KEY ITEMS.

- Video review at regional rounds. The women’s gymnastics committee recommends allowing video review in the regional round of competition, starting with the 2018 championship.

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative items.

- Video review at regional rounds of competition.

  (1) Recommendation. That the Division I Competition Oversight Committee approve a recommendation to allow video review at regional sites for the women’s gymnastics championship.

  (2) Effective date. Immediate.

  (3) Rationale. Video review is already in place for the regular season. Allowing review in the postseason would provide another avenue to ensure the correct teams are advancing to the championship site. This practice would also align women’s gymnastics with other sports that use video review. The following guidelines would be used for implementing video review at regionals:

    In the event that an inquiry response is unsatisfactory to the coach, a video may be used for the purpose of review under the following conditions:

    a. Each team is allowed one review per meet.

    b. Institutional team video footage must be used for the review. The video may be taken from any vantage point.

    c. A review that fails results in a .10 deduction from the team score.
d. All reviews must be specific to the performance or nonperformance of a particular value part, combination of skills or neutral deductions (i.e., out of bounds).

e. Reviews may not be used to evaluate a question of execution, composition or up to the level deductions. These requests will result in a .10 deduction.

f. Reviews may be viewed in slow motion.

g. The review must be submitted to the meet director or host institution designee within five minutes following the conclusion of the meet (as determined by the final score posted OR the return of the final inquiry, whichever is later). During this time, the scores are being verified by the judging panel and the head scorer’s table.

h. The coach requesting the review must provide a signed Video Review Form (VRF), cued video and team camera to the meet director (or host institution designee). The meet director (or host institution designee) will be responsible for delivering this information to the meet referee and event panel (the judges who judged the particular event) for their review on the competition floor. The coaches may not be present during the review.

i. Reviews must be conducted in the presence of the meet referee and the event panel ONLY. If the meet referee is on the panel, the next highest-rated official must participate. A simple majority of the review panel will determine success or failure of the review. If the review fails, judges may not change their scores, and the .10 will be deducted from the team score. If the review is successful, the individual’s score will be adjusted accordingly.

j. The results of the review will be noted on the VRF by the meet referee and returned to the meet director (or host institution designee) who will take the VRF to the score table. The official score will be adjusted (up or down). Then the judges will sign the official score sheet and the meet director will deliver the VRF to the coach.

k. Decisions rendered by the judges’ review panel are final and cannot be overturned.

(4) Estimated budget impact. None. The policy requires institutions to use footage from handheld devices so the host would not need to provide any additional equipment for the review.
INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Review of rule modification. The committee approved a recommendation to allow gymnasts the option to mount off of a four-inch mat on top of a sting mat on uneven bars and balance beam. This proposal will be reviewed by the Playing Rules Oversight Panel.

2. Video review at the national championship. In addition to the discussion reflected in the nonlegislative item above, the committee discussed the feasibility of implementing video review at the championship site. The committee asked staff to continue gathering information on the costs and logistics for allowing video review. Unlike regional and regular-season meets, the national championship is conducted on a podium and coaches must be in corrals on the floor, so handheld devices may not have the best vantage point to capture routines. Additionally, since the championship is broadcast by ESPN, they have rights to all footage. ESPN will allow the committee to use any footage they have, but they do not provide the equipment or staffing to actually conduct the review. Therefore, the host site would have to provide the equipment and staffing or the NCAA would need to hire an outside vendor.

3. Advancement procedures for 2018. The committee discussed but did not approve a concept to have only four teams advance to the team championship at the finals site for 2018. The committee is fully supportive of the bracket model proposed for 2019 but wanted to keep the 2018 championship consistent with the current format.

4. Other business. The committee discussed the timeline for review of the proposed bracket model. Staff indicated that the Division I Competition Oversight Committee would review the proposal at the October in-person meeting. Staff also shared information about the tentative communication plan with the regional sites for 2019-22, should the model be approved and the sites be reduced from six to four.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution and Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carolynn Kimball</td>
<td>University of New Hampshire; America East Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Kutcher-Rinehart</td>
<td>University of Denver; Big 12 Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adina Stock</td>
<td>North Carolina State University; Atlantic Coast Conference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Absentees:**  
Marianne Vydra, Oregon State University; Pac-12 Conference.

**Guests in Attendance:**  
None.

**NCAA Staff Support in Attendance:**  
Molly Simons, Championships and Alliances.

**Other NCAA Staff Members in Attendance:**  
None.