

**2014 Men's and Women's Track and Field/Cross Country Comment Period**

Last Modified: 07/11/2014

**1. The NCAA Men's and Women's Track and Field/Cross Country Rules Committee recently approved the following rules changes during its annual meeting in June. The committee is interested in receiving your feedback on these proposals. Language that is underlined is new; language with a strikethrough will be deleted from the rules book. The NCAA Playing Rules Oversight Panel (PROP) will consider these proposals and your feedback during a July 16, 2014, conference call. What is your position?**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Coach	112	64	50
Commissioner	2	6	1
Total	114	70	51

**2. What is your division?**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Division I	114	0	0
Division III	0	70	0
Division II	0	0	51
Total	114	70	51

**3. Rule 1.1.1.a The maximum lateral inclination permitted for the track across the full width of the track, preferably toward the inside lane and across all runways, shall should not exceed 1:100, one percent (1%).**

**Rationale: Allows for existing and locally desired variations. Consistent with IAAF standards.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 1.1.1.a.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	76%	69%	64%
Oppose	2%	1%	0%
No Opinion	22%	29%	36%
Total	113	68	50

#### 4. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 1.1.1.a.

##### Division I

###### Text Response

Consistent with the world standard.

Good to be in line with the IAAF.

If the width across the full width of the track meets the IAAF standards and allows for existing and local variations then I support that issue. You can't change all tracks that are already existing but future tracks can be adjusted.

Agree with rationale

We need uniformity.

Consistent with IAAF

Consistent with IAAF standards and allows for local variations

simple, consistent with IAAF.

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale" makes total sense and is in agreement with IAAF policy

I like consistency with IAAF standards

Consistent with IAAF standards.

Consistent with other regulations

Consistent with IAAF standards

Consistent with IAAF

##### Division III

###### Text Response

In 2004 we had the NCAA DIII Championship revoked from our institution citing this rule. It was completely unfair as other NCAA hosts had tracks that easily exceeded the standards but did not have an inclination survey of their track so were allowed. It was a multi-million dollar loss to our community and a waste of 18 months of work in preparation after being initially approved. It was a strike against our honesty as a host and only supported others' claims of "not knowing" if they exceeded the standards. You'll have my full support.

Provides more uniformity.

common sense---we can't all rebuild our tracks!

Consistency of rules

It is in the best interest of facilities and design

Regrading tracks and runways would be very expensive

makes it consistent since it's mandatory

Reason Given

##### Division II

###### Text Response

Allows for current facilities to be used and is in line with accepted standards of the sport.

Existing tracks should be able to be used for NCAA events, without facilities having to change any lateral inclination, as long as it's less than 1%.

Best Practice

Consistency between governing bodies

**5. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 1.1.1.a.**

Division I

Text Response

"Should" allows too much discretion to the constructing school.

Division III

Text Response

write exactly what you mean to say: that it SHALL not exceed, unless existing and locally desired variations exist and one applies for certification in those cases.

Division II

**6. Rule 1.1.2 The standard outdoor running track shall be 400 meters in length, not enclosed within a covered structure, and not less than six lanes in width.**

**Rationale: To regulate and eliminate using an enclosed facility for outdoor qualifying.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 1.1.2.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	79%	76%	80%
Oppose	8%	9%	12%
No Opinion	13%	15%	8%
Total	112	68	51

## 7. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 1.1.2.

### Division I

#### Text Response

I think that we are going to see new indoor facilities built that will include a turf field and a 400 track. That provides a decided advantage over an outdoor track facility where weather can frequently be an issue. So I am opposed to allowing facilities of that size to be used for outdoor qualifying.

This is outdoor track, leave it outdoors

Outdoor qualifying indicates venue must be an outdoor track.

Enclosed is an unfair advantage

Duh.....

Competing in an enclosed facility (indoor facility), for outdoor qualifying, would be an unfair advantage. Indoor facilities often have better competitive environments (no wind/controlled temps). This eliminates that and ensures outdoor marks are obtained outdoors.

No reason not to support this.

Outdoor tracks need to be outdoors. Covered structures are for indoor facilities only hence the word "indoor" and "outdoor". You qualify for indoor championships "indoors" and qualify for outdoor championship meets running on an outdoor 400m track, not a 200m track.

Agree with rationale

We need uniformity

Outdoor T&F implies just that...that it is outdoor. An enclosed structure yields control of the weather, both temp and wind, that is not available to all. We don't want folks to start having to fly around spending more budget to get onto an enclosed 400m facility due to the clear advantages.

Requiring athletes to qualify for outdoor championships on an outdoor track seems like a reasonable proposal.

Outdoors must be outdoors. It is that simple. Cannot be covered (indoors)

makes sense- keeps the sports separate

Indoor 400 meter would be unfair.

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale

again - fits standards that make sense

Very few facilities such as this available.

Weather is part of outdoor track and field

Outdoor track should be contested outdoors

Is consistent with "outdoor". Has this really been a problem?

not in closed because it can create an unfair advantage for those facilities that do not provide the same amenities.

Two separate seasons,... a track that is covered is considered INDOOR and a track without a cover is OUTDOOR... obvious.

makes all results fair

### Division III

#### Text Response

Makes it a uniform standard.

Fight the wind like everyone else!

If its outdoor track, it should be subject to external conditions without a roof. The only exception I take with this rule and would like clarification on is whether vaulters and vertical jumpers will still be able to move inside during inclement weather that may render those events unsafe in outdoor conditions.

spring track is outdoors, and the track should be outdoors!

Equal playing field for all competitors and regions.

It is OUTDOOR Track and field

Outdoor track & field should be outdoors.

It is outdoor track; needs to be outdoors in the elements

Reason Given

Outdoor performances are subject to variations in the weather and should not be eliminated by an enclosed structure

different seasons

Division II

Text Response

I do believe enclosed facilities give an unfair advantage to athletes compared to those qualifying outside and having to deal with wind and other natural weather conditions.

We need to keep a standard. Otherwise, times would always be questionable, and needing to be vetted.

Qualifying marks for outdoor should not be achieved on a track that is sheltered from the elements.

It would be an unfair advantage to have a qualify ion a facility that is protected from the elements...

Cause we are college programs not a High school..we should have eight lanes wide a min and 10 lane straight away.

Standard track length makes it easier for athletes and coaches to be consistent with training and racing. Although indoor tracks have their usefulness, they should not be permitted for outdoor qualifying.

I have never heard of having an outdoor track meet at an enclosed facility.

It is outdoor qualifying!

An outdoor meet should be held outdoors. An enclosure makes it indoors.

I agree with the rationale.

Outdoor should have the element of weather.

Outdoor is outdoor

allow the facility to be closed will give those running on it a competitive advantage.

provides parity in qualifying

**8. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 1.1.2.**

Division I	
Text Response	
This does not allow teams who may face an extreme weather situation to hold a competition. The fact that teams may face this situation would seem to be an increasing possibility.	
There might be a legitimate historic outdoor facility with less than 6 lanes. I would agree with the "not enclosed in a covered structure"	
I picture covered stands encircling an outdoor track when I read this, which should be allowable, of course.	
Feel this isn't a necessary regulation. If it is to be enacted, probably needs the qualifier fully, to avoid partial coverage of tracks by overhangs in some stadiums.	
Division III	
Text Response	
This is not logical. Would we penalize a 46.00 400M on a domed field as opposed to 46.00 400M on a non-sheltered track? The tracks are virtually the same size, it should not matter. Can we only qualify on sunny days? Days over 80 degrees? Would these two 46.00 400M runners not deserve to compete against each other? Strike the 6 lanes width while you are at it.	
I'm not sure where there is a 400m Indoor covered structure, but if this is all that is available to a school, it should be considered a "legal" venue.	
Poor weather conditions may mandate the use of such a facility.	
It seems unnecessary. If someone has a partially enclosed facility would that count?	
If an indoor facility is all an institution has, they should not be penalized.	
Division II	
Text Response	
Climate variations	
The northern stars will always have horrible weather of high winds and snow that covers the track all season.	
I believe Alaska has an enclosed track for 400m. I don't know of any additional enclosed structures but I can imagine an outdoor meet in late March could have feet of snow. I feel as though due to their climate this change forces a deterrence rather than avoid an advantage.	
Such a revision would unfairly disadvantage certain geographic locations, as well as resources with limited institutional means. Those without the financial means to travel far often need the option to move indoors during inclement/emergency weather. If they can't do so, they are simply losing opportunities to compete.	

**9. Rule 1.1.3 Tracks shall be surveyed and all measurements certified after initial construction and after each resurfacing. Beginning December 1, 2015, this shall also apply to each assembly of an indoor facility and the addition of any new track markings.**

**Rationale:** Extend the survey requirements of what is normally expected to include indoor facilities. This has never been specifically stated in the rule book, but is the normal protocol.

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 1.1.3.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	88%	81%	82%
Oppose	3%	1%	2%
No Opinion	9%	18%	16%
Total	112	68	51

**10. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 1.1.3.**

Division I

Text Response

If there is even a slight adjustment to an indoor track when it is re-assembled the year after being taken down - the track could be off.

This is the only way to be certain that an indoor track is the proper size each season.

All tracks should be the same, this will insure this.

Removes "gray" area of rule.

Protocol

Same thing.

Consistent with both indoor and outdoor facilities.

Good to make indoor track certification the same as outdoor.

Agreed. It will make sure of accuracy.

Agree with rationale

Simply a written statement of current process and policy.

Logical. We have been doing this for 15 years.

Obvious: Accuracy and consistency of marks.

In a sport focused on time, distance and height, it is important that all facilities are appropriately measured.

To keep consistent with every track

Have to have consistent protocol between indoor and outdoor

This seems prudent given the importance of accuracy and equity in qualifying process.

makes perfect sense.

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale

consistency, accuracy

agreed

Consistency along other regulations

to ensure the integrity of the facility

This is important for qualifying purposes and fairplay.

This provision does not go far enough. EVERY TRACK (indoor and outdoor) needs to be surveyed following the IAAF protocol if marks are going count for NCAA qualifying beginning in 2015. We have eagle eye, laser instruments, auto timing to the thousandth of a second, and sensitive wind gauges, yet there is NO verification, NONE, that the track is exactly the length it should be. Every track should be surveyed and the results POSTED at the facility in a common area with the engineering firm's stamp for everyone to see! We shouldn't have to wait for a track to be stripped or resurfaced, it's NOT FAIR that some are surveyed immediately while others will go un surveyed for years to come. Every track needs to be surveyed at the same time ! In addition, every track should have a curb (including straightaways,IAAF protocol). If an institution has a track with no curb , one should be installed and new starting lines painted if marks are to count for NCAA qualifying. Your provision is flawed and unfair as written.

To avoid short tracks. Painters are not surveyors. 1 foot off in distance means everything!

All existing tRacks should be surveyed.

Require every survey to be posted on coaches website

Division III

Text Response

Promotes consistency.

Absolutely necessary to provide standards for indoor facilities.

It's common practice

common sense

Prevent mistakes in surviving

Accuracy is vital.

Need standards to be met

Reason given

This keeps everything accurate.

good practice

Division II

Text Response

Follows normal protocol, this is an appropriate update to the rule book.

As above in rule 1.1.2. A standard needs to be maintained so times are consistent from all tracks.

Makes since that indoor tracks meet the same regulations as outdoor.

It is good to make sure that all lines are in their proper place especially after a resurfacing.

to make sure it is correct

Tracks should be standard in measurement and markings, if they are to be used for competition.

After the conclusion of the 2011 Indoor Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference Championships at Edinboro University, it was discovered that the mile, 3k, and 5k (all of which were run in lane 4) were all short 4.92 meters per mile. The new rule should help prevent something like this from happening in the future.

Agree with Rationale

I support the rationale, mainly to make sure all track markings are legitimate.

Consistency

Just making legel what we are already doing.

**11. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 1.1.3.**

Division I

Text Response

Is there really a problem with the re-assembly of tracks then being illegal? How many times has this happened? This could be cost prohibitive.

Last year our indoor track went down and up four times. This would mean that each time I'd have to have it re-certified/surveyed? I understand in cases of re-marking the track or any change in structure but not just reassembly of a certified facility.

Division III

Text Response

To avoid any question about surveying, the NCAA should define what is meant by surveying. Many institutions have interpreted surveying as verifying the distances ONLY, but have NOT included inclination surveying. Specify exactly what you mean, both distance and inclination, just distance...define explicitly, then I will be in support.

Division II

Text Response

If they are going to pay for the survey then I am ok with it.

**12. Rule 1.1.7 The visible starting line for all races not run in lanes (including the 800 Meters, when alleys are used) shall be curved so that all competitors run the same distance going into the curve. See Figure 2. The curved start line may extend beyond the outer-most lane, provided that the same start surface is available.**

**Rationale:** This allows for a start line, like the 1500, to extend into an extended back-side alley.

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 1.1.7.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	85%	78%	78%
Oppose	0%	10%	2%
No Opinion	15%	12%	20%
Total	112	68	51



**13. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 1.1.7.**

Division I

Text Response

Requires all athletes to run exact same distance regardless of start position

Makes sense

Makes perfect sense.

More flexibility for individual facilities.

Gives more room for a big field. Sometimes it is way too many people and not enough space. This will allow for that problem to be solved.

Agree with rationale

No reason to oppose.

As long as the competitors are on the track surface, I see no problem extended the starting line beyond the outside lane. Although, I feel competitors placed in this position should have the option of moving to the inside behind the first runner.

From a safety point of view it makes a lot of sense. All competitors should have a fair opportunity to run the same distance.

Allows for accuracy and visibility.

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale fairness

yes

Fairness and consistency

Division II

Text Response

As long as there is no advantage to any runner, and all is still equal, I have no problem with this rule. Those in the outside lanes should run an equal distance as those on the inside.

800 and 1500 are almost the same race

This makes for a fairer start for athletes running in longer distances, with a break-in distance for cutting into the inside lanes.

It makes sense.

Clarity

Allow for more runners in the race or more room the runners in the existing field sizes.

Division III

Text Response

I think it's obvious- to create a fair situation for all runners at the start.

it's fair.

suggest that steeple, mile, 5k, 10k could also benefit from extended line to make fair start for large fields.

It seems fair for those runners on the outside

No advantage s gained

Makes sense.

We need to get away from extended start lines marked with tape or chalk. Start lines should all be measured and certified, if a race exceeds the ability of the track to handle the start safely and fairly additional heats should be established.

I agree with rationale

**14. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 1.1.7.**

Division I
Division III
<b>Text Response</b>
Some facilities have fence lines right up against the outer lane, for consistency, all markings should be contained within.
Seems like a waste of paint.
Division II

**15. Rule 2.1 (New) Section 1. Timing** The following are desired minimum requirements and implemented wherever possible: a. Equipment must be fully automatic. b. Equipment must be capable of monitoring the adequacy of the power source. c. Equipment must have an automatic battery-power takeover system in the event of line system power failure. d. Equipment must have protection of the time base accuracy from surges in the power source. e. Equipment must produce a visual and printable photo-finish photograph with read-out times. f. One camera, preferably color, used as the primary photo-finish device. At least one additional camera designated for use as backup or for determinations not evident from the primary camera. g. The positioning of the cameras shall be on opposite sides of the track. h. A minimum of two independent power circuits for these timing devices, one for the primary, one for the backup. i. Manual backup shall be provided as deemed necessary by the games committee. An alternate finish-line crew shall operate to judge and provide manually operated timing results to supplement the fully automatic timing system. Three fully automatic timing devices must be used, one of which can distinguish color. The fully automatic timing devices must be positioned on opposite sides of the track. It is understood that lighting requirements may not be sufficient at night to properly distinguish color. There shall be a minimum of two independent power circuits for these timing devices.

**Rationale:** The current rule exists as Rule 5-12.3, but is clearly 'equipment', not related to the task of timing. Therefore, move to Rule 2. Changes are to indicate current evolution of technology and requirements for all meet types and not just championships.

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 2.1.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	72%	72%	72%
Oppose	12%	10%	8%
No Opinion	16%	18%	20%
Total	112	67	50

**16. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 2.1.**

Division I

Text Response

Technology has improved and so should our timing systems.

Decreases risk of timing malfunctions.

Again, makes more sense.

Makes sense.

I support this for track meets only. This should not apply to cross country meets. If applied to cross country meets then the cost of this for a small meet especially in an early season meet is not feasible. Many schools will not have budget for cross country meets put on a dual or triple dual meet.

Agree with rationale

Thorough. A standard for some to reach.

Since athletes qualify on time for the preliminary round it is crucial that all marks from the season are valid. Assuming most timing companies have the resources to handle this change, I think this increased requirement is a positive thing.

If the technology is there, then we need to use it.

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale

Accuracy, fairness

I'm surprised this hasn't been pass before since it makes perfect sense for fairness.

It seems logical and relatively easy to accomplish. Heads off potential disasters...

Need this to eliminate timing failures!

Division III

Text Response

It's unfair to the athletes to provide anything less to the above standards.

. . . as long as it says "whenever possible."

Consistency

The 2nd camera should only be required for championship meets.

Makes sense

I agree with the rationale

Somewhat guarantees all meets will be timed in a consistent manner and that the meet should not be interrupted to fix timing issues.

Division II

Text Response

Cleans up the language

The timing companies that charge quite a bit of money to time meets should be prepared to handle power issues and other mishaps...the rule forces timing companies to ber prepared for problems to make sure the athletes that are racing will get their correct times and try to take the human error out.

I support this because i think overall it's good for the sport. However it could mean an added cost burden to host a meet.

Keeping up with technology

**17. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 2.1.**

Division I

Text Response

I know of some buildings where cameras only fit on one side of the track indoors.  
Schools may not have more than one camera available for timing home meets  
Requiring a back-up camera could be cost prohibitive to many programs. Power surges and losses would affect both systems. As long as there is battery back-up another camera is not required.  
When setting up multiple finish lines at our smaller outdoor meets, it could require the assembly of six cameras. I don't believe that our timing services (or any smaller service) has the ability to do so.  
I am opposed simply because this might be a lot to ask for a smaller track meet to implement  
Some meets don't have the budget to invest in this equipment and should be allowed to hand-time  
It is not always possible to position cameras on opposite sides of the track.  
I am in support of all items except 1.c. For battery backup to be effective, it must provide immediate, automatic replacement of the electrical power. To accomplish this, it must be placed in-line of the power supply to the device being protected. While this sounds good, it also means that if the automatic battery-power take-over system were to fail, the device would lose power, even though the main primary power source were still active and operating. When the battery backup is a new device, it should be fairly reliable. However, as the devices age, they will lose their reliability. Our experience is that the main power source of the facility (ie. city power) is more reliable than a battery backup system. This is from experience at our facility. I am not in support of REQUIRING the use of this device for all venues and competitions. The vast majority of facilities in this country are working on a limited budget. When a device that is old appears to be working, it will not be a priority to replace it. We will have greater problems (missed races) due to failed battery backup systems than we will from failed city power. It could be a recommendation to have battery-backup, but allow the facility to evaluate the reliability of their power supply when making this decision. I am a trained electrical engineer, for what it might be worth.

