



GYMNASTICS

NCAA Women's Gymnastics Rules Cycle 2024-26 Rules Newsletter Archive for 2025-2026

General	page 2
Vault	page 3
Uneven Bars	page 3
Balance Beam	page 5
Floor Exercise	page 9
Equipment	page 12
Routine Inquiries	page 13
Meet Procedures	page 14
Appendices	page 15
Rules Resources	page 15

This Rules Newsletter Archive document is a compilation of all Clarifications and Q&As that were published in the NCAA Women's Gymnastics Rules Newsletters from October 15, 2025 to March 15, 2026.

With the intention to be an effective source document in conjunction with the current 2025-26 Rules Modifications, all the entries will be grouped by topic in the order of sections in the Rules Modifications. Any entries that were changed or corrected in subsequent Rules Newsletters are merged to represent the complete and correct clarification. The date of the original newsletter is noted at the end of each question or clarification.

Rules Modifications 25-26 Errata (10/15/25):

1. Uneven Bars, Table 3.3 Element Values Different from Level 10 - all 1 ½ pirouette in handstands are Es. An element that is missing from this exception list (those elements still Ds in the COP) is #2.403 uprise backward to handstand on HB with 1 ½ turn (Reeder).
 2. Section 8.5, chart for Triangular Meet with 6 judges – correction to the judges' numbers in panels: Beam Panel are J3 & J4, and Floor Panel are J5 & J6.
-

1 General

Q: Can the judges initiate a conference for a Team Neutral Deduction? Can a coach inquire or submit a Video Review for a TND? (11/1/25)

A: Yes. Any neutral deductions (team or individual) can be a reason for a conference, an inquiry, or a Video Review. A TND is considered a circumstance that may be a reason to call a conference, and will be specifically added to Rules Modification 1.9.g.

Reference: Rules Modifications 1.13.a and 1.13.f, page 5, and 7.1.h, page 20; Clarification from the WCPC.

Q: If the judges are in a conference called because of a difference in Start Value of a completed routine, and it seems to be going long, can they call it a Delayed Conference? (3/15/26)

A: No. A Delayed Conference can be called ONLY if the routine they are discussing was incomplete (the athlete did not finish the routine). Occasionally the conference involves a complicated issue and requires more deliberation; however, the judges have the responsibility to make the conferences quick, cooperative and efficient in resolving differences.

Reference: Rules Modification 1.9.h.; USAG Women's Prog R&P – Chapter 2 – IV.6, page 14.

Q: Did NCAA adopt the elimination of the 0.3 deduction for no dismount on UB, BB, and FX? (12/15/25)

A: Yes. The NCAA did adopt the change from USAG Dev Program of the elimination of the 0.3 deduction for no dismount/dismount of no value.

Reference: WCPC Clarification

Q: A gymnast lands with feet apart and holds her arms up in that position for a second, then, she closes her heels and holds that position with arms up for less than a second before turning to salute. Would the first held position with feet apart count as the hold in finish position and have the feet apart deduction? Or would the second held position after her feet were closed be the hold in finish position and receive the deduction for being held less than one second? (1/15/26)

A: In the Rules Newsletter Archive 2023-24, page 23, the Attached Supplement gives several examples of how the hold in finish position deduction works. If you review the 2nd example, you will see how to handle this given circumstance: there would be no deduction for closing heels (considered while in the landing position), but deduct 0.05 for not holding the finish position (once she put her heels together and showed the correct finish position).

Reference: Rules Modification 1.5.c; Rules Newsletter Archive 2023-24, page 23, Attached Supplement (originating from the November 1, 2023, Rules Newsletter).

Q: We have had our judging assistants (timers for floor, bars and beam) use the timer app on their phones for timing routines and then using handheld stopwatch for timing falls, if necessary. Is it permitted to use the timer app on the timing volunteer's cell phone? (3/15/26)

A: Yes. A host institution is required to provide timing devices (such as stopwatches) to manage event timing requirements. Host institutions cannot require volunteers to provide the timing device; however, volunteers have the option to use their phone if it has enough battery power to perform the timing duties for the competition. Volunteers may not use the device for other unallowed purposes, such as for texts or verbal conversations while on the field of play.

References: Rules Modification 8.2.g; USAG Women's Program R&P – Chapter 7 General Meet Information – X.N. page 56.

Q: If the warning and overtime sound (bell or verbal warning) is NOT audible to the gymnast, and the routine goes overtime, does it still receive the overtime deduction? This happened to us in a loud arena, and the routine timer volunteer did not stand up and could not be heard. (3/15/26)

A: The rule that applies to the signals indicating the end of the beam routine time is in *USAG Dev Prog COP Section 4 Beam – Chapter 1 General Info – II.4.*, page BEAM-3, where it states:

4. “Warning” and final “time” signal should be a special device such as a bell, whistle, or gong.

a. Verbal “warning” and “time” MUST be audible to gymnast if device is unavailable.

It does not specifically state, but the intention is that the signaling device or the verbal warning must be heard and identified by the athlete in order for the overtime deduction to be taken. The Chief Judge may decide not to take the deduction if there is information available that indicates the athlete did not hear the signal. Input from a coach may be given via a routine inquiry since this is a neutral deduction. It is up to the Chief Judge to instruct the timers how to perform their task to be noticed/heard by the athlete. Standing up is a technique that can be used, but it is not required.

2 Vault

Q: Is there a rule that NCAA gymnasts must vault on a minimum of 125 cm vault table height? (Can they vault on 120 cm)? (12/1/25)

A: No. There is no longer a minimum height of the vault table for Level 10, a new ruling this year. There is no exception made for NCAA. So your athletes may vault at 120 cm.

Reference: R&P Chapter 10 Apparatus Specifications, page 76 under IV. Vault – C.1. Vault Table.

