



MEMORANDUM

November 1, 2024

VIA EMAIL

TO: NCAA Men's and Women's Ice Hockey Conference Commissioners, Coaches and Officials

FROM: Jeff Fulton, secretary-rules editor
NCAA Men's and Women's Ice Hockey Rules Committee.

SUBJECT: Video Review Situations: Coach Challenge Guidance

This communication is in response to several situations involving video replay and the rules change approved for this season that limits some aspects of reviews. The intent by the rules committee is to be efficient with video replay and balance that with correcting the most important decisions in the game.

Background: Recent Rule Change on Video Review

As a reminder, as part of the 2024-26 rule adjustments, the committee **removed** the following provision from the video review criteria:

"When any aspect of the video replay criteria is challenged, the referee can utilize all aspects of the review criteria for that specific situation to be judged (e.g., a high stick is challenged, but the video shows the puck was kicked into the goal)."

This means a play challenged for goaltender interference, for example, may no longer be reviewed for an offside infraction or other violation within the same sequence.

Rationale:

The committee removed this provision to align with the increased use of video coaches and the unlimited coach challenges now available. The committee believes it is important to efficiently conduct reviews on what was challenged and not prolong games with lengthy reviews.

Relevant Rule References

Rule 93.7 - Coach's Challenge Requirements: To initiate a challenge, a coach must:

- **Identify** the specific video replay criteria they wish to be reviewed.
- In situations where a review is being conducted to determine if a player will be ejected, officials will have all options available to enforce after the review (no penalty, minor, major, game misconduct, disqualification).

Pre-Season Video Guidance (video mark - 19:55):

"A team must be specific in nature of the challenge. Coach's initiating a coach's challenge must provide to the referee with reasonable specificity the reason for their challenge both the reason for their challenge for example the actual infraction that is being claimed and the approximate time on the clock when the reports infractions transpired."

The rules committee is clarifying and sharing some examples in this document. It is important to note that there is a difference between the scoring of a goal and a challenge to review contact that may result in a major penalty and ejection of a player. Challenges must be specific with regard to the scoring of a goal; the challenge must be specific to the overall contact being considered, but not the type of penalty (e.g., contact to the head vs. hitting from behind). The examples below are intended to clarify application of the new rules for this year.

Situations and Guidance

Situation 1:

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/cd8j59ylb6rrqn3d84aqw/2024-02-24-Cornell-Clarkson-Goaltender-Int-Challenge-missed-hand-pass.mov?rlkey=eizpuqu3f59jtb1vhkz5rjw8s&st=7fm0jqm3&dl=0>

- **Details:** Coaches challenge by the team in red for goaltender interference on the play. After reviewing the play, the officials ruled there was no goaltender interference and allowed the goal to stand.
- **Question:** If the officials review the play and notice there was a missed game stoppage for a hand pass off the faceoff, should the goal be disallowed?
- **Answer: NO.** Since the challenge was specifically for Goaltender Interference, officials are not permitted to go back and review the faceoff or any other aspect of the play. The red team coach may initiate a separate challenge for Missed Game Stoppage, however, before play resumes.

Situation 2:

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/h3svbpp65n56u44stnib5/2024-10-28-Syr-Qu-Cth-5-Gm.mov?rlkey=3jihv6pfmdjgfir17q6hq7g4d&st=8w0o8hnc&dl=0>

- **Details:** On this play Officials initially called a minor penalty for Checking from Behind (CFB). The gold team coach challenged the play, requesting a review for a major penalty for Contact to the Head (CTH).
- **Question:** If officials review the play and determine there was no contact to the head, are they allowed to assess a 5-minute/game penalty for HFB instead?
- **Answer: YES.** Even though the challenge was specifically for Contact to the Head, officials can judge that specific hit/contact for a major penalty or higher. This is considered a successful coach's challenge.

Situation 3:

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/j9co0gymhlaqm9n4bfmli/MSU-Major-Elbowing-1730229087483.mp4?rlkey=7r4ooi7jnupgb38zo61ycf79h&e=1&st=kl3jp6nb&dl=0>

- **Details:** Officials initially called a minor penalty for Elbowing. The coach of the team with dark jerseys challenged the call, requesting a review for a major penalty for Contact to the Head.

NCAA MEMORANDUM

November 1, 2024

Page No. 3

- **Question:** If, upon review, officials determine that it qualifies as a major for Elbowing rather than a major/game for CTH, can they assess only the major for Elbowing?
- **Answer: YES.** Since that specific hit was deemed to be a major penalty or greater it can be labeled differently than what the coach specifically challenged. Additionally, as a reminder, there is no “major-only” option for Contact to the Head. Options are a minor, Major/GM, or Major/DQ. This is considered a successful coach’s challenge.

JF:th

cc: NCAA Registered Officials and Coordinators of Officials
Selected NCAA Staff Members