Division III

Text Response

It is very difficult and costly to host a track meet. We are implementing rules which continue to drive up the difficulty and cost to the point that who wants to host. Of the meets that we host and attend, no one follows all of these rules. By adding more rules are we regulating the sport at a higher level or are we just learning to cheat more ways by necessity?  
Money for small meets  
This makes it very difficult for smaller colleges to be able to handle hosting meets. If we would like to switch the direction of the 100 we now have to have four cameras instead of two. This also raises the cost of hiring an outside timing contractor. I understand the need for having two cameras on a finish line for a championship meet, but this is overkill for a regular season meet. Also, who is going to regulate this? Nobody going to the meet is ever going to complain about the FAT...it would nullify all the results.  
expense of extra timing equipment  
Costly  
I do not support these requirements for non-championship meets. Requiring cameras both inside and outside of the track along with the other requirements adds to the cost of hosting meets. Costs to host regular season meets continue to rise and this puts a heavier burden on host institutions. There are currently far too few host institutions the way it is.

Division II

Text Response

I don't think small invitationals should be required to have all of this equipment.  
I don't really oppose it, but this is way too much overkill requirement-wise for every single meet..... It's fine as long as the rules says DESIRED and not REQUIRED...  
I believe this would be an unnecessary expense, because any system failure we experience is usually a human error, and if we do have a mechanical malfunction it can be resolved in a reasonable amount of time. I do believe you need a back-up system for all major meets, i.e. invitationals, conference, etc..

**18. Rule 2.10.3 The handle may have a curved or straight grip with a maximum inside perimeter length of 110 millimeters.**

**Rationale: Conform to the new IAAF specifications. Overall length is the only length requirement.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 2.10.3.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	70%	70%	64%
Oppose	1%	0%	0%
No Opinion	29%	30%	36%
Total	110	67	50

**19. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 2.10.3.**

Division I	
<b>Text Response</b>	
Consistent with IAAF and will make it easier to weigh in.	
Conforms to world standard.	
IAAF specs	
Agree with rationale	
Keeping consistency across Track and Field	
Should match IAAF.	
Conform to new IAAF spec.	
For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale	
Needs to be uniform among rules. Reduces cost to programs with implement needs.	
Prefer to stay in alignment with IAAF	
Consistent with IAAF standards.	
Conforms to IAAF	
athletes are provided a preference	
Division III	
<b>Text Response</b>	
In line with IAAF rules.	
New rule complies with international regulations.	
Only the total length of the implement is important not the different sections, this was a dumb rule to start with.	
I agree with the rationale	
Division II	
<b>Text Response</b>	
nice to be consistent with IAAF	
some athletes have bigger hands so you may need that extra room	
Best practice.	
Consistency and help for equipment manufactureres	

**20. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 2.10.3.**

Division I
<b>Text Response</b>
Introduces gray area about how length is measured. Length should be a radial measure. Straight handles have longer radial distances at the endpoints than at the midpoint due to hypoteneuse effects.
Division III
Division II

**21. Rule 3.19 ARTICLE 1. The games committee appointed/approved medical doctor/certified trainer shall examine injured or ill competitors and make recommendations to the competitor, the competitor’s coach and the representative of any sponsoring organization as to the advisability of continued participation by the competitor in the meet. Such recommendations shall be considered in the application of the failure-to-participate rule or honest effort rule. ARTICLE 2. If a competitor is to be withdrawn from an event, or abandons an event, then an evaluation shall occur either prior to the start of the withdrawn event or immediately after the abandoned event. ARTICLE 3. Should the decision be made to withdraw from or abandon an event, the competitor shall be scratched from any subsequent event(s) in the meet. unless that competitor is medically approved to continue participation by the medical doctor/certified trainer and the referee determines that continued participation is allowable. However, a subsequent examination and resulting recommendation by the appointed/approved medical doctor/certified trainer of the competition shall be considered by the referee to determine if continued participation is allowable. ARTICLE 4. Provisions shall be made to provide medical aid to runners on a cross country course.**

**Rationale: Amend to include the rule for honest effort and abandoned events.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 3.19.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	87%	72%	76%
Oppose	4%	9%	12%
No Opinion	9%	19%	12%
Total	113	68	50

**22. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 3.19.**

Division I

Text Response

This will eliminate "shady gamesmanship" at championship meets and lessen the burden of filing protests

The old rule was not specific enough, this should be better.

We discussed this at our conference coaches meeting, and struggled with the way the rule was worded. This is a much clearer explanation of the process and the timing of examination with the medical personnel and the role of the meet referee

Improves requirements for honest effort.

The rule is not enforced most times currently

Limiting subjectivity is always better.

Got to provide aid to those that are in serious need of it.

Agree with rationale

After the debacle at the NCAA EAST First Round with this it needed to be more spelled-out.

Favors the athletes. Good for the sport. Initial diagnosis might not be accurate, condition could improve.

I think athletes and coaches need to be aware of the risks of running multiple races at a Championship meet. To start one race and abandon it to conserve energy, when you realize qualification is not a possibility, only to run another race later in the meet is unacceptable. If you start the race, you should finish the race unless an injury is preventing you from completing the race. This rule allows for those athletes to be reinstated but the process will discourage athletes from "gaming" the system.

We must be consistent with honest effort, and abandoned events rules especially in qualification meets advancing to NCAA Champs.

makes sense

The new language seems to address more scenarios with a fair approach that protects the athlete and coach.

Provides legitimacy for medical scratches.

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale

Like that it is in a 3rd party's hands

I don't think it's as clear as it could be but I support the intent.

Division III

Text Response

Makes sense.

Helps clarify medical issues in relation to honest effort rule.

This rule has been very ambiguous in the past, and this language makes it more specific and provides more guidance without being overly restrictive for special circumstances.

always good to be clear, especially in regard to honest effort

Safety

a cleaner reading of what is to happen in medical problems.

I agree with the rationale

Division II

Text Response

This is logical for the safety of competitors.

Cleans up the language

This just seems like a reasonable addition to or clarification of the old rule.

Clarity

**23. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 3.19.**

Division I

Text Response

Has the "Honest Effort Rule" been reinstated? The Failure to participate Rule had replaced it in the rule book. While they address a similar problem/ issue, they are not equal, and it is confusing to continually reference it in this manner.

Meet referee should not have say in medical matters.

Only the athlete could honestly know if they are hurt or sick

Division III

Text Response

I'm in favor of eliminating the honest effort rule. These rules were created when all entries were done manually and a change caused much work for the meet managers.

Referees should have no role in determining whether they can participate; if medical personnel say its ok to continue that should be enough

Division II

Text Response

#1-I feel it's a call that should come from the SA and coach. What if the trainer is from the opposite team? #2- I agree with this one. #3- Don't agree with this one. Many SA's scratch or abandon events for various reasons. It's the call of the SA's coach and that SA. No outside opinion is needed or required.

In general, an effort to tighten up this rule is greatly appreciated. Here are my concerns with the re-wording... Article 1 - This works well in a national championship. However, in a conference championship, it may be difficult for the host institution to provide an adequate person to serve in this role. I have seen such a situation occur. Article 2 - It may not be possible for ill athlete to be evaluated "prior to the start of the withdrawn event or immediately after the abandoned event" unless the certified medical doctor/certified trainer is willing to travel to the location of the athlete to evaluate them (hospital, etc). In this case, an athlete who is ill one day but healthy the next day on a multiple day event, may be unfairly eliminated from competition.

I'm not a fan the honest effort rule, so anything to get this rule back in the rule book I am not for, as that is a judgement call, so I am against this proposed rule, despite being in favor of the medical portion of this rule.

An evaluation from a doctor is a subjective opinion. Subjective opinions have no place in the sport of track and field. One of track and field's greatest qualities is it's objective outcomes. If an individual is unable to continue, withdraws from an event or purposely gives less than full effort, they forfeit the right to continue. Period! The honest effort rule is one of the most difficult to enforce. Everyone has a different opinion of its intent. Therefore, this rule is often neglected or abused. The honest effort rule needs to be very clear and concise. Make it simple to understand and difficult to misinterpret. This rule is one of the most important in track and field.

I am in agreement with this rule for championships, but not for regular season meets. Sometimes we enter events to see where the competition is, or gauge an athlete's fitness, and they should not be penalized under the honest effort rule for withdrawals in the regular season.



**24. Rule 3.2** The primary purpose of the games committee, as part of meet management, is to give specialized assistance and guidance to the meet director such as: y. Addressing challenges to any meet procedures, entries or event seedings prior to the start of competition.

**Rationale:** This rule change would specify who has authority prior to competition to respond to participating institutions' concerns and challenges regarding how the competition is being contested.

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 3.2.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	72%	84%	84%
Oppose	4%	1%	2%
No Opinion	24%	15%	14%
Total	112	68	50

**25. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 3.2.**

Division I

Text Response

Increases chance of expert decisions occur for fair competition

Independent arbiters are generally better.

Agree with rationale

This might allow resolution to questions before a meet begins.

Someone other than host institutions head coach needs to be in charge for the integrity of meet.

The games committee should be allowed to let the meet director know of problems and concerns prior to and during the competition that arise.

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale

fairness, accuracy during the conduct of a meet there are always too many things that can be ambiguous and not covered by all existing rules

Makes clear the line of responsibility.

Division III

Text Response

Defines games committee's role in meet management.

I agree with the rationale

Division II

Text Response

The games committee would by way of concenses resolve any of the matters addressed above. It makes sense to trouble shoot problems before they occur.

It is helpful to have the purpose of the games committee laid out.

I agree that this is a good role and clarification of the role of the games committee.

Clarity

**26. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 3.2.**

Division I

Text Response

The meet management/host institution should deal with these questions/issues.

Division III

Text Response

I like making things clear, but this doesn't accomplish that: is the committee to advise the meet director on these issues, or decide on their own?

Division II

Text Response

I agree that the game committee should rule on these matter, if not covered in the meet handbook. This is not the primary purpose of the game committee, this wording implies that after the meet begins the game committee is not needed.

**27. Rule 3.4 Primary Role ARTICLE 1. The primary responsibility of a referee shall be to render a ruling on all rules violations reported by meet officials or protests filed by coaches of competing teams once the competition starts until the protest period of the competition has ended. The referee(s) shall be knowledgeable and qualified to interpret the NCAA track and field rules and the NCAA cross country rules. The referee shall be above all other officials, ensuring fair and safe competition for all competitors and disqualifying those whose acts violate the rules of fair and safe competition. The referee shall not serve as any other official or as a member of the jury of appeals or games committee. Duties ARTICLE 2. The powers and duties of the referee(s) shall be**  
The referee(s) shall: a. After consulting with the appropriate officials, to take such actions and make such decisions, including those for which the rules make no specific provision, that provide each contestant a fair and equal opportunity; b. To have the authority to act upon apparent violations of the conduct rules, see Rules Organization, that are observed in meets in which a jury of appeal has been established; b. ensure fair and safe competition for all competitors and disqualifying those whose acts violate the rules of fair and safe competition; c. To decide all questions for which the rules make no provisions; d. To have sole power to warn and/or disqualify competitors as provided by these rules or upon report from the head umpire and head judges of field events, except as provided in Rule 3-7.1. e. Make a ruling on rules violations reported by competition officials or on filed protests. f. To decide place winners in track events and placing in cross country when the judges of the finish cannot reach a decision and when official films of the finish are available; g. In the event of record track performances, the running referee shall verify the results of the place and time and shall check all related conditions; h. In the event of record field-event performances, the throwing or jumping referee, and three field judges, shall verify all measurements and all related conditions; h. To confer with all head officials before the competition to ensure that all are aware of their responsibilities; i. To make certain that field events begin when scheduled, are properly organized and continue without delays; and j. To determine just and proper remedy for continued violation of all uniform, number, shoe and logo rules.

**Rationale:** Duties not related to making rulings on possible violations should be handled by other meet personnel so that the referee(s) can focus on the task of ensuring a fair competition. The referee(s) should not be responsible for overseeing events, but rather interpreting rules and making informed rulings on perceived violations and protests. If a jury of appeal does exist, they should be the only authority to overrule a referee's decision. The referee(s) should not be allowed to scrutinize actions that have not been witnessed by an official or for which a protest has not

been filed, therefore preventing some actions from being more heavily scrutinized than others.

Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 3.4.

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	81%	71%	74%
Oppose	5%	14%	4%
No Opinion	14%	15%	22%
Total	113	66	50

28. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 3.4.

Division I
Text Response
This will make a referee's life much easier and will keep most decisions in the hand of the event officials.
Sometimes they need to reiterate priorities with event officials.....oversee the fail conduct and control of each event to mitigate future problems the might arise.
It makes sense.
Agree with rationale
focuses responsibilities
in theory, it's sounds good; but what do officials/referees think about this rule?
The referee(s) should not be responsible for overseeing events, but rather interpreting rules and making informed rulings on perceived violations and protests.
For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale
The Referee's duties need to be clearly defined and they need to be empowered to do their job. There needs to be certification for TF Referees and a Clearinghouse / Director who works with them to ensure the validity of Collegiate TF Competitions.
It might make sense to assign responsibility for H, I, and J to the games committee or meet director.
Division III
Text Response
Support for championship level meets. Rule as written could require many smaller meets to add an additional official in order to satisfy the separation of meet referee and official roles. Given the broad range of institutions across DIII, this could be a problematic requirement for institutions with less funding.
This helps clarify the difference between a referee and the meet organization.
I agree mostly with this proposal. However, from a cost perspective, many institutions may find it difficult to now pay for another official to work a meet (as this proposal does not allow the referee to have any other duties; ex. a referee can also not be a starter according to this rule proposal).
I agree with the rationale
Division II
Text Response
It is good to define each position especially in the bigger meets. This will help with the management of the meet.

**29. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 3.4.**

Division I	
Text Response	
Meet Ref should be able to be a part of the games committee and other decisions that would otherwise be only up to meet director. The director should not be over a particular event agreed, but if the meet referee witnesses a rules violation that is not seen by a "regular" official he should not be required to ignore that violation. He should be able to make a ruling on it directly.	
While I appreciate the effort to streamline the work of the referee, this does leave out a major issue of notification to athletes and teams involved in a decision (the rest of d. ). If that were dropped it would need to be done in concert with assigning those duties to another official.	
If it is not broke, why fix it. Wondering if there have been problems that suggest this change. Seems unnecessary.	
Division III	
Text Response	
I agree with rule; but it just makes good sense to reinforce the duties of the other officials. Preventive officiating is much better than trying to correct after the fact	
this clarifies, but severely limits the referee's possibilities of helping in a meet, especially ones smaller than ncaa championship, or maybe large conferences. the ref may spend all day with little to do, and could be useful...	
One more requirement to host a meet that small schools might struggle to comply with	
I think a ref has the ability to do more than one job, at least at a none NCAA Championship event. Without using this person on another job (which they are qualified for) seems a waste of an important and knowledgeable official., Say 4x100 Relay zone official.	
I do not see a need for these changes.	
This may make some sense on a championship level when the number of officials allows for the referee to "specialize". However, during regular season meets it is necessary to have the referee sometimes fill in when an official does not show. It is certainly necessary for the referee to meet with the other officials, the make certain field events begin on time, etc.	
Division II	
Text Response	
Why have separate referees and officials?	
I think it is beneficial for the meet referee to meet with all the head officials before a meet begins so everyone is on the same page.	

**30. Rule 3.4.2.a The powers and duties of the referee(s) shall be: a. After consulting with the appropriate officials, to decide all questions, take such actions and make such decisions, including, but not limited to, those for which the rules make no specific provision, that provide each contestant a fair and equal opportunity;**

**Rationale:** This change combines the elements of current Rules 3.4.2.a and 3.4.2.c.

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 3.4.2.a.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	82%	76%	71%
Oppose	1%	2%	2%
No Opinion	17%	23%	27%
Total	110	66	49

**31. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 3.4.2.a.**

Division I	
Text Response	
Yes	
Agree with rationale	
Cleans up the language. Eliminates redundancy.	
Fair consolidation of terms	
significant language added	
Must empower the referee to have the final say on everything associated to rules decisions, especially for those "unseen/unknown" situations.	
Good condensation.	
Division III	
Text Response	
Let the referee focus	
Seems reasonable	
Define an "appropriate official"	
Seems logical if this position is used	
Good use of words	
I agree with the rationale	
Division II	

**32. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 3.4.2.a.**

Division I	
Text Response	
Final decisions should be made by jury of appeals.	
Division III	
Division II	
Text Response	
Wording sounds like referee is the final word and dosen't account for the jury of appeal.	

**33. Rule 3.4.2.c The powers and duties of the referee(s) shall be: c. To decide all questions regarding the re-staging of an event for which the rules make no provisions;**

**Rationale: Clarifies current practice.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 3.4.2.c.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	72%	81%	69%
Oppose	5%	0%	2%
No Opinion	24%	19%	29%
Total	110	67	49

**34. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 3.4.2.c.**

Division I

Text Response

Agree with rationale  
clarification welcome  
Clarifies current practice.  
For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale

Division III

Text Response

Agree with rationale  
Keep it away from the coaches  
cleans up language

I agree with the rationale

Division II

Text Response

I agree.

**35. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 3.4.2.c.**

Division I

Text Response

Limits decision on rules with no provisions to single circumstance, restaging.  
sounds like the referee can do whatever they want  
What is re-staging an event?

Division III

Division II

**36. Rule 3.4.3 The referee's decisions in all matters shall be final and without appeal, except in those meets in which a games committee or an appointed jury of appeal has been established for that specific purpose. The games committee or jury of appeal then will have the final authority.**

**Rationale: The games committee is the administrator of the competition and has the responsibility to appoint a jury of appeal if one is so desired, but the games committee is not by default the administrator as well as the jury.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 3.4.3.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	75%	73%	76%
Oppose	6%	12%	4%
No Opinion	19%	15%	20%
Total	111	66	49

**37. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 3.4.3.**

Division I

Text Response

makes it cleaner

Games committee doesn't always want to make the decisions

Absolutely. Independent group needed.

Agree with rationale

Consolidates terms - this does not preclude the members of the games committee from also serving as the jury of appeals, but does separate the understanding of those specific roles.

necessary clarification

One person needs to make the final decision on the conduct of meet.

States clearly who has the final authority in different scenarios.

