



## 2014 NCAA Men's and Women's Ice Hockey Survey: Executive Summary

### PURPOSE

Per the request of the NCAA Ice Hockey Rules Committee, a survey was developed to obtain feedback from head men's and women's lacrosse coaches from all sponsoring NCAA member institutions, as well as officials, coordinators of officials, and conference commissioners in regards to current rules, the possible rule changes. The results from this survey seek to provide the committee with detailed information on the respondents' opinions regarding current and potential men's and women's ice hockey rules.

### RESPONSE RATE

	n	N	Response Rate by Position
Head Coach (Men & Women)	104	218	47.7%
Commissioner	6	14	42.9%
Coordinator of Officials	11	18	61.1%
Officials	233	517	45.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>767</b>	<b>46.2%</b>

### RESPONSE CHARACTERISTICS

	n	%
Head Coach (Men)	70	19.8
Head Coach (Women)	34	9.6
Commissioner	6	1.7
Coordinator of Officials	11	3.1
Officials	233	65.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>100.0</b>

	Division I	Division III
Head Coach (Men)	47.8%	52.2%
Head Coach (Women)	52.9%	47.1%
Commissioner	50.0%	50.0%
Coordinator of Officials	54.5%	45.5%

	Division I (Men)	Division I (Women)	Division III (Men)	Division III (Women)
Officials	37.8%	18.0%	28.3%	15.9%

2014 NCAA Men's and Women's Ice Hockey Rules Survey:  
Executive Summary

**MAJOR FINDINGS**

\*Note: The following tables show responses of the majority (more than 50%).

	<b>STRONGLY SUPPORT / SUPPORT</b>	<b>LIMITED SUPPORT / NO SUPPORT</b>	<b>TOTAL CONSENSUS</b>
<b><i>When asked to indicate their level of support in regard to the following previous rule changes and state of the game, the following responses were submitted by the various groups:</i></b>			
<i>Allowing Video Reviews of Offsides. Allows video review of Too Many Men and Offsides that directly lead to a goal for possible overturn.</i>	Coach (Women) 61.7% Coordinators 54.6% Officials 67.8%	Coach (Men) 50.7% Commissioners 83.3%	Strongly Support / Support 62.3%
<i>Scoring Chances. Have recent rules revisions led to additional scoring chances?</i>	Coach (Men) 60.6% Commissioners 60.0% Officials 67.5%	Coach (Women) 51.6%	Strongly Support / Support 63.8%
<b><i>When asked to indicate their level of support in regard to the following proposals, the following responses were submitted by the various groups:</i></b>			
<i>Overtime. To alter the number of players during overtime to 4-on-4.</i>	Coach (Women) 51.5% Coordinators 81.8% Officials 92.2%	Coach (Men) 61.4% Commissioners 66.6%	Strongly Support / Support 76.3%
<i>Overtime. To extend the overtime period (to be determined how much time).</i>		Coach (Men) 58.6% Coach (Women) 75.7% Commissioners 83.3% Coordinators 54.6% Officials 60.6%	Limited Support / No Support 61.8%
<i>Shootouts. To continue to allow shootouts by mutual consent?</i>	Officials 64.5%	Coach (Women) 58.8% Commissioners 66.7% Coordinators 81.8%	Strongly Support / Support 57.4%
<i>Penalty enforcement. Do you support removing most disqualification penalties (with the exception of fighting, etc.)?</i>	Coach (Men) 51.4% Coordinators 54.6% Officials 58.4%	Coach (Women) 64.7% Commissioners 100.0%	Strongly Support / Support 53.7%
<i>Penalty enforcement. Do you support removing the mandatory 3-game misconduct rule and instead make the rule require that a conference review be conducted when a student-athlete reaches a third.</i>	Coach (Men) 71.4% Coach (Women) 61.7% Coordinators 63.6% Officials 70.8%	Commissioners 83.3%	Strongly Support / Support 69.0%

2014 NCAA Men's and Women's Ice Hockey Rules Survey:  
Executive Summary

	STRONGLY SUPPORT / SUPPORT	LIMITED SUPPORT / NO SUPPORT	TOTAL CONSENSUS
<b><i>When asked to indicate their level of support in regard to the following proposals, the following responses were submitted by the various groups:</i></b>			
<i>Video Review: Penalty enforcement. In games where video replay is available, game officials may review major penalties POSTGAME to determine if a game misconduct or DQ is appropriate.</i>	Coach (Men) 75.7% Coach (Women) 51.5% Officials 67.0%	Commissioners 60.0% Coordinators 81.9%	Strongly Support / Support 65.4%
<i>Video Review: Penalty enforcement. In games where video replay is available, game officials may review major penalties IMMEDIATELY to determine if a game misconduct or DQ is appropriate. Major penalty would stand regardless.</i>		Coach (Men) 64.3% Coach (Women) 61.8% Commissioners 83.4% Coordinators 81.8% Officials 54.8%	Limited Support / No Support 58.7%
<i>Video Review: Penalty enforcement. In games where video replay is available, conference offices may request a review of an independent panel to consider removing a Game Misconduct or DQ.</i>	Coach (Men) 67.1% Coach (Women) 61.7%	Coordinators 54.6% Officials 56.2%	Strongly Support / Support 50.5%
<i>Number of players allowed. Proposal is to increase the number of players to participate in the game to be 21 players total (including 2 or 3 goalkeepers at a team's choice).</i>	Coach (Men) 55.7% Coach (Women) 63.6% Coordinators 63.7% Officials 67.6%		Strongly Support / Support 64.4%
<i>Experimental Rule. Should the committee allow play to continue experimentally, only in situations when the puck is in one of the offensive zones (e.g., neutral zone puck shot out of play would be a whistle).</i>		Coach (Men) 82.6% Coach (Women) 91.2% Commissioners 80.0% Coordinators 72.7% Officials 76.3%	Limited Support / No Support 78.9%

