



NCAA Ice Hockey Rules Committee

2012 ANNUAL MEETING REPORT

This report was developed during the committee's June 2012 by the Ice Hockey Rules Committee in Indianapolis. All proposals must be approved by the Playing Rules Oversight Panel before final implementation.

1. Rules Changes. The committee proposed the following changes, effective with the 2012-13 season unless otherwise noted:

- **Net Dislodgement.** In the event that the goal post is displaced, either deliberately or accidentally, by a defending player, prior to the puck crossing the goal line between the normal position of the goalposts, the Referee may award a goal.

In order to award a goal in this situation, the goal post must have been displaced by the actions of a defending player, the puck must have been shot (or the player must be in position to shoot) at the goal prior to the goal post being displaced, and it must be determined that the puck would have entered the net between the normal position of the goal posts.

When the goal post has been displaced deliberately by the defending team when their goalkeeper has been removed for an extra attacker thereby preventing an impending goal by the attacking team, the Referee shall award a goal to the attacking team.

The goal frame is considered to be displaced if either or both goal pegs are no longer in their respective holes in the ice, or the net has come completely off one or both pegs, prior to or as the puck enters the goal.

The goal frame shall be considered in its proper position when at least a portion of the flexible peg(s) are still inside both the goal post and the hole in the ice. The flexible pegs could be bent, but as long as at least a portion of the flexible peg(s) are still in the hole in the ice and the goal post, the goal frame shall be deemed to be in its proper position. The goal frame could be raised somewhat on one post (or both), but as long as the flexible pegs are still in contact with the holes in the ice and the goal posts, the goal frame shall not be deemed to be displaced.

Rationale: *The committee believes the current rule is too stringent in this area and that there are numerous examples where goals are disallowed by rule that the committee believes should count. This will eliminate a significant advantage being gained by the defensive team.*

- **Overtime Period.** The committee approved four-on-four play as a legal method to play the five-minute overtime period. Additionally, a shootout remains in the rules book to be used by conference rule or mutual consent of the competing institutions. The default position is five-on-five play if the teams are unable to agree.

***Rationale:** Consensus was not reached with regard to mandating 4-on-4 play during the overtime period, but there was support for making this style of play, which is currently used in the National Hockey League, as a legal option.*

- **Hand Pass in Defensive Zone.** It is not legal to hand pass the puck in any zone. If the hand pass is initiated in the defensive zone, a change of players shall not be permitted by the offending team. A team will be permitted to use its timeout for rules that do not allow a substitution of players. The team that is prevented by rule from substituting its players must call the timeout to be allowed to change.

***Rationale:** Similar to other rules that provide the defense with a potential advantage, the committee believes curbing such action by not allowing a change of players will have a positive impact.*

- **Goals Scored Off Of Skate.** A puck that is directed into the net by an attacking player's skate shall be a legitimate goal as long as no distinct kicking motion is evident. A goal cannot be scored by an attacking player who kicks a puck that deflects into the net off any player, goalkeeper or official. A puck that deflects into the net off an attacking player's skate who does not use a distinct kicking motion is a legitimate goal.

The following should clarify deflections following a kicked puck that enters the goal:

- (i) A kicked puck that deflects off the body of any player of either team (including the goalkeeper) shall be ruled no goal.
- (ii) A kicked puck that deflects off the stick of any player (excluding the goalkeeper's stick) shall be ruled a good goal.
- (iii) A goal will be allowed when an attacking player kicks the puck and the puck deflects off his own stick and then into the net.

A goal cannot be scored by an attacking player who kicks any equipment (stick, glove, helmet, etc.) at the puck, including kicking the blade of his own stick, causing the puck to cross the goal line. A puck that is batted into the net by a hand or foot or deliberately batted with any part of the attacking player's body is not a legal goal.

Philosophy Statement: With the use of a foot/skate, was a distinct kicking motion evident? If so, the apparent goal must be disallowed. A **distinct kicking motion** is one which, with a pendulum motion, the player propels the puck with his skate into the net. If the on-ice officials determine that it was put into the net by an attacking player using a distinct kicking motion, it must be ruled no goal. This would also be true even if the puck, after being kicked, deflects off any other player of either team and then into the net. This is still no goal.