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale

jury usually has more knowledge of events

Great clarification

Clarifies responsibility of each.

Division III

Text Response

The buck stops here!

The buck has to stop somewhere, the Ref is in a good position for that.

Division II

Text Response

Seems the best route to staying unbiased.

Makes sense that administrator can delegate this authority to games committee if necessary

Makes good sense

**38. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 3.4.3.**

Division I

Text Response

so now there needs to be a games committee and a jury of appeal?? too complicated. One could suffice.

Games committee should exist for things like.. Where coaches boxes should be located. Entrance to facility. Details related to athlete flow etc.. Practice times,

Some meets are not large enough to merit or do not have the resources to provide a jury of appeals.

Home field advantage to assign a jury of appeals appointed by meet administrator, especially since this jury has power over the meet referee.

Division III

Text Response

Most meets combine true games committee and the jury of appeal. Seems to work---maybe separate at nationals.

If no jury of appeals is available the game's committee should have this responsibility

this doesn't indicate that the games committee can designate itself as jury of appeal. can it? if so, write this in.

Adds way to much administration to a meet and gets way to many people involved with decisions

This is making things too complicated with multiple committees or jury of appeal. A games committee can handle both duties.

Division II

Text Response

By not allow individuals to wear dual hats we are increase the number of officials need to run off a track and field meet.

**39. Rule 4.2.1 Competitors who conduct themselves in an unsporting manner, or who are offensive by action or language, or who are found to be in violation of honest effort, shall be warned and/or disqualified by the referee from the event and from the remainder of the meet (Rule 3-4.2d).**

**Rationale: Amend to include the reinstated rule for honest effort.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 4.2.1.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	85%	80%	88%
Oppose	8%	11%	4%
No Opinion	7%	9%	8%
Total	112	66	49

**40. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 4.2.1**

Division I
<b>Text Response</b>
Still need to further limit the possibility of arbitrary decisions.
Agree with rationale
Specifies that it is the duty and responsibility of the Referee to oversee the honest effort rule. This is often overlooked by the referee, relying on coaches to make a protest after the fact, which causes unnecessary emotional grievance to athletes involved.
or is significant
The honest effort rule is too black & white and when you get too many people involved in making a decision, you have issues. One perpdson, the referee needs to have the final say.
For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale
Division III
<b>Text Response</b>
I would give the warning to the coaches in the pre-meet meeting and disqualify from that point on.
I agree with the rationale
Division II
<b>Text Response</b>
I have no problem with this. Depending on the severity of the issue at hand, a warning may be too lenient.
Athletes need to display sportsmanlike behavior
Supports good sportsmanship
This is a needed clarification.



**41. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 4.2.1.**

Division I	
<b>Text Response</b>	
I don't like that the you can be just warned for the honest effort rule it should be more than warning Do we need a definition of "honest effort" in order to implement these changes? It is and has been a VERY broadly interpreted term.	
Has the "Honest Effort Rule" been reinstated? The "Failure to Participate" Rule had replaced it. It is confusing, and undermines the intention of the change of the rule to continually reference the former rule in this manner. The rule change had been to take away the subjectivity/ judgement of intention of the competitor in the case of "Honest Effort", and replace it with a more objective standard. While I agree with the rule change, I disagree with the inclusion of "Honest Effort" in the Rationale statement.	
Division III	
<b>Text Response</b>	
"honest effort" has been a farce throughout. I have sat by committee members when an athlete CLEARLY jogged the 1500 trials since he had qualified in the 800. No one wanted to make the call!! Keep this rule as it was!	
This arbitrarily dictates what can be considered honest effort. Honest effort should have no bearing on disqualifications from events due to unsporting behavior. If an unsporting behavior requires ejection from the meat that should be its own separate bylaw	
separate thes 2 issues: conduct and sportsmanship here. honest effort under it's own section.	
warned before disqualified	
What is honest effort really?	
I do not believe we should reinstate the "honest effort rule". We've eliminated this rule in the past and reinstating it creates confusion and is not needed. There is not a current problem so we should not be changing the rules back without and obvious problem in that area.	
Division II	
<b>Text Response</b>	
Please do not reinstate the honest effort rule.	
What is a honest effort is not clear in all cases. An honest effort to win could be very difference from an effort to finish 8th and score points.	

**42. Rule 4.3.4.b b. The use of additional numbers usually affixed to the uniform to aid in the placing of competitors in a race shall be allowed. Placement is at the direction of the clerk of the course so that proper logos are not shall be on the hip or outer upper leg. Institution and sponsor logos shall not be obscured and uniform requirements are shall be observed.**

**Rationale: Hip numbers should not obscure team or sponsorship logos. Specifying the location of additional numbers will ensure consistent placement and can also aide in student-athletes' familiarity with meet procedures between competitions.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 4.3.4.b.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	70%	70%	65%
Oppose	12%	12%	12%
No Opinion	19%	18%	22%
Total	112	66	49

**43. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 4.3.4.b.**

Division I

Text Response

Why not.

Agree with rationale

Simplifying language is always good.

I get the logo part. Don't get familiarity with meet procedures.  
easier to identify

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale

Division III

Text Response

I agree with the rationale

Division II

Text Response

I like that it makes this the same across all meets. Easier for coaches, official and especially athletes.

Consistent placement of numbers is less confusing for the athletes

#### 44. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 4.3.4.b.

##### Division I

###### Text Response

In long distance events, especially in warm conditions hip numbers often fall off, I agree that placing hip numbers on the uniform should not obscure the name or sponsor logo, however an effective place to put them is on the middle back, this helps lap counters as well, if the hip # falls off or is obscured, it still can be seen as the runner passes. The placement shouldn't be restricted to just the hip or leg.

placement of the numbers should be decided where officials/timing equipment can best distinguish the runners' designations and not dictated on whether a sponsored logo can be seen. the clerks know what will best aid keeping track of the runners; the "sponsorship" impact should have no place in collegiate athletics and I am disappointed that an amateur T&F committee has approved this.

I understand the idea of what you are saying with this rule to not cover logos. However, most of the time the extra numbers are used are in the distance races - or non lane races. We have all watched many a track meet - hip numbers falling off happens all of the time, especially when they are placed on the legs because the briefs/tights get wet with sweat and the numbers don't stick. In races run in lanes it isn't a big deal since you can figure out who finishes in each lane they are assigned if their hip numbers fall off. In the distance races - when hip numbers fall off it becomes very difficult to figure out who the finishers are - especially in regular season meets where the field might be large or where lapping happens. The number put on the chest hardly ever falls off and provides a security net for making sure to be able to identify who the runner is. I think it is important to be able to continue to add numbers to the chest, but make sure that it isn't covering up the logos while doing so.

what about an additional # on chest?

Some timing systems are set up differently requiring different hip number placement.

not clear enough about logo covering...the need for numbers is unnecessary since many fall off before the event is started

I am strongly opposed to this rule change. As this is written, it prevents a number from being placed on the front of the jersey. I am guessing that few if any of the individuals who have written this rule have ever had to determine race finish order of a tight 800m race. Side placed timing cameras (which read a number on the hip) are not always able to accurately determine finish place. The front facing timing camera (such as Identilynx) is benefited greatly from a number placed on the front of the jersey. Come up with a different rule to maintain visibility of the institution name and your sponsors without preventing the number from being placed on the front. Why do you think that EVERY competition places numbers on the front of the jersey? Because it is an effective tool for the official. You are asking for results to be slower and wrong. Let's rework this to not create a negative impact on the timing crews.

We need to find a way to get rid of those numbers. They always fall off and stick all over everything but the athlete

##### Division III

###### Text Response

When has a hip number ever obstructed uniform logo to the point where Nike has complained. This should not be a rule. Temporary numbers do not need be regulated in the bylaws

For distance races that don't finish in lanes, it is helpful to have the ability to place competitors numbers on the front chest for visual ID purposes.

I think the number on the chest is a good aid for officials and announcers.

Numbers constantly fall off the hip. They work better on the front at least as a backup

Only allowing these numbers on the hip or outer upper leg is not sufficient. They should also be allowed on the chest area if they do not obscure institution or sponsor logos. This is too restrictive.

##### Division II

###### Text Response

It should be at the clerk's discretion.

For distance races most officials prefer to have a number posted on the chest for the purposes of tracking laps. I think that giving the, that option would be preferred to requiring that they are exclusively on the hips.

A logo is not more important than athlete identification

most meet that I have attend have placed these additional numbers on the chest to allow official to see them better.

**45. Rule 4.3.7.a Protests relating to matters that develop during the conduct of the meet should be made at once and not later than 30 15 minutes after the results have been announced or posted. For Cross Country, not later than 30 minutes after the last race of the meet has been posted. All implicated coaches must be notified of a tendered protest.**

**Rationale: With new technologies more readily available, coaches have quicker access to results and therefore have the ability to more quickly file their protest. For years there was a 15 minute limit to file a protest for a preliminary round event, and that was sufficient time to file a protest.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 4.3.7.a.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	50%	54%	52%
Oppose	37%	38%	34%
No Opinion	13%	7%	14%
Total	111	68	50

**46. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 4.3.7.a.**

Division I

Text Response

Yes. But protests of individual attempts in the horizontal jumps and throws should be made and reviewed IMMEDIATELY and notification made to all concerned. There should be no provision that allows for review of individual attempts after the completion of the event. This is a huge problem.....the return to the use of plasticine when eagle eye is not available,would eliminate these issues in the jumps.

an announced and obvious location for physical posting should be required, as well as electronic posting.

Agree with rationale

Please make sure to emphasize that all coaches implicated in a protest must be notified as this doesn't happen very often

With instant results, 15 minutes is sufficient to protest. Need to do this to move meet along.

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale the faster the better

Division III

Text Response

better meet if it's faster.

A good adjustment

I support the intent of the rule change, yet 15 minutes may prove to be an insufficient amount of time for coaches to properly address an issue.

This rule will allow us to run more efficient meets, keep awards moving

I agree with the rationale

Division II

Text Response

You have no idea how stupid it is to wait 30 minutes when none of the coaches want to file a protest after a Cross Country meet, and the kids want to go eat and everyone is just standing around.

#### 47. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 4.3.7.a.

##### Division I

##### Text Response

Even at championship meets, the results are sometimes not announced or posted in timely manner and sometimes when the results become official there is not "notice" so coaches may not be aware when the time limit begins.

Should stay at 30 minutes

I am in favor of keeping 30min time frame.

I don't think that 15 minutes is enough time to track down the official results, consult the rule book for a specific citation, write the appeal and find the referee.

Not enough time for coaches to see results

Often at Championships, and by the time the preliminary results are announced/ posted there is a reticence by officials to reconsider results under protest due to time constraints. 30 min provides ample time, and is the manner of tradition and practice. 15 min's often does not provide time to notify the Head Coach, get to the Protest Table & file the Protest, and initiate an action before the event final is underway.

If you have athletes competing in rounds immediately after the event you would like to protest it might take up to 30 minutes to hear of and make the protest.

Coaches who coach both men and women may not have a chance to look at results until after the last cross country race. This is a good rule for track, but not for cross country. I would say 30 minutes after the 1st race and 15 minutes after the 2nd race for cross country would be a better option.

The posting of field event results remains variable and unpredictable at many meets. Additionally, on-field coaches are often prohibited from accessing results using new technologies from the coaches' box. Protest window should be left at 30min.

Oppose the Cross Country change. At an efficiently run meet. This posting may occur during the next event for which the coach has responsibilities and could affect that time frame. 15 minutes after last race posted is fine the technology piece can also be more of an issue at cross country venues where manual posting is the norm because of lack of Wi-Fi services for posting.

Ought to be language about display of time posted, preferably on the results posted. One more thing to worry about. But I see the need for quick resolution.

What guarantee is that results are posted on time? Inclement weather has often resulted in results not being posted - or posting changed to a different location. Additionally, with multiple athletes/events continuing onward, smaller teams without ample amount of coaches to manage an appeal with only "15 minutes" means that the coach must abandon their coaching duties to seek out the appeal paperwork/process before returning to support their athletes. 30minutes was fine. no reason to change.

This also assumes that coaches are "hovering" around the posting area, almost anticipating the need for a protest. Most coaches have additional teams that are competing the same day and might not be able to stay near the posting area to make the 15 minutes a reasonable rule change. 30 minutes is not that great a time. It should remain as such.

While I agree that this should be possible with new technologies, the reality is that some meets are run better than others. I do not think the extra 15mins is unreasonable; at the end of the day, the most important thing should be that the results are valid. Shortening the time to file a protest only increases the chances that a violation will not be corrected.

Coaches engaged in related duties specific to their job may not be able to file a protest within a 15 minute time span if they are engaged in duties that prevent them from leaving at that moment to file. In addition, it cannot be assumed that a coach is able to check results quickly, especially if they are in a field event coaching and the results are not live online, and/or the paper form of results are in a location far from where the coach is coaching from.

Not enough time. Assumes all coaches have smart phones.

Coaches, especially those on a smaller staff, might not have the opportunity to regularly check the results. In addition there is a wide degree of time in which the results are posted depending on the timing system and crew. 30 minutes ensures that coaches have ample time to see the results and determine whether a protest is necessary.

There is a lot going on at a track and field meet and 30 minutes is a reasonable timeframe for a coach who his coaching multiple athletes to protest a result. 15 minutes is too short a time.

There are many things going on at track meets and sometimes they are at varying locations. To reduce the time may limit those individuals needing to make a protest from being able to get to the location once someone has realized the error.

Despite the advancement of technologies, there are still times that the technology may be inhibited. Moreover, a coach may miss the initial posting of official results within the initial 15 minute window due to coaching athletes in other events. To have the coach's attention completely inwrapped in waiting for the official results so as to determine if a protest needs to be filed could in turn penalize the coach's other athletes by not having the coach's attention focused on them.

While what you are saying sounds really good, experience tells a different story. How many times have the results of the NCAA D1 XC Championships been so hard to find at the meet that you finally give up and leave the meet not knowing? Before you change this rule, create a rule that designates when and where the results will be posted. Require a link to results that must be displayed days before the meet ever starts and that is made active to display the results on a specific time-table. Going to NCAA.com is WORTHLESS when trying to find results. I think that you have the cart before the horse.

keep it 30 min., since the rule states that its ONLY the head coach that can protest and appeal... often times, the head coach is needing to be contacted and informed of the situation,..... need time to discuss, and formulate the appeal.

30 minutes is better, 15 minutes not enough time

### Division III

#### Text Response

15 minutes seems too short. Coaches who are dealing with both genders across many different track and field events might need the full 30 minutes to consult with their athletes and assistant coaches to determine a course of action.

New technology may be advanced enough to allow for faster results to become available to coaches, but hat does not make the coaches more available to review protests. On teams with minimal coaching staffs there should not be a restriction on time beyond 30 minutes for coaches to file or review protests Problem with result posting. Stay at 30 minutes

I don't think that 15mins is enough time to immediately locate the results (we often don't know exactly where or exactly \*when\* they are getting posted and there is often much to do with care to the student-athletes and families besides stand around and wait for results at one location), assess the results for accuracy, consult the student-athletes of concern, check the rulebook, develop the language for a protest, locate the referee, and then file the protest. Even 20mins (instead of 15mins) would be better if the rules committee is feeling that 30mins is too long.

Often times coaches of smaller institutions are busy doing multiple tasks that they are physically unable to see every result within 15 minutes. They usually relay on others to find them when there is a questionable call. I feel this would take the coach away more away from his coaching duties and make him more a quality control analyst.

Not enough time in case of issue with timing service.

If a coach is coaching both genders; it is putting undo pressure on that coach. Old rule is better in this case

while info can be learned quicker perhaps, it is still difficult for coach to learn, then write protest, then find committee to turn into, even IF not other things were needed to be done. but we know in context of a track meet there is LOTS going on. 30 mins is even difficult. in XC even more so as coach is checking athletes after race, and hard to even find them in large crowd. plus coach may be preparing another group for the next race...

15 minutes is not sufficient time for a protest at a major championship. Some institutions do not have the benefit of having 10 coaches on staff, and the head coach may not always be able to immediately file a protest with such a short window. The 30 minute time frame is fair and works fine and should be left alone.

15 minutes is not sufficient duration to gather the complete facts in order to file a protest. Frequently results are not posted in a timely manner after being announced. Also in the case of cross-country results, some meets have mutple races with some teams having divided squads in multiple races which makes getting results and filing the protest in a timely manner even more difficult anyway with the 30 minutes time frame. It would be almost impossible with a 15 minute time frame.

In cross country there is too much going on after the race in musing tending to spent athletes. Want coaches to take care of team first while having time to still file protest. 15 min is too quick depending on outdoor locations

This would be ideal, however, some venues are more spread out than others (i.e. an throwing area may be quite far from where results are posted, and often being so far away, one is unable to hear announced results). I'm in favor of "45 mins".

There are still many championship meets where Live Results are not available and a coach should not need to be within a few minutes of results posting in case they need to file a protest. A coach must have the ability to coach their athletes in multiple venues and not be stuck waiting for results posting. Keep the 30 minute protest period.

Even with advanced technology results are not always viewed immediately. Whether it be a computer glitch where real-time results are not being posted, or the playing field is large enough where announcements may not be heard, it can still be difficult to manage within 15 minutes.

30 minutes is a good time length. 15 minutes does not allow the coach adequate time to collect all the facts and file the protest.

Many coaches may be occupied with other duties during the protest period (ex: coaching field events) which may be unfair to coaches who cannot afford to abandon their athletes while at the same time are entitled to submit a protest.

I would like to see this amended to say "announced and posted" . In many meet locations, the speaker system does not work very well or there may not even be an announcer for anything other than winners. Often the results are not posted in a timely manner, particularly if an issue exists with the results. If there is not a combination of announcement and posting, a coach may not know either has happened or that the results are even available.

## Division II

### Text Response

I believe that in cross country you must wait to start the protest period until all races are complete. This is not fair to a coach who is coaching both genders and may not be able to see the results until after the last race. I believe 15 minutes is okay, if it starts after the last race.

Coaches are very busy at track meets with multiple events going on at the same time. 15 minutes could easily pass with results posted for an event without a coach seeing them. 30 minutes is more safe window.

Not enough time if you coach both men and women. Keep it at 30 minutes.

I feel that 30 minutes should remain to file protest. Coaches who have other athletes in other events may not hear or may not even know there is an issue with one of their other athletes... the coach needs the extra 15 minutes..

Some facilities are very spread out and a head coach may need more than 15 minutes to be properly informed that an appeal was necessary.

Teams with smaller coaching staffs may have a more difficult time learning of an incident that may merit a protest and then completing and submitting to the proper location the necessary protest form within 15 minutes of the announcement or posting of the event. Not enough is gained by reducing the time from 30 minutes to 15 minutes.