3 Uneven Bars

Q: With a free hip within groups 3/6/7, would it receive +.1 CV bonus if it is connected to a C with flight/turn (for example, a blind change)? (10/15/25)

A: No. To receive +.1 CV for C+C on uneven bars, both Cs must have turn or flight. The exception for turn/flight requirement for C elements in Groups 3/6/7 only occurs if BOTH C elements are in Groups 3/6/7, and are different. So, for example, a clear hip handstand (#3.304) connected to a pike toe-on handstand (#7.309) will receive C+C bonus, but the clear hip handstand connected to a back giant handstand with ½ turn (#4.303) will not receive the C+C bonus.

Reference: USAG COP Section 3 Uneven Bars – Chapter 4 Bonus – II.A. under the C+C box on page BARS-40.

Q: In Rules Modification Section 3.4.c.1.b, in the example of the giant 1/2 to Jaegar with a fall where hands don’t touch, if the gymnast repeats the combination successfully, it indicates that the athlete does not receive CV Bonus for the second giant 1/2 to Jaegar connection. Why not? (11/15/25 correction in 12/15/25)

A: Clarification – it does receive bonus. The intent of the originating USAG Dev Prog COP rules dealing with the repeat of elements on bars after a fall with NO TOUCH of hands was to count the resulting zero Value Part on bars as a different element in terms of connection. Therefore, the 3.4.c.1 example of the repeated connection of giant ½ + Jaegar would receive CV Bonus the C+D.

HOWEVER, in the 3.4.c.2 example, when the athlete TOUCHES her hands then falls on the Jaegar, she receives the D Value Part for the Jaegar (but no D/E Bonus). This value part credit then makes the

repeat giant ½ + Jaeger the same connection, and would not receive the CV Bonus for the second C+D connection. The paragraph remains as written.

This clarification supercedes the previously published answer in the November 15, 2025 newsletter, and **adds +0.1 CV Bonus for the giant ½ + Jaeger connection in 3.4.c.1.b.**

References: Rules Modification 3.4.c.; USAG Dev Prog COP Section 1 General – Chapter 3.I.C Recognition of Value Parts first paragraph, page GENERAL-16; COP Section 3 Uneven Bars – Chapter 1 General Info – VII.A.1.c.& 2.a., page BARS-7; Chapter 4 Bonus – I.D,F & K, pages BARS-38 & 39; Ch 4 – III.D page BARS 49; and Ch 4 – VIII.A,C & D, page BARS-50.

Q: A gymnast performs back giant ½ turn to Jaeger, touches her hands and falls. She repeats the giant ½ turn to Jaeger, catches and does a tap swing/counterswing before an overshoot to handstand on the low bar. Would the repeat Jaeger receive the D +0.1 Bonus and Additional D/E Bonus for the single bar release? (2/1/26)

A: No. When the athlete catches the bar on the repeat performance after a fall with touch on the first attempt, the second Jaeger is considered the same as the first attempt because the tap swing/counterswing (considered an extra swing) that follows is not an element in the Code of Points (0 VP).

For your example: First giant ½ (C) + Jaeger (D), touch bar and falls = receives D VP for the Jaeger, no CV or D/E Bonus due to the fall, but is eligible for UTL with the single bar release (*Rules Modification 3.4.c.2*).

Repeat: giant ½ + Jaeger, catch the bar, extra swing, then performs the overshoot to handstand = receives 0 VP for the Jaeger, no D/E Bonus, no Additional D/E Bonus for the release (since no D/E Bonus), no CV Bonus for the giant ½ to Jaeger (*Rules Modification 3.4.c.2 and the clarification in the Rules Newsletter December 15, 2025*).

As a side note: in *USAG Dev Prog COP Section 3 Uneven Bars – Chapter 3 execution – III. Specific Execution Deductions Intermediate (extra) swing, page BARS-32*, paragraph 4 states that an “extra swing after the last element in a direct connection of a C/D/E, apply CV and D/E Bonus”. This rule would apply if a giant ½ turn + Jaeger was performed with a catch and extra swing as a FIRST performance – receiving CV Bonus for the connection, D VP, D/E Bonus, Additional D/E Bonus and UTL eligibility for the Jaeger, but also would receive -0.3 extra swing and no connection any following element.

Reference: Clarification from USAG NTC.

Q: How much bonus does this combination receive: Shaposhnikova (clear hip from low bar to high bar, #3.401 - E) + overshoot to 3/4 handstand (#4.204 – C after D/E release). (1/15/26)

A: +0.4 total bonus: +0.2 for the D/E Bonus, +0.1 for the CV Bonus, and +0.1 Additional Bonus for the E release.

Reference: Rules Modification 3.5; USAG Dev Prog COP Section 3 Bars – Chapter 4 Bonus – II.A. page BARS-41 and III.D.1, page BARS-49.

Q: Can you clarify the specific body position of the #8.301 Bars dismount (clear support front tuck salto with 1/2 twist) that has an NCAA value different than in USAG? I want to clarify that the wording “clear support” means clear hip entry (like Group 3 elements) is the D exception and that a toe-on entry (like Group 7 elements) into the front tuck 1/2 is NOT a D exception. (1/15/26)

A: In the USAG COP chart for Bars dismount element #8.301 (page BARS-91), there are several variations listed. To understand the two body positions of this dismount: if you look at the artwork of #8.301, the first variation of the underswing shows a **toe-on** position (pike body with feet touching the bar), and the second variation shows the **clear** position (body in hollow, hips close to the bar) – yes, as you noted, similar to Group 7 & Group 3 elements. The only variation of this dismount that is considered a

D in NCAA is the clear underswing to salto forward tucked with 1/2 twist. The description and shorthand (with no artwork) of this NCAA element exception is listed as the very last variation of element #8.301.

Reference: Rules Modification 3.3 table; USAG Dev Prog COP Section 3 Bars skill chart #8.301, page BARS-91.

