



**REPORT OF THE  
NCAA DIVISION I MEN’S ICE HOCKEY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
JUNE 24, 2026, VIDEOCONFERENCE**

**ACTION ITEMS.**

- **Recommendation to NCAA Division I Cabinet – Application of NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2025-35.** The NCAA Division I Men’s Ice Hockey Oversight Committee reviewed a recommendation from the NCAA Division I Men’s Ice Hockey Rules Subcommittee to introduce legislation that would modify Division I Proposal No. 2025-35, to permit, in ice hockey, an institution to place an additional commercial trademark or logo on student-athlete helmets (mirrored placement). As an amendment to the Ice Hockey Rules Subcommittee recommendation, the Men’s Ice Hockey Oversight Committee requests Division I Cabinet consider a modification to Proposal No. 2025-35 that maintains the limit of three commercial trademarks or logos, but eliminates the item specific limits (i.e., two logos on apparel/uniform and one logo on equipment). This recommendation would allow each sport to determine the proper placement of commercial logos based on sport-specific market trends and promotes institutional discretion and decision-making.

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.**

1. **Division I Men’s Ice Hockey Rules Subcommittee Playing Rules Proposals.** The Men’s Ice Hockey Oversight Committee reviewed and adopted 31 playing rules proposals developed by the Division I Men’s Ice Hockey Rules Subcommittee. Additional information related to the proposals and committee actions can be found in the attachment.
2. **Women’s Ice Hockey Annual Meeting Update.** The Men’s Ice Hockey Oversight Committee received an update on the Women’s Ice Hockey Committee’s annual meeting on June 22-23.
3. **Future meetings.**
  - TBD

*Committee Chair: Timothy Troville, Harvard University*

*Staff Liaisons: Travis Johnston, NCAA Division I Governance and Member Services  
Chad Tolliver, NCAA Championships and Alliances*

<b>NCAA Division I Men’s Ice Hockey Oversight Committee June 24, 2026, Videoconference</b>
<b>Attendees:</b>
Frank Cole, NCAA rules-editor.
Jeff Fulton, officials coordinator.
Blake James, Boston College; Hockey East.
Forrest Karr, American Hockey Coaches Association.
Chris Melde, Michigan State University; Big Ten Conference.
Josh Richelew, University of Michigan; Big Ten Conference.

William Riga, College of the Holy Cross; Atlantic Hockey America (alternate).
Josh Berlo, University of Denver; National Collegiate Hockey Conference.
Luke Strand, University of Minnesota Mankato; Central Collegiate Hockey Association.
Timothy Troville, Harvard University; ECAC.
Thomas Weis, Ohio State University; Big Ten Conference.
<b>Absentees:</b>
Rick Gotkin, Mercyhurst University; Atlantic Hockey America.
Scott Sandelin, University of Minnesota Duluth; National Collegiate Hockey Conference.
<b>Invited Guest(s):</b>
Steve Metcalf; Hockey East.
<b>NCAA Staff Liaisons in Attendance:</b>
Travis Johnston and Chad Tolliver.
<b>Other NCAA Staff Members in Attendance:</b>
Paden Ali and Ty Halpin.

## 2026 and 2027 Ice Hockey Rules Recommendations for Comment



#	Rule	Recommendation and Rationale	DI M	DI W	DIII M	DIII W
		Section 1				
1	Rule 3.1 Player's Benches	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> The accommodations provided, including bench height and number of doors must be similar for both teams.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> Uniform bench and access-door accommodations for both teams preserve the principles of fairness, neutrality, and consistent game operations.</p>	X	X	X	X
		Section 2				
2	Rule 7.2 Starting Lineups	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> If the team that scores a goal on the first shift of the game challenges the starting line-up of the opposing team and the opposing team did not have the correct starting line-up, the scoring of the goal would nullify the bench minor penalty, and no further penalties would be assessed.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> The combination of disallowing the goal and assessing a bench minor restores competitive fairness while emphasizing the importance of proper pregame procedures.</p>	X	X	X	X
		Section 3				
3	Rule 9.3 Protective Equipment	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Require that all players wear cut-resistant protection on the neck, wrist, and socks beginning with the 27-28 season for Division I and 28-29 for Division III.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> The adoption of mandatory cut-resistant protection standards reflects the continued emphasis on student-athlete safety and injury prevention.</p>	X	X	X	X
4	Rule 9.4 Helmets	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> A player who intentionally removes their helmet during play will be assessed a minor penalty. If a goalkeeper intentionally removes their helmet and/or facemask when the opposing team is on a breakaway, a goal will be awarded to the non-offending team.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> This rule reinforces the importance of mandatory protective equipment and promotes player safety by prohibiting the</p>	X	X	X	X

