

# Scholars Bowl Manual – Revisions for 2023-24

## Rule 1 Team Composition, Bullet Point 5 (page 9)

### CURRENT FORM

Hats may NOT be worn during competition.

### SUGGESTED REVISION

Delete this bullet point and the text shown above.

### RATIONALE

Hats do not hurt fair play, are not potential hazards that could cause injury, and simply don't impact scholars' bowl matches.

## Rule 2 Electronic Communication Devices (page 9)

### CURRENT FORM

...A disruption caused by a team member or a coach due to any sounds from communication devices will result in disqualification of a team for said round. The disqualified team will receive zero points for the round and [the] remaining team will finish the round vs. empty chairs.

### SUGGESTED REVISION

...A five point penalty will be immediately assessed against any team who has an electronic device (other than a medical device) that disrupts a round. (This point-penalty applies only to players seated at the competition table.) In case of a disruption by a coach, an alternate, or an audience member, the room judge will ask the offender to leave the room for the remainder of the round.

### RATIONALE

The current penalty is excessively punitive. Making this adjustment will cause less disruption in tournaments and will be more commensurate to the infraction.

## Rule 4 Scoring (page 9) & Moderator Guidelines (page 13)

### CURRENT FORM

4. Scoring: ...If the moderator is interrupted by a team buzzing in before the question is read completely, and the player who is recognized gives an incorrect or unacceptable answer, the team will lose five (5) points.

### SUGGESTED REVISION

4. Scoring: ...If the moderator is interrupted by a team buzzing in before the question is read completely, **the moderator shall immediately stop reading and shall immediately announce “Interruption.”** If the player who is recognized gives an incorrect or unacceptable answer, the team will lose five (5) points.

### RATIONALE

-When the moderator does not announce interruptions, it creates confusion for the scoreboard worker and for the competitors.

-Currently, the handbook does not offer guidance on this issue; adding this language will result in fewer challenges and in rounds that run more smoothly.

## Rule 9, Acceptability of Answers (page 10)

### CURRENT FORM

Acceptability of answers: The first answer given by a team member will be the one taken as the answer, whether correct or incorrect. All answers must be given in the English language. Last names are acceptable unless otherwise specified by the moderator. If a player states the correct answer, but mispronounces it, the response will be accepted if, in the opinion of the judge, the player's attempted pronunciation represents a reasonable phonetic possibility based on the way the word is written. This provision must not be used to create an argument for acceptance of a mispronunciation that demonstrates lack of knowledge of the correct answer.

### SUGGESTED REVISION

Acceptability of answers: The first answer given by a team member will be the one taken as the answer, whether correct or incorrect **with no additional prompting**. All answers must be given in the English language. Last names are acceptable unless otherwise specified by the moderator. If a player states the correct answer, but mispronounces it, the response will be accepted if, in the opinion of the judge, the player's attempted pronunciation represents a reasonable phonetic possibility based on the way the word is written. This provision must not be used to create an argument for acceptance of a mispronunciation that demonstrates lack of knowledge of the correct answer.

### RATIONALE

There is currently some discrepancy about whether it is appropriate to prompt a respondent by saying, "Can you be more specific?" or "I need more information." Adding such prompts makes it clear to the opposing team that the response is close to the correct answer and allows the team who responded first to essentially have another attempt at the question. This practice leads to unnecessary challenges that cannot be resolved using the current rules.

## Breaking Ties in a Round of Competition (page 11)

### CURRENT FORM

In the event of a tie at the end of the round, tiebreaker questions will be given until one team answers correctly or a team interrupting the moderator answers incorrectly. Tiebreaker questions may come from any of the seven categories and are selected by a random draw by the moderator from the seven subject areas listed on page 29 and will be replaced after each draw. Points earned in a tiebreaker will be included in determining final standings.

### SUGGESTED REVISION

In the event of a tie at the end of the round, tiebreaker questions will be given until one team answers correctly or a team interrupting the moderator answers incorrectly. Tiebreaker questions may come from any of the seven categories and are selected by a random draw by the moderator from the seven subject areas listed on page 29, **without being replaced after each draw**. Points earned in a tiebreaker will be included in determining final standings.

### RATIONALE

Tiles should not be replaced because doing so could potentially result in a situation where there is not a question available from the assigned replacement round. (For example: WL is drawn and no one gets it. If the tile is replaced and is drawn again, the WL question assigned for replacement has already been used. Such a situation would cause needless delay.)

## **Rules for Question Submission (page 15)**

### CURRENT FORM

As a prerequisite for a regional assignment, each school must submit a total of 35 questions in the following seven categories (5 questions per category):

### SUGGESTED REVISION

As a prerequisite for regional assignment, each school must submit **at least** a total of 35 questions. Schools are encouraged to submit at least five questions in each of the following seven categories **if at all possible**.

### RATIONALE

We need more quality questions. If we encourage people who are capable question writers to write more, it might help. If we let people submit any questions, they are able to write well, that is better than having 5 or 10 they can write well and 20 we are going to toss.

## **[Non-Rule Amendment] Scholars Bowl Checklist (page 2)**

### CURRENT FORM

There is no language of notification regarding coaching clinics.

### SUGGESTED REVISION

Add the following line:

September 2 - 30: Attend Optional KASBC Coaches Clinic. Regional Dates Vary - see [kasbc.weebly.com](http://kasbc.weebly.com) for dates near you.

### RATIONALE

These clinics and KASBC need more promotion. Adding this to the manual will increase the likelihood of awareness and, hopefully, increase attendance.