASE #1**

The moderator asks the following question in The Arts:

Name the lyricist who composed the lyrics to such songs as Embraceable You, which was composed by his well known brother.

Player 1 from Team X rings in, and is properly recognized after hearing the word Embraceable.

Player 1 states George..I mean Ira Gershwin

The moderator should respond: "Incorrect"

While the entire answer must be evaluated, players are not permitted to change their answers once they have given an incorrect answer. If the player had quickly answered George who composed and Ira Gershwin the lyricist, this could be interpreted as giving two pieces of information, and could be accepted. Thus moderators need to be careful about being too quick to say correct or incorrect. Make certain the player has completed the answer. Coaches need to coach their players to NOT give additional information, until they are prompted by the moderator.

#### **4-B-3: CASE #2**

The moderator asks the following question in Language Arts/Spelling:

Spell the word which applies to the largest marsupial in Australia.

Player 1 from Team X rings in, and is properly recognized.

Player 1 states k-a-n-g.....k-a-n-g-a-r-o-o

The moderator should respond: Correct

Under the current interpretation of 4-B-3, moderators must be extremely focused on what a player actually says. The past interpretation held spelling as a special case where players could not repeat what they had already said. Now, this is permissible, assuming the player has not made a mistake, and does not attempt to correct it. This rule change is more in line with accepted practice in national spelling competitions, and is in line with all other cases in scholastic bowl.

#### **4-B-4: CASE #1**

The moderator asks the following question in Social Studies/History

"Who was the 35th president of the United States?"

The printed answer is: JOHN KENNEDY (both names needed)

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and is recognized. He says: "Oh, I forgot ... OH, John Kennedy".

The moderator should respond: "Correct"

Obviously, the "first thing out of the mouth" was not the correct answer ... it also obviously was not an attempt to answer. Good moderators know to ignore this (as long as the words don't constitute something unsportsmanlike or an attempt to stall). If the moderator in any way suspects that it was a part of the answer, the moderator must rule against that answer. However, coaches are strongly urged to warn their players to say nothing except for their answer, as, on occasion, it may be difficult to determine where the answer starts.

#### **4-B-5: CASE #1**

The moderator asks a Toss-up in the category Social Studies/Law:

A famous Supreme Court case established that a person under arrest must be informed of certain rights under the law. Name either the plaintiff or defendant in this famous case."

The printed answer is: "MIRANDA or the state of ARIZONA" (either one)

Player 1 from Team X rings in after the word "case". Player 1 is properly recognized.

Player 1 states: "Oh ... (quietly) New Mexico, Texas, (loudly) ARIZONA!"

The word "Arizona" was spoken before the moderator's three second count is completed.

The moderator should respond: "Incorrect."

In this case, the player is giving information that can be clearly interpreted as part of a given answer. The moderator would do best to say "sorry" after the word "New Mexico". Coaches would do best to coach players in not speaking any words unless they want that to be considered.

#### **4-B-5: CASE #2**

The moderator reads the following question in Science/Physics:

"A wire with a resistance of 14 ohms carries a current of 2 amps. What is the potential difference across the ends of the wire?"

The printed answer is: "28 Volts"

Player #1 on Team X rings in. The moderator properly recognizes her.

Player #1 answers: "28"

The moderator should respond: "I need more information."

Player #1 responds: "Volts squared"

The moderator should respond: "Incorrect"

Many moderators (and coaches) erroneously believe in the "first thing out of the mouth rule," but seem to bend it to give them advantage in their situation. The whole answer must be considered. In this case, the units are obviously wrong, even though the first part, by itself (28 Volts), would have been correct. Moderators should allow students to complete their answers, before stating that an answer is correct or incorrect.

#### **4-B-6: CASE #1**

The moderator asks a Toss-up in the category of Social Studies-History:

"Identify the full name of the forty-third president of the United States."

The printed answer is: GEORGE WALKER BUSH (full name required)

Player 1 from Team X rings in and is properly recognized.

Player 1 states: "George Bush"

The moderator properly states: "I need more information"

Player 1 responds: "George W. Bush"

The moderator should respond: "Incorrect."

The player has not given one single piece of incorrect information. Why shouldn't the player be allowed to continue? There needs to be a limit to a player's ability to answer, because the player very well could be stalling for time, trying to recall a key fact. A player may only get prompted once.

#### **4-B-6: CASE #2**

The moderator asks a Toss-up in the category of Social Studies-History:

"Identify the full name of the forty-third president of the United States."

The printed answer is: GEORGE WALKER BUSH (full name required)

Player 1 from Team X rings in and is properly recognized.

Player 1 states: "George Bush"

The moderator properly states: "I need more information"

Player 1 responds: "George W. Bush"

The moderator should respond: "Sorry, that is incorrect."

Player 3 from Team Y rings in and is properly recognized.

Player 3 states: "George Bush"

The moderator properly states: "I need more information"

Player 3 states: "George Walker Bush"

The moderator should respond: "Correct."

Some coaches have come under the belief that prompting can only be given to the first team to ring in. This is not true. Both teams may be prompted if more information is needed on a particular toss-up or part of a bonus. The limitation is that each team can only be prompted once on any particular toss-up or bonus part.

#### **4-B-8: CASE #1**

The moderator asks a Toss-up in the category of Language Arts-Literature:

"One of Shakespeare's plays ends, 'For never was a story of more woe than this'. What was the name of the Friar who helped Romeo and Juliet?"

The printed answer is: (Friar) LAURENCE

Player 1 from Team X rings in after the word "woe", and is properly recognized.

Player 1 states: "Romeo and Juliet"

The moderator properly states: "Incorrect"

Player 3 from Team Y rings in and is properly recognized.

Player 3 states: "Laurence"

The moderator properly states: "Correct"

The Coach of Team X claims that this question is a hose, and that the question should be replaced, and asked to both teams.