#	Rule	Recommendation and Rationale	DI M	DI W	DIII M	DIII W
		intentional removal of helmets during live play. In addition, the automatic goal provision for goalkeepers who deliberately remove their helmet and/or facemask during an opposing breakaway preserves competitive fairness by eliminating the opportunity to intentionally create a stoppage of play to negate a clear scoring opportunity.				
		Section 4				
5	Rule 19 Coincidental Penalties	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> During the last five minutes of regulation or at any time in overtime, when a minor penalty is assessed to a player of Team A, and a major penalty is assessed to one player of Team B at the same stoppage of play, the three minute (or one minute, if A is serving a double minor) differential shall be served immediately.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> During the final five minutes of regulation and at any time in overtime, the immediate serving of the differential between coincidental penalties ensures that the penalized team does not gain an unintended advantage through penalty timing administration.</p>	X	X	X	X
6	Rule 20 Major Penalties	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> A second major penalty in the same game is an automatic game misconduct.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> Major penalties are reserved for serious infractions. When a player commits a second major foul in the same game, the automatic game misconduct reflects the seriousness of repeated dangerous actions and helps protect player safety</p>	X	X	X	X
7	Rule 28.2 Major or Misconduct Penalty to Goalkeeper	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> A goalkeeper shall not be sent to the penalty bench for an offense which incurs a major penalty.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> Goalkeepers occupy a unique role with specialized equipment and substitution requirements. Having another player serve the major penalty maintains the full penalty consequence</p>	X	X	X	X

#	Rule	Recommendation and Rationale	DI M	DI W	DIII M	DIII W
		without unnecessarily disrupting game flow or creating avoidable safety and administrative issues.				
8	Rule 28.4 Goalkeeper's Privileged Area	<b>Recommendation:</b> Remove the Goalkeeper's Privileged Area.  <b>Rationale:</b> Obsolete rule in most other levels of hockey	X		X	
9	New Rule 28.4 Trapezoid	<b>Recommendation:</b> Establish the Goalkeeper's Trapezoid  <b>Rationale:</b> The trapezoid is designed to create more contested puck situations and encourage offensive pressure. Restricting where goalkeepers can handle the puck behind the net prevents teams from neutralizing forechecks too easily and helps generate more sustained offensive-zone play.	X		X	
<b>Section 6</b>						
10	Rule 47.1 Face Masks	<b>Recommendation:</b> Add other helmet openings to the foul of Face Mask.  <b>Rationale:</b> Expanding the rule beyond the traditional face mask improves safety, creates more consistent enforcement, and addresses dangerous actions that can place stress on the head and neck area.		X		X
11	Rule 48.1 Fighting	<b>Recommendation:</b> Edit the definition of fighting to be "one player punches or attempts to punch an opponent repeatedly". Singular punches to be penalized as roughing. <i>In the Women's game only:</i> A major penalty of roughing to be permissive for a "sucker punch".  <b>Rationale:</b> This change draws a clearer line between a fight and a single act of punching, so officials can apply penalties more consistently. Repeated punches remain fighting, while a single punch is treated as roughing. In the women's game, a "sucker punch" is treated more severely due to the elevated safety risk and lack of opportunity for response or self-defense.	X	X	X	X
12	Rule 49 Head-Butting	<b>Recommendation:</b> Allow a minor penalty to be called for an attempted head-butt or a head-butt that is not done forcibly. Reserve	X	X	X	X

#	Rule	Recommendation and Rationale	DI M	DI W	DIII M	DIII W
		<p>the Major and Game Misconduct penalty for a forcible or egregious head-butt.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> This change creates a clearer penalty scale for head-butting. Minor penalties apply to attempts or non-forceful contact, while more severe, intentional head-butting actions continue to carry major and game misconduct penalties. The goal is more consistent enforcement and better alignment between the severity of the act and the penalty assessed.</p>				
13	Rule 50 Checking From Behind	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Remove “in open ice” from the checking from behind rule.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> The revision simplifies penalty application for officials by eliminating discretion between a minor and major standard on checking-from-behind fouls. Officials can utilize other fouls such as “charging” for open ice hits from behind when warranted.</p>	X	X	X	X
14	Rule 53.3 Hitting after the Whistle	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Eliminate “hitting after the whistle”, classify this contact as roughing or unsportsmanlike conduct, when it occurs.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> Contact occurring after the whistle is typically retaliatory, unnecessary, or confrontational in nature and more appropriately fits within existing categories that already address avoidable physical altercations and player behavior.</p>	X	X	X	X
15	Rule 55.5 Throwing the Stick	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Change the penalty for throwing the stick outside the playing area from a Misconduct to a Game Misconduct.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> Reinforces the emphasis on player safety and sportsmanship by addressing behavior that presents unnecessary risk to participants, fans and officials.</p>	X	X	X	X

