

Speech/Debate Protest for 2018-2019

At a November tournament, a protest was filed against a student in an LD round. The protest claimed they violated the rule on page SPE 21, Rule XI, Section J, rule d-e (*Use of Computer*). The complaint claimed the student used the internet to access Google during their speech, and right after the competitor's speech. The judge actually saw the student's computer screen. The tournament manager investigated and found there was a violation of the rule, and the students were disqualified from the tournament.

At a January tournament, a protest was filed against 2 students from 2 different schools claiming they both used the exact same introduction and both presentations were similar in OO. The complaint claimed it violated rule XI.1. The tournament manager investigated and found there was a no evidence of a violation of the rule, and the students were allowed to continue in the tournament.

At a tournament in January, a protest was filed claiming Monologue rule XI, Section 8, rule 8 was violated. It claimed the student was doing a monologue from a skit originally performed on Saturday Night Live in 2013. The complaint said that the material was not published or available in print to the public. The tournament manager investigated and found there was a violation of the rule (no script available), and the student was disqualified from the tournament.

At another tournament in January, a HD in the final round was protested claiming rule XI, section H, rule 3 was violated. They believed that the material was not from an approved source available to the public. The tournament manager investigated, and the protest was declined, and the students allowed to proceed. Note: Each decision on published material will be handled on a case-by-case basis, and material that one tournament decides is "legal" may in fact be found "illegal" at another tournament based on the decision of the committee that is gathered at each site.

At a tournament in February, a protest was filed by a judge, claiming a students HI performance violated the improper performance standard on page 17 rule 17, H-9. It claimed the performance included profane language, vulgar gestures and obscene scenes concerning pedophilia. The tournament manager investigated and found there was a violation of the rules, and the student was disqualified from the tournament.

At a tournament in February, a protest was filed by a coach against a HD for profanity claiming the students broke rule XI-H:9; on page SPE17. The tournament manager investigated and found there was a violation of the rules, and the students were disqualified from the tournament.

At a February tournament a protest was filed claiming the rule on page SPE22, rule XI-K:G that states "*By choosing to use laptop computers in the round, debaters are consenting to give tournament officials the right to search their files.*" The protest claimed the students did not want tournament officials to view the laptop. The protest also indicated that the PF team violated the Improper performance rule concerning profanity. The tournament manager investigated and found there was a violation of the rules, and the students were disqualified from the tournament.