The Coach of Team X is correct. The question should be replaced (preferably with a literature question). 4-B-8 (the so-called "Hose Rule") is vitally important as a protection to players against poor question writing, and moderators who would otherwise find a way to hurt a player who might have deeper knowledge. Some moderators/coaches believe that an answer like this is the consequence of being aggressive and knowing more. Such attitudes are dangerous in the same way one would say that a football team having fast running backs is inherently unfair. Moderators in this case are absolutely required to replace the question. Failure to do so opens the concern among coaches and players that the moderator may be allowing personal opinions to sway their impartiality.

#### **4-B-8: CASE #2**

The moderator asks a Toss-up in the category of Mathematics-Algebra:

"Solve for 'x'.  $12 = 5x + 3$ . Give your answer as a mixed number."

The printed answer is: 1 and  $\frac{4}{5}$

Player 1 from Team X rings in after "3", and is properly recognized.

Player 1 states: "1.8"

The moderator properly states: "Incorrect"

Player 3 from Team Y rings in and is properly recognized.

Player 3 states: "1 and  $\frac{4}{5}$ "

The moderator properly states: "Correct"

The Coach of Team X claims that this question is a hose, and that the answer should be accepted.

The Coach of Team X is correct. This is different from Case #1. In Case #1, the question misled the player into thinking that the answer was the play's title, meaning that the question itself had no true answer. In this case, there is a definitive answer, and the player is not initially misled. There is a definitive answer that happens to have multiple forms of expression (mixed number, decimal, improper fraction). The question becomes a hose because the stipulation requiring a particular form comes at the end of the question. In this case, it can be definitively shown that the player's answer is equal to the proper answer. In this case, throwing out the question penalizes the player. While more commonly seen in computation questions, situations like this can come about in any case where there are synonymous answers, and only at the end is the stipulation given. Again, moderators are required to take this action to protect players from poor question writing.

#### **4-B-8: CASE #3**

The moderator asks a Toss-up in the category of Language Arts-Literature:

"This German author, born in 1877 won the 1946 Nobel Prize in Literature. Name this author of *The Glass Bead Game* and *Siddhartha*.

The printed answer is: (Hermann) HESSE

Player 1 from Team X rings in after "This German author", and is properly recognized.

Player 1 states: "Goethe"

The moderator properly states: "Incorrect"

Player 3 from Team Y rings in after the question is completed and is properly recognized.

Player 3 states: "Hesse"

The moderator properly states: "Correct"

The Coach of Team X claims that this question is a hose, and that the answer should be accepted.

The Coach of Team X is incorrect. Certainly, Goethe is a German author, but in this case, this is a stock clue that keeps many, many possible answers open. The question immediately moves to uniquely identify the author after that, and in no way attempted to mislead the player. Not every aggressive attempt to answer constitutes a hose. It is critical that coaches and moderators be familiar with not only when 4-B-8 should be applied, but when it should not be applied.

#### **4-B-8: CASE #4**

The moderator asks a Toss-up in the category of Social Studies-Geography:

"In which country could you visit the cities: Paris, Montpellier, Saint Paul, Marseille, and Tours.

The printed answer is: France

Player 1 from Team X rings in after "Montpellier", and is properly recognized.

Player 1 states: "United States"

The moderator properly states: "Incorrect"

Player 3 from Team Y rings in and is properly recognized.

Player 3 states: "France"

The moderator properly states: "Correct"

The Coach of Team X claims that this question is a hose, and that the answer should be accepted. The Coach of Team X is correct. All of these towns except for Marseille and Tours can also be found in the United States. Either the question writer was unaware of

the deception, or did so intentionally. In either case, the player should be protected. The question should be discarded, and a replacement read to both teams.

NOTE: When the wrong answer is printed on the page, this is not a hose, as players who have given the correct answer should be credited with the points. See Rule 4-I-5 for more information.

#### **4-B-10: CASE #1**

The moderator asks the following question in Social Studies:

Which first lady was famous for offering a televised tour of the recently renovated White House in the early 1960s? The printed answer is (Jacqueline) KENNEDY

Player 1 from Team X rings in, and is properly recognized.

Player 1 states Jacqueline Bouvier

The moderator should respond: Correct.

4-B-10 is an attempt to clear up a gray area by giving general benefit of the doubt to the player. Bouvier is Mrs. Kennedy's well known maiden name, and such, since it uniquely identifies the correct answer, should be accepted. While not all moderators may be aware of this, on a protest filed properly by the team in question, if their assertion can be proven, the moderator has no ground to deny the protest.

Another issue illustrated here is that moderators are not forced to accept the "answer on the paper". Too many moderators have fallen into the fallacy that they must accept what is on the paper, and that the paper cannot be in error. This has never been true. Moderators, as long as they maintain impartiality, should use their heads in evaluating a situation: many times the players and coaches do know more than the question writer.

#### **4-B-10: CASE #2**

The moderator asks the following question in Social Studies:

Founded around 550 BC, what nation was invaded in the fourth century BC by Alexander the Great?

The printed answer is: (The) PERSIAN (Empire)

Player 1 from Team X rings in, and is properly recognized.

Player 1 states Iran

The moderator should respond: Incorrect.

4-B-10 does not permit players to get around the facts. Iran was not used as a name for the current political unit until the twentieth century. This question begins by stating that the nation was founded in 550 BC. The current nation of Iran and the Persian Empire may have shared a great deal of the same territory, but are not considered to be the same entity. Had the question begun with the statement "Give the current name of this nation." Then obviously Iran becomes acceptable. Note the difference with case #1: While Jacqueline Bouvier and Kennedy are undeniably the same person, the Persian Empire and Iran are undeniably different (though related) entities.

#### **4-B-10: CASE #3**

The moderator asks the following question in Social Studies:

Starting in 1949, Chang Kai-shek ruled over what nation, relocated from the mainland after a communist revolution? The printed answer is: REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Player 1 from Team X rings in, and is properly recognized.