30 minutes is still a good amount of time, as with many meets, there is still quite a delay in getting results posted and available to everyone.

Sometimes 15 minutes isn't enough for the coach to get all the details of what happened, confirm the rule in the rulebook and draft a quality protest.

Coaches are busy during meets, and many times 15 minutes is not enough time to file a protest in the proper fashion.

Coaches are very busy at meets sometimes attending to the needs of 60, 70, 80 athletes at a competition site. In addition, coaches are sometimes a quarter, half, or miles away at a venue removed from the main facility coaching athletes. Even with the advances in technology the logistics of learning of an issue, determining a course of action, and filing a protest take sufficient time. Keep the limit at 30 minutes.

If the results need to be adjusted and there're is plenty of evidence then the original time of 30 min should still be used.

Coaching Men and Women means that there is not always the opportunity to review results quickly...15



minutes is not much time during a long meet, or fast moving championship of finals.

**48. Rule 4.3.8** As part of the protest process, the decision of a referee may be appealed through an appointed jury of appeal, in writing, not later than 30 minutes after the decision of the referee has been announced. The referee must be interviewed and any official evidence available to the referee may be reviewed. If such evidence is not conclusive, the decision of the referee shall be upheld. No further appeal is available. The result of an appeal shall be posted and the affected coaches notified.

**Rationale:** Since the evidence to overturn a referee's decision must be conclusive, the jury must be aware of the process used by the referee in making the original decision.

Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 4.3.8.

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	82%	83%	76%
Oppose	5%	3%	0%
No Opinion	13%	14%	24%
Total	112	65	49

**49. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 4.3.8.**

Division I

Text Response

Clearer

Great idea

The time limit should match 4.3.7.a (15 minutes). Having different time limits will cause confusion and open the door for additional protests. Based on the rationale for changing 4.3.7.a the same holds for 4.3.8

Yes

Agree with rationale

sounds clear and fair. Any official evidence... what makes it official?

Support above rationale

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale

Division III

Text Response

To make the jury aware is great and they must also be able to notify coaching staffs as well gather all information that is available and allowed before making a decision!

An expert in track can make a decision regardless of a protesters feelings

I agree with the rationale

Division II

Text Response

This only seems logical.

As stated above



**50. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 4.3.8.**

Division I

Text Response

The goal is to get it right, not see it the way the referee saw it. The rule still requires conclusive evidence to overturn a referee's decision.

What if technology fails?

15 minutes, not 30 minutes

This rule is incomplete. It does not designate whom is required to interview the referee. Nor does it indicate a timeline for this interview.

Division III

Division II

**51. Rule 4.3.9 Within 72 hours after the last event of a meet, or before the subsequent round, results can be corrected without the need for formal protest if administrative errors are detected (such as incorrect calculation of team, individual or combined-event scores, timing, placing or other errors based on factual evidence). A correctable error shall include a coach's request to review the order of finish from an FAT system.**

**Rationale: This is what is currently occurring at the majority of track and field and cross country competitions. Making this change would enable the protest period for cross country to be shortened, thus allowing a more fan friendly time period between the conclusion of competition and the awards ceremony.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 4.3.9.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	87%	83%	82%
Oppose	3%	3%	2%
No Opinion	11%	14%	16%
Total	112	66	50

**52. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 4.3.9.**

Division I

Text Response

Great idea

Agree with rationale

Sounds reasonable

The rule sounds good; but the rationalization " allowing a more fan friendly time period between the conclusion of competition and the awards ceremony." is poor. Focus of a rule should be to enhance the efficiency, fairness, and transparency of a process to ensure the correct results are found; not to ensure a fan base is more easily appeased.

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale

Previously had an error where an athlete was given the wrong time at a meet. By the time that I had seen the results (they were not being published online and I was at a different venue for a separate event) the protest window had ended. I asked if there was a way to correct a mistake made other than the protest which wasn't necessary in this case as it did not affect the meet outcome. I was told only a protest could do so. This rule seems to amend this situation.

This is a good rule change/clarification. There are times when an athlete is not correctly identified and a time is applied to the wrong athletes. Additional input from a coach to identify his/her athlete is most helpful toward accurate results.

Division III

Text Response

Ok

Great idea. This addresses a significant portion of my concern for rule 4.3.7.a. this seems good on reading, but not sure how this shortens xc, as that is not mentioned here...

Consistency

Let's be more athlete coach and fan friendly.

I agree with the rationale

Division II

Text Response

I have seen multiple timing/scoring errors in my five years as a head coach, one of which included our no. 3 runner at the Atlantic Region meet not appearing in the initial team scoring. I was able to speak with the meet timers and the results were corrected, which moved us up two places in the team scoring.

**53. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 4.3.9.**

Division I

Text Response

The results should be correct when the awards announced.

72 hours is way too long. Amend to 48 hours and the above rationale is good. Agree that with shortening protest period in XC

Division III

Text Response

three days!!!!?????????

Division II

**54. Rule 4.4.2 (New) Events ARTICLE 2. Track and Field championship events shall be as follows:**

- |                   |                   |  |
|-------------------|-------------------|--|
| a. Indoor:        | 60 Meter          | Distance Medley Relay (1200m, 400m, 800m, 1600m) |
| 60 Meter Hurdles  | High Jump         | 200 Meters Pole Vault                            |
| 400 Meters        | Long Jump         |  |
| 800 Meters        | Triple Jump       | Mile Shot Put                                    |
| 3,000 Meters      | Weight Throw      | 5,000  |
| Meters Pentathlon | 4x400 Meter Relay | Heptathlon                                       |
| b. Outdoor:       | 100 Meters        |  |

100/110 Hurdles Shot Put 200 Meters 400 Hurdles Discus Throw 400 Meters  
 4x100 Meter Relay Hammer Throw 800 Meters 4x400 Meter Relay Javelin Throw  
 1500 Meters High Jump Decathlon 3,000 Steeplechase Pole Vault Heptathlon  
 5,000 Meters Long Jump 10,000 Meters Triple Jump c. The 55 Meters and 55  
 Meter Hurdles may only be used as replacement for the respective 60 Meter events within facilities  
 unable to be configured for the 60 Meter events. Outdoor facilities, where the full oval is surveyed  
 for 440 yards, may contest the imperial equivalent of the 4x100 Meter Relay and the 4x400 Meter  
 Relay as replacement events. Indoor facilities, where the full oval is surveyed in yards, may  
 contest the imperial equivalent of the 4x400 Meter Relay and the Distance Medley Relay as  
 replacement events. d. The events listed above may be altered at the discretion of the games  
 committee.

**Rationale:** This adds to the Rules Book a list of events that are NCAA Championship events and incorporates the variations and restrictions currently found in the Qualifying Regulations for Championship performances.

Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 4.4.2.

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	75%	80%	72%
Oppose	12%	5%	8%
No Opinion	13%	15%	20%
Total	112	66	50

**55. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 4.4.2.**

Division I	
Text Response	Agree with rationale did not know there are still yard tracks For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale," with the following question: can a Games Committee choose to run the 3000 meters outdoors in lieu of the 5000 meters in non-Championship competitions? (This is a common practice among institutions hosting meets at altitude, where racing 5000 meters is often considered counterproductive because (a) existing altitude conversions for 5000 meters are considered inadequate, making qualifying extremely difficult, and (b) recovery time from a quality effort at 5000 meters is increased, rendering performances in races in subsequent weeks more difficult. The weight throw is dangerous, time consuming and not facility friendly. Should not be an official event
Division III	
Text Response	Definition of a track meet. I agree with the rationale
Division II	
Text Response	I feel that conferences should also follow this policy in their championships. I strongly support the standard event schedule for our sport. I think that this should be extended to include ANY championship meet (ie: conference championships) not just the National Meet.

**56. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 4.4.2.**

Division I

Text Response

This changes the running of our conference (Big Ten) meet by not allowing us to compete in a 600m race. This is a historical race in the conference and allows for more competitors at the championship. This aids in athlete development and student-athlete experience at the championship. Regular season and conference meets are not the NCAA and should not be forced to change events if not desired by the conference coaches. Internationally, they run 3200 or 2000m races at times, even though they are not standard races.

There is obviously a lot of discussion going on about defining what constitutes a track meet. I do not want to see this defined in the rule book.

Conferences have used other non-traditional events and should be allowed to do continue those events. They allow greater access to conference championships to many student athletes.

I don't think you can make it that all championships are the same. What about the 4x800m?

It is unclear whether this list is meant to be exclusive or not. Many conferences have additional events in their indoor and outdoor championships (Indoor: 500m, 600m, 1000m, 4x800m relay, and Outdoor: 4x800m relay) and this might be misconstrued as a way by some to eliminate those events. This should remain at the discretion of the coaching body of the respective conferences.

This will turn into where we will not be able to run odd events at Championships like the 1000m - which has been run forever on the east coast at most conference meets. This will take away tradition and history for a lot of conference championship meets.

Does not allow for flexibility in constructing a meet that includes traditional conference events not included in this list (600m, 1k, 4x8 etc). Coaches put together meet events to accommodate their individual tracks (indoors) and based on what works best for their facility, time frame, fan base. Ok for NCAA championships to have only these events, but it is not ok for the NCAA to tell coaches what events they can only have at their own site.

conferences should be able to add events if needed

Division III

Text Response

I do not believe that indoor facilities that can not host a full 60 meter race or outdoor facilities still measured in yards should be used for NCAA Championship meets.

what about the 4 x 800 relay

The language of this rule reads "Championship Events" not "NCAA Championship Events." This will not allow for individual conferences to hold differing events as part of their conference meet completion the way the proposal is worded.

Division II

Text Response

I am okay with this proposal, but not if these are the only events at a championship meet. My conference currently has a 600 and 1000 meter race too during the indoor season, so as long as my conference can still keep these races, I would be okay with it. Otherwise, I feel this rule needs to wait a few years to be implemented, as my current team and incoming recruiting class are geared specifically towards these two events, in addition to the proposed championship events.

If university what to contest events that will help get their athletes ready for national events like a 600 meter or 1000 meter then they should have to right to. We often run less than 8000 meters in cross country early in the season to help get our athletes ready to run 8000 meters later in season.

There is a legacy of non-traditional events (500yard/meter, 600meter, 1000meter) in many collegiate conferences throughout the Midwest. Such conferences should be able to continue to conduct their legacy events at Championships in any fashion they see fit.

**57. Rule 4.4.2** The interval between the starting times of track events shall not exceed 10 minutes, except in the 3000 Meters and Steeplechase, in which the interval shall be 15 minutes; the 5000 Meters interval shall be 20 minutes; and the 10000 Meters interval shall be 40 minutes except for the 3000 Meters, 3000 Meter Steeplechase, 5000 Meters and the 10,000 Meters where the interval shall be minimized to allow the continued flow of the track meet.

**Rationale:** The interval specified for the distance races between starts of races is impossible to adhere to in the women's races and some of the men's races. We need to have a rule that gives the Meet Director and Games Committee a reasonable chance to follow a prescribed and legitimate schedule.

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 4.4.2.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	74%	68%	74%
Oppose	9%	11%	8%
No Opinion	17%	22%	18%
Total	112	65	50

**58. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 4.4.2.**

Division I	
<b>Text Response</b>	
Agree with rationale	
Common sense rule.	
good change.	
For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale	
any thing that can make a meet run smoothly and quickly for the competition.	
Division III	
<b>Text Response</b>	
common sense	
Makes sense	
Exact time schedules won't always work, I do worry a little about some coaches taking advantage of this change	
Division II	
<b>Text Response</b>	
This just makes sense	
yes to move the meet along that is one problem we have our meets take to long	
Most meet directors are pretty good at estimating a schedule and moving the meet along without much down time	
This is true, not all athletes are able to complete those distances within the formerly allotted times.	
The old rule did not allow a sufficient amount of time between starting times for the distance races	
As stated above	

**59. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 4.4.2.**

Division I

Text Response

It is amazing to require that much time. TRACK MEETS are TOO LONG. The time should not exceed 5 minutes. Why does it take a basketball halftime between each running event.

If there are multiple heats of an event there is no way to adhere to this rule as written. For instance, if in a large invitational there are multiple heats of the 800, there is no way that a 10 min interval btwn START times can be adhered to. Perhaps the rule should read "no more than 10 min between the conclusion of one event and the start of the next event"

This should be up to the discretion of the local meet organizer. What if weather conditions; such as heat, make running the event dangerous at that time. This rule should NOT be adopted.

Hurdles

Too difficult to determine prior to a meet due to weather/safety.

NO interval requirement is needed. Let meet directors run the meet they wish to run. this becomes cumbersome on the meet host institution

should be shorter 5 mins between events. track is boring because if dead time

Division III

Text Response

an event (defined in next rule below) is all heats/sections, and those are usually MORE than 10 minutes. rewrite to make clear...

I don't believe the rule book needs to specify these intervals at all. Leave it to the discretion of the meet director. Many meets depart from this anyway.

A good start but doesn't allow for 25 heats of the women's 200m for example which by rule would have to be completed in 10 minutes.

Division II

Text Response

Please reword this and do a better job of taking emotions out of the rationale including sexism.

I feel things are just fine the way they currently are. No need to add another rule.

What if your meet has three heats of the mens mile, then you couldn't have less then 10 minutes between track events. I would say the next heat or next event most begins no more than 2 minutes after the last run. Excluding the mile relay which can be the last event contested at a championship meet.

**60. Rule 4.4.5 (Move to 4.4.3) Definition of Event ARTICLE 3. An event is all groupings, divisions or sections pertaining to one running or field event discipline per gender. All rounds of a running event shall be contested using the same physical configuration, except running direction, for events of 200 meters or less.**

**Rationale: This is a clarification of the current definition of an event.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 4.4.5.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	71%	77%	78%
Oppose	5%	2%	2%
No Opinion	23%	22%	20%
Total	112	65	50

**61. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 4.4.5.**

Division I

Text Response

Agree with rationale

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale

Division III

Text Response

This does define what an event is

I agree with the rationale given.

Division II

**62. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 4.4.5.**

Division I

Text Response

Sounds like you can switch direction of heats

Meet management should have a say in how best to conduct a meet on an institutions campus. ok for NCAA Champs (all rounds).

I am confused. Running direction, with the potential impact of wind, seems like one of the most important things to keep consistent. Not sure what I am missing. Are you allowing the heats of a race to change direction if the wind changes?

Division III

Text Response

does this allow for a 100m heat could be run one direction, and subsequent heat in another direction? unheard of...

Division II

**63. Rule 4.4.4 Order of Events – Running Article 4. The order of running events for the final round and all single session competitions should be: Indoor: Mile, 60 Meters, 400 Meters, 60 Meter Hurdles, 800 Meters, 200 Meters, 3,000 Meters, 4x400 Meter Relay Outdoor: 3000 Meter Steeplechase, 4x100 Meter Relay, 1500 Meters, 100/110 Meter Hurdles, 400 Meters, 100 Meters, 800 Meters, 400 Meter Hurdles, 200 Meters, 5000 Meters, 4x400 Meter Relay The games committee shall schedule additional events in a manner most appropriate for weather and facility considerations. Order of Events – Field ARTICLE 5. The order of field events for all competitions shall be determined by the games committee so that efficient use is made of the available time and facilities. The scheduling of the Hammer Throw and Javelin Throw shall be made with an awareness of the specials needs of those events. Mixed Gender ARTICLE 9. Mixed gender competition is permitted in any field event. Mixed gender competition is permitted in any Combined Event. Mixed gender is not permitted in any running event except the 10,000 Meters.**

**Rationale: The current order of events, with and without prelims, is not realistic and has an option for change built into the rule. The proposed rule includes the most common historical order of events for running, as well as guidelines for field events which never before existed. A combination of indoor and outdoor now exists in one location. Additionally, Mixed Gender procedure is currently in the Qualifying Regulations.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 4.4.4.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	54%	69%	64%
Oppose	32%	9%	16%
No Opinion	14%	22%	20%
Total	111	64	50



**64. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 4.4.4.**

Division I

Text Response

Like the idea of being able to change the distance races

I don't really understand why the mixed gender issue is part of this rule. It has nothing to do with the order of events. I disagree with the mixed gender portion of this rule.

Agree with rationale

Consider clarifying the "specials (sic) needs of those events" in Article 5.

I support this proposal for championship meets as long as it does not affect the way meets are scheduled during the season. The size of a facility, the number of sections or added events may make it difficult to use this format for all meets.

Division III

Text Response

good, except for: this makes clear, but in outdoor meets does not allow possible switching times of steeple and 5k if hot/humid conditions warrant running those events at different times for athletes' safety. is this covered elsewhere?

Meet management should be allowed to have mixed gender in any running event.

Clarity on Mixed Gender events helpful. DO NOT SUPPORT a strict set order of events, mandatory single division scoring of meets, prohibition of unattached athletes, or any of the other proposed changes to the running of a legal collegiate meet that have been discussed. Such proposals would be very harmful to our sport and our student-athletes.

I agree with the rationale given.

Division II

Text Response

The order of events needs to be consistent in order that athletes that run multiple events will best be able to prepare for championships during the course of the season.

I think that the mixed gender 10k exception should be removed. Women running in a mixed gender 10k have the potential to receive pacing assistance from male racers that does not exist in any other event.

## 65. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 4.4.4.

### Division I

#### Text Response

Most meet order of events should be left to the Games Committee.

The only aspect of this rule I oppose is the mixed gender 10,000m. The rule is being abused every year for the sole purpose of having men specifically entered and act as pacers for women to run NCAA qualifying times. I support all other aspects of this rule change.

Facility and climate conditions are a factor in conducting an outdoor track and field meet. The order of events needs to reflect the flexibility allowed to track and field so that all student athletes have the opportunity to compete in the best possible conditions.

This does not allow for primarily early season variations which may benefit the athletes such as a 2000 meter steeplechase and a 3000 instead of a 5000.

Meet management should have the ability to set the order of their meet.

This is VERY bad for the sport!!!! What if the local organizer is trying to promote, and get a big crowd, for a sub 4:00 mile and wants it at the end of the meet? What if weather conditions are not optimal for this schedule? This is a rule that could hurt some of this country's best and most productive meets.

This rule will hurt the sport. As the local organizer I should get to make the decision as to the order and time frame of the events.

I believe it is important to keep men and women separate during field event competition. Men can have a psychological affect on women, benefitting their teammates, both intentional and unintentional. Indoor part of this does not recognize the 5000m or the DMR, events included in the ppropose 4.4.2 Article 2 (a). These events, and additional events referred to in my previous comments about conferences and their choices, might make adhering to this order of events unrealistic for the athletes involved. Perhaps the "Games Committee" proviso should include the decision to alter this order as best for the needs of the athletes and competition site.