Q: What are the specifics for fulfilling the Special Requirement of two (2) bar changes? Does a college athlete need to perform at least one (1) value part element on each bar to meet this requirement? For example: gymnast mounts the HB, performs 3 elements with an Overshoot ½ turn from HB to LB (one bar change) ending with a fall (hands collapse, arms bend, body position bent into the fall), with no glide kip. Gymnast remounts the LB by crawling up onto the LB and jumps to the HB, continues her routine to dismount off the HB. No value part element is performed on the LB. (2/1/26)

A: Referring to the *USAG Dev Prog COP*, Level 10 has the composition requirement for two bar changes, and it points to the Level 9 Special Requirement definition of bar changes as a reference. Therefore, the Level 9 SR#1 specifications for fulfilling the two bar changes SR applies.

Referring to this definition – paragraph 1.b states that the athlete must perform Value Parts on both bars. Paragraph 1.d specifies that after a fall from the HB, if the athlete climbs up on the LB to jump to the HB, this action is NOT considered a bar change. So, to answer your question – yes, there would be a 0.2 deduction for Special Requirement because no element was performed on the low bar. The athlete could fulfill the SR by performing a recognized element on the low bar (such as a cast squat on) before jumping to the high bar.

Reference: USAG Dev Prog COP Section 3 Uneven Bars – Chapter 2 Compositional Categories – chart III, page BARS-29; Section 3.2.II.B.1. b & d, page BARS-21; Rules Modification 3.1.a.

4 Balance Beam

Q: An athlete performs a switch leap mount (#1.401 D) to a straddle jump 1/4 turn (#2.202 C), for a D+C receiving +.1 D/E bonus and +.2 CV bonus. Will this connection fulfill the event Special Requirement for a Dance-Dance series? (10/15/25)

A: Yes. An athlete who performs a dance (D) designated mount (such as indicated in #1.401 switch leg leap mount) connected to another dance element on the beam will fulfill the Special Requirement of a Dance-Dance series. Elements from Group 1 Mounts, Group 2 Leaps/Hops/Jumps, and Group 3 Turns are permitted for this Special Requirement.

Reference: Rules Modification 4.1.b, page 11; USAG Dev Prog COP Section 4 Beam – Chapter 2 Compositional Categories – IV.F, page BEAM-26.

Q: Would a switch leap mount (#1.401) to a split jump (#2.201) fulfill the dance/dance series Special Requirement with a minimum of a dance C, and the SR of leap/jump with 180° split? (2/1/26)

A: Yes. The dance series Special Requirement may include a dance mount, which is designated in the *USAG Dev Prog COP* skill charts with a “(D)” marked in the skill box. The switch leg leap mount (D VP) connected to a split jump (B VP) will fulfill SR for the dance-dance series, and the split jump will fulfill the leap/jump with 180° split SR.

References: Rules Modification 4.1.b&c; USAG Dev Prog COP Section 4 Beam – Chapter 2.II.2.b, page BEAM-18 and 2.IV.F, page BEAM-26; Chapter 4 Bonus II.D, page BEAM-35; Element chart for #1.401, page BEAM-43.

Q: Does a switch leg leap + back handspring swing down (#7.212) fulfill the leap series Special Requirement? (12/15/25)

A: Yes. A mixed series of a switch leg leap (C) + back handspring with high flight phase to swing down (B, #7.212) would fulfill the dance/acro series Special Requirement. The dance element is a C, and the series does not end in a dismount.

Reference: Rules Modification 4.1.b.

Q: An athlete performs a cartwheel through a chest stand with creative leg movements in a vertical hold position to finish the cartwheel motion in a straddle sit on the beam. Is this considered a forward/sideward acro element for composition? (3/1/26)

A: Yes. This element is a variation listed in #7.103, cartwheel through a chest stand, and is considered a sideward element for composition.

Reference: Rules Modification 4.2.a.2; USAG Dev Prog COP, Element #7.103, page BEAM-78; Clarification from the USAG NTC.

Q: On Beam, does a handstand or a forward roll count for forward/sideward acro element for composition? (3/1/26)

A: Permitted elements that count for acro direction composition are in Group 1 - Mounts (those marked FA/SA in the skill chart box), Group 6 - Rolls, Group 7 - Walkovers/Cartwheels, and Group 8 - Saltos. Therefore, a forward roll (#6.101) or cartwheel(#7.103) would count, but NOT a handstand, found in Group 5 - Holds (#5.106).

Reference: Rules Modification 4.2.a.2

Q: When an element that lands on one foot connects to a 2-foot takeoff element, such as a switch split leap to straddle jump, or a cat leap to straddle jump, how is it connected without counting a step in between? (11/1/25)

A: To understand how to make a direction connection of a leap to a jump, the COP states: **the landing leg or free leg on the first element must be the take-off leg for the next element.** For a leap landing on one foot directly connecting to a 2-foot take-off jump, the free leg closes to join the landing leg of the leap (in front or back) to perform the jump off two feet. To describe this technique using your examples:

1. To connect a cat leap to a straddle jump – the free leg of the cat leap (poised in front upon landing) closes to meet the landing leg of the cat leap (usually to the front) to jump off two feet for the straddle jump.
2. To connect a switch-leg leap to a straddle jump – the front landing leg is used to plant for the jump, while the free leg (coming from behind upon landing) closes to the landing leg (behind or in front) to then jump off two feet to straddle.

Reference: USAG Dev Prog COP – Section 4 Beam – Chapter 2 Compositional Categories – III. Clarification Regarding Series, paragraph A, page BEAM-24

Q: When a swing of the leg above 45 degrees breaks an acro series on Beam, does the series remain eligible for UTL, per Rules Modification 4.2.d.4? (11/15/25)

A: Yes. If an acro series on beam breaks by any means as defined in the USAG Dev Prog COP, then the UTL rule in Rules Modification 4.2.d.4. applies. The series does not receive CV Bonus or Special Requirement, but is eligible to fulfill UTL with another D/E acro element or E dance element in the routine.