#	Rule	Recommendation and Rationale	DI M	DI W	DIII M	DIII W
16	Rule 55 Goalkeeper Leaving Stick	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> If a goalkeeper, upon leaving the ice, leaves the stick or other equipment, or piles snow that stops an imminent goal, a goal shall be awarded.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> Similar to existing awarded-goal provisions for fouls committed during clear scoring opportunities, this revision restores equity when an imminent goal is prevented through illegal tactics rather than legal play.</p>	X	X	X	X
Section 7						
17	Rule 59.1 Interference	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> When any member of the defending team, including the Coach or any non-playing person, throws or shoots any part of a stick or any other object or piece of equipment at the puck or puck carrier in his defending zone, a penalty shot shall be awarded.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> This rule addresses deliberate actions involving the use of abandoned or broken equipment, or other debris, to interfere with the puck or puck carrier. Assessing a penalty shot provides a strong deterrent against this behavior and ensures that a clear scoring opportunity is restored when an infraction directly impacts play.</p>	X		X	
Section 8						
18	Rule 64.4 High Sticking	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Permit high sticking the puck anywhere on the ice.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> This change removes the stoppage when a player plays the puck with a high stick. The focus is on keeping the game flowing and rewarding skill, while still maintaining strict penalties for any high sticking that involves contact with another player.</p>		X		X
Section 9						
19	New Rule Delay of Game	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> In the event that the puck is shot into the end zone by the attacking team from their own side of the center red line,</p>	X	X	X	X

#	Rule	Recommendation and Rationale	DI M	DI W	DIII M	DIII W
		<p>and the opposing goalkeeper freezes the puck resulting in a stoppage of play, the ensuing face-off shall be conducted at one of the end zone face-off spots in the goalkeeper's defending zone.</p> <p>The defending team shall not be permitted to make any player substitutions prior to the face-off. However, a team shall be permitted to make a player substitution to replace an injured player, or when a penalty has been assessed which affects the on-ice strength of either team.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> This rule is designed to keep the game moving and prevent teams from using a goalie freeze as a way to slow play or gain a line change advantage. The face-off location rewards territorial pressure, and limiting substitutions ensures the defending team cannot use the stoppage for strategic rest unless it's for injury or penalties.</p>				
20	Rule 79.5 Spitting	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Spitting to be penalized as a Game Disqualification.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> Spitting is treated as an immediate removal offense because it presents both a health risk and a serious sportsmanship issue. The penalty reflects zero tolerance for conduct that endangers others and is considered fundamentally unacceptable in the game.</p>	X	X	X	X
<b>Section 10</b>						
21	Rule 81 Faceoffs	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Require that the blade of the stick is flat on the ice during faceoffs.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> This creates a consistent standard for all faceoffs and removes tactics like angling or lifting the blade to gain an advantage. It makes enforcement clearer for officials and ensures a fair, repeatable faceoff procedure in every situation.</p>	X		X	
22	Rule 86.1 Offside	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> A player must control the puck with their stick prior to their skates going into the offensive zone.</p>	X	X	X	X

#	Rule	Recommendation and Rationale	DI M	DI W	DIII M	DIII W
		<b>Rationale:</b> The goal is to make zone entries more controlled and less based on skating through a loose puck. Players must clearly possess the puck with their stick before entering the offensive zone, which helps reduce offside confusion and encourages more structured offensive play.				
23	Rule 84.2 Hand Pass	<b>Recommendation:</b> Permit hand passes that are initiated and completed in the defensive zone.  <b>Rationale:</b> The rule is designed to reduce stoppages for technical infractions that do not create a competitive advantage in dangerous areas, while improving flow and defensive-zone problem-solving.	X	X	X	X
24	Rule 84.2 High Stick	<b>Recommendation:</b> When a high-sticking the puck violation by the defensive team in the defensive zone, a change of players will be permitted by the offending team.  <b>Rationale:</b> Prevent the defense from stopping long attacking zone possessions by playing the stick with a high puck, in order to change lines.	X			
25	Rule 84.3/84.4 Faceoff Location following hand pass or high stick	<b>Recommendation:</b> The faceoff location following a hand pass or high stick violation will take place at the faceoff dot nearest the point of the infraction with the least territorial advantage gained.  <b>Rationale:</b> This approach minimizes disproportionate territorial penalties for non-penalty infractions, improves consistency in officiating decisions, and supports continuous play.	X	X	X	X
26	Rule 92.2 Timeout	<b>Recommendation:</b> You may not use your timeout if your team is not allowed to change players due to an infraction.  <b>Rationale:</b> Allowing a timeout in such situations would undermine the competitive consequence of the infraction by enabling a reset of lineup conditions.	X			
27	Rule 92.2 Timeout	<b>Recommendation:</b> Eliminate the additional timeout in overtime during the regular season.	X		X	