2014 NCAA Men's and Women's Ice Hockey Rules Survey:  
Executive Summary

	STRONGLY SUPPORT / SUPPORT	LIMITED SUPPORT / NO SUPPORT	TOTAL CONSENSUS
<b><i>When asked to indicate their level of support in regard to the following proposals, the following responses were submitted by the various groups:</i></b>			
<i>Faceoff Location. Should the committee change the rule when a puck is deflected out of play of an attacking player to keep the faceoff in the attacking zone?</i>	Commissioners 80.0%	Coach (Men) 51.4% Coach (Women) 79.4% Coordinators 54.5% Officials 75.0%	Limited Support / No Support 69.3%
<i>Faceoffs dropping the puck. Allow linesmen to present the puck; current mechanic is to drop the puck from the bellline.</i>	Coach (Men) 97.1% Coach (Women) 87.6% Commissioners 80.0% Coordinators 81.8% Officials 76.5%		Strongly Support / Support 81.9%
<i>Faceoff locations. All faceoffs would be conducted at one of five locations. Neutral zone dots no longer used.</i>	Commissioners 60.0%	Coach (Men) 81.4% Coach (Women) 97.1% Coordinators 54.5% Officials 72.0%	Limited Support / No Support 75.3%
<i>Faceoff markings. Move the lines further apart for the wingers. Rationale: Will limit prewhistle contact and will provide some opportunities for spacing/set plays on faceoffs.</i>	Commissioners 80.0% Officials 54.6%	Coach (Women) 58.9% Coordinators 60.0%	Limited Support / No Support 52.3%
<i>Faceoffs after non-change situation. Do you support Stronglyer enforcement of delay of game penalties to curb this action? Guidance would be for officials to warn a team and then issue bench minor penalties for each subsequent delay.</i>	Coach (Men) 61.4% Commissioners 80.0% Coordinators 81.8% Officials 76.0%		Strongly Support / Support 70.8%
<i>Shootouts. Would you support allowing one player to take multiple shots during a shootout?</i>		Coach (Men) 82.9% Coach (Women) 76.5% Commissioners 100.0% Coordinators 81.8% Officials 67.9%	Limited Support / No Support 72.8%

2014 NCAA Men's and Women's Ice Hockey Rules Survey:  
Executive Summary

	STRONGLY SUPPORT / SUPPORT	LIMITED SUPPORT / NO SUPPORT	TOTAL CONSENSUS
<b><i>When asked to indicate their level of support in regard to the following proposals, the following responses were submitted by the various groups:</i></b>			
<i>Shootout/Penalty Shot Situations. When a goalkeeper dislodges the net in a shootout or penalty shot, what should our rule be? If it is clearly intentional should we award a goal? And if not, should we award another shot?</i>	Coach (Men) 70.2% Coach (Women) 58.8% Coordinators 90.9% Officials 80.6%		Strongly Support / Support 76.2%
<i>Goal nets. Should NHL nets be referenced as legal? Currently, these meet our specifications, but some institutions believed they were not legal.</i>	Coach (Men) 84.3% Coach (Women) 73.5% Commissioners 60.0% Coordinators 90.9% Officials 90.8%		Strongly Support / Support 87.4%
<i>Goal nets. Should the new NHL goal net specifications become mandatory in the future? The shallow nets could be approved at the start of the 2015-16 season for DI and 2016-17 for DIII?</i>	Coach (Men) 74.3% Coach (Women) 61.8% Officials 80.7%	Commissioners 60.0% Coordinators 54.6%	Strongly Support / Support 75.8%
<i>Goal nets. In NCAA tournament play, is it important that the same net be used for all rounds of the championship? This season, the traditional NCAA nets were used.</i>	Coach (Men) 92.7% Coach (Women) 70.6% Commissioners 60.0% Coordinators 81.9% Officials 85.1%		Strongly Support / Support 84.7%
<i>Goalkeeper hit in head. Should the committee change the rule to be an immediate whistle when a shot hits the goalkeeper in the head?</i>	Commissioners 60.0%	Coach (Men) 85.7% Coach (Women) 79.5% Coordinators 54.6% Officials 76.8%	Limited Support / No Support 77.6%

See Appendix A for additional feedback regarding ice hockey playing rules.