Player 1 states TAIWAN

The moderator should respond: Correct.

Taiwan is the commonly associated name of the political entity otherwise known as the Republic of China by some, or as Chinese Taipei to others. Since they are generally interchangeable, they can be accepted for each other. If the question had asked for the name of the island, then Republic of China would have been incorrect. As a side note, note that this is different with United Kingdom/Great Britain issues as those terms in proper usage refer to the same entity at different points in history, and are thus not always interchangeable.

#### **4-C Completeness**

##### **4-C-1a: CASE #1**

The moderator asks the following question in Social Studies/History

"Who was the 35th president of the United States?"

The printed answer is: JOHN KENNEDY (both names needed)

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and is recognized. He answers: "KENNEDY"

The moderator should respond: "correct".

This is a change from a past interpretation. One of the issues confronting us more and more is question writers attempting to override the rules of the game. Question writers may NOT do this. Nowhere in the question is the player informed that there is an exception to the requirement for a first name. Thus, the question becomes a hose since the player is being tricked.

##### **4-C-1b-1: CASE #1**

The moderator reads the following question in Mathematics/General Math:

"A rectangle has sides of 3 and 2. Including proper units, what is the area of the rectangle?"

The printed answer is "6 units squared, or 6 square units"

Player #1 on Team X rings in. The moderator properly recognizes her.

Player #1 answers: "6"

The moderator should respond: "Correct."

Again, this is an attempt by the question writer to circumvent the rules. The proper units in this case are none at all, since the question provided none to work with.

#### **4-C-1b-2: CASE #2**

The moderator reads the following question in Mathematics/General Math:

"A rectangle has sides of 3 and 2. What is the area of the rectangle?"

The printed answer is "6"

Player #1 on Team X rings in. The moderator properly recognizes her.

Player #1 answers: "6 feet squared"

The moderator should respond: "I'm sorry, that is incorrect."

Under no circumstance is a player allowed to invent units. It is the player's responsibility to pay attention to what is being asked for (or in this case, what is not being asked for).

#### **4-C-1b-2: CASE #3**

The moderator reads the following question in Mathematics/General Math:

"A rectangle has sides of 3 and 2. What is the area of the rectangle?"

The printed answer is "6"

Player #1 on Team X rings in. The moderator properly recognizes her.

Player #1 answers: "6 square units"

The moderator should respond: "That is correct."

In the absence of units, players are generally allowed to use "generic units" as filler. No penalty should be given.

#### **4-C-1b-4: CASE #1**

The moderator reads the following question in Mathematics/General Math:

"A rectangle has sides of 3 and 2. Including proper units, what is the area of the rectangle?"

The printed answer is "6 units squared, or 6 square units"

Player #1 on Team X rings in. The moderator properly recognizes her.

Player #1 answers: "6 units"

The moderator should respond: "I'm sorry, that is incorrect."

Though similar to Case #1 for rule 4-C-1b-1, there is an important subtle difference. Though it appears that the moderator might prompt for more information, this should not be done in this case. Because of how close the player came to this answer, prompting for more information would be tantamount to giving the answer away. Moderators should be cautious in this situation to avoid giving away the answer to the other team. Moderators should avoid saying things like: "I'm sorry, I can't accept that answer," as this statement can hint that the answer was close, but not correct. Moderators should also monitor their facial expressions to avoid giving away such hints to the other team.

Simply put, units are either completely correct or not. Incomplete units do not warrant prompting for more information.

#### **4-C-1c: CASE #1**

The moderator reads the following question in Miscellaneous/Sports:

"Which team won the 1997 World Series?"

The printed answer is: "FLORIDA MARLINS"

Player #1 on Team X rings in. The moderator properly recognizes her.

Player #1 answers: "Florida"

The moderator should respond: "Correct."

This is a reinterpretation based on current trends. The belief now is that the proper geographic part of the name, or the team name itself are acceptable, without prompting for the other. This is true, even if the printed answer requires both. It would not be the case if the question began "Give the full name of the team", in which case "Florida" should be prompted.

#### **4-C-1c: CASE #2**

The moderator reads the following question in Miscellaneous/Sports:

"Which team won the 1997 World Series?"

The printed answer is: "MARLINS"

Player #1 on Team X rings in. The moderator properly recognizes her.

Player #1 answers: "Florida"

The moderator should respond: "Correct."

An important point needs to be made here. What if the moderator didn't know that Florida was correct information, when paired with "Marlins"? If a moderator is in doubt, they may always choose to consult with coaches. Ideally, it is best to consult with coaches BEFORE reading the question, however, it may be done also after both teams have answered. Generally, in a case like this, this knowledge is well known, and most people will know its correctness, helping the moderator make a decision. If the moderator

is in doubt, the decision needs to be rendered quickly, and without giving away to the other team through body language that there is uncertainty. In that case, ruling the answer as incorrect is probably the best decision ... the other team can then answer, and the moderator may then consult coaches and players on the first team's answer.

#### **4-C-1d: CASE #1**

The moderator reads the following question in Social Studies/History:

"Which English monarch was famous for having six wives, only one of which outlived him?"

The printed answer is: HENRY VIII

Player #1 on Team X rings in. The moderator properly recognizes him.

Player #1 answers: "King Henry"

The moderator should respond: "I need more information."

As long as the player can come up with some indication of "8" in three seconds, the answer will be considered correct.

#### **4-C-1d: CASE #2**

The moderator reads the following question in Social Studies/History:

""Who was the leader of the Aztec Empire when Cortez reached Mexico?"

The printed answer is: "MONTEZUMA"

Player #1 on Team X rings in. The moderator properly recognizes him.

Player #1 answers: "Montezuma the Second"

The moderator should respond: "Incorrect."