Meet management must have a say in how best to run a meet at home on an institutions campus. Not up to NCAA to tell a school how to conduct a meet. Coaches/meet managers know best what works for their institution.

There needs to be more clarity in this rule if a meet director wishes to change the order or omit events. This is not a good idea as it changes many meet structures currently in place and event order should be left up to the host institution.

It is not clear if the Games Committee has discretion to amend the order of events. There may be facility, staffing, and/or regional issues requiring adjustments for the well-being of the student-athlete, which does not appear to be accounted for in the current language.

Prefer switching the 60 meters and 60 Hurdles indoors, to more closely resemble the outdoor schedule, i.e., Hurdles immediately following Mile, just as it follows 1500 Outdoors.

no 4x800 relay indoors

Don't support non-mixed gender in running events if qualifying is not an issue.

why do some rules allow for change and others don't? IE- rule 4.4.2. Be consistent are we trying to be uniform in each in every circumstance or allowing for some discretion. Nothing wrong with a little local variance for some competitions.

For outdoor track competitions, given how often weather can play a role in performances, the order of events needs to be left to the discretion of the meet management in non-championship meets. While the idea of creating a uniform order of events is a nice idea, it does not necessarily put the athletes in the best position to perform well in terms of achieving a particular mark, which is of particular concern when trying to earn qualifying performances. For instance, It is not preferable or in the athlete's best interest to run a distance event (i.e. the 3000m Steeplechase) first when it temperature may be close to its peak and similarly it may be less advantageous for a sprinter to compete when the temperature has fallen off (this would especially be the case where you find considerable temperature variations between when there is daylight versus when there is not). Moreover, this rational is less of a concern in championship competitions as these meets are purely about the competition of place, rather than having the added element of obtaining a mark of some type.

Mixed gender should not happen (except the 10k) unless we are going to combine the teams into one and score points as one team

This rule does not take into consideration indoor facilities which are not owned and operated by the

host institution. Therefore, rental costs or time allowed in the facility may make the proposed order impossible. There has to be some flexibility for those of us who have to adjust to the demands of the facility.

Individuals, not teams, qualify by posting the BEST times and distances for the NCAA championships. Weather is of primary concern for a spring sport. (I'm not concerned with the indoor order of events). If windy conditions subside at outdoor venues in the early evening, a games committee should be allowed to adjust order of events to ensure best qualifying conditions for the 400 and up . If this rule passes, by your rational, I will propose that sprint and hurdle events should always finish on the homestretch at the common finish line (no turning events around to take advantage of tail winds for the sprinters hurdlers: and jumpers). Defining the "Common Finish Line " so all fans that buy the prime seating near the finish line will get their money's worth ! Your rule punishes athletes on the oval in the spring and favors the sprinters and jumpers, giving them a distinct advantage over these oval events to qualify for NCAAs.

I absolutely appose mixing genders within a competition. In no other sport does this ever happen. It's not good for the sport and makes us look like a club activity.

Coaches should decide order based on conditions and facilities needs. We need to change the NCAA meet qualifying procedures so that we qualify our teams for the "team" championship, not a group of individuals and then score the meet as a team competition.

Meet officials should be able to create the schedule how they see fit. Uniformity is the death of our sport. Exploit the good things suppress the bad. We will never go back to crowds of the 60s and 70s accept it an moved on.

### Division III

#### Text Response

why would you run the hurdles first outdoors & not do the same indoors. Logically, it would be better to run hurdles first indoors; then 400M; then 60 M dash

if you don't have mixed gender in the running events, you don't have it in any field events

Just because an order of events is more "historical" does not mean that it is appropriate and will fit fairly to every situation. Additionally, allowing "mixed gender" competition in field events will create several logistical and meet management issues.

### Division II

#### Text Response

It is too cold to jump into ice cold water at 9 am in the northern

I oppose the option for mixed gender competition. It's just one more rule that muddies the waters of what we can and can't do at a meet. It complicates the rule book in a time where we are in need of simplification!

Let the games committees, host schools, or individual conferences decide upon the order of events, as they are the ones hosting the event. Please don't overstate your powers and try and dictate this....

Individual meets set up their time schedules for specific reasons, please don't tell them how to run their own meets!!!

The order of running events does not allow for flexibility in weather conditions (heat) for events in the regular schedule such as the 5000m or for running such events men's and women's sections at different times in the schedule to make a meet more conducive to spectators.

**66. Rule 5.1.2** All races shall be started as a result of the starter activating a simultaneous audible and visual signal. The report of a pistol that can be cocked, not less than .32-caliber, or an electronic tone of at least 112 dB at 15 feet, together with the flash/smoke generated by the pistol, or an electronic flash/strobe, clearly visible to the timers, shall be used. The signal shall be the report of a pistol that can be cocked, or an electronic tone of at least 112 dB at 15 feet. The pistol shall be not less than .32-caliber, together with a simultaneous flash/smoke generated by a pistol or an electronic flash/strobe, clearly visible to the timers whenever Manual Timing is used. A .22-caliber pistol may be used for Fully Automatic Timing and for indoor events. A misfire shall not be a start. A .22-caliber pistol may be used at indoor events.

**Rationale:** With automatic timing it is not necessary to have the flash or smoke.

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 5.1.2.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	77%	70%	71%
Oppose	5%	11%	8%
No Opinion	19%	19%	20%
Total	111	64	49

**67. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 5.1.2.**

Division I	
<b>Text Response</b>	
Agree with rationale	
Ok with .22 or tone, whatever works.	
except, of course, when the timing unit fails - even with fail-safes, it's happened. Having smoke means at least there's an opportunity for a back-up hand-timing to occur.	
With automatic timing it is not necessary to have the flash or smoke.	
For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale	
Brings this up to date.	
Division III	
<b>Text Response</b>	
Good technology	
This issue is inconsequential, but the wording is clearer.	
Division II	
<b>Text Response</b>	
Athletes need to made aware by the starter or clerk prior to each race that a misfire does not constitute at start.	
The old rule was before automatic timing	

**68. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 5.1.2.**

Division I	
Text Response	
Why not use the .22 indoors?	
MANY spectators and coaches still use stopwatches in which the report of smoke is used to start the watch. Particularly in relays where feedback to athletes is necessary coaches will need to see the smoke of the starters pistol in order to get accurate split times.	
Clarifying language may be helpful, but the proposed rationale does not match the proposed rule revision.	
There continues to need to be a visual signal (this isn't necessarily smoke) for athletes who are hearing impaired.	
While FAT eliminates the necessity of a flash/smoke it is nice to have for both coaches and spectators wishing to get intermediate splits. Furthermore, having coached a hearing-impaired athlete, the lack of a visual cue places such competitors at a competitive disadvantage.	
Division III	
Text Response	
An electronic strobe/tone gun has no place in track & field	
If I am reading this correctly, flash/smoke is not required unless manual timing is being used. However, I expect that coaches and educated spectators value flash or smoke.	
It is difficult to find good .32 shells...and expensive. .32 is always on back order or they will not sell more than 150 rounds. This makes it extremely difficult if you host many meets. The problem we run across is most starters will use a real pistol instead of an actual starters pistol. A .22 caliber starters pistol (non crimp type) is considerably louder (well over 112db at 15ft) than a real pistol firing .32 starter shells.	
Some schools still do not have the equipment to have both timing systems that do not use "flash" starting systems. Would suggest "strongly encouraged" included in the rule.	
Division II	
Text Response	
I only oppose this because there may be a need for back-up timing using a stopwatch. the flash or smoke is necessary for that.	
Too much overkill regarding the actual number of decibels at a certain distance....	
Flash and smoke may not be necessary for timing, but it is important for coaches and spectators.	

**69. Rule 5.1.4 The runners shall take the “On your marks” position, either crouched or standing, promptly and in such a way that no part of the body touches the track on or beyond the starting line, or outside their assigned lane.**

**Rationale:** This eliminates the confusion by the implication made in Rule 5-4. An exception is stated in Rule 10-4.7. Also complies with other rules books.

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 5.1.4.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	81%	71%	90%
Oppose	2%	10%	0%
No Opinion	17%	19%	10%
Total	110	63	49

**70. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 5.1.4.**

Division I	
Text Response	
Agree with rationale	
If last phrase is "outside their assigned lane/starting position" This allows for that outside alley to extend past the outside lane	
OK	
Agree with rationale above	
For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale"	
Division III	
Text Response	
Fine	
"Promptly" is a vague word and cannot be enforced as written. Need. To have a time limit to get in position	
Keep'em in there lanes	
I agree with the rationale given.	
Division II	
Text Response	
This rarely happens but does clarify the rule just in case.	
Good clarification.	

**71. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 5.1.4.**

Division I	
Division III	
Text Response	
Some Indoor Tracks do not provide sufficient lane width for hand placement while in the blocks.	
In distance races with allys, it is sometimes necessary to have athlete line up beyond the outside if the ally to accommodate all runners and to give all runners a fair start (assuming there is a define waterfall line extended beyond assigned lanes).	
Division II	

**72. Rule 5.5.2.a The referee, after consulting with the appropriate officials, shall disqualify a competitor who: a. Flagrantly, impedes another runner;**

**Rationale: Just impeding in any manner is not a violation. Current international rule uses 'deliberately'. There should be something other than an inadvertent action.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 5.5.2.a.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	83%	85%	87%
Oppose	5%	9%	4%
No Opinion	12%	6%	9%
Total	112	65	47

**73. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 5.5.2.a.**

Division I

Text Response

"rubbing is racing" and not uncommon. This contact must be significant and volitional to warrant a DQ  
Should we use "deliberately" also?

Consider using international wording of deliberately instead of flagrantly.

I agree with the rationale but this is a rule where there is a lot of subjectivity.

Great clarification

Carelessly or callously

This leave an action open to interpretation, Many time contact is unavoidable as well as unintentional.

Agree with rationale

Agree that there should be something other than inadvertent action. Flagrantly is much stronger and deliberate

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale

Is "Deliberately" IAAF wording?

Division III

Text Response

accidents happen, but this leaves a lot up to "perception" and "judgment."

Alberto Salazar is not going to like this... How else will he get runners disqualified for beating his athletes?

Need to uphold the principles of fairness and Good Sportsmanship in this sport

good word, gets rid of bumping and racing accidents.

I agree with the rationale given.

Division II

Text Response

This is fair to the competitors, as not all impeding is purposeful or unavoidable.

I agree that an athlete that unintentionally impedes another athlete should not be disqualified

Should be intentional impeding of another runner

Good to see the NCAA following suit with international rules on this one. Incidental things happen while racing all the time. Intent should be the true determinant.

Excellent clarification to that rule!!!

There should be something other than inadvertent action. The word choice should be specific 'deliberately' entails knowing intent/omniscience which is problematic. Flagrantly seems a good option.

#### 74. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 5.5.2.a.

##### Division I

###### Text Response

Internationally they have it right. The language we are using opens the door for petty protest used to help coaches change the outcome of a races because they do not like the final results that their athlete was not fast enough. Please. Find a way to stop the petty protests, There is always some contact in races not run in lanes.

Remove the subjectivity of intention, and make the rule simply read "impedes". The Referee, and/ or Jury can then be charged with the incident, rather than intention, and/ or degree of violation. Impedes is sufficient in itself.

action can be deliberate but not appear flagrant.

In some cases impeding a competitor, whether flagrant or not is still impeding and should be considered for disqualification.

There has to be something on the books to deter impeding another runner. This does not do it.

Totally disagree with you rationale How in the world are you gonna determine if it was flagrant or not ? And why to do we follow some IAAF rules when it is convenient for the officials ( they do not want to make a tough call ) and not follow other IAAF rules that ensure all schools facilities are exactly what they claim to be ( not convenient to the officials or committee to monitor ). If you impede, you gained an advantage whether it was flagrant or not. I will just tell my runners to be more aggressive ( just don't throw a punch or push someone off the track) the referee doesn't want to make a call.

##### Division III

###### Text Response

sometimes an accidental impeding occurs but still should be considered a disqualification. the rule would be better to describe what impeding looks like, give specific, explicit examples.

'flagrant' is hard to define/delineate. does this include cutting a runner off, not being a stride and a half ahead, as in other rule? this is often clearly done, and a violation, but with the cutoff runner 'backing' off it may not look flagrant.

Deliberately would be a better term than flagrantly.

How does one prove intentional/flagrant impedance. This rule is going to get abused. You need to be aware of your surroundings, in soccer if you accidentally crash into someone because you are running with your head down, you are still subject to a yellow card.

Flagrantly is too open to interpretation. A runner can deliberately impede in a mild way that will affect participants that will not rise to flagrant. Just look at basketball - they have fouls and flagrant fouls - all are still fouls that affect competition. The use of flagrant doesn't address those deliberate methods of impediment that do rise to flagrant

##### Division II

###### Text Response

Remove the word flagrantly. If a person impedes another it should be grounds for disqualification.

A flagrant or non-flagrant impediment to a runner still results in that runner being disadvantaged during a race.



**75. Rule 5.5.2.b** The referee, after consulting with the appropriate officials, shall disqualify a competitor who: b. In a race run on a curve, steps on or over the lane line to the left with two consecutive steps of the left foot either both feet or a single foot;

**Rationale:** Any two violations of the lane line should result in a penalty. Judges have ruled that a left-right combination is not a violation. In reality, a single step on a lane line is the same as an 'out-of-bounds' in any other sport. Any crossing of a foul line in the field events is a penalty.

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 5.5.2.b.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	77%	65%	80%
Oppose	14%	23%	13%
No Opinion	9%	12%	7%
Total	111	65	46

**76. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 5.5.2.b.**

Division I	
<b>Text Response</b>	
Agree with rationale needed	
For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale Eliminates some officials confusion with "left-left".	
Division III	
<b>Text Response</b>	
Easier for an official to call	
This keeps all events on an equal interpretation of a boundary line violation.	
I support this as long as an athlete would not be disqualified if they were pushed and subsequently stepped over the lane line with two foot contacts. An athlete in this situation needs the ability to regain balance and position within the lane.	
I agree with the rationale given.	
Division II	
<b>Text Response</b>	
Would like to add "unless the pushed off the track by a competitor" this makes more sense than the original ruling	
2 steps is fair. one step could happen for any number of reasons, including wind or jostling by another runner. In other sports, an athlete can cross the out-of-bounds line as long as they keep the ball inbounds.	
Good Clarification	
Potentially leading to a need for more officials, etc. which could be a problem for meet administration, but the logic is sound.	

**77. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 5.5.2.b.**

Division I

Text Response

Rather have "may" instead of shall.

This is madness. You want to disqualify a person every time they step on the line. Other sports penalize not disqualify. This is the most petty offense in our sport. It has no advantage. Now you want yo make it stricter.

Also, in sports like basketball if you get pushed out of bounds then that is a foul and not a change of possession. In a distance race if you are running a curve and get bumped and run 2 steps consecutive then that is not a grounds for disqualification.

Revision would halve the number of steps required for disqualification.

Should be a single step

needs to be written more clearly...idea is right, but it is written poorly

Seems like you need to make up your mind. In 5.5.2a, you talk about only considering Flagrant violations, meaning that you are increasing the application of incidental contact. Yet, here in rule b, you are tightening the rules. I think that I could support this in laned races. But, in alley races and on the inside curve, the "incidental" contact can easily push a runner over the line, which does happen. Seems like this is an application of "If it is not broke, don't fix it." You don't have other competitors pushing an implement out of bounds in a field event. And, most other sports, other than contact sports, do not have incidental contact impacting the out of bounds rules.

Yet on a track with cones, no curb, you never have enough officials to watch every step for the entire race , straights and curves! If it's so important not to cross a foul line in a field event (you rightfully said it!!) the same attention to detail needs to apply to the inside line on a oval race, which if violated, shortens the race for those individuals . If it's not a big deal , why were curbs invented!!!! Be consistent with ALL your rationale on this survey, you are all over the place, jury picking as you go.

Division III

Text Response

I would add, "unless interfered with by another runner." In the impeding rule above, you've just opened up inadvertant contact for races, but now have said two steps on the line and you are disqualified. This is very different than a field event where it is one competitor at a time. A running event adds other runners/variables that are not in control of a competitor.

Your rationale is incorrect. In college football if one foot is out of bounds in the other inbounds the player is still inbounds. In soccer the player can be out of bounds all day. the only thing that matters is whether the ball completely crosses the line, if the ball has not crossed the line but rather is on it, hen play is still allowed to progress. In this regard, one step on the line is a real judgement call, there should be a clearly repetitive touching of the lane line 2-3 step minimum, not 1-2.

Rule should be one step with either foot is out of lane

On the line is still considered in for some sports (e.g., tennis). Over the line is clearly out. While this is not the intent of the questions and change posed, still should be considered.

Biomechanically, an athlete may need the extra right foot step to gain balance & avoid injury needs to be written precisely, as "2 consecutive lefts, or rights, or left-right, or right-left". (it is hard, but possible, to take 2 rights without a left I think...). also,, saying '2 consecutive steps of both feet' might be read as needing 4 steps total...

It is to easy to inadvertently take a step that touches a line indoors that provides absolutel no advantage.

Division II

Text Response

This rule needs further clarification. Is this only in the sprinting events or for distance events as well. A 10k runner isn't really getting an unfair advantage if they lose their balance and take a couple steps inside the rail.

Unless it is deliberate and FLAGRANT, let it go....

Three consecutive steps rather than two.

**78. Rule 5.5.3** The referee, after consulting with the appropriate officials, shall disqualify a competitor who: a. Flagrantly jostles, cuts across or obstructs another competitor so as to impede the other runner's progress. Direct contact is not necessary; any action that causes another runner to break stride or lose momentum is grounds for disqualification; b. Flagrantly veers to the right or to the left so as to impede a challenging runner or forces the challenging runner to run a greater distance; c. Voluntarily leaves the track or abandons the race, then returns later to continue the race; d. Tries to force a way between two leading runners and makes direct contact so as to impede the progress of either; e. Steps on or over the curb with two consecutive steps of the left foot either both feet or a single foot; Rationale: Adds a degree of action to the violation. Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 5.5.3.

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	83%	66%	77%
Oppose	8%	18%	13%
No Opinion	9%	15%	11%
Total	110	65	47

**79. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 5.5.3.**

Division I

Text Response

Consider deliberately instead of flagrantly

The clarification should help the referee.

outcome of races should be determined by ability, not ability to keep another from passing you.

Agree with rationale

This is a tough one because creating or choosing qualifier type terms can be so divisive. The idea is certainly appropriate, that with a large number of people trying to inhabit a small space there will be inadvertent contact/interference that should be differentiated from deliberate contact/interference.

ok

Agree with above rationale

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale

Consistent with earlier change suggestions - use of Flagrant and foot steps

Division III

Text Response

I agree with the rationale given.