Reference: Rules Modification 4.2.d.4, page 12; USAG Dev Prog COP Section 4 Beam – 2.III.A., page BEAM-23.

Q: An athlete performs a switch leg leap to gainer back layout salto full dismount, in which she lands and takes off on the same leg for the connection. What is the requirement for the free leg that swings into the dismount? Would there be any action of the free leg that would break the series or any requirement of the free leg (such as staying below 45 degrees)? (12/1/25)

A: For a dance/acro (mixed) dismount series, the free leg of the dance element that drops and lifts again before connecting to the acro element would break the series. In your example, it would break the series if the free leg (back leg) of the switch leg leap, upon landing, drops and lifts again before it swings down-forward-upward to perform the gainer back layout salto full twist. There should be a smooth, continuous connection between elements of the series.

A 45° leg swing between connecting elements breaks an acro series, but not a dance or mixed series.

Resources: USAG Dev Prog COP Section 4 Beam – Chapter 2.III. Clarification Regarding Series, paragraphs A.3.e.1. and A.4.g, page BEAM-24.

Q: An athlete mounts the beam, then sits and performs some choreography facing sideways. Does this action fulfill the composition requirement of movement/choreography for the sideward direction? (12/1/25)

A: Yes. Rules Modification 4.2.c.3 specifically states that choreography can be performed at ANY level (standing, semi-low and low to the beam).

Q: An athlete attempts an acro series on beam: side aerial (D) + side salto (D), but breaks the series. I understand that she receives -0.2 SR acro series deduction and does not receive the CV Bonus. Unless she has another D/E acro or E dance element in her routine, she will receive the 0.1 UTL deduction. Since the series is broken, would the side salto count as the additional D acro element for UTL? (12/1/25)

A: No. The side salto was part of the attempted series. For UTL, the additional D acro must be separate from the series.

Reference: Rules Modification 4.2.d

Q: A gymnast performs a front toss (front salto forward off one leg, #8.401) to a BHS (back handspring, #7.208). During the front toss, arm position upon landing is in front of torso and above the knee joint/top of thighs. As gymnast enters the BHS, arms drop below the knee & swings behind the thigh before they swing forward & upward as she executes the BHS. Does this arm swing constitute a break in the series? (10/15/25)

A: No. This is a counter movement series, which permits the swing of the arms. It comes down to physics – to change direction of movement in a counter series, you need to change the momentum to the other direction. Swinging the arms is often essential in that effort, so it is permitted. To be connected in this case, it requires the athlete to have CONTINUOUS movement and IN LINE with the Beam, which includes any body movement as well.

Reference: USAG Dev Prog COP Section 4 Beam – Chapter 2. III. Clarifications Regarding Series – A.1 and 2, page BEAM-24.

Q: I understand the specific clarifications for BHS + front aerial and BHS + back layout step-out; are those the only exceptions where they do not receive CV bonus? I saw that a front toss tucked + BHS received a +.20 for that connection. Is it only those two specific instances where we wouldn't give the CV bonus? (12/15/25)

A: Yes. The back layout step-out (D) or the aerial front walkover (D), when connected to any style of back handspring (#7.208, 7.210, 7.211, or 7.212), the D elements are considered as C's for CV Bonus calculations. These elements are the only two D elements where this happens. Under NCAA rules, the B + C 2-acro flight combination does NOT receive CV Bonus.

Any other D element connected to a back handspring – such as the front toss (salto forward tucked with one leg take-off, #8.401) + back handspring – will be considered its original D value for CV Bonus. In this example, the B + D receives +0.2 CV Bonus. Please refer to the examples of this rule in Rules Modification 4.4.

Reference: Rules Modifications 4.4.a. and 4.4.c; USAG Dev Prog COP Section 4 Beam – Chapter 4 Bonus – II.A., page BEAM-32.

Q: An athlete performs a front toss salto (#8.401), wobbles and takes some steps backwards. She then performs a front toss salto + back handspring but breaks the series due to a balance error. There is no other D/E acro or E dance in the routine. Does the gymnast receive a UTL deduction? (1/15/26)

A: Yes. If an element receives zero VP, it is not eligible to fulfill UTL. So, if a gymnast performs the front toss, walks back, performs a front toss + back handspring broken series, then the second front toss receives 0 VP (as identical) and would not fulfill UTL.

Note: in a previous clarification in Rules Newsletter November 15, 2023 (see Rules Newsletter Archive 2023-24, page 12), example Q-2 clarification is no longer valid because of the updated Rules Modification 1.5.b.

Reference: Rules Modification 1.5.b and 4.2.d.4; USAG Dev Prog COP Section 4 Balance Beam – Chapter 1 General Info – V. Recognition of Value Parts A.4, page BEAM-7; Clarification from the WCPC.

Q: A gymnast performs a front toss salto (#8.401 D) and wobbles. She repeats the front toss and wobbles again (0 VP) while trying to connect to a back handspring (B) in an attempt at a series. No acro series was awarded. Later she performs a front toss pike salto (#8.501 E). Does she receive an UTL deduction? (3/15/26)

A: Yes. Since the repeated front toss (#8.401) did not connect to the back handspring, the element received a zero VP (as identical) and is not eligible for UTL as an acro flight series (attempted) to fulfill UTL. Even with the additional E acro, she already lost eligibility with the lack of a flight series.

Reference: Rules Modification 1.5.b and 4.2.d.4; USAG Dev Prog COP Section 4 Balance Beam – Chapter 1 General Info – V. Recognition of Value Parts A.4, page BEAM-7; Rules Newsletter January 15, 2026.