Another tricky point ... what happens if a player gives information that is not so readily identifiable as correct, even if it is actually correct. The moderator has the same options as before. The moderator should rule immediately, allow the other team to answer, and then consult coaches and players as needed. (you may notice that this ruling on Montezuma is in the back of this manual ... this would be the time for a coach to approach the official with the Case Manual, and argue his/her case. Coaches are warned that players should know in such cases to avoid showing off; giving the most common name of something is always the best bet. However, in this particular case, the points should be awarded, as Montezuma II is correct.

#### **4-C-1e: CASE #1**

The moderator asks the following question in Science/Physics:

Which radioactive isotope was used as the fissionable substance in the nuclear weapon dropped on Hiroshima, Japan in 1945?"

The printed answer is: "Uranium-235"

Player #1 on Team X rings in. The moderator properly recognizes him.

Player #1 answers: "uranium"

The moderator should respond: "I need more information".

This is a grey area that requires moderators to know some subtleties. The mass number (the -235) is not optional information and is absolutely needed. Coaches also need to be knowledgeable about this, in the event a moderator were to rule "uranium" a correct answer, and begin a challenge to the ruling.

#### **4-C-2: CASE #1**

The moderator asks a Tossup in the category Literature/Language Arts:

"Governor Bellingham, Roger Chillingworth, and Hester Prynne ... Who was the author who created these characters in the novel The Scarlet Letter?"

The printed answer is: "Nathaniel HAWTHORNE"

Player 1 from Team X rings in after the word "Chillingworth". Player 1 is properly recognized.

Player 1 responds: "The Scarlet Letter, written by Hawthorne"

The moderator should respond: "correct"

Even though the first part of Player #1's answer is not actually the "correct" answer, the answer contains the correct answer, in addition to other correct information that is reflected in the rest of the question. Notice, only two pieces of information were given (book and author). To not allow this is to unduly penalize a player who knows where the answer is going, in favor of a poorly written question.

#### **4-C-2: CASE #2**

The moderator asks a Tossup in the category Literature/Language Arts:

"One word answer needed. What is the name often applied to the document, dated November 2, 1917 and named for a Foreign Secretary, which served as the British government's official support for establishing a Jewish homeland in Palestine." The Printed answer is "Balfour"

Player 1 from Team X rings in after the word 'Secretary'. Player 1 is properly recognized.

Player 1 responds: The Balfour Declaration

The moderator should respond: That is correct.

This is an important case for moderators and coaches to be on the same page with, as few cases cause such problems. Question writers never have the right to override the "additional correct information" rule. The rules of competition are clear that additional correct information is always permissible. Even when the question begins with "one word answer needed", this never means that

any number of words beyond one is automatically incorrect. The “one word answer needed” is there as a piece of advice for players, but does not become a hard and fast “rule”.

#### **4-C-2: CASE #3**

The moderator asks a Tossup in the category Literature/Language Arts:

"Governor Bellingham, Roger Chillingworth, and Hester Prynne ... Who was the author who created these characters in the novel The Scarlet Letter?"

The printed answer is: "Nathaniel HAWTHORNE"

Player 1 from Team X rings in after the word "Chillingworth". Player 1 is properly recognized.

Player 1 responds: The House of the Seven Gables, by Hawthorne"

The moderator should respond: "I'm sorry, that is incorrect."

Even though both pieces of given information are correct, the inclusion of the novel The House of the Seven Gables has no pertinence to this question. It came out of a student guessing, incorrectly, for the name of a book that he thought might have these characters. This is the case, even though the player's response did have the needed correct answer as part of the response.

#### **4-C-2: CASE #4**

The moderator asks a Tossup in the category Literature/Language Arts:

"Governor Bellingham, Roger Chillingworth, and Hester Prynne ... Who was the author who created these characters in the novel The Scarlet Letter?"

The printed answer is: "Nathaniel HAWTHORNE"

Player 1 from Team X rings in after the word "Chillingworth". Player 1 is properly recognized.

Player 1 responds: "The Scarlet Letter, written by Hawthorne, who was from Massachusetts."

The moderator should respond: "I'm sorry, that is incorrect."

Even though all of the information is correct, this player shows no real fine knowledge of what the question is asking. There is a limit of TWO pieces of information in an appropriate answer.

#### **4-C-2: CASE #5**

The moderator reads a toss-up:

"Evaluate the definite integral of the quantity natural log of "x", close quantity, minus one, from one to three."

The printed answer is: The natural log of 3.

After ten seconds, Player #1 on Team X rings in, and is properly recognized. Player #1 responds:

"The natural log of three minus the natural log of 1"

The moderator should respond "That is incorrect."

While the answer IS equivalent to the correct answer, this is an example of when additional correct information cannot defend an incorrect answer. Rule 4-B-9 overrules this, since the answer was not given in the most simplified form.

#### **4-D Toss-Up Questions**

##### **4-D-1c: CASE #1**

The moderator asks a tossup question in Social Studies/Geography:

"What is the largest country, by land area, in the world?"

The printed answer is "Russia".

Player #1 for Team X immediately rings in, and says Russia before the moderator can recognize her.

The moderator replies: That is correct for five points.

Each moderator has his/her own tempo of recognizing. Moderators must strive to maintain consistency. Moderators are reminded that they should establish a method of recognition with both teams before the match starts, and enforce this rigorously throughout the match. Players can help their own cause by displaying name plates in front of them that are legible to the moderator.

##### **4-D-6: CASE #1**

The moderator asks a tossup question in Social Studies/Geography:

"What is the largest country, by land area, in the world?"

The printed answer is "Russia".

AFTER 5 SECONDS ELAPSE, player #1 for Team X rings in, and is properly recognized.

Player #1 waits two seconds, and answers: "Switzerland"

The moderator replies: "That is incorrect".

AT THIS POINT, THERE IS ONE SECOND LEFT ON THE CLOCK.

The moderator should visually count out THREE seconds, during which, the second team may legally ring in to answer. The three seconds is not in addition to the remaining time. Since there was one second remaining on the clock, a count of three seconds will extend for two seconds after the clock runs out.