Division II

Text Response

Would like to add "unless the pushed off the track my a competitor" to (e.)

Flagrant athletes need to be disqualified

Does the interpretation of this rule include a hurdle being displaced into another lane casing an impediment to a competitor?

**80. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 5.5.3.**

Division I

Text Response

Again, the rules are being made to increase the number of disqualifications rather than look for fairness. Conference and national meets are going to be more about how many times you can get your opponent DQed rather by performance. Quit opening the door for meets by run in court rooms rather than on the track.

Remove the subjectivity of intention, and make the rule simply read "impedes", rather than jostles/ veers. The Referee, and/ or Jury can then be charged with review of the incident, rather than intention, and/ or degree of violation. in this case also, Impedes is sufficient in itself.

I agree with some of this rule. I agree with B & C and I OPPOSE A, D, & E. A, D, & E is called racing - things are going to happen it is up to athletes to be aware of what is going on in race.

Still poorly written for the stepping over the curve...please rewrite and the rule is fine

|

one can be pushed off the track and never gain an advantage

Division III

Text Response

sometimes violations are not flagrant, but still obstruct or impede another runner. just because it was an inadvertant mistake, doesn't make it any less of a mistake.

Veering must be more clearly defined in letter B before support can be given for this rule. What is considered appropriate spacing vs veering?

E- do not agree with What if runner is forced off the track by another athlete?

Biomechanically, an athlete may need the extra right foot step to gain balance & avoid injury in part b. this seems to allow for someone to gradual move outward down final straight, as many runners do - this does not seem flagrant veering, but has been against the rules in the past. reword foot placement over curb as I wrote up in preceding rule about inner line violation.

Should use the word 'deliberately' instead of 'flagrantly'

Do not like flagrant - too high a level of misconduct in order to be disqualified - misconduct has many levels/degrees that all should be addressed for disqualification

I oppose "e". Someone may stumble or get bumped and step on or over the curb on the straight, gaining no advantage, in fact may run a greater distance. I support all other segments.

Division II

Text Response

For part e, I think the traditional 2 left steps was a better rule allowing for the jostling that can occur in middle distance races.

Disagree with e. Disqualification is too severe for distance races where a runner can briefly lose their balance and gains no competitive advantage. This happened to one of our milers on a 200 meter banked track at Penn State University in January. He lost his balance coming around the final turn, took two steps inside the rail, and was disqualified. This did not help his time or place in any way, in fact, it would have hurt his time. I am the coach at a Division II school with no indoor facility, so our athletes never have the opportunity to practice running these tight turns and it seems unfair that we have an athlete disqualified who gained no competitive advantage from briefly losing his balance and then recovering.

I am fine with proposals A-d, but not E....

Remove flagrantly from the equation. If a person jostles or veers and impedes another it is a violation.

**81. Rule 5.6** The referee, after consulting with the appropriate officials, shall disqualify a competitor who: a. Advances or trails a leg or foot outside the hurdle width and below the top horizontal plane or the plane extended of the hurdle; b. Runs around or under a hurdle; Does not hurdle each hurdle within the competitor's lane; c. Runs over a hurdle not in the hurdler's lane; or Deliberately knocks down any hurdle; or d. Knocks down any hurdle by hand.

**Rationale:** To clearly identify that the violation is not in hitting the hurdle below the top plane during a race. Any deliberate knocking down of a hurdle is a violation.

Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 5.6.

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	86%	83%	89%
Oppose	4%	5%	0%
No Opinion	10%	12%	11%
Total	110	66	47

**82. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 5.6.**

Division I
<b>Text Response</b>
May need to address wording of c. deliberately knocks down any hurdle - leaves a lot of judgement on the official to determine.
Good clarification.
I support...However, I believe the wording "deliberately knocks down and hurdle" needs some work. How will it be determined if the action is "deliberate".
Agree with rationale
Think hard about disqualification for "deliberately knocking down any hurdle" This is highly subjective, and the hurdle weight is specified such that there is an intrinsic penalty for significant contact with hurdles. Overall, the intent of the rule is good.
OK
Agree with above rationale
For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale
Division III
<b>Text Response</b>
this is an infraction that results in an advantage. That's not so certain with the one step on the lane line. So I'm lenient on the curve (two steps!) but not on the trail leg.
This rule needed clarification.
Or uses ball of the foot (on purpose ) to push hurdles down to avoid making a proper clearance too often not called. in 400 hurdles many violations of trail leg around hurdle below bar...
The problem is still deliberately doesn't that imply understanding intent?
I agree with the rationale given.
Division II
<b>Text Response</b>
This new rule is more clear
Could be hard to delineate deliberate action of feet/leg movements in the hurdles.

**83. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 5.6.**

Division I	
<b>Text Response</b>	
	This is crazy. Some hurdles are 42 inches wide and some 48 inches. You now want to call it foul when a hurdler goes outside the hurdle? This happens every race. Some times a hurdler loses their balance. Again who is looking for rules to increase DQs. Those in outside lanes are going to be at a greater disadvantage. Are we going to have an official at each hurdle like the long jump and call it a foul when a millimeter of the foot is outside the plane of the hurdle. Don't see justification for change. If this is the rationale, I think the wording can be better. I agree with rationale, but question the wording. What is the definition of deliberately in this case? How do you distinguish between knocking a hurdle down in the process of running the race and deliberately doing so?
Division III	
<b>Text Response</b>	
	This puts too much pressure on an official to guess if the athlete "deliberately" knocked down a hurdle. Hitting a hurdle is usually not an advantage to the athlete.
Division II	

**84. Rule 5.7 The referee, after consulting with the appropriate officials, shall disqualify a competitor who: a. Advances or trails a leg or foot outside the hurdle width and below the top horizontal plane of the hurdle; b. Runs around a hurdle; Does not traverse over each hurdle; or c. Does not attempt every hurdle; or d. Does not go over or through the water. Rationale: To clarify the violations of the steeplechase. This is consistent with the new hurdle violations. Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 5.7.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	85%	88%	96%
Oppose	2%	2%	0%
No Opinion	13%	11%	4%
Total	109	65	48

**85. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 5.7.**

Division I	
<b>Text Response</b>	
	Agree with rationale Ok For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale"
Division III	
<b>Text Response</b>	
	Agree with Rationale I agree with the rationale given.
Division II	
<b>Text Response</b>	
	Would like to add "unless impacted by another run in their way" Question? Can a steeple runner put their hands on the barriers? I can't think of any reason not to support this rule clarification.

**86. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 5.7.**

Division I
<b>Text Response</b>
The 'chase is NOT a hurdle race run in lanes. In many 'chase races there are way too many competitors. Disagree with above for safety reasons. There has to be some flexibility when 12-18 athletes are approaching the same 'chase barrier in the early laps. What does traverse mean?
Division III
Division II

**87. Rule 5.8.4 In the sprint relays, outgoing runners, while waiting for the baton, may use the international zone if the incoming runner is running a leg of 200 meters (220 yards) or less and each leg is lane specific. Receivers for relay exchanges that do not occur in assigned lanes shall line up, as instructed by an official, in the same relative position as their incoming teammates; the leaders shall pass in the first position, the second-place holders in the second position, etc. This line-up position is determined and should be maintained when the leader is at the beginning of the straight before the pass. When interference is not possible, receivers may move to the inside and should maintain the same relative positions.**

**Rationale: Provide better procedure to eliminate the confusion during the exchange. International zone use interpretation added for clarity.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 5.8.4.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	75%	77%	81%
Oppose	3%	5%	0%
No Opinion	22%	18%	19%
Total	110	65	48

**88. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 5.8.4.**

Division I
<b>Text Response</b>
Agree with rationale Agree with above rationale For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale"
Division III
<b>Text Response</b>
Agree thank you will there be similar clarification about order of exchange for mid-distance relays, particularly the indoor DMR which has very crowded and fast handoffs from 1200 to 400 legs and 400 to 800 legs... I liked the jousling before as athlete head down the final straight, this is a good sound idea and will help a lot of what I like about watching a 4x4 but is way better for competitors.
Division II

**89. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 5.8.4.**

Division I

Text Response

As written I believe this rule will allow too much confusion and jostling in the last 100M before the exchange.

The beginning of the straight before the pass outdoors is 100 meters, too far for the line-position to be maintained

Have seen too many officials line up athletes in the wrong order, athletes know their teammates - Official could be used to signal a "no change" time frame once leader is on to the straight.

Division III

Text Response

so many things can happen in the last 50/100M that to hold your position is sometimes NOT the best option for one or more teams. changing positions should be allowed, even after the official lines up outgoing runners. then allow referees to sort out any interference or impeding. we will have more accidents in the exchange area if we remove flexibility of movement by outgoing runners.

Would not allow the fly zone to be used in medley relays where at least one leg is longer than 400m (such as a sprint medley) since each leg has to be lane specific.

Division II

**90. Rule 5.8.6 Incoming and outgoing competitors, after exchanging the baton, must remain in their lanes or established paths until the course is clear in order to avoid contact with the other competitors. When interference is no longer possible, incoming and outgoing runners should move to the inside.**

**Rationale: Provide better procedure during the exchange.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 5.8.6.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	82%	82%	81%
Oppose	6%	6%	2%
No Opinion	13%	12%	17%
Total	109	66	48



**91. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 5.8.6.**

Division I

Text Response

I strongly support this rule. BUT, at the NCAA (and many other) championship, the placement of the finish line scoreboard DOES NOT ALLOW the incoming runners to step off of the track to the left (without running into the scoreboard). The scoreboard placement causes runners to move right or simply stop where they are once they have handed off the baton, creating a real mess for the runners toward the back of the race. This rule is great but we really need to examine the placement of the finish line board at our championships.

Agree with rationale

Good procedure

Support, but the impementation will be difficult

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale

Clarity for officials and their instructions

clean up language of moivng to the inside,.... runners can then move outside their lanes.

Division III

Text Response

Agree

I agree with the rationale given.

Division II

Text Response

I like that this rule gives the relay runners clear instructions on what to do after handing off the baton.

**92. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 5.8.6.**

Division I

Text Response

This is a very organic, chaotic environment, and athletes need to be ready and able to respond as best they are able. I would argue that we are better off with athletes stepping off the track as they are able, rather than stopping and standing at the finish, clogging up the area, until the exchange for all teams is completed.

Yes, there are some instances of collision, but outweighed by usual non collision. Typically I have seen this interpreted at the high school level (many officials cross over) as stay put until the last team hands off. Holding athletes will further clog the inside lanes.

If a runner in lane 8 moves to the outside rather than the inside are they in violation of this rule as written and open for disqualification?

Division III

Text Response

I would like to see more clarification with regard to "in their lanes or established paths". I would like to see a clear determination between oval lanes and straight lanes. Continuing in the path would generally indicate staying straight which could cause a collision with an outgoing runner from an outside lane. I prefer staying in the oval lanes, which eliminates any confusion. I also want to see it clearly stated, after handing off an incoming runner must continue in their lane to get away from the hand off zone. When runners look back to get the baton and then turn around is where most collisions take place. Clearing the zone would be most helpful. Avoid stopping and standing or sitting in lane.

Division II

Text Response

The word flagrant or intentional contact needs to be added to the rule....it gets pretty crazy in those realy areas....and a runner may move to avoid contact with one runner and then run into a dirrerent runner.

**93. Rule 5.9.g** The referee, after consulting with the appropriate officials, shall disqualify a relay team when: After passing the baton, a runner veers out of the passing lanes or from a straight course and flagrantly impedes an opposing runner.

**Rationale:** Provide greater clarity as to what is a violation at the exchange of a baton. There must be more than an impedance. Coordinates with previous changes in Rule 5.5.3.

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 5.9.g.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	79%	78%	79%
Oppose	6%	8%	8%
No Opinion	16%	14%	13%
Total	109	64	48

**94. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 5.9.g.**

Division I	
<b>Text Response</b>	
	Often time is a 4 x 400 relay contact is unavoidable. Many times it occurs because the exiting runner is following an official's direction to clear the track.
	See Above finish line board issue
	Agree with rationale
	good
	Agree with rationale, but good luck with implementation
	For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale"
Division III	
<b>Text Response</b>	
	Agree
	I agree with the rationale given.
Division II	
<b>Text Response</b>	
	I am for altering any rule that could punish student-athletes for incidental things that have little to no impact on the race.

**95. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 5.9.g.**

Division I	
Text Response	
Remove "Flagrantly", and make it simply impedes.	
I don't think impeding has to be flagrant to still warrant disqualification.	
In the case of exchanging a baton of a race run in lanes if you exit your lane and impede a runner in any way it should be a violation. In the case of a relay run not in lanes where runners are moving in the same basic space only flagrant contact should be grounds for a violation. The rule needs to be amended to account for this difference in relay exchanges being run in lanes or not.	
Division III	
Text Response	
sometimes accidental impeding occurs but is no less an advantage/disadvantage and should be disqualified as well.	
Just because it is not flagrant does not make it right in this case. They need to know the rule.	
again, flagrant is hard to define. blatant might be a better word, and even if 'unintentional' may have severely impeded another team by not following the rules for avoiding interference...	
Should use the phrase 'flagrantly OR deliberately'.	
same as above. The oval lane should be the path, not the straight lane.	
Division II	
Text Response	
In this instance I disagree with the addition of "Flagrantly". Athletes need to be very aware of the impact that they can have on another team by being in the wrong place after an exchange. This is an important rule.	
Remove the word flagrantly.	

**96. Rule 5.10.1 The games committee may shall use the following methods in order to administer running events:**

**Rationale: Current procedure in Rule 5-11 indicates three rounds for large fields, but has an exception for scheduling constraints. Three rounds is seldom chosen. The change to 'shall' disallows all other non-listed creative methods.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 5.10.1.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	56%	60%	61%
Oppose	14%	12%	8%
No Opinion	30%	28%	31%
Total	108	65	49

**97. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 5.10.1.**

Division I	
Text Response	
Agree with rationale	
Shall is good. May invites chaos.	
It would have been helpful to display the remainder of the rule so that we did not have to look it up.	
Division III	
Text Response	
Some bizarre things occur when it's not spelled out.	
I agree with the rationale given.	
Division II	

**98. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 5.10.1.**

Division I

Text Response

Takes away flexibility from meet management.

Meet management should have the ability to determine rounds based on their facility and time limitations.

Room for slight improvisation for practical purposes should have been left as is.

Coaches, and meet directors have to have the ability to be creative with scheduling for home meets. They know best what works for their. This is important for the integrity of their meet.

Often institutions hosting large meets take creative methods to advance competitors from qualifying rounds to finals, while still complying with established rules re: number of finalists. There's NO overwhelming reason NOT to allow some variance from holding 3 rounds when it would add to length of competition and demands on the competitors.

If we qualify for the NCAA Championships as a team and not an individual , I would agree with this rule. I personally think we should qualify as a team, but until we do, stop trying to put the "Cart before the horse ". Qualify as a team , and I'm all for "defining a meet", keeping a consistent order of events, etc . But implementing these rules HURTS the " individual athlete " . The NCAA rule book says we are an "Individual Sport", not a "Team Sport "!!! CHANGE OUR SPORT TO A TEAM SPORT DISTINCTION IN THE NCAA RULE BOOK, and all your rationale makes sense. Until that happens , it hurts the athlete.

Why add more rounds to meets that are already too big and last too long.

Division III

Text Response

Let meet management or games committee determine their own meet structure.

give slack in meets where weather forecasts are a factor.

This is too restrictive for meets that follow the NCAA rule book but are not NCAA championships.

Intent is key here, does this preclude timed finals with 4 heats?

It is very valuable for meets with large fields to offer a semi final and final or even a consolation final for races of 200 meters or under to allow athletes a quality race with good competition.

Division II

Text Response

I am BIG time against this rule change, especially at a conference meet..... My RATIONALE is that if my athlete only qualifies for the conference meet in a 4 x 100 relay, or 4 x 400 relay, then that is the only event that they may compete in, even though they are the 25th fastest athlete in the conference. Otherwise an addition round of qualifying is required, and that is just plain DUMB!!!!!! I just watched the USA T&F Champs with qualifying in the women's 400 meters.... 18 were scheduled to start.....

One scratched, and then one false started in the final heat. Thus, 16 individuals ran a prelim race, and all 16 advanced... What a waste of effort and time!!!!!!!!!! Have some common sense on occasion.....

I stand by my 4 x 100 and 4 x 400 rationale and that some individuals might only be able to compete in one event at a two day conference meet, which in reality could become three days, including a day of travel the day before the meet. My conference has a lot of teams, so allowing 28-32 to compete, but only advance 8-9 finals is acceptable to me, versus forcing an additional round of qualifying.

Please listen to the athletes on this one, versus the rule making administrators. I am not only a coach, but also a USATF official, and I feel this rule significantly hurts some athletes abilities to compete in a more than one event in championship meet.... Please don't change this rule...

**99. Rule 5.10.5 In the event of a tie for the last qualifying position based on place for a subsequent race, the number of advancers based on time shall be reduced. If there are no advancers by time, advancement for the last qualifier shall be as if those tied were advancing by time. In the event of a tie for the last qualifying place position based on time for a subsequent race, after applying Rule 5-12.2d, and assuming positions on the track are available, all tying runners shall qualify. If enough positions are not available, the advancer shall be determined by a**

runoff or drawn by lot, based on a decision before the meet by the games committee. A runoff is not subject to Rule 4-2.2.

**Rationale: To provide guidance in advancing when a tie for the last qualifying place occurs.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 5.10.5.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	62%	62%	67%
Oppose	7%	18%	8%
No Opinion	30%	20%	24%
Total	109	65	49

**100. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 5.10.5.**

Division I

Text Response

Agree with rationale  
For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale"

Division III

Division II

Text Response

I feel that prior to the meet that the games committee notify all coaches as to whether there will be a run off or a coin toss to settle ties

**101. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 5.10.5.**

Division I

Text Response

Less opportunity

With Modern timing, ties should not occur. Run-offs are not practical and can be dangerous for competitors.

Someone from another heat with a faster time than the automatic qualifier position could/would be eliminated....if I read this correctly. Top 5 from each heat and next 2 fastest times: Heat 1 - tie for 5th and 6th place at 3:45.20 for 1500 meters Heat 2- 7th place runs 3:44.00. He does not advance because 5th and 6th place tie in slower heat. I oppose this.

This provides for a situation where even more folks from a heat that "doesn't run" can advance from a tie in the last "place advancing", and fewer from those heats that "go out and race" get back on time. if after going to the thosanth of a second,... I oppose a run off.

