

SCHOLASTIC BOWL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

May 5, 2010

The IHSA Scholastic Bowl Advisory Committee met at the IHSA Office, Bloomington, Illinois on Monday, May 5, 2010, beginning at 10:00 a.m. Committee Members present were: Ken Dentino, Coach at Maple Park (Kaneland); Cynthia Wierzba, Coach at Farmington/Tournament Manager; Brendan Ayd, Coach at Toledo (Cumberland); Matthew Bardoe, Coach at The Latin School; Libby Letterly, Coach at Williamsville; Joe Iorio, Athletic Director at Columbia; Others in attendance, Ron McGraw, IHSA Asst. Executive Director; Rob Grierson, Coordinator of Officials, Winnetka (New Trier); David Reinstein, Coach at Winnetka (New Trier) & representative of the Coaches Association.

Ron McGraw led a discussion concerning the procedures related to developing the pairings and brackets for the Regional and Sectional Tournaments. It was decided to continue to use the same procedures for pairing, seeding and bracketing. While the sectional seed meetings will continue to identify the top 8 teams, coaches must understand that only the top 4 will be guaranteed to be placed in different regionals. The 5 – 8 seeds will be separated in the traditional format when the geography of the sectional permits. In other words, the number 1 seed may not see the number 8 seed, etc. If a traditional bracket match up (1-8, 2-7, 3-6, 4-5) resulting in extensive travel, the geography will take precedence and determine the regional placement.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Clarify VIII-P Questions Breakdown

Recommendation: Add the following sentence to the opening paragraph:

Questions should be prefaced by a mention of the major category only, with no specification of their sub-category.

Rationale: The current system has three pitfalls. First, it places too many restrictions on the editor's freedom to rearrange questions when assembling question sets. Second, it makes it difficult or impossible to replace a question before or during a match without disrupting the suggested sub-category distribution. Third, when players know the sub-category before the question is read, it allows them to restrict their consideration of the body of knowledge covered and easily guess answers.

Motion-Matthew Bardoe Second-Brendan Ayd Passed 6-0

Approved

2. Eliminate VIII-O Eliminate Driver's Education as a sub-category of Miscellaneous

Recommendation: Eliminate Driver's Education as a sub-category of Miscellaneous

Rationale:

1. Unlike every other category, "Illinois Rules of the Road" is the only source for these questions.
2. It is long established that it cannot be argued that Drivers Ed should be included because it is "taught in Illinois schools", since we do not have foreign language questions.
3. Given that Drivers Ed is pretty much exclusively not taught to freshmen, it puts class "A" teams forced to move up younger players when varsity players are scarce at a disadvantage.
4. As a question writer, it is extraordinarily difficult to write good questions in this topic. The result is, more often than not, questions which students cannot answer, or are simply not fun for players to answer.

No Action Taken

3. **Modify Item VIII-P-8** Modify the number of computational questions allowed in any match

Recommendation: There will be no less than four (4) and no more than five (5) computational math toss-ups per round. There will be no more than one (1) computational science toss-up per round. All computational toss-up questions will be from either the math or science categories, and need not be multi-clue.

Rationale: The first change was the original intent; the second change is to acknowledge that computational questions are not required to be pyramidal.

Approved

4. **Modify Item VIII-O** Modify the sub-categories and distribution of questions within sub-categories as follows:

Recommendation: Modify the current question distribution list

SCIENCE 6/6**A. 5/5 Drawn from a mix of:**

Biology, Chemistry and Physics

B. 1/1 Drawn from other sciences such as but not limited to:

Astronomy, Earth Science, Health Science, Environmental Science, Archaeology/Paleontology

And not requiring all subcategories to be represented equally.

MATH 6/6**A. 4/4 Drawn from a mix of:**

Algebra, Geometry, Pre-Calculus, Trigonometry, Analytic Geometry

B. 1/1 Calculus**C. 1/1 Drawn from other mathematics such as but not limited to**

Number Theory, Probability, Statistics, Combinatorics, Topology, Set Theory

And not requiring all subcategories to be represented equally.

SOCIAL STUDIES 6/6**A. 3/3 History, drawn from a mix of:**

US History, European History, World History from a variety of cultures, Ancient History

B. 2/2 drawn from a mix of:

Geography, Current Events – within the past year, US Government, Comparative Government

C. 1/1 drawn from other social sciences such as but not limited to:

Psychology, Sociology, Religion, Economics, Philosophy, Political Science

And not requiring all subcategories to be represented equally.