#### **4-D-6: CASE #2**

The moderator asks a tossup question in Social Studies/Geography:

"What is the largest country, by land area, in the world?"

The printed answer is "Russia".

Player #1 for Team X immediately rings in, and is properly recognized by the moderator. The moderator quietly counts out three seconds. As the time expires, player #1 says "Russia".

The moderator replies: "Incorrect."

Moderators should NOT give any hint whatsoever (including intonation or body language) that the given answer was correct, and would have otherwise been accepted. Team Y now has a chance to answer, with the time remaining or three seconds, WHICHEVER IS GREATER!

The decision as to whether or not the answer started before or after time expired lies with the moderator.

#### **4-D-8: Case #1**

A toss-up in mathematics is asked. Player #1 on Team X rings in, and is properly recognized. Player #1 continues to calculate by writing. After two seconds, Player #1 begins to answer, and continues to write while continuously answering.

The moderator should allow this, as long as the player does not wait, and then stutter through an answer which accounts for over three seconds of delaying.

#### **4-E Bonus Questions**

##### **4-E-2: CASE #1**

While reading a bonus question, the moderator notices that the captains of both Team X and Team Y are looking around at the papers in front of her teammates. As soon as the moderator is done reading the bonus, the captain of Team X (which had control of the bonus) rings in and says "We have no answers."

This is perfectly legal on all parts. When a team is in control of the bonus, that means they not only have the first chance to earn points, but it also means that they may make it more difficult for the other team. In this case, Team Y will have a chance to answer.

This Case also addresses Rule 4-E-3e.

##### **4-E-3d: CASE #1**

Team X is in control of a bonus. After 15 seconds, the captain of Team X calls time. Two seconds later, the moderator sees a piece of paper being passed from the desk of player #2 on Team Y to the captain of Team Y.

This is legal. Teams have up to three seconds to pass papers after time is called or expires.

#### **4-E-3d: CASE #2**

Team X is in control of a bonus. After 15 seconds, the captain of Team X calls time. Two seconds later, the moderator sees player #2 on Team Y point to something on the paper in front of Team Y's captain.

This is illegal. Paper passing is permitted for up to three seconds, however, communication must cease once time is called or expires. In this case, the moderator will penalize Team Y by not permitting them to answer any parts of the bonus that might be rebounded to them. Team Y may attempt to answer the next toss-up.

#### **4-E-4a & 4-E-4b: CASE #1**

Team X is in control of the bonus. After time is expired, the captain for Team X begins reading the answers to the bonus, but was never recognized by the moderator.

While it is better for all involved that the player wait until he is sure that the moderator has stated their readiness to listen, there is no penalty for not being recognized by the moderator in this situation.

#### **4-E-4a & 4-E-4b: CASE #2**

Team X is in control of the bonus. After time is expired, the captain for Team X defers to player #4, who gives the team's answers, even though the moderator never recognized player #4.

As with Case #1, there is no penalty.

#### **4-E-4c: CASE #1**

After time has been called by the captain of Team X, he begins by giving the answers to parts 1 & 2 of a four part bonus. At this time, he defers to Player #4 on Team X to provide the answers to parts 3 & 4.

This is also illegal. So-called "Shotgun Deferring" is not permitted. The moderator should stop the captain, and ask him to provide the answers to parts 3 & 4. If he cannot provide them, parts 3 & 4 rebound to the other team. If player #4 does answer, it is illegal talking, and parts 3 & 4 rebound to the other team. There is no replacement bonus in this case.

In any event, Team X does earn the points for parts 1 & 2 of the bonus, if they were answered correctly.

#### **4-E-5: CASE #1:**

Team X has control of a bonus, and calls time after 15 seconds. Team X gives answers to parts 3 & 4 of a four part bonus. Team Y's captain then gives the answer to part #1. While answering, the moderator sees Team Y's captain appears to be looking over at one of his fellow players at the paper in front of that player.

The moderator needs to make a quick decision. If the moderator believes that the looking over aided the answer, then the moderator should not accept the answer and not award the points (being careful to not indicate why). If the moderator believes that the person answering was not aided, then the answer is accepted, the points awarded, and play continues. It is not an automatic default to penalize a player in this situation, unless the moderator truly believes the player was being aided. Coaches and players need to be warned. While answering, even if looking around is innocent, can be construed as illegal communication, and may be penalized. Players should also be cautioned about making any form of gesture that could be construed as a signal by the moderator.

Rules 4-A-2 and 4-A-3 cover legal communication for players. It is especially crucial for players to know the difference between what is considered illegal and legal communication. Every year in the Regionals, many inexperienced teams and coaches become upset when they are penalized for this because they are not used to playing by the rules.

\*Moderators are cautioned to use good and reasonable judgment in enforcing this rule. Some playing areas do not permit captains unlimited room to put papers passed to them. Generally permit players to look at papers passed to them, even if it is not directly in front of them for the sake of space, as long as it appears that a good faith attempt was made to pass the paper. The same would apply to teams playing at tables; where benefit of the doubt should be given to good faith attempts to pass papers to a player.

#### **4-E-5a: CASE #1**

Team X has control of the bonus in mathematics. After 15 seconds, the captain of Team X calls time. The captain defers to Player #3 on Team X, who begins answering while checking off answers with a pencil. The moderator notices that Player #2 on team X is also checking off answers, as well as Player #2 on Team Y.

There is no penalty here. It is permissible for any players to check off answers. Only writing which appears to be working toward an answer for the player who gives answers should be penalized.

#### **4-G Penalties**

##### **4-G-1: CASE #1**

The moderator has just finished reading a toss-up question when she hears something that appears to be the answer coming from a group of Team X's uniformed players that are not currently playing. She is certain that the current players heard the answer. A few moments later, a player for Team X rings in, is recognized, and gives the correct answer.

