

REPORT OF THE NCAA WOMEN'S GYMNASTICS COMMITTEE JUNE 6, 2022, ANNUAL MEETING RULES DISCUSSION

ACTION ITEMS.

- 1. Legislative items.
 - None.
- **2.** Nonlegislative items. The NCAA Women's Gymnastics Committee approved the following rules modification proposals for the 2023 and 2024 seasons. The committee requests approval from the NCAA Playing Rules Oversight Panel (PROP) for the following items:
 - a. Vault chart.
 - (1) <u>Recommendation</u>. Adjust the start value on two vaults to 9.95.

1.08 – Handspring Front tuck $\frac{1}{2}$ - currently 9.9 – raise to 9.95 1.09 – Handspring $\frac{1}{2}$ turn back tuck – currently 9.9 – raise to 9.95.

- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. The development program has raised 1.08 and 1.09 and are similar difficulty.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. Provides more start vault to the student-athlete.

b. Vault chart.

(1) <u>Recommendation</u>. Adjust the start value on the following vault.

4.36 – RO, FF 1/1. Back Tuck - currently 10.0 – lower to 9.95.

- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. The RO, FF 1/1, Back Tuck is less difficult than the same Vault in the pike position and the values should reflect the difficulty.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal.

c. Vault chart.

(1) <u>Recommendation</u>. Add the following vaults to the NCAA Vault Chart.

2.06 – ¼ on – ¼ front tuck 1 ½ (Carey) – 10.0 - #3.508 in DP program 2.08 – Tsukahara – 1/2 front pike - 9.9 - Was 2.15 in NCAA Chart

- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. The USAG has added 2.06 (3.508 DP) to their chart and valued this Vault as a 10.0 with .1 bonus. The vault 2.15 was formerly known as Tsukahara ¹/₄-3/4 turn front pike. The change renames and renumbers the vault with the same value.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

d. Vault chart.

- (1) <u>Recommendation</u>. Remove the following vaults from the NCAA Vault Chart.
 - 2.14 Tsukahara $\frac{1}{4}$ -3/4 turn front tuck 9.8 Use VT #2.03 on current code. 2.16 – Tsukahara $\frac{1}{4}$ -3/4 turn front layout – 10.0 – Use VT # 2.08 on current code.
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. This vault already exists in the code in the tuck position and should be eliminated.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. None.

e. Vault landing mat.

(1) <u>Recommendation</u>. Add the following lines to the vault landing mat.

Add lines in a funnel shape (FIG) with the following dimensions: Width of the landing corridor at the table site – 95 cm Width of the landing corridor (end of bi-fold 4 inch mat) – 138 cm Act as a visual guide for officials regarding the current direction deduction (up to 0.3)

- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. The proposed lines serve as a guide to evaluate the vault landing properly and consistently apply the appropriate deduction. These lines can be placed with tape or chalk and do not require additional matting.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

f. Uneven bars.

(1) Recommendation. Adjust the Skill Value on the following skill:

Double Tuck Flyaway w/ 1/2 - Currently D – Proposed to E.

- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. The change provides variety in the dismounts and does not distinguish when the half twist occurs during the skill.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) <u>Student-athlete impact</u>. Minimal impact.

g. Uneven bars.

(1) <u>Recommendation</u>. Adjust the Skill Value on the following skills:

8.301 from HB, toe on Front Pike $\frac{1}{2}$ - Currently C – Proposed D 8.301 from HB, back stalder from **tuck or pike** w/ $\frac{1}{2}$ turn – Currently C - Proposed D 8.301 from HB, clear support from **tuck or pike** w/ $\frac{1}{2}$ turn – Currently C – Proposed D

- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. These skills provide variety for the dismount skill.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) <u>Student-athlete impact</u>. Minimal impact.
- h. Balance beam.

(1) Recommendation. Adjust the Skill Value on the following skill:

Double Full Dismount – Currently C – Proposed D.

- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. This proposal provides an option for more difficult leaps and additional difficulty in dismounts.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

i. Balance beam.

(1) <u>Recommendation</u>. Adjust the Skill Value on the following skill:

Switch side leap w/ $\frac{1}{4}$ - Currently D – Proposed E.

- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. This proposal provides an option for more difficult leaps and additional difficulty in dismounts.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

j. Balance beam.

(1) <u>Recommendation</u>. Adjust the Skill Value on the following skill:

Tourjete and w/ $\frac{1}{4}$ - Currently D – Proposed E.

- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. This proposal provides an option for more difficult leaps and additional difficulty in dismounts.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) <u>Student-athlete impact</u>. Minimal impact.

k. Balance beam – Special Requirements 4.1.e.

- (1) <u>Recommendation</u>. Require a minimum of a C dismount.
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. To increase the level of difficulty on Beam to come closer to the dismount requirements on Bars and Floor. C options are listed below, but a reminder that there are also many "D" and "E" valued dismounts to choose from as well.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) <u>Student-athlete impact</u>. Minimal impact.
- I. Floor exercise Defining Acro Pass 5.1.
 - (1) <u>Recommendation</u>. To define an Acro Pass as:

"One or more acro elements, one element must be a salto valued at C or higher."

- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. This proposal is intended to provide clarity in the terminology within the rule modification document.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) <u>Student-athlete impact</u>. Minimal impact.
- m. Floor exercise Special requirement 5.2.a.
 - (1) <u>Recommendation</u>. Adjust 5.2.a as follows:

"One acro pass with two (2) saltos (same or different), OR two directly connected saltos (if the two saltos are not directly connected, they must be included within an acro pass, which is defined above). Aerials will not be considered saltos."

- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. Changing the language to list ACRO PASS throughout this requirement to be consistent throughout. In addition, many indirect combinations have been raised in connection bonus providing more opportunities to fulfill this requirement.

- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

n. Floor exercise choice of elements not "up to the competitive level."

(1) Recommendation. Eliminate the third bullet in 5.2d:

One (1) E valued element OR Two (2) different D element (one of which must be an acro element) One (1) Acro SERIES (3 Acro flight elements) with C salto or better An acro dismount with a C (min) salto in bonus combination or a D (min) salto.

- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. Eliminating the Acro Series reference from the criteria for consistency with previous proposed change (proposal 14).
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) <u>Student-athlete impact</u>. Minimal impact.

o. Floor exercise specific skill value.

(1) <u>Recommendation</u>. Increase the following Skill Value:

Switch Side ¹/₂ - Currently C – Proposed D

- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. This increase provides an additional D leap skill for student-athletes.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) <u>Student-athlete impact</u>. Minimal impact.

p. Eliminate floor exercise – Bonus principle 5.4.b.

- (1) <u>Recommendation</u>. Eliminate the Gym/Acro/Gym bonus principle.
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.

- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. The principle has provided confusion in judging and is difficult to consistently be awarded.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) <u>Student-athlete impact</u>. Positive impact for student-athletes because of consistent equitable judging.

q. Equipment – Remove 8-inch mat on floor exercise.

- (1) <u>Recommendation</u>. Remove the 8-inch mat from Floor matting.
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. The 8-inch mat is not currently used because of its larger size. This size causes it to be difficult to remain in place.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

r. Equipment – Judging positions.

- (1) <u>Recommendation</u>. When using a 6 judge panel on Uneven Bars and Vault, the judges shall not sit apart.
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. To allow judges to have a consistent visual of the routine to minimize scoring variance amongst the panel.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) <u>Student-athlete impact</u>. Minimal impact.

s. Equipment – Uniform requirement.

- (1) <u>Recommendation</u>. Remove the following language "Leotard straps much be a minimum of 2 cm in width."
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.

- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. The FIG has been liberalized to permit more artistic variety in the team uniform.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

t. Conduct.

(1) <u>Recommendation</u>. Coaches, student-athletes and staff will use the same yellow card procedure.

The yellow card is a warning (information provided to the head coach). If a red card is then issued, this will result in a 0.10 deduction from the team score as a neutral deduction.

- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. The proposed change addresses repeated conduct issues by the team with a team penalty.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) <u>Student-athlete impact</u>. Minimal impact.

u. Video inquiry.

(1) <u>Recommendation</u>. Permit the use of video during an inquiry by adding additional check box on NCAA Video Inquiry Form to note, "Video Upon Request."

The coach, when completing the inquiry form, can check the box to make the judge aware that video is available as additional information for the inquiry.

- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. To allow judges as much information as possible to properly evaluate the skill and routine to provide the correct scoring for the student-athlete.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) <u>Student-athlete impact</u>. Minimal impact.

v. Video review.

- (1) <u>Recommendation</u>. Revise the Video Review Form to have consistent language with the NCAA Inquiry Form.
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. Items that are able to be inquired about during the competition can go to video review at the conclusion of the meet. It is appropriate that the forms reflect what is reviewable.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal.

w. Video inquiry deduction.

- (1) Recommendation. To eliminate the 0.10 deduction for the use of video reviews.
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. The use of video review is intended to ensure the correct score was given and a team should not be penalized for requesting the review.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) <u>Student-athlete impact</u>. Minimal.

x. Inquiry or video review score change.

- (1) <u>Recommendation</u>. If a score is changes during an inquiry or video review, the skill or connection under review is subject to additional deductions for incompletion or rhythm.
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. To all a routine to be given an accurate deduction and be properly scored.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) <u>Student-athlete impact</u>. Minimal.
- y. Equipment failure Video review.

- (1) <u>Recommendation</u>. When an equipment failure occurs, the Meet Referee may have the option to review video (both real time or slow motion) prior to making a decision.
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. The recommendation provides the Meet Referee time to review carefully the situation to determine if equipment failure occurred and how to proceed.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) <u>Student-athlete impact</u>. Minimal impact.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

• **Review of proposed rules changes and revisions.** The Women's Gymnastics Committee reviewed proposed rules modifications from the Women's Gymnastics Coaches Association and the NCAA rules interpreter. The Women's Gymnastics Committee recommended 25 modifications that are included in the Action Items section of this report. Many of the proposed rules modifications are intended to provide more opportunity for artistic elements to the student-athlete and provide for enhanced student-athlete experience.

Committee Chair:Kasey Crawford, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse.Staff Liaison(s):Ben Brownlee, NCAA Championships and Alliances.Noël Couch, NCAA Championships and Alliances.

NCAA Women's Gymnastics Committee June 6-7, 2022, Annual Meeting

Attendees:

Kasey Crawford, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse.

Cindy Harris, Illinois State University.

Erin Kido, Eastern Michigan University.

Lauren Procopio, University of Pennsylvania (via videoconference).

Jenny Rowland, University of Florida (in attendance day one).

Randy Solorio, California State University, Sacramento.

Guard Young, Brigham Young University.

Absentees:

Jenny Rowland, University of Florida (absent day two).

Guests in Attendance:

Catherine "Cookie" Batsche, National Association of Women's Gymnastics Judges President.

Chrystal Chollet-Norton, Rules Interpreter.

Lois Colburn, National Association of Women's Gymnastics Judges National Collegiate Assigner.

Ken Cysewski, AAI.

Michael J. Feinberg, ESPN.

Jason Fredericks, Road to Nationals.

Dan Margulis, ESPN.

NCAA Staff Liaison (or Staff Support if subcommittee) in Attendance:

Noël Couch.

Other NCAA Staff Members in Attendance:

Ben Brownlee, Victoria Lipscomb and Natalie Steger.