Officials must use a philosophy of “when in doubt, it is a goal.” Unless the official is certain that a goal was scored through an illegal action (e.g., hand pass or kick), the goal must count. Games that have replay available are able to correct any egregious errors, but in those situations, if there is any doubt, goals must be allowed to stand.

Rationale: *This rules change brings the college game in line with the NHL rules in this area and makes this rule much easier for players, coaches and officials to understand and administer.*

- **Goal Scored During Delayed Offside.** If a puck is shot on goal during a delayed offside, the play shall be allowed to continue under the normal clearing the zone rules. Should the puck enter the defending team’s goal, during a delayed offside either directly or off the goalkeeper, a player or an on-ice official, the goal shall be disallowed. The fact that the attacking team may have cleared the zone prior to the puck entering the goal has no bearing on this ruling.

The only way an attacking team can score a goal on a delayed offside situation is if the defending team shoots or puts the puck into their own net without action or contact by the offending team.

Rationale: *While not a significant issue in the game, this rule change clarifies and eliminates potential goals being scored during a time when the offensive team had violated the rules.*

- **NCAA Championship Video Replay.** Penalties may not be assessed through the use of video review. However, the officials may correct an error on calling an offside or too many players on the ice that directly leads to a goal. **Philosophy statement:** This rule is not intended to review close line plays where the officials have made a definitive call.

Rationale: *This rule change is intended to allow egregious offsides or too many men on the ice errors to be corrected when it is clear the on-ice officials have missed an infraction. As the philosophy statement notes, it is not intended to allow routine reviews of other points in the game.*

- **Team Timeout to Request Video Review.** A team may now use its timeout to request a video review, provided the play is reviewable and the team has its timeout. If the result of the review is a reversal of the on-ice call, the team will retain its timeout. There is no limit to the number of reviews a team may request.

Rationale: *While rare, this will provide the team an additional recourse to have a play reviewed when needed. The committee believes strongly that the overall goal is to use replay to enhance the game and this meets that goal.*

- **Encroachment Exception on Faceoffs.** When the defending team is penalized and the attacking players enter the attacking zone beyond the outer edge of the end zone face-off circle - face-off in the neutral zone.

Rationale: *Altercations often ensue as a direct result of attacking players moving into the attacking zone beyond the outer edge of the end zone face-off circle following a whistle. The committee believes this rule will help prevent these types of situations from occurring.*

- **Video on the Bench.** The use of video in the player's bench area is prohibited.
PENALTY – For a violation, after a warning by the referee, a bench minor penalty shall be assessed.

***Rationale:** While not a major issue in the game today, the committee believes in-game use of video should be eliminated, similar to the rules in NCAA football and men's basketball. Using video between periods, etc. is not under the rules committee's purview, but video devices will no longer be allowed in the player's bench area.*

- **Officiating Systems.** The committee voted to remove the two-referee, one-linesman system from the men's ice hockey rules, effective with the 2013-14 season. The two-referee, one-lineman system will remain available for women's ice hockey competition.

***Rationale:** After using the two-referee, two-linesman system in the NCAA Division III Championships, the committee believes this system is required to properly enforce the rules in the men's game, where checking and contact fouls are difficult to judge. The 2-2 system has been successfully used in Division I competition and feedback has indicated that its use in some Division III conferences this season was successful. Given the limited financial impact, the committee voted to provide a grace period for implementation. The women's members of the committee believe the 2-1 system is adequate, so it will remain as an option in the women's game.*

- **Bench Personnel.** The limit of bench personnel has been increased to eight (8) persons.

***Rationale:** Some coaches have requested the ability to have more personnel on the bench, particularly when hallway access to the locker rooms is not an option. For student-athlete welfare and experience reasons, the committee is in favor of increasing this number.*

- **Goal Judges.** The committee eliminated the requirement to have goal judges and will only recommend the use of goal judges.