LITERATURE & LANGUAGE ARTS 6/6**A. 5/5 Literature, drawn from a mix of:**

US Literature, British Literature, World Literature from a variety of cultures, Mythology

B. 1/1 Language Arts, drawn from a mix of

Grammar/Usage, Spelling, Speech, Vocabulary

FINE ARTS 4/4

A. 2/2 Visual Arts, composed of

- a. At least 1/1 History of Art**
- b. No more than 1/1 Theory and Technique**

B. 2/2 Music, composed of

- a. At least 1/1 Classical Music and Opera**
- b. No more than 1/1 drawn from other Music including but not limited to:**

Jazz, Musical Theatre, Music Theory, Composers of the Modern Era, Performers in the Rock & Roll Hall of Fame **And not requiring all subcategories to be represented equally.**

MISCELLANEOUS 2/2, drawn from four different categories below:

Interdisciplinary, Journalism, Sports, Technology, Agriculture, Family Consumer Science, Driver's Education, Industrial Arts, Pop Culture, Consumer Education

Note: There was a great deal of discussion that took place in order to arrive at the distribution list presented here. All of the categories were reviewed independently by the committee to determine if they should continue to remain as categories.

Rationale: While the very specific requirements for the number of questions in each sub-category were intended to provide consistency from set to set, there were unintended results. First, the Editor had little or no freedom to replace poorly written questions in one sub-category with better questions from another sub-category. In addition, coaches began counting every sub-category, relying on those counts to make coaching decisions, and feeling slighted if the counts came up wrong. The following proposals remove the specific restrictions while maintaining the spirit of the distribution and adding variety.

Motion – Cynthia Wierzba Second – Ken Dentino Passed 6-0

Approved

5. Add Item VIII-V - Technology Rule and Item VIII-H - Coaches seating

Recommendation: Technology use during competition in the IHSA State Series

Coaches, officials, and spectators should have cell phones, smart phones, and pagers turned off or silenced during matches. Players, in particular, must have any and all communication devices turned off and stored in inaccessible places (pockets, purses, held by non-players or coaches, etc.) while playing. Any use of technology that appears to be allowing illegal communication to the current players is prohibited. This does not include the use of technology, internet-capable or otherwise, for doing research during an appeal.

Modify Item VIII-H - Coaches seating

Recommendation: V-III-H reads in part; Coaches and reserve players should be separated from the competitors and may be behind or in front of the teams depending on the room constraints. ADD: Only coaches, school officials, and substitute players may sit at the coaches table.

Rationale: The proliferation of electronic gadgets that facilitate communication, including but not limited to texting, has increased the potential not only for distraction but also for illegal communication. Furthermore, while coaches are in fact teachers of a variety of disciplines and may therefore have specific knowledge in their own area of expertise, teams have an unfair advantage if coaches are allowed to invite outside experts to join them at the coaching table – experts who are able to consider questions and answers real-time, confer with coaches and substitute players, and provide support for appeals.

Motion – Cindy Wierzba Second – Libby Letterly Passed 5-0 (1 Abstention)

Approved

6. Item II-B 2011 Adopt Tournament Dates

Recommendation: The 2011 Regional Tournaments will be conducted on Monday, March 7, 2011. The 2011 Sectional date will be Saturday, March 12, 2011. Seeding meetings will be conducted on Wednesday, February 9, 2011.

Rationale: The tournaments have been conducted on Tuesday in recent years to avoid Casimir Pulaski Day (a conflict with some member schools). Competing on Tuesdays has created conflicts with some schools that have a basketball team still competing at the Super Sectional level of the IHSA Boys Basketball Tournament. While both situations can create potential conflicts for some, it was determined that the Pulaski conflict was easier to resolve.

Motion – Cindy Wierzba Second – Brendan Aydt Passed 6-0

Approved

7. Modify V-B-8 The current voting system at Seeding Meetings favors teams that are not present and therefore not allowed to vote, since all teams receiving votes get points and teams in attendance are not allowed to vote for themselves.

Recommendation: This can be remedied by totaling the total points received by each team (the number 1 seed receives 8 points, 2nd 7, etc.), and then **calculating their average points** by dividing the teams total points by the number of teams **eligible** to vote for them. The highest **average score** would become the number 1 seed in the group.

For example: If there were 32 teams in the sectional cluster and 10 teams were present at the seeding meeting then a team that was present would divide their total by 9 and a team not present would have its total divided by 10.

Rationale: Teams that are present and not allowed to vote for themselves and so they are at a disadvantage when compared to teams not present at the seeding meeting.