This is an uncomfortable situation for moderators to be in. If the moderator suspected that the players heard the answer, stop, and offer a replacement question. In addition, both teams should be warned for illegal talking. The moderator may even insist that non-players move further away from the current players.

##### **4-G-3a: CASE #1**

The moderator has just finished reading a toss-up question, and hears the answer come from a group of Team Y's uniformed players that are not currently playing. Both teams have been warned already about illegal communication.

This is illegal communication, and warrants a penalty. The moderator should inform teams that this is illegal, and that Team Y is out of the tossup. Team X may ring in before time expires.

##### **4-G-4: CASE #1**

An audience member, after having been warned, has twice yelled out answers, or has in general been distracting. The audience member has been previously warned.

At this time, the moderator should eject the person. Do not make a show of this. Do what is needed to avoid confrontation, but do not attempt to continue the match until the person is removed from the room. Even if the audience member is wearing a school shirt, the team should not be penalized. If there is further difficulty, you may ask one of the coaches for assistance. One of the other officials should be sent to get the local manager.

If the person in question is a uniformed player who is not currently playing, the player may be ejected, and the team may be further penalized. This Case also addresses Rule 4-G-5.

#### **4-H Moderator or Timekeeper Errors**

##### **4-H-1a: CASE #1**

The moderator is about to read Toss-up #15, the last question before halftime, but instead reads Toss-up #16.

The moderator should renumber the questions by hand, making Toss-up #16 (and its bonus) the new #15. Toss-up #15 (and its bonus) are now the new #16. Coaches should be informed of the error, so that they may continue to track category usage.

##### **4-H-1b: CASE #1**

The toss-up in the question booklet reads "What does MACH 1 mean?"

The printed answer is: "The speed of sound"

The moderator reads "What does March 1st mean?"

The teams stare blankly at each other.

In this case, the question should be thrown out, and a replacement toss-up in that category should be read.

##### **4-H-1c: Case #1**

The moderator reads a toss-up: "What three letter word can be synonymous with the word 'wildebeest'?" and then promptly adds

"Oh, that's what a gnu is?"

Replace the toss-up with a toss-up from the same category.

##### **4-H-1c: Case #2**

The moderator reads a toss-up: "What three letter word can be synonymous with the word 'wildebeest'?"

After 9 seconds, Player #1 on Team X rings in, and is recognized. Player #1 responds "kangaroo".

The moderator states that this is incorrect and that the correct answer is "gnu". Team Y was not given a chance to respond.

Read a replacement question for Team Y only.

#### **4-H-1d: CASE #1**

The moderator reads a toss-up: What three letter word can be synonymous with the word 'wildebeest'?"

Player #1 on Team X rings in and is recognized. Player #1 responds "yak."

The moderator responds "I'm sorry, the answer is 'gnu'"

Team Y is silent, though the Head Coach of Team Y is trying to get the moderator's attention.

A replacement toss-up should be read for the second team only.

The problem arises if the replacement question is substantially more difficult or substantially easier. Moderators can lose a great deal of respect for making such an error. Simply put: Don't do it!

#### **4-H-1e: CASE #1**

The moderator accidentally turns the page after toss-up #12 is answered correctly, and reads the wrong bonus.

Inform the coaches of the error only if this occurs at the question that is before half time. Bonus #13 is now bonus #12, and bonus #12 becomes bonus #13. However, if this results in a bonus being paired with a toss-up of the same category, the moderator should rearrange some of the bonus questions to assure that this does not happen.

#### **4-H-1f: CASE #1**

This bonus question is written in the question packet:

"Identify, in any order, the four best selling cola drinks in the U.S."

HOWEVER, the moderator actually reads the following:

"Identify, in any order, the four best selling Coca-Cola drinks in the U.S."

The moderator in this case made a mistake in the reading of the initial bonus question. That is, before any "parts" of the bonus were read (not that this bonus had any parts). In this case the moderator has two options:

- a). If the mistake is discovered before the answers are given, the moderator may opt to reread the bonus correctly, and give both teams a second chance to confer.
- b). If the answers are already given when the mistake is discovered, a replacement bonus should be read for both teams.

In this particular case, the bonus question must be thrown out as one of the answers has already been given.

#### **4-H-1f: CASE #2**

The following bonus question is asked:

Identify the following countries:

1. The country you live in now.
2. The biggest country by area in the world.
3. The country that shares a name with a Southern U.S. state.

Answers: 1. USA 2. Russia 3. Georgia

The moderator reads the question, but for some reason says the word "northern" instead of "southern", in part 3. Neither team answers part 3 correct.

This mistake does not apply to the whole bonus, and the entire bonus should not be replaced. The moderator should find a single part to a replacement bonus that is as close to the category as possible (in this case, Social Studies--Geography), and read that part for both teams. Since it is only a single part, give the teams ten seconds (15 seconds if a computation) to confer.

#### **4-H-1g: CASE #1**

The following bonus is read:

Identify in any order the names of Donald Duck's nephews.

The moderator immediately mutters: Louie, that was the third one!

Moderators are advised that this problem can undermine their credibility very quickly. The entire bonus now must be replaced for both teams.

#### **4-H-1h: CASE #1**

The following bonus is read:

Identify in any order the names of Donald Duck's nephews.

The Captain of Team X (in control) calls time, and answers: Huey, Dewey, and Mickey.

The moderator responds that "Huey and Dewey are correct, but that Mickey should have been 'Louie'". The Coach of Team Y is understandably upset.

In this case, a single part of a bonus was mangled by the moderator by revealing the answer before a potential rebound. Give Team X the points they deserve (13 in this case), and find a single part of a replacement bonus, and read this only to Team Y. Try to make the question as close to the category of the original question as possible, and give Team Y ten seconds (15 seconds if a computation) to confer on this single part.

#### **4-H-1i: CASE #1**

A difficult toss-up question has been asked. The timekeeper is not paying attention to the time, and it is clear that too much time has passed. Player #4 on Team X rings in, and after being recognized, gives the correct answer.