Division III

Text Response

This needs to be much more clearly written... It's more ambiguous now.

place is determined by time, so a tying final place means they were in same heat, and could not be differentiated by time, which means they tied by time. if the next round can take an additional tied person by time it should be able to take this tied placer. not fair to eliminate both (or more) tied placers and have LESS than the planned number move on...

I am unsure of the line "determined by a runoff or drawn by lot". Those are two very differing scenarios and I would prefer to see one or the other. It would make it much easier on the games committee.

I don't agree with the first statement of the rule in the event of a tie for the last qualifying position based on place for a subsequent race, the number of advancers based on time shall be reduced

I think the positions sent to a final should be absolute, break a tie by using 1000's if necessary if not a run off as the rules now provide for. We should also break ties in the field with a second best mark, or number of misses.

Run off only and not drawn by lot

Run-off is the only acceptable alternative. Drawing by lot diminishes the credibillity for the qualifier(s) to be determined.

Why wouldn't we go deeper in the results (i.e. to the next decimal point)?

Language provides little guidance and creates only confusion.

Division II

Text Response

Runoffs and draw by lot are both inherently unfair. We need to find a way to get rid of those as solutions to determining a final qualifier for an event.

- 102. Rule 6.1.8 (Delete Rules 6.8.2, 6.9.2, 6.10.2 and 6.11.2) THROWING AIDS a. For the purposes of this rule, the following shall be considered assistance, and therefore not allowed:**
- 1) The use of gloves except in the Hammer Throw and the Weight Throw. For these two events, the gloves shall be smooth on the back and on the front and the tips of the glove fingers, other than the thumb, shall be open. An additional layer of leather may be affixed to the palm of the glove for additional protection.**
  - 2) The taping of two or more fingers together. If taping is used on the hands and fingers, it may be continuous provided that as a result no two or more fingers are taped together in such a way that the fingers cannot move individually. The taping must be shown to the head event judge before the event starts.**
  - 3) The spraying or spreading by a competitor of any substance onto the throwing surface of the circle or onto the bottom of their shoes, except for water as a cleaning agent, nor the roughening of the surface of the circle.**
- b. For the purposes of this rule, the following shall not be considered assistance, and therefore allowed:**
- 1) The use, in order to obtain a better grip, of a suitable substance on the hands only or in the case of the Hammer Throw and Weight Throw, on the gloves. Such substances may be used on the neck in the Shot Put.**
  - 2) The use of chalk or a similar substance applied directly on**

the implement. Any such substances shall be easily removable using a wet cloth and shall not leave any residue. 3) The use of taping on the hands and fingers that is not in contravention of section a.(2) of this Rule.

**Rationale:** Make all taping allowances and restrictions the same across all rule books (IAAF and USATF) and have consistency in all cases where competitions involving NCAA competitors may occur. Wound protection and support belts are already allowed in Rule 4-3.6b(5). Incorporates all elements of the deleted rules into one rule. 3)

Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 6.1.8.

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	72%	78%	71%
Oppose	1%	0%	6%
No Opinion	27%	22%	22%
Total	109	65	49

**103. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 6.1.8.**

Division I	
<b>Text Response</b>	
Being consistent with all the rulebooks is a good idea.	
Agree with rationale	
Above rationale makes perfect sense	
For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale	
In all I support this rule, but believe that a potential condition should be discussed and stated that gloves may be worn in the warm up period.	
Condensation and consistency	
Division III	
<b>Text Response</b>	
Keep it consistent with IAAF, NCAA USATF	
Open wounds are not the only reason for needing tape. This allows for that I agree with the rationale given.	
Division II	
<b>Text Response</b>	
Glad you're coming.	
Best practice.	
Consistency in this area is a very good thing.	

**104. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 6.1.8.**

Division I	
<b>Text Response</b>	
This would allow taping above the wrist which could affect performance similar to lifting suits. Maybe more language needed to clarify. This could aid performance.	
Division III	
Division II	

**105. Rule 6.1.9** Once a competition has begun, except as scheduled, competitors are not allowed to use for practice purposes the runway, ring, or takeoff area, or throwing implements associated with competition, except as scheduled.

**Rationale:** Provide clarity regarding the procedure for warm-up, eliminating the possibility of using equipment within the competition area except for actual competition.

Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 6.1.9.

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	71%	67%	80%
Oppose	7%	11%	2%
No Opinion	21%	22%	18%
Total	107	64	49

**106. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 6.1.9.**

Division I

Text Response

Agree with rationale  
ok

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale

Division III

Text Response

keeps event smooth  
I agree with the rationale given.

Division II

Text Response

provides for the safety of competitors and athletes who are warming up  
Provides clarity



**107. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 6.1.9.**

Division I

Text Response

According to this rule a pole vaulter can not do anything with their pole...poe cary..plant drills etc... The inclusion of throwing implements is innappropriate. For example, in the javelin the implement is often used to stretch and develop range of motion in an event specific manner between attempts. This rule would unnecessarily prohibit such use of the implements, or require that implements/equipment not associated with the competition be introduced into the area, thus creating an environment which invites questionable moral choices to be pursued (i.e. throwing a non-inspected implement in competition)

Most stadiums do not have a separate practice track and there is always a need for competitors to "practice" at a competition site.

If you are at a national championship and the facility has grass around the jump runways and the officials will not allow the athletes onto the track to run strides, pole runs, approaches, etc... where are the athletes expected to stay "warm" once the competition starts. We need to make sure that the athletes are able to have a safe attempt at their trial.

Some field events do not have adequate additional warmup space for athletes. Runways should be available within reason to allow athletes to stay warm in between or prior to attempts.

Division III

Text Response

This rules unnecessary as common practice already dictates this what happens if a throw is on the 3rd day of a competition does that mean an athlete can't use there implement after the first day of comp? Am reading into this like someone else may?

Division II

**108. Rule 6.1.14.a Performances that result in a pass or a foul shall be recorded as: P=Pass, F=Foul on a scorecard shall be a distance of an 'O' for a successful trial, an 'X' for any type of foul/failure or a dash (-) to indicate a pass.**

**Rationale: Standardization of officiating notation with IAAF and USATF.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 6.1.14.a.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	79%	75%	80%
Oppose	2%	2%	0%
No Opinion	19%	23%	20%
Total	109	64	49

**109. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 6.1.14.a.**

Division I

Text Response

Consistency.

Agree with rationale  
uniformity

Agree with above rationale

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale"

Division III

Text Response

simple and clear, I like this standardization.

I agree with the rationale given.

Division II

Text Response

Makes sense to be consistent

Standardization between organizations is good for the sport and to help officials.

**110. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 6.1.14.a.**

Division I

Text Response

A P is much better and less misunderstood.

Should this say "shall be a distance OR an 'O' for a successful trial"? Makes no sense as currently written.

Division III

Text Response

- or P to indicate a pass.

Division II

**111. Rule 6.2 Purpose of Qualifying/Preliminaries ARTICLE 1.** The games committee should reduce the number of competitors in the final rounds to a workable size through the use of a separate qualifying competition and/or preliminary rounds. When a competitor who has earned advancement to subsequent rounds is unable to compete, another competitor shall not advance. Field event competitors who first report after the first competitive attempt has been made shall not be allowed to compete in the event. The procedure and criteria for conducting field events shall be used for all competition unless extraordinary circumstances exist, normally not controllable, which require alteration by the games committee: **ARTICLE 1.** The games committee shall use the following methods in order to administer field events: a. Reduce the number of competitors in the preliminary rounds through the use of separate qualifying competitions. b. Achieve the number of competitors advancing to the final rounds through flights of preliminary rounds. **ARTICLE 2.** Field event competitors who first report to the event, or flight if checked-in by flight, after the first competitive attempt has been made in the event/flight, shall not be allowed to compete in the event. **ARTICLE 3.** When a competitor who has earned advancement to subsequent rounds is unable to compete, another competitor shall not advance.

**Rationale:** Clarification of existing provisions, replicate rule format for running event procedure. Add a currently used option and impose limitations.

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 6.2.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	64%	66%	65%
Oppose	6%	3%	6%
No Opinion	31%	31%	29%
Total	107	64	49

**112. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 6.2.**

Division I	
Text Response	
Agree with rationale	
In Article 1, is the goal is to reduce the number of competitors in the PRELIMINARY or the FINAL rounds? Otherwise good.	
Important to be consistent with what we do on the track	
For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale"	
Division III	
Text Response	
Agree with rationale	
I agree with the rationale given.	
Division II	

**113. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 6.2.**

Division I

Text Response

Prefer to give flexibility to meet management.

I see some good things in recognition of flight specific competition. The sentence beginning with "The procedure..." ought to be an article. At first confusing. But I guess this is language added to existing articles 2 and 3 which otherwise are unchanged. I'm sure there are good reasons for doing it this way, shifting language to new articles, etc...

Division III

Text Response

Article 2 is NOT acceptable. All that should matter is whether the athlete completes their attempt when call in order. Whether runners or field eventers, we need to avoid babysitting. The athletes who do not report for instructions are held to the standards of all rules as applicable. What advantage does a competitor gain by not reporting by the first attempt in the flight?

Division II

Text Response

I don't agree with an option of imposing limitations.

**114. Rule 6.4.3 When there are large fields in the High Jump or Pole Vault, greater than 15, it is advisable for the games committee to establish continuing flights of five competitors (five-alive method) as a replacement to the normal order of competition. When the number of competitors exceeds 20, the games committee shall select one of the following options: a. Utilize a qualifying competition, Rule 6.2.2, following the normal order of competition. b. Utilize two flights following the normal order of competition. The overall placing is determined by combining the results of both flights. Ties for first place shall not be broken. c. Rotating flights (five-alive method) may be used until there are 9 or fewer competitors remaining at a bar height. For rotating flights, once a competitor has cleared or missed three attempts at a height, another athlete shall be added to that position in the continuing flight, moving down the listed order of competition until all competitors have completed attempts at each height. Therefore, jumps attempted by competitors would not be separated by more than four attempts from other competitors at any height. When the number of competitors remaining at a given height is fewer than nine, the five-alive method is abandoned and replaced by a continuous flight until the next height change.**

**Rationale: Provide options for administering the vertical jump events.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 6.4.3.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	70%	63%	80%
Oppose	3%	6%	4%
No Opinion	27%	31%	16%
Total	107	65	49

**115. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 6.4.3.**

Division I

Text Response

May consider raising number of competitors to 24 as that is the number we use at the Preliminary Round Competitions

Why is 6.4.3 a. not used at the national outdoor championship finals? 24 athletes is too much for a vertical jump final.

Agree with rationale

OK

Agree with above rationale

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale. However, I'd like to ask the Rules Committee to review at a later time eliminating the use of "rotating flights" in vertical jumps for the following reasons:

a) MANY vertical jumps officials do NOT correctly apply the "rotating flights" format, including occasionally even at NCAA Championships (mistakes were made last month for the Men's Pole Vault at D1 Championships in Eugene; b) IAAF does not utilize "rotating flights"

The real problem is that the meets are too big. Too many teams.

Division III

Text Response

Agree

didn't we already have these options?

Division II

Text Response

Additional options beyond five alive would be nice to have.

**116. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 6.4.3.**

Division I

Text Response

Leave it up to meet management.

20 is too restrictive, as high jump competitions with 25+ can be effectively managed in a reasonable period of time with good bar progressions and officiating.

Division III

Division II

**117. Rule 7.1.4 (New) At the conclusion of the competition, any institution that has not had a scoring competitor shall be listed with a team score of zero (0).**

**Rationale: By assigning each institution with a score of zero, team scores throughout the competition will more accurately reflect the score for each competing institution. Likewise, indicating a score of zero for an institution that fails to score during the competition more accurately reflects the total team scores and placing of teams at the conclusion of the competition. The current scoring system does not accurately reflect team places if an institution scores a single point and another institution scores zero points.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 7.1.4.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	82%	79%	80%
Oppose	6%	3%	2%
No Opinion	12%	18%	18%
Total	109	66	50

**118. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 7.1.4.**

Division I

Text Response

I agree that this should be the procedure for all scored meets. I do NOT agree that every single meet should be scored.

Agree with rationale

This does allow for the immediate identification of teams in a competition when looking to support compliance with meet scheduling.

logical

I don't think this is a rule of accuracy; if this is the vein of thought supporting this rule then why not have all of the athletes listed in each event with a 0 for points as well? Top 8 score, but all the other 30 below them should have zeros next to their name. Not sure why this rule even needed to be added.

Should be great for teams to keep up their self-esteem with a big zero next to their name.

I've always felt that every team that competes at a meet with team scoring should be represented in the final team scoring. Who would ever think, in any other sport, to list the resulting score of a head-to-head competition as Team A: 78, with no score for team B, merely because the result was a shut-out?

All participating teams should be listed on results at all times.

Agree with above rationale

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale"

I like this rule for relatively sized meets feeling every team's point total should be listed in any situation, however, in the case of a meet like the NCAA championship should there be an exorbitant list of teams present who received 0 points? Maybe a review of this is in order first to determine how extensive a list of 0's in this case would be. Will a team with 0 points be given a place? For example a 12 team league has 2 teams finish with zero points, are they tied for 11th place or do they receive no team place but a report of 0 points?

Thank you

Division III

Text Response

Agree

if a team competed and did not score points its score is zero

See rationale

This is a great change.

Helps with administering NCAA "counting" competition.

Finally! This also indicates the total number of participating teams.

Division II

Text Response

All teams that compete should be represented in the team results.

This would allow those schools that do not score to be included in the results...this will indicate that they competed....If those that do not score are not counted in the results, then there is no record of them competing in the meet.

Really like this rule change. The scoring should reflect all colleges that participated.

Yup - our sports information director always misidentifies the total number of teams that competed because institutions who fail to score any points haven't been listed in the final results.

Much needed!

It's about time. This will accurately reflect the total number of teams/schools represented at a competition

**119. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 7.1.4.**

Division I

Division III

Text Response

No school should have a score of zero listed

Division II

**120. Rule 8.2.2 c. The optimal width of a championship course shall should not be less than 10 meters throughout. f. The first turn of a non-championship course shall not be less than 400 meters and preferably not less than 600 meters from the start. The optimal first turn of a championship course shall should not be less than 600 meters and preferably not less than 800 meters from the start.**

**Rationale: The stated requirements are the most desired, but frequently not possible to attain due to available bids or other circumstances, making decisions to always be in violation of the rule.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 8.2.2.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	77%	79%	74%
Oppose	9%	3%	12%
No Opinion	14%	18%	14%
Total	111	66	50



**121. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 8.2.2.**

Division I

Text Response

We need to have more options for championship XC courses, this should help. should is useless language. Effectively you have no rule. Provide an acceptable range using shall language.

Facilities and bids are limited. There needs to be some flexibility.

Agree with above rationale

safety

It might give more institutions the chance to host a championship race.

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale

Once again.....this rule is not enforced. The NCAA and the championship sub committee doesn't look at the rules before selecting sites .....ex. XC (L'ville)

Division III

Text Response

rationale offered

This is better, but I still feel that it is too restrictive -- it disallows some good championship (NCAA or otherwise) courses. In addition, a very gradual corner at 300M is probably safer/easier for a field to negotiate than a sharp corner at 800M.

thank you!

W have had impossible standards up t now for XC courses, this is better and reflects what we are looking for.

I agree with the rationale stated.

Division II

Text Response

Gives more freedom for institutions to bid for meets.

Allows for more flexibility in the selection of a course.

I think as coaches we have the ability to determine whether or not there will be adequate room from 400 meters to 800 meters once the race starts to funnel down to the 10+ meters in width.

**122. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 8.2.2.**

Division I	
Text Response	
In a championship race the pack has not spread out in the first 400 meters. Requirement should stay at 800 or at least 600. Course that don't meet this requirement shouldn't be able to host a championship meet.	
This should be up to the local organizers. If the course won an NCAA or NCAA Regional bid then it is the job of the people who awarded the bid to make sure it is a fair course. What is the width is 9.5 meters but is fair? and they put in an otherwise outstanding bid?	
This will limit the availability of courses for regional qualifying meet. We are already having trouble finding hosts for regional meets and this clarification will make it even tougher.	
Division III	
Text Response	
Will limit the courses available to compete; part of the allure of cross country is knowing good places to pass and where not too; same at the start - 400 m is plenty of time to get to a turn or you learn to hold back. It's race strategy	
Division II	
Text Response	
Too few courses available	
Placing more restrictions will discourage schools from hosting meets.	
Many host sites can't accomodate these requirements..... These stated requirements are most desired, but not always practical. Thus, don't make it an official rule... Otherwise, good luck in time find host sites for major meets and championships.....	
I would like to have turns of 135 degrees or more are considered straight lines	

**123. Rule 8.5.2 (Delete) The referee shall have the following additional responsibilities: a. Oversee the inspection of the course, start and finish. See applicable sections of Rule 5; b. Review and approve all final meet results.**

**Rationale: The games committee and meet director should be responsible for overseeing the course, as they are currently prescribed (see Rule 3), leaving the referee free to rule on perceived rules violations and/or protests. The referee should not be part of the process of compiling and reporting results. They should be free of the process so that if the results are protested, their views will not be tainted and they will be free to make an impartial ruling.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 8.5.2.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	75%	72%	80%
Oppose	3%	3%	2%
No Opinion	23%	25%	18%
Total	111	65	49

**124. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 8.5.2.**

Division I

Text Response

Agree with rationale

ok

Agree with above rationale

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale

Good rule. This is a good clarification.

Division III

Text Response

Agree

By the time the Ref arrives it's way to late to make changes to courses, or provide for more officials. I agree with the rationale stated.

Division II

Text Response

I do think this rule helps to guarantee the impartiality of the referee's ruling.

**125. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 8.5.2.**

Division I

Text Response

The referee's role of "Review and approve all final meet results" does not imply that they are involved in compiling the results. In fact, this allows the referee to have oversight over the final product, in effect error checking the results and providing an additional layer of impartiality.

For the referee to rule on the event, it is necessary to understand and have inspected the facility / course involved. This requirement makes sure the referee is knowledgeable about the environment in which decisions are being made.

Division III

Text Response

Agree on the race results however all referees in all sports inspect the competition site and our sport should have the same expectations and responsibility for our referee. They have to sign off that it is a fair site

Division II

**126. Rule 8.5.6.e (New)** An assistant starter should be placed behind the starting line near the middle of the field to initiate and/or affect a recall as required within this rule for the first 100 meters of the race.

**Rationale:** In 2014, two additional starters were added to be placed at appropriate distances from the start to fire the pistol in case of a false start within the first 100 meters of the race. However, an athlete in the middle of the field, especially a large field such as at regional and national championship competitions, could be unseen by all three current recall starters. An additional recall starter placed behind the starting line, near the middle of the field, would not have his or her line of sight blocked by other competitors should an athlete fall to the ground within the first 100 meters of the race.