Motion – Ken Dentino Second - Matthew Bardoe Passed 6-0

Approved at August 9, 2010 meeting

ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Rule 4-E-4** explains the process for submitting answers to bonus questions as follows:
“4-E-4a. The moderator will immediately recognize the captain of the team (by name or by team name) that was awarded the bonus.

4-E-4b. The captain will begin answering, or prior to giving any answers, may designate another player on her/his team to answer; in this situation, the moderator will then recognize the designee by name, who will begin answering.

4-E-4c. A designee, once designated, may not designate anyone else.”

Recommendation The following should be added:

4-E-4d. There is no penalty for blurting a bonus answer when given by the captain or a player previously designated by the captain. If a player who is not the captain and has not been previously designated by the captain blurts a bonus answer this should be treated as illegal communication.

Rationale: Clarifies common practice. There is no need for players to be recognized when giving bonus answers since individual statistics for bonus answers are not kept. The only reason for recognition is to maintain the flow of the match.

Motion – Matthew Bardoe

Second – Ken Dentino

Passed 6-0

2. **Rule 4-B-6** reads in part: “A moderator may offer a player only one chance to give ‘additional’ necessary information to a toss-up or bonus part.”

Recommendation: This should be changed to: A moderator may offer a player extra chances to give ‘additional’ necessary information to a toss-up or bonus part as long as the information provided is correct and relevant, but not complete.

Rationale: This is a change in long-time practice. Players should not be expected to ‘read the moderator’s mind’ and somehow know what additional information is required. “Jones” could be prompted and elicit “William Jones” which could then be prompted and elicit “William Jones the Elder” which would finally match what is printed on the page

Motion – Brendan Aydt

Second – Matthew Bardoe

Passed 5-0 (1abstention)

3. **Add rule 4-C-2b:**

Recommendation: The allowance for additional correct information cannot be overridden by stipulations in the question (such as 'Give a two word answer').

Rationale: Question writers are more and more trying to override the long standing rule explicitly giving players the right to give additional correct information by including these stipulations. However, the question writers are really not trying to make life easier for players ... they are just trying to help guide them to a particular answer. However, in the absence of a rule, moderators and coaches are under the belief that these stipulations are there to punish or restrict players. This rule reaffirms long standing precedent that players may still give additional correct information.

Motion – Matthew Bardoe

Second-Ken Dentino

Passed 6-0

4. **Rule 4-I-1a** currently reads:

Only the head coach or an adult worker may appeal to the moderator. A player may signal her/his coach if s/he believes there is a reason why an appeal should be initiated, but moderators will ignore this signal.

Recommendation: to read:

A Player or the head coach, or an adult worker may initiate an appeal to the moderator.

Rationale: In the regular season, especially in cases where tournaments allow "B" teams, teams often don't have a coach, and even when they do, it has become standard practice to allow players to initiate protests. Even in the IHSA state series, it has become standard practice for players to signal their coaches, the coach stops the moderator, and then asks the player to handle the protest from there. The current rule is often ignored, and slows the match. The rules allowing moderators to ignore frivolous protests still stands. With this, Rule 4-I-2 would be thrown out ("Players may never initiate an appeal. ").

5. Throw out rule 4-I-1e, which currently reads: **NO MOTION WAS MADE**

"No more than three (3) minutes shall be allowed for any appeal from start to decision."

and replace it with:

If a coach/player initiates a protest, the moderator will publicly note the protest, and move on with the match. The resolution of the protest can be handled at half time (if in the first half) or at the end of the game (if in the second half, and only if the protest would affect the outcome of the game or potential tournament finish).

Rationale: The current system slows matches down, especially given that only a small number of protests actually affect the outcome of a match/tournament placement. It is further slowed by the need to look up information. If the match simply continued, coaches could look up information while the match proceeded, leading to quicker decisions later on, if they are needed. Based on my experience as a moderator, this will not only improve the accuracy of the "right thing" being done, but will speed up matches.

6. Change Rule 3-E-2, which currently reads: **NO MOTION WAS MADE**

Only the head coach may call a time-out. A player may signal his/her coach (Rule 4-A-3g) if s/he believes there is a reason why a time-out should be called, but moderators will ignore this signal.

and change it to:

The team captain or head coach may call a time out. Individual coaches may choose to retain this right for themselves, if they choose.

Rationale: In most situations, especially at tournaments with "B" teams, it is already common practice to allow players to call time outs. The rule as it reads just slows things down as players signal and the coach calls the time out. It will speed things up by allowing players to call these timeouts themselves, if the coach allows them to.

ITEMS OF GENERAL DISCUSSION

*Regional and sectional grouping and seeding.

*Online seeding

*Dropping "Driver's Ed." as a sub category (agreed to maintain)

*Format