

MINUTES
BASKETBALL RULES COMMITTEE
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF STATE HIGH SCHOOL ASSOCIATIONS

Downtown Marriott	Indianapolis, Indiana	April 17-20, 2004
-------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

Committee members in attendance:

Larry Boucher	Chair	2005
Bob Pugh	Section 1	2004
Jack Baly	Section 2	2005
Wanda Gilliland	Section 3	2004
Theresa Wynns	Section 4	2006
Larry Mollring	Section 5	2005
Charles Breithaupt	Section 6	2007
Gary Whelchel	Section 7	2006
Jim Gordon	Section 8	2007
Kathy McGee	NFHS Coaches Association	2006
Ronnie Girouard	NFHS Officials Association	2005

Guests in Attendance:

Mary Struckhoff	NFHS Staff Liaison
Barbara Jacobs	NCAA Representative
Peter Webb	IAABO Representative
Bill Topp	Referee Magazine Representative

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTION, GENERAL INFORMATION

Mary Struckhoff, NFHS Basketball Rules Editor and Staff Liaison welcomed all committee members. Chairman Larry Boucher welcomed new committee members, Larry Mollring of Section 5, Charles Breighaupt of Section 6 and Jim Gordon of Section 8.

Mary Struckhoff introduced guests, Barbara Jacobs of the NCAA, Peter Webb of IAABO and Bill Topp of Referee Magazine. These guests assist the committee with keeping abreast of trends in the game and keep the lines of communication open between organizations.

Mary Struckhoff and Larry Boucher reviewed several administrative items with the committee.

2. ORGANIZATIONAL REPORTS FROM INVITED GUESTS

Each guest gave a brief report regarding their respective organizations and what trends are occurring.

3. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES OF CONSTITUENT FEEDBACK:

- A. Sectional – All sectional representatives spoke to or attempted to make contact with the state administrators in their respective sections.
- B. Coaches and Officials – The coaches and officials representatives reported some general feedback received from those groups.

4. REVIEW SUMMARY OF 2004 QUESTIONNAIRE AND STATISTICAL SURVEY

The committee reviewed the basketball questionnaire results (attached). The girls and boys basketball statistics that had been submitted from member state associations were also reviewed.

5. REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE

The committee reviewed other various pieces of correspondence.

6. DISCUSSION/VOTING OF:

A. Rule Changes

#	Rules Reference	Proposed Rule Change	Passed	Failed	No Action
1	1-5-2	Delete first Sentence. Requires contrasting lines and markings. Rationale: The lane space marks and neutral zone may be the same color as the lane lines, and end lines. Deleting this would allow for either contrasting or the same color as the free throw lane lines to be acceptable.	X		
2	1-13-2	Delete last nine words of sentence, prior to the Note (“ . . . and of a color contrasting with the boundary line.”) Rationale: Since it is out-of-bounds, there is not a real need to have it contrasting. Deleting this would allow for either contrasting or the same color as the sideline to be acceptable.	X		
3	1-13-2	Determining a national standard length for the coaching box rather than permitting the state to determine the length. Pros: a. Reduces the number of state adoptions and brings the rules code closer to a national standard. b. Reduces the confusion for coaches/teams playing in neighboring states with different box lengths or bench decorum standards. Cons: a. Doesn’t permit states to determine their own needs regarding coaching behaviors and sportsmanship issues. b. Forces states not utilizing the established standard to conform.		X	
4	2-1-1	The officials’ uniform shall be a black and white striped shirt or a grey shirt, black pants, shoes and socks. Both officials must wear the same color shirt. Rationale: Gives the states the option of two shirts and doesn’t force anyone to go out and buy a new shirt if they choose not to.			X
5	2-12-5	Sound a warning signal at 10 seconds of the 15 SECONDS (maximum) permitted for replacing a disqualified or injured player, or for a player directed to leave the game. Rationale: This has become another 30 second time-out. Coaches don’t need 30 seconds to determine who the substitute will be.		X	
6	3-4-6 Note	The home team shall wear <u>WHITE</u> uniforms and the visiting team dark uniforms. Rationale: More and more teams are opting for a light-colored home uniform that causes confusion with opponent’s dark color.	X		
7	4-6	In the heading change the word “player” to “opponent.” In article 1, delete the words “or any part of the basket.” After article 2 add a new heading: “Basket interference occurs when a player.” Add a new article 3: Touches any part of the basket while the ball is on or within the basket. Renumber Articles 3 & 4 accordingly. Make this corresponding change to Rule 9 Section 11. Rationale: This change will allow an offensive player to tap the ball while it is on the rim, in the basket or in the imaginary cylinder. The basket interference rule was probably written long before the tap was treated the same as a try. Since the offense is trying to score why prevent the offense the opportunity to tap the ball while is on the rim, in the basket or in the imaginary cylinder. One of Dr. Naismith’s original rules stipulates that a goal is made when the ball is thrown or batted into the basket and stays there providing those defending (the opponents) do not disturb the goal. I guess that is when they were using a basket that was not open on the bottom. It seems it was not Dr. Naismith’s intent to restrict the offensive player in this situation.			X

