



REPORT OF THE
NCAA WATER POLO RULES SUBCOMMITTEE
MAY 8 -9, 2022, ANNUAL MEETING

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative items. The NCAA Water Polo Rules Subcommittee approved the following rules change proposals for the 2022-23 and 2023-24 seasons. The subcommittee requests approval from the NCAA Playing Rules Oversight Panel (PROP) for the following items:

a. Ball Description (Rule 1.16).

- (1) Recommendation. Delete the words “predominantly yellow or gold in color”. The ball would still be required to be a color that contrasts with the colors of the players’ caps and that is clearly and safely visible.
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) Rationale. This proposed change will allow for a variety of game ball designs. With this change, the colored panels will still be manufactured, but now the programs may request designs that are fitting to their distinctive school colors and logos, tournaments and events.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. New water polo balls are approximately \$30 per ball. This is a permissive rule and would not require teams to purchase new equipment.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

b. Number of Players, Illegal Player (Rule 2.1.1).

- (1) Recommendation. Add a second player entering during play wearing a goalkeeper’s cap to the definition of an illegal player.
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) Rationale. The current rule does not clearly specify that only one player in the field of play may wear a goalkeeper's cap at a time. The proposed change will clarify that point and will also clarify that a second player who enters during play while wearing a goalkeeper's cap is an illegal player.

(4) Estimated budget impact. None.

(5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

c. Referee – Control Over Conduct (Rule 3.6).

(1) Recommendation. When issuing a Yellow/Red card, the referee must follow the same procedures as required for issuing a Red card. The referee will stop play and remove the ball from the water for the issuance of the Yellow/Red card to the head coach.

(2) Effective date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. The current rule does not indicate whether play must be stopped for issuance of a Yellow/Red card. By providing a clear indication that the Yellow/Red card has been issued, there will be less confusion for coaches and scorekeepers.

(4) Estimated budget impact. None.

(5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

d. Thirty-Second Timeout (Rule 4.12).

(1) Recommendation. The defensive team will be permitted to call a 30-second timeout at the same times when the defense is permitted to call a full timeout.

(2) Effective date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. The current rule does not permit the defensive team to call a 30-second timeout. The proposed change would treat 30-second and full timeouts the same.

(4) Estimated budget impact. None.

(5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

e. Referee – Injury Timeout (New Rule 4.13).

(1) Recommendation. The referees, at their discretion, when there is a potentially injured athlete, may call an injury timeout that will not be charged against either team.

(2) Effective date. Immediate.

- (3) Rationale. The current rules do not explicitly give the referee the authority to stop play for a concern of player safety or injury.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. Positive student-athlete impact when a potential injury has occurred.

f. Goals – How Scored (Rule 4.20).

- (1) Recommendation. Add to the cases in which a player can take a direct shot following removal of the ball from the pool as follows: “When the referee stops play for a replacement of a cap or zipping up a suit following awarding of a corner throw.”
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) Rationale. In the previous rules cycle, players were permitted to shoot directly on a corner throw. If the ball is removed from the water prior to the corner throw to address cap and suit issues, the corner throw cannot be directly shot. This proposal would allow the replacement of a cap or zipping of a suit without the offense losing the benefit of being permitted to directly shoot the corner throw.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

g. Goals – How Scored (4.20.4).

- (1) Recommendation. Delete the second paragraph which states “This applies only to a foul committed by the defense. If the offense commits a foul, the throw is taken from the location of the ball when the team awarded the free throw takes possession of the ball.”
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) Rationale. This Article describes the shooting options for a player taking a free throw outside of the 6-meter line. The second paragraph means, as written, that if the offense commits a foul on the perimeter and the counter attacking player takes possession of the ball, swims down the pool one-on-goalie, the ball cannot be shot without first passing it to another player. This proposal will correct this situation.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.

(5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

h. Goals – Expiration of Time (Rule 4.21 Note 2).

(1) Recommendation. Revise Note 2 to read: “If the ball that is in flight toward the goal in the circumstances of this rule lands on the water and then crosses completely over the goal line, the referee shall award a goal only if the ball crosses the goal line due to the momentum of the shot.”

(2) Effective date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. The current Note states that the referee shall award a goal only if the ball floats over the goal line immediately due to the momentum of the shot. The use of “floats” and “immediately” is contradictory and can present issues with administering this situation.

(4) Estimated budget impact. None.

(5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

i. Leaving the Field of Play (Rule 4.25).

(1) Recommendation. Add the following language to Interpretation b to read: An excluded player who leaves the pool (walks on the deck), other than from the re-entry area following the entry of a substitute, is excluded from the remainder of the game, but not given a misconduct.

(2) Effective date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. Adding the proposed language will clarify that while an excluded player who leaves the pool prior to reaching the re-entry area is excluded from the remainder of the game, the player is not given a misconduct. The proposed language is consistent with that in Rule 7 Section 16, which states that a player who interferes with a penalty throw "shall be excluded from the remainder of the game (but not given a misconduct)."

(4) Estimated budget impact. None.

(5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

j. Keeping the Ball Without Shooting – Women’s Shot Clock (Rule 6.15).

- (1) Recommendation. Reduce the length of the women's shot clock from 0:35 to 0:30.
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) Rationale. A reduction in the women's shot clock will reduce the opportunity for holding and grabbing that occurs.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

k. Simulation (Rule 7.10).