Q: An athlete performs a flight series of BHS + BHS + back salto layout stepout, then later in the routine performs a dismount series of BHS + back layout with 1 1/2 twist dismount. I am aware that she will not receive VP credit for the third BHS, and therefore, not receive CV for the dismount (but will receive VP for the dismount element). If she does not need the skill VP or CV Bonus, is it okay for her to perform that third BHS? (10/15/25)

A: Yes, with a reminder that the routine will need a forward/sideward acro element somewhere for composition, and that any execution deductions would still be applied.

Reference: Rules Modification 1.5.a, 4.1.a & e, and 4.2.a.1 & 2; USAG Dev Prog COP Section 4 Beam – Chapter 1 General – V.4 counting elements, page BEAM-7.

Q: College made the exception for the Beam dismount element #9.202, a gainer entry front salto layout full dismount off the side (a “Mabrey” in stretched position), to earn a C value in college. I do not see that element listed in this year's modifications in the "Element values different from Level 10" table. Does that mean it is no longer a C for us? (12/15/25)

A: It is still a C. It is element #9.302 in the USAG Dev Prog Code, so it no longer required to be listed as an element with a different value from Level 10 in the NCAA Rules Modification table. This element is an aerial walkover with full twist dismount off side of beam, also from a swing through (gainer style). Note: the skill chart block for element #9.302 (page BEAM-88) is tucked into the bottom of the “D” value column to accommodate the spacing on that page.

Reference: USAG Dev Prog COP Skill Chart #9.302, page BEAM-88.

5 Floor Exercise

Q: For Floor Exercise element #1.203 turning leap, does this skill fulfill the Special Requirement of a leap with a 180° split in the dance passage? (11/1/25)

A: Yes, the #1.203 Jeté en tournant (turning leap) may fulfill a leap with a 180° split as an element of the dance passage Special Requirement, because it takes off from one leg, and it has the expectation of a 180° split. Remember that the front leg must be extended, and a split that is less than 180° but greater than 135° would receive up to 0.2 deduction for insufficient split.

Reference USAG Dev Prog COP Section 5 Floor Ex – Chapter 2 Compositional Categories – II.A.3.c. dance passage specifics, page FLOOR-16.

Q: What is the specific technique (split timing, split position, degree of turn) required to receive the D value part in NCAA for the switch-side leap with ½ or ¾ turn? (2/15/26)

A: For switch-side leap with ½ or ¾ turn (C in USAG, D in NCAA), the proper technique is stated in the USAG skill chart for #1.305. A *Switch-side leap* is defined as “a split leap forward with leg change (180° separation) and ¼ (90° turn) to side-split leap (180°) or straddle-pike position (180°).” Additional switch-side leap specific element technique (having a 45° leg split before switch, ¼ (90°) turn must occur in the air, etc.) is described in *USAG Dev Prog COP* in Specific Element Technique Clarifications.

In the switch-side leap with ½ or ¾ turn, if the side-split position is overturned beyond the specified initial ¼ (90°) turn, it would receive a deduction for lack of precision (up to 0.1).

The switch-side leap ½ turn would show a total ¾ turn from the take-off to landing to receive the D value part. The switch-side leap ¾ turn would show a total full turn from take-off to landing to receive the D value part. Any deviation from these turn completions may receive up to 0.2 for incomplete turn.

If the switch leap with a turn shows a (front) split position, it is a switch-leg leap with ½ turn (#1.304, C), or switch-leg leap with full turn (#1.404, D). There is no switch-leg leap ¾ turn in the COP. Therefore, the turn of the switch-leg leap is evaluated within 90° of the turn in relation to either the switch-leg leap with ½ turn or with full turn, with up to 0.2 for incomplete turn. The timing of the turn is not specified.

Reference: USAG Dev Prog COP Section 5 Floor Ex – Chapter 1 General Info – VI.B.2.b, page FLOOR-7; Section 5.1.VI.E.6, page FLOOR-9; Section 5.1.VI.F.5, page FLOOR-11; Skill charts #1.304, 1.404 & 1.305; Rules Modification 5.4; Clarification from the WCPC.

Q: If an athlete performs a front aerial that lands on her lead foot and her back, does it count as an A element? (11/1/25)

A: Yes. A front aerial walkover(#5.301) landing on her foot and her back as a final position would fall under the USAG Dev Prog rule as a variation of a root acro skill with optional final position, counting as an A element.

Reference: USAG Dev Prog COP Section 5 FX – Chapter 1 General Info – VI.A.2., page FLOOR-6.

Q: What is the value for a Pike jump full twist Shushunova, which is not specifically listed in the COP? (11/15/25)

A: The pike jump full twist to prone (Shushunova-style) is considered a variation of #1.306 pike jump full twist, with a different landing. It is a C value. A leap/jump/hop NOT found in the COP may be awarded comparable VP credit for the root element with a different landing position.

Reference: USAG Dev Prog COP Section 5 Floor Exercise – Chapter 1 General Info – VI.A.1. page FLOOR-6.

Q: Does a front toss to the knee count as an A skill on Floor Exercise? (12/1/25)

A: Yes. The “front toss” is an A Value Part, element #5.103. It is considered an aerial walkover in a tucked position to land kneeling, which is one of the options in #5.103. As noted at the bottom of this element block, this skill does NOT count as a forward salto for composition or for special requirement purposes.

Reference: USAG Dev Prog COP Section 5 Floor, skill chart element 5.103, page FLOOR-58.

Q: Does a shoulder roll on floor exercise count as an A value part? It is not the skill chart. (3/1/26)

A: Yes. A shoulder roll is a variation of a backward roll, #4.102, and is an A value part.

Reference: USAG Dev Prog COP, Element #4.102, page FLOOR-56; Clarification from the USAG NTC.