#	Rule	Recommendation and Rationale	DI M	DI W	DIII M	DIII W
		<b>Rationale:</b> This change keeps overtime moving by reducing stoppages. Teams still retain their regulation timeout, but no extra timeout is added in overtime, encouraging quicker resolution and more continuous play during the extra period.				
28	Rule 92.2 Timeout	<b>Recommendation:</b> Only one timeout will be permitted per stoppage, regardless of which team has called the timeout.  <b>Rationale:</b> This prevents both teams from using multiple timeouts during the same stoppage to extend delays. It keeps the game moving while still allowing each team reasonable opportunity to use timeouts strategically within separate stoppages.	X			
29	Rule 91.2 Shootout	<b>Recommendation:</b> Eliminate the mandatory shootout at the end of extra periods. Defer procedure to conference policy. In non-conference games, the policy of the home team’s conference will be followed. In neutral site games, the policy of the designated home team or in-season tournament will be followed.  <b>Rationale:</b> This change gives conferences control over how games are decided after overtime, whether that is a tie, extended overtime, or a shootout.		X		X
		Section 11				
30	Rule 93.4 Coaches Challenge	<b>Recommendation:</b> Allow a coach to challenge when a minor penalty for goalkeeper interference and the goal is disallowed.  <b>Rationale:</b> Permitting a coach’s challenge for disallowed goals due to goalkeeper interference introduces an additional layer of review for one of the most subjective goal review categories. The provision is designed to improve accuracy in determining whether interference materially affected the goalkeeper’s ability to play their position	X	X	X	X
31	Rule 93.4.c Coaches Challenge	<b>Recommendation:</b> Require a coaches challenge for an unobserved act that would lead to a major penalty of a player.	X	X		

#	Rule	Recommendation and Rationale	DI M	DI W	DIII M	DIII W
		<b>Rationale:</b> This change ensures that if an act was not directly observed by officials, it must be initiated through a coach’s challenge and confirmed via video before a player is removed.				
32	Rule 93.4 Coaches Challenge	<b>Recommendation:</b> Permit only one coaches challenge per stoppage by the same team.  <b>Rationale:</b> Reduces the potential for compounded delays arising from sequential reviews initiated by the same team during a single stoppage, while still allowing meaningful access to video review for eligible situations.	X		X	
33	Rule 93.7 Video Review	<b>Recommendation:</b> Require all goals be cleared in NCAA Tournament games.  <b>Rationale:</b> Every goal in the NCAA Tournament would be automatically reviewed before being confirmed. The goal is to eliminate missed calls in the most important games of the season and ensure that all scoring plays are validated consistently using available video evidence.		X		X
		Section 12				
34	Rule 94 Body Checking	<b>Recommended Change:</b> Restructure Rule 94 to provide clarity on legal body contact and illegal body checking. Guidance will be provided to allow legal contact on parallel pursuits, end-wall pursuits, forward angling, corner defense, and 50/50 puck battles. Illegal methods continue to include overt extension of the shoulder, arm or torso, opposite direction hits, and driving through opponents.  <b>Rationale:</b> This rule language update is intended to improve the consistency and clarity of the body contact standard in women’s ice hockey. The revision better defines legal competitive contact associated with angling, positioning, puck pursuit, and contested puck battles while continuing to prohibit deliberate body checking and forceful physical play.		X		X

#	Rule	Recommendation and Rationale	DI M	DI W	DIII M	DIII W
		<p>The updated language with situations provides officials, coaches, and players with clearer guidance regarding acceptable body contact, particularly in transition play, puck retrievals, and contested possession situations where incidental or competitive contact is expected.</p> <p>This clarification supports more uniform rule enforcement nationally while maintaining the women’s game’s emphasis on skill, puck possession, positioning, and player safety.</p>				
		Appendices				
35	Appendix B Shootout	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> All players are eligible to participate in the shootout unless they are serving a 10-minute misconduct or have been assessed a game-misconduct or Disqualification penalty.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> This change makes shootouts more about the full roster available at the end of the game. Players are only excluded if they are serving a major disciplinary penalty or have been removed from the game, ensuring coaches can use their best available players for this deciding format.</p>	X	X	X	X
		Other				
36	Exhibition Games	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Define exhibition games and require that all NCAA Ice Hockey Rules will be followed in these formats.</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> Exhibition games are still NCAA games in terms of rules. Even though they don’t count toward standings, they must be played under the full NCAA rulebook so that players, coaches, and officials are operating under the same standards as regular-season and tournament competition.</p>	X	X	X	X