- (1) Recommendation. Change the penalty for Simulation from a turnover when on offense and an exclusion foul when on defense to a team Yellow card for the first offense by each team. Subsequent calls for simulation on that team will be considered a Minor Act of Misconduct by the offending player.
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) Rationale. The Water Polo Rules Subcommittee believes that the penalty for simulating or faking a foul is currently not balanced between the offense and the defense. Under this proposal the first violation by a team will result in a warning to the entire team. If a team continues, the offending player(s) will receive a MAM. The procedure and penalty will be the same for both the offense and the defense.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

l. Misconduct (Rule 7.11.1).

- (1) Recommendation. Eliminate the word "deliberate" in reference to elbowing to the head, face, or neck, or headbutting an opponent.
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) Rationale. The proposed change will provide a better definition of Misconduct and, coupled with changes to the language in 7.13.1, better distinguish it from Flagrant Misconduct.

(4) Estimated budget impact. None.

(5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

m. Minor Acts of Misconduct (Rule 7.12.1).

(1) Recommendation. Change the article to read “An exclusion foul with a 20-second period of exclusion will be awarded for minor acts of misconduct (MAM) that are not sufficient to warrant exclusion of the remainder of the game. Minor Acts of Misconduct are for players directing minor comments or gestures toward the referee. Minor taunting, gestures, shoving, pushing or sinking a member of the opposing team or simulation are considered example of Minor Acts of Misconduct.”

(2) Effective date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. This change provides a clearer description of a MAM, better distinguishing it from a regular exclusion foul and a misconduct foul.

(4) Estimated budget impact. None.

(5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

n. Minor Acts of Misconduct (Rule 7.12.6).

(1) Recommendation. Add language to the end of Article 6 to read as follows: If a player receives a second minor act of misconduct in the same game, the player will be excluded for the remainder of the game but not given a misconduct.

(2) Effective date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. Adding the proposed language will clarify that while a second minor act of misconduct will result in exclusion from the remainder of the game, the player is not given a full misconduct. The proposed language is consistent with that in Rule 7 Section 16, which states that a player who interferes with a penalty throw "shall be excluded from the remainder of the game (but not given a misconduct)."

(4) Estimated budget impact. None.

(5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

o. Flagrant Misconduct, Including Fighting (Rule 7.13.1).

- (1) Recommendation. Change the words “with malicious intent” to “with malicious and deliberate intent”.
- (2) Effective date. Immediate.
- (3) Rationale. The proposed language provides more clarity to help distinguish Flagrant Misconduct from Misconduct.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. Minimal impact.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Welcome and announcements.** The chair of the Water Polo Rules Subcommittee welcomes the subcommittee members and invited guests and thanked them for their time.
2. **Review of agenda and committee procedures.** The meeting schedule and agenda were reviewed. The Subcommittee also reviewed the subcommittee procedures, which included the NCAA conflict of interest policy, guidance for subcommittee members regarding meeting reports, notes and email, voting procedures, principles for rules writing, and experimental playing rules guidelines. The Subcommittee was reminded of the directive of the PROP from 2014. This directive encourages all rules committees to strongly consider providing at least a one-year delay for Division II and Division III institutions before implementing any rules changes that have financial or facility implications.
3. **Approval of the 2021 annual meeting report.** The Subcommittee reviewed and approved the report as written.
4. **National coordinator of officials’ report.** The Subcommittee heard a report from the national coordinator of officials, which included an overview of selections for both the men’s and women’s NCAA National Collegiate Championships and an update on the continuing education and training efforts being provided to officials through the NCAA central hub on ArbiterSports.
5. **Secretary-rules editor report.** The Subcommittee heard a report from the secretary-rules editor, which included an overview of interpretations from the 2021-22 seasons. A summary was also provided of major rules proposals and survey results.
6. **Review of 2022 rules survey.** The Subcommittee reviewed the 2022 rules survey results in conjunction with the discussion of the corresponding rules change proposal. It was noted that

the response rate was below 50% among all groups surveyed, except conference commissioners.

7. **Review of proposed rules changes and revisions.** The Subcommittee reviewed and considered 31 rules proposals and approved 15 rules change for the 2022-23 and 2023-24 men's and women's water polo seasons, as noted above in the Action Items section of this report. In addition, the subcommittee discussed the potential of an experimental rule regarding a significant change to the Advantage rule (Rule 3.5). The subcommittee requested that the secretary-rules editor and national coordinator of officials work with representatives from the water polo coaches' association to identify specific language and officiating mechanics for the subcommittee to review over the next academic year. The subcommittee anticipates considering an experimental rule during the 2023 annual meeting.
8. **Selection of new chair.** The Subcommittee selected Nikola Malezanov, Washington and Jefferson College, as chair for the 2022-23 academic year.
9. **Future meeting schedule.**
10. **Adjournment.** The Water Polo Rules Subcommittee adjourned at 10 a.m. Eastern time on Monday, May 9.

Committee Chair: Ted Minnis, Harvard University

Staff Liaison(s): Ben Brownlee, Championships and Alliances, Playing Rules and Officiating

Water Polo Rules Subcommittee May 8-9, 2022, Annual Meeting	
Attendees:	
David Alberstein, Secretary-Rules Editor.	
Andy Fee, Long Beach State University.	
Nikola Malezanov, Washington and Jefferson College.	
Ted Minnis, Harvard University.	
Erica Monteabaro, University of California, Irvine.	
Daniel Teliski, Gannon University.	
Chris Vidale, Marist College.	
Absentees:	
None.	
Guests in Attendance:	
Amber Drury, national coordinator of officials.	
Ross Spiritosanto, active official.	
Brad Walker, America East Conference, Playing Rules Oversight Panel.	

NCAA Staff Liaison (or Staff Support if subcommittee) in Attendance:
Ben Brownlee.
Other NCAA Staff Members in Attendance:
None.