Q: An athlete performs a round off + back tuck salto off 2 feet to land prone – not land feet first. Does this acro element fulfill the backward salto composition requirement? (2/1/26)

A: No. For the composition deduction for lack of variety in choice of acro elements, there must be both forward/sideward and backward saltos in the routine. A salto landing in a prone position is not a defined salto and does not fulfill this composition requirement.

Reference: Rules Modification 5.1.b and 5.3.a.2.

Q: When landing the final acro element of the acro pass, is it permitted for the athlete to do a small rebound to land in a lunge position? (11/1/25)

A: No. There is no penalty for taking a small, controlled step forward (from a forward acro skill) or backward (from a backward acro skill) to finish in a lunge position. However, a small hop (moving both feet) would incur an up to 0.1 deduction for landing.

Resources: USAG Dev Prog COP Section 5 Floor Exercise – Chapter 3 Execution – Table II, second row, page FLOOR-25, and Chapter 3.II.A.1. page FLOOR-28.

Q: I have an athlete who performs front tumbling in her two acro passes, and then performs a cartwheel-back layout step-out at the end of her routine, to fulfill her backward tumbling composition requirement. Is there a penalty to performing the cartwheel back layout step-out at the end of her routine? (11/15/25)

A: Yes. The cartwheel – step together to back salto layout step-out is an A salto series. If the athlete performs this connected salto pass at the end of her routine, it will receive a 0.2 deduction for Special Requirement of a salto performed as the last isolated salto or within the last salto connection NOT a C salto. If the A salto connection occurs before a last acro pass with a C salto, then there would be no deduction.

Reference: USAG Dev Prog COP Section 5 Floor Ex – Chapter 1 General Info – VI.A.2., page FLOOR-6.

Q: If a performance of a “D” dance element on floor is insufficient and receives a lower value part, and there is only one other D (an acro) element in the routine, would this routine receive a UTL deduction for not having the required two D elements, although I know the athlete was attempting a D element? (1/15/26)

A: Yes, the UTL deduction is taken in this example. There is no stipulation for an “attempt” fulfilling UTL on Floor Exercise.

Reference: Rules Modification 5.3.d.1

Q: If an athlete performs three acro passes, but the third (last) pass was a repeat of a previous pass and receives zero (0) Value Part for the salto, I understand how it would not fulfill the Special Requirement for last salto. In terms of UTL, would the judge look back to the second acro pass and treat that as the last completed pass to fulfill UTL? (10/15/25)

A: No. The last acro pass that received zero VP for the repeated salto in the same connection does not mean that the gymnast didn't attempt to perform an acro pass. She still tumbled acro skills from an approach (hurdle or run), and the acro pass will receive deductions according to rules of VP, SR, and composition (UTL). A judge would not consider the previous successful acro pass as the last pass.

Reference: USAG COP Section 5 Floor Exercise – Chapter 1 General Info – VI.A.6. page FLOOR-6, and Chapter 2- Compositional Categories – II.A.4.a.2 and 4.b, page FLOOR-18; Rules Modifications 5.2.c, 5.3.d., page 15; Rules Newsletter March 15, 2025 Floor Ex (pages 12-13 in 2024-25 Archive).

Q: On Floor Ex, the C+C direct connection receives +0.3 in connection bonus. Does it have to be with two different C elements (similar to the B+B connection), or would a front layout salto full + front layout salto full receive +0.3 CV? (11/1/25)

A: The Floor Exercise direct connection C + C that receives +0.3 CV Bonus does not require that the two elements be different. So a front layout salto full twist + front layout salto full twist will receive the +0.3 CV Bonus.

Reference: Rules Modification 5.5.c; USAG Dev Prog COP Section 5 Floor Exercise – Chapter 4 Bonus – B. Direct Connection, page FLOOR-35.

Q: What bonus would the athlete receive with the following two acro passes within a routine?

First pass: Punch front layout salto + Rudi (front layout salto 1 ½ twist) (B + D)

Second pass: Punch Rudi + front layout salto (D + B) (2/1/26)

A: The connections with the same elements but in different order are considered different. Therefore, both acro passes will receive +0.2 CV Bonus for direct connection of B + D. The first Rudi receives +0.1 D/E Bonus; however, the second Rudi would not receive D/E Bonus, because the same D/E element is eligible for D/E Bonus one time only. The total bonus for both acro passes is +0.5.

Reference: USAG Dev Prog COP Section 5 Floor Exercise – Chapter 4 Bonus – I.G page FLOOR-29; 5.4.II.B page FLOOR-34; 5.4.III.D.2, page FLOOR-40.

Q: An athlete's acro passes consist of front layout salto + front 1/1 and a front layout salto + Rudi. The first front layout in each pass is taught to be long and low (about her shoulder height, maybe slightly lower) so the punch angle is deep enough that the second salto can rise. Is this technique allowable so that the front layout saltos would not receive amplitude deductions? (3/1/26)

A: Yes. Any forward salto used as an accelerating element in a directly connected forward salto pass receives NO deduction for insufficient amplitude, while the last salto in the connection is expected to have greater amplitude. The forward layout saltos in both of the acro passes in your example are considered accelerating elements, so they should not receive amplitude deductions. However, body and leg form deductions are permitted.

Reference: USAG Dev Prog COP Section 5 FX – Chapter 1 General Info – VI.F.12, page FLOOR-12

Q: Following up the discussion from the March 1st Rules Newsletter of a forward acro pass with an accelerating forward salto, what happens if a split jump is added to the last salto element, in terms of amplitude? Using the previous example, in an acro/dance pass of a front layout salto + Rudi + split jump, is the split jump the only element expected to rise, or is there a deduction for the Rudi (last salto in this pass) if it is lacking amplitude as well? (3/15/26)

A: The Rudi is still expected to have greater amplitude than the front layout salto, regardless of adding a split jump in the series. The split jump also requires appropriate amplitude.

