Ben and I negate, Resolved: In United States Public K-12 Schools, the probable cause standard ought to apply to Searches of Students

**Contention 1: General Security**

Probable cause in schools would increase the use of general security for a few reasons

**First, the evidence necessity.** When probable cause is instituted in the affirmative world, general security measures will increase in order to achieve the standard set by legislators. *Tonja Jacobi from Notre Dame* finds that generalized security measures, such as metal detectors and dog searches, can themselves provide probable cause.

**Second, fear, which occurs because of media hype.** *Jessie Pollack of George Washington University* finds that the media disproportionately reports on youth stories despite the fact that they are less likely to commit crimes. Moreover, *Nancy Heitzeg of St. Catherine University* furthers that the media already forsakes the reality of dropping crime rates in favor of sensationalized accounts of youthful offenders. In the affirmative world, media hype increases for one reason. This is problematic because The National School Safety Center reports that [the probable cause standard] would seriously impair the ability to maintain discipline and a safe school environment. This is important, as *Donna Killingbeck of Michigan University* concludes that strict security measures continue to increase due to the response and concerns of over-sensationalized media.

**The impact is damaging trust.**

*Jason Nance* *of Southern Florida University* reports that strict security measures in schools create mistrust among students. Moreover, *Martin Gardener* writes that every student becomes a suspect under general security, marginalizing the whole student population into feeling alienated.

This is problematic as *Katie James of the University of Georgia* empirically concludes a one-unit decrease in the perceived teacher fairness scale is associated with a forty seven percent increase a student’s odds of fighting at school.

**Contention 2: Revitalizing Zero Tolerance Policies**

Adopting probable cause reintroduces zero tolerance policies to schools for two reasons.

**First: *School Overreaction*.** Hugo Mialon finds that probable cause expands the exclusionary rule which in turn creates the perception that students will not get punished for carrying contraband to school. Which is why he concludes probable cause increases crime. The National School Safety Center furthers this by explaining that probable cause decreases perception of safety in schools. Schools over react to this decrease in safety and increase security measures. Jack Cutrone theorizes that due to a lack of resources in schools to promote safety, school administrators often rely on low cost quick fixes and Nancy Heitzeg Confirms with past precedent that schools have implemented zero tolerance policies with no concern about their effectiveness. The Center for Youth Justice finds that zero tolerance policy implementation is fueled by youth crime. Thus when crime increases, schools are going to pressure themselves into expanding zero tolerance policies. Lowenstein concludes that concerns about school safety spur widespread adoption of zero tolerance policies.

**Second: *Media Madness.*** In the status quo, media discourse on youth crime is relatively subtle. Perry Moriearty of the University of Minnesota finds that discourse in the media treating students as criminals has reduced on the whole.

Adopting probable cause would provide the media with the perfect opportunity to reverse this trend and sensationalize the issue, by spinning the new standard as dangerous to the school environment, labeling schools as unable to handle youth crime, and blaming future instances of violence on the inability of schools to readily search students.

Empirically, Nancy Heitzeg of the St Catherine University finds that while the media coverage of the school shootings created the perception that school violence was high, there was actually a significant decrease in violent activity at the time. This is because, as John Horner of the University of Missouri explains, media sensationalism fosters a narrative of fear, creating a call to protect children and to increase security measures. But worse media sensationalism decreases public awareness of criminalization, as Catherine Happerof the University of Glasgow explains, the media severely limits and distorts information, leading to public to disengagement. Thus destroying calls for reform and reverting the system back to its broken state. Which is why Nancy Heitzeg explains that national media coverage spurs adoption of zero tolerance policies.

**The Impact is *Incarceration of Children***

By reversing the trend and stopping the school to prison pipeline we solve for this childhood incarceration

Lowenstein explains that zero tolerance policies lead to students being suspended for minor infractions because the policies don’t distinguish between serious and non-serious offenses. These zero tolerance policies, Heitzeg asserts, directly lead to 3.3 million suspensions and 100,000 expulsions per year. Of which she finds African Americans are 10x more likely to be expelled. The Center for Youth Justice empirically confirms that being suspended increases a student’s chance of dropping out by 68%. This is bad, as Dillion explains 10% of white dropouts and 25% of African American dropouts are incarcerated.

Because Probable Cause is probably a bad idea, We Negate