***Rationale:** With the use of the 2-2 officiating system and video replay in many Division I men's games, the committee believes the benefit of having goal judges is limited.*

2. **Points of Emphasis/Officiating Guidance.** The committee continues to believe that all rules in place are important and need to be enforced as written. However, there are several elements of the game that the committee requests additional attention:

- a. **Contact to the Head (Point of Emphasis).** Overall, the committee believes this rule has started to have the intended impact of reducing the number of dangerous plays involving the head and neck area. It is critical that the college hockey community continue to be vigilant with this rule and the committee firmly believes additional enforcement will assist.

The committee continues to emphasize several items of additional guidance for teams and officials to use when considering this rule.

- i. **Targeting.** In some cases, it was misunderstood that "targeting" the head and neck was only to be reserved for a player who intentionally delivered contact in this area. That is

not the case. Targeting and directly contacting the head and neck area should clearly be a major penalty and at least a game misconduct. **But targeting is not a requirement for this rule to be enforced.** In fact, this concept was not included in this rule because it is nearly impossible for an official to judge intent.

- ii. *Blindside/unsuspecting players.* The committee notes the following existing language in the rules book, which it believes is important: ***“A player delivering a check to an unsuspecting and vulnerable player puts themselves in jeopardy of being penalized under this rule.”*** This rule exists in the book currently and the committee views this portion of the rule as similar to the hitting from behind standard. The responsibility lies with the player delivering the contact.
 - iii. *Additional guidance situations.* Currently, there are several points in the rules intended to illustrate situations where players are vulnerable or types of contact may lead to a penalty under this rule. As additional guidance, the committee approved the following situations to add to the list, which will appear in the new rules book:
 - *A player that is reckless.*
 - *A player that is about to receive a pass.*
 - *Direct contact with the head or neck from any direction.*
 - iv. *Additional Guidance.* As additional guidance, when the initial force of the contact is a shoulder to the body of the opponent and then slides up to the head or neck area, the committee believes this type of indirect contact to the head action may still be penalized, at the referee’s discretion, as another penalty (e.g., elbowing, roughing, high sticking, charging etc.) When officials penalize this type of infraction, the committee is requiring that officials assess this penalty placing the wording “indirect contact to the head – elbowing, etc.” This will allow for a consistent seasonal tracking of these types of indirect contact to the head minor penalties. This is in no way intended to replace or encourage a lessening of contact to the head penalties.
 - iv. *Overall enforcement.* The committee believes the 2010-11 and 2011-12 seasons were a good start with the understanding and enforcement of this rule. As with any safety-related rule, the intended result is to change player behavior. The committee understands how difficult it can be to make this call in the moment at full speed and continues to instruct officials to gather and communicate before making the penalty determination. While the penalty is severe for this foul, the long-term impact of changing the standard of acceptable contact should not be discounted. If officials have any of the ingredients listed in the rules book, the contact to the head penalty must be enforced.
3. **Use of ¾ Visor in Men’s Ice Hockey.** The committee has established a collaborative process with the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sport to collect data and fully explore the possibility of allowing men’s players to wear three-quarter visors. This

partnership includes other hockey leagues and will not solely be limited to the visor with the intent to make a recommendation in the next two years. A more detailed communication will be distributed to the men's ice hockey community shortly.

4. Future Considerations. The committee reviewed several requests from the ice hockey community and approved the following items for consideration in the next rules cycle:

- New $\frac{3}{4}$ visor (men's hockey only).
- Leaving feet to block shots.
- Pucks off netting behind goal remain in play.
- Using only five faceoff locations (center ice, end zones).
- Traveling Penalties. *A player who takes a penalty late in the game has their penalty carried forward to the next game (e.g., a major penalty that occurs within the last five minutes and a minor within the last two minutes would be carried forward, assuming the team on the power play does not score).*

Thank you for your time and attention to this memorandum. If you have any questions about this, please contact committee chair Ed McLaughlin, Niagara University (edm@niagara.edu), secretary-editor Steve Piotrowski (spiotrowski@ccha.com) or NCAA staff liaison Ty Halpin (thalpin@ncaa.org).