Reference: Rules Newsletter March 1st 2026; USAG Dev Prog COP Section 5 FX – Chapter 1 General Info – VI.F.12, page FLOOR-12

6 Equipment

Q: The measurements for the Floor Exercise Field of play, 12 m x 12m with allowance of + 3cm does not mention -3cm, which is different than FIG and USAG. Is this accurate? (10/15/25)

A: Yes, this is intentional. The WCGA did not want the FX diagonals to be any smaller than what the 12m X 12m sides provide – so they set the allowance to go only up (+3cm), not down, resulting in the minimum of 1697 cm on the diagonals from the exact 12m X 12m measurement.

Reference: Rules Modifications 6.1.k, page 18.

Clarifications: July 2025 changes to USAG that are clarified as different for NCAA competitions: (11/1/25)

1. **Injury assessment** – no change to current NCAA rules. Unlike USAG, the injury assessment is a timed procedure, and the athlete may not leave the equipment area to then return later in the competition to continue her routine. *Rules Modification 1.7.*
2. **Beam end cap** – no changes to current NCAA rules. If the Beam end cap falls off the beam during any time in the routine, it is NOT considered equipment failure. *Rules Modification 6.1.h.*
3. **Floor Ex supplemental mats** – no change to current NCAA rules. Coaches may add or relocate supplemental mats during a routine performance. *Rules Modifications 6.2.d & e.*
4. **Additional Beam matting** to the right and left of each Beam dismount area is RECOMMENDED BUT NOT REQUIRED at competitions for the 2025-26 season. See the new Beam mat specifications in *Rules & Policies Chapter 10 Apparatus Specifications – IV. Balance Beam A.2, page 81*).
5. **Adding chalk/water to bars during routine** – no change to current NCAA rules. Coach or teammate may apply chalk/water to bars during a fall, within the fall time. Clarification: violation of the rule is a **0.2 TND**. *Rules Modification 6.1.o; Clarified by the WCPC.*

Q: In the Equipment Penalties Rules Modifications 6.2.f.b states that a 0.2 TND will occur for use of tape on BB. Is it permissible to place tape in an "X" shape on the BB landing mat or on the beam support leg protective padding at floor level? The assumption is that these are visual spotting cues for the gymnast. (2/1/26)

A: Tape is not permitted on landing mats, but chalk marks are permitted as a visual cue for the athlete. The markings must be removed after the athlete completes competition on that event.

Reference: USAG Women's Rules & Policies - Chapter 10 Apparatus Specs - II.B in Matting Specs, page 74.

Q: Is tape permitted on the springboard? Where are matting guidelines for landings and for vault? (2/1/26)

A: There is no rule stating that tape is not permitted on the springboard, so it is allowed. Matting specifications for vault and other equipment are found in the *USAG Women's Program Rules & Policies, Chapter 10*, starting on page 74. The specifications for the white lines on the vault mats are in *Rules Modification 2.8 and Appendix I.2.*

Q: If an equipment violation would receive a Team Neutral Deduction, is there a warning first? (3/15/26)

A: No. The equipment deductions – such as unauthorized supplemental mats or using tape on the hand placement mats – do not require a warning. The Team Neutral Deduction should be applied when it occurs in competition.

Reference: Rules Modification 6.2.f and 1.13.

Q: An 8" skill cushion mat was held at a nearly vertical angle by the coaches in a way to potentially catch an athlete during a bar release while in a competition. Would there be a deduction? (2/15/26)

A: No. A skill cushion mat can be picked up and used at an angle for safety purposes related to specific uneven bar releases in warm-up and competition without deduction. Any existing rules related to contact with the mat (raised or resting on the competition matting surface) by the competing athlete would apply in this situation as in any other.

Reference: USAG Dev Prog COP Section 3 Bars – Chapter 3 Execution – Table II, pages BARS-30-31; Clarification from the C&C Committee.

Q: If the competition venue can accommodate, may a judge move tables to get a better view? For example, on floor exercise moving the judges' tables so one judge can better see one diagonal, and the other judge the second diagonal. (2/15/26)

A: Yes, judges are permitted to move tables to a more favorable vantage point related to their responsibilities; however, this must be requested before competition begins and with the approval of both the Meet Ref and the Meet Director facilitating the event. Many factors are considered before committing to the move, such as wiring for judging software, wiring for television broadcasts, as well as equipment layout in the venue. Existing table location recommendations place judges on opposing sides on all events whenever possible. Moreover, judges' tables on floor exercise should be positioned diagonally from one another on opposing sides.

Reference: Rules Modification 8.1.a & c, Appendix III.B.1.c; Clarification from the C&C Committee.

Q: In the placement of the judges' tables in a competition, may both tables be on the same side of the equipment? (3/15/26)

A: Yes. Although table location recommendations place judges on opposing sides of all events wherever possible, there are no rules that specify where to place the judges' tables. The reason is to allow for flexibility to accommodate the different dimensions of a venue and the layout of the equipment that best fits the space. The overriding goal is to provide judges a clear view of the event area given any space limitations, and not to interfere with the space needed for an adjacent event.

Established rules that impact the set-up:

- The judges must be seated separately at different tables on the competition floor, unless impractical due to equipment placement.
- If judges must sit at the same table, they must be separated with a person (score flasher or volunteer), or with a gap between them.
- Judges are permitted to move tables to a more favorable vantage point related to their responsibilities; however, this must be requested before competition begins and with the approval of both the Meet Referee and the Meet Director facilitating the event, to ensure electronic wiring or equipment layout factors are considered.

References: Rules Modification 1.9.b and 8.1.c; Rules Newsletter Feb 15th, 2026.

