



2018 RULES INTERPRETATION NEWSLETTER #2

October 4th, 2018



NOTE: Use the following code to analyze these situations:

R = RECEIVING TEAM

R1 = RIGHT BACK
R2 = RIGHT FRONT
R3 = CENTER FRONT
R4 = LEFT FRONT
R5 = LEFT BACK
R6 = CENTER BACK

S = SERVING TEAM

S1 = RIGHT BACK
S2 = RIGHT FRONT
S3 = CENTER FRONT
S4 = LEFT FRONT
S5 = LEFT BACK
S6 = CENTER BACK

SITUATION 1: Player S10 is preparing to serve the ball. After authorization S10 bounces the ball off her foot. A member of the Team S bench tosses the ball to S10 who legally serves the ball within 8 seconds. The referee allows play to continue.

RULING: *The referee's decision is correct. The player completed a legal service regardless of a teammate tossing the ball back to S10.*

SITUATION 2: Player S10 is preparing to serve the ball. After authorization S10 bounces the ball off her foot. S10 asks the ball retriever to give her a different ball, and she legally serves the ball within 8 seconds. The referee allows play to continue.

RULING: *The referee's decision is incorrect. The referee should whistle and signal replay. Playing a "new" ball is not fair to the opponents who may be waiting for the original ball to be put into play.*

SITUATION 3: Player R3 has a towel tucked in the waistband of her uniform. As she is attempting to block, the towel touches the net. The second referee signals a net fault.

RULING: *The referee's decision is correct. The towel is considered player equipment, and it is a fault if player equipment touches the net.*

SITUATION 4: Prior to the start of the match, Coach S tells the officials that S4 has an insulin pump on the back of her arm. The coach informs the referees that the trainer will be monitoring S4's blood sugar, and she may have to be tested during the match. The referees inform the coach that a substitution must be made for S4 to be tested.

RULING: *The referees' decision is incorrect. This situation should be treated like any other injury or illness, and the player is allowed a 30-second evaluation. At the end of the 30-second evaluation, the coach has the option to take a timeout or substitute. Insulin pumps may be legally worn as long as they are padded with ½" slow rebounding foam (Rule 7.2.4.1).*

Situation 5: Player S2 tosses the ball for service, and the ball hits a basketball backboard. The first referee signals out.

Ruling: *The referee's decision is correct. A service toss that contacts an overhead obstruction is out.*

Challenge Review System (CRS) Scenarios

Situation 1: After a very long rally, Team R hits the ball in the net and Team S is awarded the rally. The Team R coach challenges that Team S was in the net. The second referee accepts the challenge and starts looking for a net from the start of the rally.

Ruling: *The referee's decision is incorrect. The second referee must come to a mutual agreement with the coach regarding the approximate play the coach believes the net fault occurred, and that is the portion of the video that is reviewed.*

Situation 2: Player S5 and S6 both attempt to play a free ball, and the first referee determines that S5 and S6 simultaneously contacted the ball. Team S uses two more contacts and sends the ball to the Team R court. The Team R coach challenges that S5 and S6 did not touch the ball simultaneously and that their contacts were consecutive. The second referee denies the challenge since it involves judgment.

Ruling: *The referee's decision is incorrect. The coach is challenging 4 hits (player touching the ball), and that is a challengeable action.*

NCAA Techniques

As we progress through the first part of the season, I'd like to highlight several technique clarifications and points of emphasis.

- With the combination this year of the challengeable decisions in/out with touch, there have been questions as to the proper post-video review signal sequence.

For example: The officials call a ball in, and a coach challenges because, in their opinion, the ball was out. If the video review shows indisputable evidence that the ball **was** out, but was touched by a defender before it landed out, what is the proper signal sequence to communicate this decision? In this case, the team winning the rally has not changed, but the "original decision" was reversed.

In order to properly communicate this, as with any original decision reversal, the second referee should face the court, whistle and **first give the new fault signal**. In the example above, the signal would be "touch". The first referee mimics the fault signal, then re-signals the team that won the rally. The second referee mimics that signal.

One way to think of this is that the "original decision" is the fault that was called, not the team that won the rally. So, any time that original decision is reversed, or found by indisputable video evidence to be incorrect, the new fault should be signaled.

- Staying with the CRS topic, please review the PAVO Officiating Manual and the checklists available on the Central Hub for the signal sequence to be used as you accept a challenge, as well as when you communicate the result of a challenge.

Remember that the challengeable decision signal to be used after the double whistle and raised fist is NOT a fault signal. You are not necessarily signaling what the challenging team wants – you are identifying a category. There is only one signal to be used for each of the five possible challengeable

decisions. These should be made with the same hand as the raised fist...on the side of the team that is challenging. To review:

- Coach challenges an In/Out decision – signal “in”
- Coach challenges whether a ball was touched – signal “touch”
- Coach challenges whether a net fault occurred – signal “net fault”
- Coach challenges whether a service line fault occurred – point at the service line on the side of the team challenging
- Coach challenges whether there was an attack line fault – signal “illegal attack”

To clarify, for a ball touching the antenna, the challengeable decision is in/out. For a player touching the antenna, the challengeable decision is net fault. For a challenge of whether or not a pancake attempt was successful, the challengeable decision is in/out. For a possible 4-hits by a team or 2-hits by the same player during separate attempts, the challengeable decision is touch.

- With the change in the intermission interval this year between sets 2 and 3, the question becomes, “Should I signal for the teams to switch courts, or just release them to the benches?”

Rules 9.2.4.2 and 9.2.4.3 cover this. So, if the interval is an extended intermission, that is more than 3 minutes, simply dismiss the teams from their courts. If the set interval is 3 minutes, give the signal to change courts.

I realize that there may be times where, even with a 5-minute intermission, the teams just change courts on their own, and that is just fine. If we give the change of courts signal, we want to enforce that procedure, and there are just too many variations with the 5-minute intermission (one team goes to the locker room and the other stays on the court, etc.) to be able to change this procedure.

First referees, remember to dialogue with your whole team as to what your intermission plan will be. It is recommended, but not required that the first referee come off of the stand between sets two and three, regardless of the intermission length. If there are on-court promotional activities during **any** of the intervals between sets, the first referee must come off the stand. If you are planning on going to the locker room during the intermission, just like at the end of the match, your plan should NOT include the first referee waiting to walk across the court with the line judges.