Timekeepers need to be aware of the time at each point in the match. Except in rare circumstances, it is not excusable to make this mistake. To help prevent this, moderators should also keep an eye on the time, perhaps by noting a wall clock, or having the timekeeper sit near the moderator. In this case, the answer should not be allowed, and the match should proceed to the next toss-up question.

#### **4-H-1i: CASE #2**

The following question is asked:

How big an area is bounded by a square with each side being 3 feet?

The printed answer is "9 square feet."

Player #1 on Team X rings in, is recognized, and states "9 inches square"

The moderator rules "That is correct." The Coach from Team Y is already walking toward the moderator.

Consider this: If the moderator had said "Incorrect," there is no problem. Instead, the moderator has now made a mistake that has given the other team a strong hint that the incorrect answer is close (hopefully the moderator has changed his/her ruling when asked by the Coach of Team Y!). As a result, read a replacement toss-up in the same category for Team Y only. If Team Y gets the replacement toss-up correct, they control the bonus, and Team X may rebound the bonus.

#### **4-H-1i: CASE #3**

A tossup question is asked with the answer "The Cask of Amontillado":

Player #1 on Team X rings in, is recognized, and answers "The Cask of Amontillados"

As the moderator hears the word "Amontillado", the moderator responds "correct", but upon realizing that an "s" has been added, immediately changes the ruling to "incorrect".

Like with the case above, the moderator has made an error that has all but given away the correct answer. The proper procedure is to replace the tossup, and read it only for the team that has not buzzed in.

#### **4-H-1i: CASE #4**

A tossup question is asked with the answer "The Cask of Amontillado":

Player #1 on Team X rings in, is recognized, and answers, very quietly "A Case of Donaldo"

The moderator asks the player to repeat the answer, which he does, and the moderator rules the player incorrect.

Player #3 on Team Y rings in and after being recognized, answers “The Cask of Amontillado”. After being ruled correct, the coach of Team X protests that this is moderator error, and a replacement tossup should be read for Team Y.

Asking for a player to repeat an answer is not an error, and is not grounds for a replacement to be read. It is wholly contingent on players to speak in a voice that can be heard by moderator, coaches, and players alike. Failure to do so could lead to situations like this, which might give the other team an advantage.

#### **4-I Appeals to the Moderator**

Before examining examples, players and coaches need to remember that the moderator has the right to reject any and all appeals, even before they are made. Moderators can tell coaches to sit down if they suspect an appeal is imminent. Coaches need to be aware that a moderator who does this is within his/her power.

On the other hand, moderators who act in an unreasonable manner in this respect invite scorn from coaches and players, and may find themselves rightfully disinclined from officiating in the future. No one likes a person in a game who acts like they are beyond the ability to make a mistake. Moderators who exercise an iron grip may find that they will have other problems in dealing with players and coaches. In short, moderators are strongly encouraged to listen to legitimate appeals.

#### **4-I-1a: CASE #1**

After a bonus question is completed, and points are awarded, the Head coach of Team X approaches the moderator to ask a question about match procedure. The two continue to talk and the coach is making no progress in pleading his case. The co-coach of Team X now approaches the moderator to add more volume to the argument.

Only one coach is permitted to communicate with the moderator (2-A-2), and only the moderator can request the other coach from that team to approach. The co-coach (or assistant coach) should never become involved in this type of behavior. As the moderator has the responsibility to maintain control of the match, the moderator should tell the second coach to return to his/her seat, quickly render a decision, and continue the match. Having said that, moderators are strongly encouraged to listen to parties, and not exclude them from a conversation.

#### **4-I-2a: CASE #1**

A toss-up question is asked in the area of history:

"Who was the first president of the United States?"

The printed answer is "Abraham Lincoln".

Player #3 on Team X rings in and says "George Washington."

The moderator states "I'm sorry, that is incorrect."

Player #2 on Team Y immediately (though politely) gets the moderator's attention, and informs the moderator that he believes the answer of "Washington" to be correct.

In the past, this act of sportsmanship would have been declared illegal communication. However, there is no reason to not allow an act of sportsmanship. In this case, the moderator will know that the two players are correct, give ten points to Team X, and move on to the bonus question. However, at this point if the moderator were still unsure, the moderator may consult with other officials

in the room, coaches, and if necessary request a brief explanation from the player involved. In any event, Team Y is not to be penalized.

#### **4-I-4a: CASE #1**

A bonus question in pop culture is asked:

"Identify in any order the original members of N'Sync."

After both teams answer (Team Y answers one part correctly), the Coach of Team Y approaches the moderator, and appeals that a replacement question should be asked because this question was "trivial".

It may be trivial, or even in bad taste, but the moderator can't help that! This is not a proper appeal to make. If this is a question of inappropriate material for a question, (especially on the basis of being morally appropriate for high school students), you should raise the issue with the local manager, and perhaps with the question provider.

#### **4-I-5: CASE #1**

The moderator asks the following question in Arts:

"Which famous painter painted the painting better known as "The Mona Lisa"?"

The printed answer is: "Michelangelo".

Player #1 on Team X rings in, and is properly recognized.

Player #1 answers: "DaVinci"

The moderator responds: "That is incorrect".

The coach for Team X politely gets the moderator's attention, and informs the moderator that the answer might be wrong, and that Team X was correct. The coach then shows the moderator a page from the "World Almanac" that shows the painter of the Mona Lisa to be Leonardo DaVinci. The moderator rules that Team X is correct, and proceeds.

This is an example of how a proper appeal should be made. The only problem here is that the Coach of Team X should have waited until the Team Y has answered. In the event the moderator does not change his/her mind, the Coach of Team X has just given Team Y additional time to consider an answer.

#### **4-K-5: CASE #1**

The moderator asks the following question in Social Studies:

Which first lady was famous for offering a televised tour of the recently renovated White House in the early 1960s?