7 Routine Inquiry Process

Q: As the Meet Referee in a Quad meet, there were multiple inquiries resulting in score changes which required that I notify all the Head Coaches. Given the size of the venue and the amount of activity I had as Meet Referee, I was hindered from notifying each Head Coach in a timely manner. Is there some guidance to help apply this notification rule? (2/1/26)

A: A duty of the Meet Referee is to notify the Head Coaches, at the earliest convenience, of score changes that occur after initial flashing of scores. However, if the Meet Referee is detained and not able to perform this duty in a timely manner, then the Meet Referee may ask the Meet Director to assist in completing the notifications, as needed.

Reference: Rules Mods 1.9.i, 1.13.e, and Appendix III.B.2.b&e; Clarification from the Officiating Committee

8 Meet Procedures

Clarification: Meet Procedures - Open Stretch (2/1/26)

Rules Modification 8.3.a.1 will now read: “A 20-minute open stretch, in which the athletes may stretch on the Floor Exercise mat and matting around the other equipment, as desired. In the last 5 minutes of the 20-minute open stretch period, all equipment is open to mount or use as desired. This period is immediately followed by a 2-minute transition period.”

Reference: Clarification from the Championship & Competition Committee

Q: What is permissible on a meet day walk-through? For example, when a team arrives to a competition site the day of the meet to check out the equipment, are the gymnasts allowed to mount the equipment? (2/1/26)

A: No. Prior to competition, only visualization and/or stretching activities are permitted. Matting surrounding each event (including FX itself and VT runway only) may be used for visualization, provided the equipment is not mounted or used for gymnastics-specific or inverted skills.

Reference: Rules Modification 8.3.a

Q: Our team begins on bars immediately following march-in. Would it be permissible for only the six bar competitors to have their jackets tied around their shoulders during walk-in, or would all team members need to wear jackets tied the same way? (2/15/26)

A: During regular season march-in ceremonies, if athletes who are competing on Uneven Bars for their first competitive rotation choose to wear their grips in preparation, they are permitted to adapt how they wear their uniform apparel or jackets to accommodate the grips. The athletes that choose to wear grips MUST match each other in how they wear their apparel. Those Uneven Bar competitors who choose not to wear their grips during march-in will wear their uniforms to match the rest of the team. The intent of this rule is to have the teams look their best during march-in and be as close to identical as possible.

Reference: Rules Modification 1.10.a; Clarification from the WCGA.

Q: During the waiting period after completing an event competition but before the 2-minute transition, may the coach walk over to the team’s next competitive event, if open, to set the equipment? (2/15/26)

A: Yes. However, the athletes must remain at their completed event until the 2-minute transition period is announced.

Reference: Rules Modification 8.3.b.1.a; Clarification by the C&C Committee.

Q: Can an athlete who is next to compete warm-up elements on mats of open equipment? For example, a gymnast is performing on floor, and the next athlete goes over to the beam mats (no team is currently competing on beam) to do a standing back tuck on the mats. (2/15/26)

A: Yes. During regular season competition, the 20 cm mats surrounding vault, bars, and beam, as well as the vault runway, may be used for this specific warm-up activity and is not required to be on the event where this athlete is competing. Warm-up on another event matting is only permitted if the event is open or if competition has concluded on the event for that rotation. The floor exercise or other apparatus cannot be used for this purpose. It is permissible to jump or bounce on the floor exercise; however, no elements or inverting can be performed on the floor exercise within boundaries. When possible, panel matting should be provided as an additional warm-up space and would be available with the 20 cm usage listed above. For example, a dual meet is now in the third rotation, and an athlete performing on beam goes over to use the 20 cm bar mats where competition has concluded and does a flight series. This is permitted.

Reference: Rules Modification 8.3.b.5; Clarification from the C&C Committee.

Q: Is it permitted to have more than two exhibitions at each event at a meet? Even if the judges don't judge the extra athletes? (3/1/26)

A: No. A maximum of two exhibitions per event will be permitted after the official lineup has completed competition on that event. There is no exception for absence of scoring by the judges.

Reference: Rules Modification 8.2.k; Clarification from the C&C Committee

Appendices

Change in Rule: Appendix IV: Affiliation Policy (10/15/25)

In **Appendix IV.4.d**, the specification of ****POSTSEASON ONLY**** for the affiliation rule is removed. A significant other or immediate family member of anyone that is currently a part of any NCAA women's gymnastics program, in any paid or unpaid capacity, is ineligible to judge any NCAA competitions. This change is applicable to the 2026 season. *Per vote by the WCGA Board of Directors.*

Rules Resources

The **NCAA Rules Interpreter** is Janette Doucette, email address: wgym.ncaa.rules@outlook.com. **Please submit any questions for rule interpretation by electronic mail only.** Coaches, please provide your name and institution. Judges, please provide your name and state.

The **2025-26 NCAA Rules Modification Document and Meet Procedures** direct link: [Rules Modifications 25-26](#)

Rules Newsletters and Archive are located on the [NCAA Gymnastics Rules of the Game page](#) or on the [NAWGJ NCAA Rules page](#).

The **Women's Gymnastics Supplemental Procedures and Forms document**, which contains the Inquiry /Routine Summary Form, Video Review Form, and other competition-related forms, direct link: [2026 Supplemental P&F](#).

The **USAG Women's Developmental Program Optional 2022-26 Code of Points (USAG Dev Prog COP)** is purchased at this link: [USAG Dev Prog COP](#). **This page also contains links to updated COP Appendices and Replacement Pages.**

To update your current version of the USAG Dev Prog COP follow the directions: [Google Play eBook FAQ](#). The most recent COP version cover page will show "updated Jul 2025" at the bottom.

The **Women's Program Rules & Policies 2025-26** direct link: [R&P 25-26](#).

The **new element evaluation form** can be downloaded from the USAG women's development program website under forms at [USAG New Element Eval Form](#).

FX Music approval: contact your Regional Technical Committee Chair (RTCC) ([USAG Women's Gym Directory](#)).

*Janette Doucette
NCAA Women's Gymnastics Rules Interpreter
wgym.ncaa.rules@outlook.com*