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 8.5.6.e.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	78%	66%	67%
Oppose	3%	6%	18%
No Opinion	19%	28%	14%
Total	110	64	49

**127. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 8.5.6.e.**

Division I	
<b>Text Response</b>	
Only for major championships.	
Agree with rationale	
This position doesn't necessarily guarantee someone will be seen, better position would be elevated behind the line.	
makes sense. Favors athlete.	
Agree with above rationale	
For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale	
Division III	
<b>Text Response</b>	
fair starts	
much can be seen from behind the competition	
I agree with the rationale stated.	
Division II	
<b>Text Response</b>	
This rule would help ensure there are no false starts or runners who go down at the beginning of a race.	

**128. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 8.5.6.e.**

Division I	
Text Response	
Enough starters as is	
While I agree with the intent of the rule, the ever decreasing number of officials/starters will make it difficult to acquire the appropriate number of starters for every meet.	
Never seen a race where a competitor fell and it was not noticed.	
Division III	
Text Response	
Oppose if this increases the cost of officials for conducting a meet. The rationale makes it seem like the rule would require a fourth recall starter.	
Division II	
Text Response	
Cost for small meets	
One assistant starter at the outside perimeter of the course near the 100m mark and one assistant starter behind the finish line in addition to the head starter should be completely adequate to detect any fallen runner.	
The starting requirements are becoming ridiculous...Pretty soon we're going to need more starters than course marshals.	
The rule is not practical for small meets but is by this rule, required.	
OVERKILL.....	

**129. Rule 8.6.3.d Ties in team scoring shall be broken by comparing in order the place finish of each of the five scoring members of the tied teams. The team with the majority of winning places comparisons shall be awarded the higher place.**

**Rationale:** This proposal is to clarify the tie breaking procedure so that no mistake is made.

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 8.6.3.d.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	85%	83%	84%
Oppose	5%	8%	6%
No Opinion	10%	9%	10%
Total	109	64	49

**130. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 8.6.3.d.**

Division I

Text Response

Makes sense

Agree with rationale

OK

Agree with above rationale

For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale"

Division III

Text Response

Agree

Still a weird way to break ties that needs clarification because few people want to learn this method or understand it, but if this is the way, then this is a clarification.

Is very clear and fair.

I understood it before....

I agree with the rationale stated.

Division II

Text Response

I thought this rule was clear before, but just in case..

**131. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 8.6.3.d.**

Division I

Text Response

The tie should be broken by comparing the position of the sixth runner on each team.

6th runner should be tie breaker

no clear winner.....should be determined by 6th place runner

It should then go to the 6th man. This is a team sport and you run 7! If you do not have a 6th man you lose the tiebreaker; that simple!

Division III

Text Response

I am in favor of the 6th runner being used as the tie breaker.

I support the best sixth competitor for breaking ties. It is the best method for determining the best team as team depth is a more important factor.

Division II

Text Response

It should be the team the best 6th place finisher.

Needs to be more clearly worded.

I believe this tie breaker method eliminates the importance of the "pushers" (sixth and seventh runners).

**132. Rule 8.6.3.e (New) Teams that start at least five runners and have fewer than five runners finish the race shall be listed alphabetically at the end of the team results as did not finish.**

**Rationale: The current scoring system does not accurately reflect all team places or which teams actually competed. By assigning a DNF to each institution that begins the competition as a team, starts five runners or more, but does not have at least five runners complete the race, it more accurately reflects the total team scores and placing of teams at the conclusion of the competition.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 8.6.3.e.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	84%	74%	92%
Oppose	5%	5%	2%
No Opinion	12%	22%	6%
Total	111	65	49

**133. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 8.6.3.e.**

Division I	
Text Response	
Agree with rationale	
OK	
Agree with above rationale	
For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale"	
Division III	
Text Response	
Agree	
Good concept, but perhaps there is gentler terminology than "DNF" for incomplete teams?... like "incomplete?"	
while in essence I support, in most meets there has been no 'declaration' of runners, so it is impossible to know which teams started 5 or more if 4 or less finished...	
The DNF do speak to conditions, and possible gamesmanship	
Indicating the total number of teams starting the competition is important	
Division II	
Text Response	
Makes sense	
I support this proposal for the same reason I believe teams that score 0 points should be listed at the bottom of the team scores at the end of competition.	
The Greater Louisville Classic does so and we appreciated this addition.	
Excellent. Same reasoning as TF. This is needed to again reflect the true number of schools participating. Could actually list all schools with a note of how many actual finishers for each specific team.	

**134. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 8.6.3.e.**

Division I	
Text Response	
a DNF designation isn't appropriate as the team finished, but they no longer became eligible to score/win the meet. A different designation should be denoted as DNF can be misleading and infers that all runners dropped off the course.	
Division III	

**135. Rule 10.4 SECTION 4. Race Conduct Running Event Procedure and Qualifying The procedure and criteria in this Section and Section 5 shall be used for all competition unless extraordinary circumstances exist, normally not controllable, which require alteration by the games committee: ARTICLE 1. The games committee may use the following methods in order to administer running events: a. The number of contestants in any event may be reduced to a workable size by establishing qualifying standards or by requiring qualifying heats conducted under specified conditions and preceding the competition proper. The games committee may determine special qualifying round participation criteria. b. If the limits of time or facilities require, races (including relays) may be contested as a final in timed sections. When used, the structure for using timed section finals shall be determined by the games committee and should be consistent throughout the meet. c. From a single entry list, a series of rounds with an advancement procedure for each round leading to an event final. ARTICLE 2. In cases in which a competitor has qualified for the next round and is unable to compete, another competitor shall not be moved into the next round. Canceling Heats ARTICLE 3. If heats are drawn for a race but the number of competitors who report to the start line is small enough to be run in one race, based on the number of lanes at the facility, the heats shall be canceled and the race shall be run as a final at the originally scheduled final time. Redrawing Heats ARTICLE 4. Whenever the referee determines that the number of entries or scratches reduces the number of competitors in any heat so as to eliminate the element of competition, the games committee shall, as appropriate, redraw the heats, reduce the number of qualifiers from each heat and select any additional qualifiers on a time basis in order to restore the element of competition. Tie for Last Qualifying Position ARTICLE 5. In the event of a tie for the last qualifying place for a subsequent race, after applying Rule 5-12.2d, and assuming positions on the track are available, all tying runners shall qualify. If enough positions are not available, the advancer shall be determined by a runoff or drawn by lot, based on a decision before the meet by the games committee. A runoff is not subject to Rule 4-2.2. Qualifying ARTICLE 6. In the 55 Meters, 60 Meters, 55 Meter Hurdles, 60 Meter Hurdles, 200 Meters, 300 Meters, 400 Meters, 500 Meters, 600 Meters, 4x200 Meter Relay and 4x400 Meter Relay: a. No qualifying race shall have fewer than two competitors. b. The maximum number that shall advance to a final is eight. This maximum shall be ten for events less than 200 meters if and only if the facility has sufficient permanent lanes in such events for the increased number. c. When the number of advancers to the final round is less than or equal to the number of lanes, at least the heat winner shall advance to the next round. All other qualifiers in the round shall advance on the basis of time. d. When the facility has fewer than eight usable lanes and eight competitors/teams advance to the final, the competitors/teams shall qualify only on the basis of time from preliminary rounds. Advancement based on time only is not permitted for any other circumstance. e. In events where more than two rounds are contested, it is preferred that at least two qualifiers from each heat advance to the next round before using the above advancement to the final. f. The provisions of this Article shall also apply to non-championship relay and individual events where the first leg or total distance is less than 800 meters. ARTICLE 7. If preliminaries are contested in the 800 Meters, 1000 Meters or the 4x800 Meter Relay, eight competitors /teams shall qualify to the final. It is recommended that the top two from each heat advance; however, at least two must advance on the basis of time. ARTICLE 8. If preliminaries are contested run in the 1500 Meters or the Mile, at least nine but and not more than 12 competitors, as determined by the games committee, shall qualify to the final. It is recommended that the top three from each heat advance; however, at least two must advance on the basis of time. If 12 or fewer competitors report for the 1500 Meters or the Mile, it is recommended that the event shall be run as a final. ARTICLE 9. If**



preliminaries are contested run in the 3000 Meters, 12 competitors shall qualify to the final. It is recommended that the top four from each heat advance; however, at least two must advance on the basis of time. If more than 16 competitors report for the 3000 Meters, it is recommended that the event shall be contested as a timed-section final or as preliminaries with advancement to a final. Legal Start Position Running and Violations ARTICLE 17. Competitors in races with staggered starts may place their hands outside their lanes, but not beyond the starting line extended.

**Rationale:** The changes to rule 10-4 and 10-5 reflect a reorganization of rules pertaining to indoor T&F and an attempt to put all indoor T&F items in one place. Most items are not 'new', but restated in this rule for clarity.

Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 10.4.

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	66%	68%	67%
Oppose	6%	2%	4%
No Opinion	28%	31%	29%
Total	111	62	49

**136. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 10.4.**

Division I

Text Response

I am opposed to Article 17. Inconsistent with starting position definitions earlier in this document.  
 Agree with rationale  
 Agree with above rationale

Division III

Text Response

Ok  
 I agree with the rationale stated.

Division II

**137. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 10.4.**

Division I

Text Response

I think is someone scratches then someone should be moved up

In indoor meets, since 8 to the final almost inevitably means there will be 2 heats for the final, we should be taking 10 to those finals in the 200m, 400m, and (where competed) the 500m. This prevents anyone from scoring in the final from merely finishing. All "point scoring" places would be contested in the final, not earned by simply qualifying for the final. As for the argument that in the 60m/60mHH, most facilities can only advance 8, this is a limitation of facilities. We take more than 8 to a 1500m or Mile final, and advance 9 to the field event finals.

I agree with much of this rule for the rationale used by the Committee, HOWEVER, I disagree with Article 6.b and 7. I believe when lanes or space are available, it is better by far to advance nine (9) to a Final for competitive purposes. With 9 competitors in a 2-section final on a track which has 6 lanes on the oval (i.e., there are open lanes available to put the 9th qualifier), and when there are 8 scoring places, ALL competitors must actually race (HARD!) to score, vs with only 8 in a final and 8 scoring places, a competitor can give a sub-maximal effort and still score. This would also give those track finals the same # of competitors as in field events, where "one more than the number of scoring places" advance to the finals.

90% of it is good... The maximum number that shall advance to a final is eight. This maximum shall be ten for events less than 200 meters if and only if the facility has sufficient permanent lanes in such events for the increased number. -- That does not make sense to me. Is the maximum 8 or is it 10???

Article 17 is in conflict with a previous rule of not being outside of your lane...

I don't understand Article 6 b

Division III

Text Response

Oppose procedure for finals with 6 lane track or fewer. allow a two-section timed final, whose number of finalists is determined prior to the meet by the games committee.

Division II

Text Response

Oppose Article 9 only.

Let individual conferences decide their procedures within the current rules..... No need to add more rules.....

**138. Rule 10.4 ARTICLE 2.** The 800 Meters, 1000 Meters and 4x800 Meter Relay shall start and continue in lanes or alleys until at least the end of the second turn. On tracks of more than 200 meters, these events shall start and continue in lanes or alleys until the end of the first turn. After such start, the race shall continue in lane one. **ARTICLE 3.** The 800 Meters shall have not more than 12 competitors in any non-championship race. In a championship, each race, preliminary or final, shall be limited to eight competitors, barring extraordinary conditions. **ARTICLE 4.** In individual races longer than 1000 meters and the Distance Medley Relay, if the number of competitors or teams exceeds the number of lanes on the track, all groups shall use a waterfall start, which may be staggered. See Rule 5-1.7. After such start , the race shall continue in lane one.

**Rationale:** A companion to proposal for Rule 5.4.2.e so that where an event is staged is defined.

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 10.4.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	72%	71%	78%
Oppose	6%	10%	4%
No Opinion	22%	19%	18%
Total	111	63	49

**139. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 10.4.**

Division I
<b>Text Response</b>
Given
Agree with rationale
...although I still feel that at least 9 should advance to the 800m, 1000m, and 4x800m finals for all indoor championships to guarantee competition for all point scoring places.
Agree with above rational
For the reasons stated in the Committee's "Rationale
Division III
<b>Text Response</b>
12 is already more than enough to scramble the first lap
Field size should be regulated
while I support, I suggest that for DMR relay, with 1200 first leg, it be made same as 4x800 relay to run a 2-turn stagger for the waterfall start.
see rationale
I agree with the rationale stated.
Division II

**140. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 10.4.**

Division I

Text Response

800m should be consider for waterfall and not limited to 12 runners.

This should be up to the local organizer.

The race has to be in Lane One. This makes no sense.

Except in Championship meets the meet director shall have the ability to decide the # in a section based on their particular track whether 4 lane, 6 or 8 or 9. A 6 lane indoor track is different than and 8 lane. leave up to meet director.

Division III

Division II

Text Response

Let host schools decide on how many individuals to allow in heat. Example: If there are 25 competitors, then go with 13 and 12, or vice versa. Don't waste everyone's time and force three heats.....

**141. Rule 10.5 SECTION 5. Regulations for Meets Formation of Heats / Assignment of Lanes Responsibility ARTICLE 1. The games committee shall be responsible for the original formation of heats and the assignment of lanes. Regulations for Forming Heats ARTICLE 2. In all running events that do not have advancement to the final based on time only, the preliminary round heats shall be formed according to Rule 5-11.2a. Rule 5-11.2c shall apply for the second and subsequent rounds. ARTICLE 4. A final round, contested as a result of Rule 10-4.6d, eight competitors advancing when the facility has fewer than eight usable lanes, shall be contested in two sections formed by seeding competitors from the ranked advancement list, in groups of two, left to right only for the two sections.**

**Rationale: The changes to rule 10-4 and 10-5 reflect a re-organization of rules pertaining to indoor T&F and an attempt to put all indoor T&F item in one place. Most items are not 'new', but restated in this rule for clarity.**

**Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 10.5.**

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	68%	77%	69%
Oppose	2%	0%	2%
No Opinion	31%	23%	29%
Total	111	60	48

**142. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 10.5.**

Division I

Text Response

Agree with rationale

Agree with above rationale

Division III

Text Response

I agree with the rationale stated.

Division II

**143. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 10.5.**

Division I

Text Response

I disagree only because this would conflict with my earlier rationale re: Rule 10.4 (see above).  
I think this is still very unclear. It seems that there is incongruity with 10.5.1 and 10.5.2. For example, is the 200 an advancement of time only or heat winner then time?

Division III

Division II

**144. Rule 10.5.1.b** On a track with fewer than eight lanes, when When eight competitors advance to the final in the races listed in this article, the competitors shall qualify to a two-section final on the basis of time from preliminary rounds. Two sections shall be formed by seeding competitors from the ranked list of times, left to right only for the two sections. See Rule 10-5.1a using the following assignments:      Heat 1    Heat 2      3    1      4    2      6    5      8    7

**Rationale:** The top two qualifiers in the finals of the 200 Meters, 300 Meters, 400 Meters, 500 Meters, 600 Meters, 4x200 and 4x400 Meter Relays should have the opportunity to compete head to head against each other in the final.

Please indicate whether you support, oppose or have no opinion regarding rule 10.5.1.b.

Answer	Division I	Division III	Division II
Support	65%	69%	69%
Oppose	9%	16%	14%
No Opinion	26%	15%	16%
Total	111	61	49

**145. Please provide feedback on why you support rule 10.5.1.b.**

Division I

Text Response

STRONGLY SUPPORT

Agree with rationale

This works well. It is a difficult issue. But preferred lanes should have merit to qualifying. The 5th qualifier should not have the second best lane. This is better...

This makes sense but I still think the whole 10.5 section needs to be rewritten for guys like me who can't seem to untangle it.

Division III

Text Response

no perfect way to spread these competitors, so this seems as good or better than others, even though #3 time might have won a heat and been unchallenged, and possibly the best in the field...

Makes for good racing.

1 vs. 2 is much better than 1 vs. 3 and 2 vs. 4!!!

I agree with the rationale stated.

Division II

**146. Please provide feedback on why you do not support rule 10.5.1.b.**

Division I

Text Response

not sure why top 4 times shouldn't be competing against one another. some lanes are tougher to run in, but being out of the competition is more detrimental. this doesn't make any sense if competition is at the heart of our sport.

I'll bet most #3 individuals/teams would prefer lane 4 against qualifiers 1 and 2, rather than lane 6 in a different heat. Is it possible to give individual/team #3, and then subsequently individual/team #4, the choice of the "lesser" lane but better competition?

Again, I disagree only where implementation of this would conflict with my earlier rationale re: Rule 10.4 (see above).

Top 3 should get the chance to compete against each other

Indoor only the 200m should use this procedure. The 400 on up should have the top 4 in the fast heat.

As we do with the 4x400 currently

Division III

Text Response

I would vote in favor of this rule for any race run in lanes the whole way. However, when races cut in or proceed in lane 1, then all the top competitors should be in the same heat, i.e. ranks 1-4 together and 5-8 together. This rule is trying to rectify the top two seeds not racing against each other to determine a champion, however, it is just as likely that the 3rd or 4th ranked competitor could win as well. Indoor track will never be perfect, but the best should run against the best.

Heat two should be four fastest time.

Good for the 400, 500, 600, 4x2, and 4x4. Unfair in the 200 to the #2 qualifier. Puts them at a disadvantage compared to the #3 qualifier.

Heat 1 - 5,6,7,8 Heat 2 - 1,2,3,4

All four top teams should compete against each other

This gives the 3rd qualifier a better lane selection than the the second fastest qualifier. In an indoor 200 meter race that gives a significant advantage to the 3rd qualifier over the second.

Division II

Text Response

Should be top times in heat 2

If that is the rationale, why not put qualifiers 5-8 in the first heat and qualifiers 1-4 in the second heat?

Leave the opening text "On a track with fewer than eight lanes" in tact. If a track has 8 lanes they should all be used in an 8-person final instead of splitting it into to sections. It's about competition and the whole rationale about the top two competing together becomes irrelevant because everyone is in the same section. The rest of it I agree with, but keep everyone in one section on an 8 lane track.

It could be a good rule, but when the Indoor National Championships all had different qualifying procedures for the 800 meters, or mile, and I forget which it was, it just proves that there are too many interpretations of the qualifying procedures. Plus, it has been mentioned previously that you might not be able to have some of the above listed races, because they aren't Championship Events..... (300, 500, 600, 4 x 200) So, I'm even more confused about all of these proposals, then I was before, and I've read these proposals at least a dozen times....

In a championship timed final all of the fastest runners should be placed in a heat together.

Heat assignment for the final should be based on finishing place in the preliminary round, rather than on time.