The printed answer is (Jacqueline) KENNEDY

Player 1 from Team X rings in, and is properly recognized.

Player 1 states Jacqueline Bouvier

The moderator is unsure. The moderator should respond: Incorrect.

This is the exact same case as used in 4-B-10, but in this case, the moderator responds incorrect. Why?

The moderator must be EXTREMELY careful to not give a hint to the team that potentially will rebound a toss-up or bonus part by suggesting that an answer is close to being correct. If the moderator hems and haws, or immediately says correct (and turns out to be wrong), this leads to protests, slowed down matches, and the need to replace the question, which can change the outcome of the match. The BEST solution is to default to ruling the answer to be incorrect, and take the time while the other team is pondering the answer to make a decision on the first answer. If you suddenly remember that the first answer is correct, make the change, and move on. If not, the first team will protest, and provide evidence, in which case you correct the decision, and move on. The WORST thing a moderator could do in this situation is consider the answer for a few moments, and then say incorrect while the other team takes extra time to think, now armed with the knowledge that the first answer was close. To do that is to become a sixth player on one of the teams, and must be avoided. MAKE your decision, and correct later if necessary.

## **RULE 5: Local Matches and Tournaments Outside the IHSA State Series**

### **5-D. Permissible Changes**

#### **5-D-1: CASE #1**

At a local tournament, the Coach of Team X informs the moderator that she is going to watch her "B" team, and since there is no other coach, is designating the player-captain of this, her "A" team, to make coaching decisions. After a bonus question, the player captain approaches the moderator to question match play. In the IHSA State Series, this is illegal. However, this may be permitted in some local tournaments where an "A" or "B" team is being used, or where a coach is acting as a moderator. Local Managers need to stress to all coaches if this is going to be permitted, and coaches must stress the necessity for polite and gentle tones of voice from captains. Moderators are well within their authority to reject appeals that are not made politely, and are well within their authority to penalize teams after they have been warned if the requests are not made in a polite manner. Coaches may want to keep this in mind if they need to do this; captains needn't be the best player, but they should definitely be the most capable of having a reasonable conversation with the moderator.

As time has passed, it is clear that Illinois Scholastic Bowl operates more and more under different sets of rules from week to week. Coaches and moderators need to be understanding of this as they switch from tournament to tournament and from regular season to state series.

### **APPENDIX 1: A few notes to local managers on Matching Tops**

Local Managers have the final decision on deciding if tops are appropriate and matching or not. The problem of appropriateness is that it can be somewhat subjective. Below are some illustrative examples of acceptable and unacceptable situations that local managers should use in guiding their judgment. Head Coaches must remember, that if there is even the slightest doubt as to whether a uniform is appropriate, they have the responsibility to contact the local manager in advance to conform with his/her idea of appropriateness/similarity.

The following situations should meet the definitions of appropriate and similar:

1. A team of all boys appears wearing white dress shirts of different styles, different sports coats and ties.

2. A co-ed team: the boys are all wearing white dress shirts of different style and with different ties. The ladies are wearing white blouses.
3. A co-ed team appears. The boys are all wearing blue dress shirts, of different shades. The ladies are wearing blue blouses, also of different shade, and of slightly different style.
4. A coed team appears, and are all wearing tie-dye shirts of identical color scheme, and similar but not matching pattern.
5. A team wears identical t-shirts with their school logo, but wears jackets over the shirt.

The following situations would not meet the definition of similar and/or appropriate, and would lead to a penalty”

1. A co-ed team appears. They all wear identical shirts with logos for the local beer distributorship.
2. A co-ed team appears to play a team named the "Hawks". They all wear identical shirts of a bloodied smashed bird.
3. A player is wearing jeans with holes in them (this player cannot play until they are dressed appropriately).
4. A team wears matching hoodies.

#### **CASE #1**

The Coach of Team X brings to the moderator's attention that a member of Team Y is wearing an undershirt under his otherwise matching top, and asks that a 30 point penalty be assessed against Team Y.

The moderator should inform the coach that underwear is not to be considered when judging a top to be matching. As a matter of fact, this should be considered an attempt to intimidate. This might only be brought up if, during a stoppage of play, a player is attempting to enter the game without a legal, matching top.

#### **CASE #2**

Team X arrives to compete with male team members dressed in blue dress shirts. The girls are wearing white blouses. The coach of Team Y asks immediately that a 30-point penalty be assessed against Team X.

The moderator should contact the local manager. The local manager should declare that these tops are NOT matching. If five players with matching tops cannot begin the match, the players with non-matching tops may play, but the opposing team will receive 30 points.

#### **CASE #3**

The coach of Team X calls a legal time out. The coach sends in a player who is wearing a top that appears not to match the tops of the other players.

Ideally, the moderator would have noted this before the match began, and contacted the local manager. If this was not done, the moderator must stop, and contact the local manager for a ruling. If the local manager rules the top to not be matching, then the

coach of Team X must send in a player who is wearing a matching top. If this cannot be done, then the substitution will not be allowed.

#### **CASE #4**

Team X arrives to compete wearing prison uniforms. The uniforms are neat, and are indeed matching.

The moderator should immediately contact the tournament director. In this case, the tournament director should declare that these uniforms are not in good taste, and should immediately inform the coach to have the players change into appropriate clothing. If the students change into appropriate clothing that does not include matching tops, a 30-point penalty should be assessed at the beginning of the match. If more appropriate clothing is not available by the time the match is scheduled to begin, the local manager should declare a forfeit.

It is the RESPONSIBILITY of the head coach to know what is appropriate, and what is not appropriate (see the IHSA Terms and Conditions). Having fun is important, and being able to have a team design a creative, catchy uniform is important to some programs.

However, it is never an excuse to sacrifice taste for expression. Head coaches are warned that if they are in doubt, they should contact the local manager, and get clearance before arriving.