8A	4-10	Eliminate the definition of Closely Guarded in Rule 4 and the violation associated with it in Rule 9. Rationale: The offensive guards in high school are being placed at a great disadvantage by the closely guarded rule. Defensive players gang up on the guards and make it impossible for the guards to get away or around two and three defensive players. The defense literally smothers the guard such that the only way to get out of traps is to request a time-out. Traps by the defense usually occur when the guard crosses in a corner just over the division line and at a sideline. Most guards at the high school level cannot handle this condition. With the elimination of closely guarded requirement, the defense would have to play a normal defense, which would allow the offense to be more effective. In addition this would relieve an official from a counting situation so that the official would be able to observe playing action instead of being worried about counting. Also some officials have difficulty determining what constitutes six feet and when a player is no longer closely guarded.			X
8B	4-10	Eliminate "closely guarded" rule while dribbling (same as NCAA women's rule). RATIONALE: The rule as it currently reads, eliminates one of the first offensive skills players are taught, "ball handling". It should be the responsibility of the defensive player(s) to force the ball handler to pick up the dribble through good defensive skills. Additionally, changing the rule as it currently reads will eliminate the confusion that coaches, players and referees have with regard to the distance required (6 feet) to start and end the count while dribbling, and all the counts that may start and end (hold-dribble-hold).			X
8B	4-10	Eliminating the closely-guarded count while dribbling. Pros: a. Legal guarding distance and count are inconsistently applied by officials. Cons: a. Doesn't reward good defense. b. Offense could manipulate the clock more by putting the ball in the hands of a good dribbler.			X
8.1	4-19-12	Team control foul. A team control foul is a committed foul that is committed by a member of a team that has control or is in possession of the ball during a throw-in. Rationale: NCAA adopted this rule in 2003. The penalty for a player control or a team control foul are now the same. It has helped speed the game up with fewer free throw attempts.			X
9	4-29	The rule should read "Kicking the ball is intentionally striking it with any part of the leg or foot." Rationale: It is impossible to kick something without using at least parts of the entire leg. If it is <u>intentional</u> it should be penalized regardless of the fact that it may have actually struck the thigh of a player's leg. Currently, the rule requires an interpretation by officials that is more complicated and subject to misapplication. This change would make the determination simpler and more evenly applied.	X		
10	4-35-4 New	Add new Article 4 that states "During a throw-in and during jump ball situations, the division line and frontcourt/backcourt status will not apply. This applies to an airborne player. Rationale: During throw-ins and jump balls, there should be no division line or back-court issues that officials should have to interpret. Current rules allow for defender A1 to intercept a throw-in in his/her frontcourt and land in their backcourt or pass (while airborne) to a teammate in their frontcourt without penalty, but current rules do not allow for A1 to pass the intercepted throw-in (while airborne) to a teammate in their backcourt. This interpretation or rule seems too technical in nature and this change would allow for a more accurately applied enforcement of a more easily understood rule.			X

11A	5-5	<p>Playing the game in halves instead of quarters.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Fewer interruptions in the contest, speeds up the contest. b. Fewer “last-second shots” to facilitate. c. Eighteen-minute halves increases potential playing time for players. d. Reduces the number of heat-up/cool-down situations. <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. NFHS records would have to be differentiated between the two different eras (quarters/halves). b. States may need to adjust eligibility/playing limitations from quarters to halves. c. Fewer intermissions, fewer coaching opportunities. 		X	
11B	5-5	Playing the game in 16-minute halves.			X
11C	5-5	<p>Playing the game in 18-minute halves.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Gives players more playing time. <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Eighteen-minute halves extend the game. 			X
11C	5-5-1	<p>Permit states by adoption to play in halves. Rationale: 1). A longer game will allow for greater participation. There will be 20 extra minutes (4 min. X 5 players) of playing time. 2). Basketball is the shortest timed high school game (FB 48 min., Soc 80 min., Hockey 51 min.). 3). Additions of players time have been made in other sports: 6 min. in Hockey; Volleyball 3 out of 5 games; Wrestling additional weight class. 4). Today’s athletes are physically able to play longer games. In some cases two games are played in one day, and at youth levels they play 3 in a day. 5). Eliminating intermissions between quarters creates a better flow to the game and eliminates the last second shots except at the end of each half. 6). With no quarter intermissions 2 minutes are gained, helps counter the addition.</p>		X	
12	5-8-3a	<p>Not permitting an airborne player to call a time-out.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Doesn’t give an advantage to a player who may be about to violate or go out of bounds. <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Creates an exception to the traditional tenant of basketball rules that permit a player in control of the ball to request a time-out. b. May be difficult to enforce (defining airborne). c. Teams have a limited number of time-outs; why not let them use them when desired (within the rules). (1) Forces other similar scenarios to be discussed (i.e., player leaning ready to fall out of bounds or fall into the backcourt, can he/she call a time-out?) 		X	
13	5-11-3 New	<p>A coach may elect to use one of his/her allotted time-outs for the purpose of substituting only. If the team has any 30 second time-outs remaining, this “substitution only” time-out will be charged as such. If no 30 second time-outs are available the coach will be charged with a 60 second time-out. Teams are not permitted to leave the playing court or convene near their benches during this “substitution only” time-out. Rationale: Often times near the end of a lopsided game, coaches simply want to allow substitute players to get into the game, but do not want or need a time-out to coach their players. This change would enable the coach to do this, and not cause an undue delay in the game. This change does not add anymore time-outs to the allotted two 30 second, and three 60 second time-outs.</p>		X	

14	7-5-9	<p>When an official calls a double foul (personal, technical or simultaneous) when no free throws are to be shot, each player is charged with a foul that counts toward his/her total, plus the foul counts toward the team total. Play is resumed by awarding the ball at the point of interruption. This change would eliminate Rule 6-3-3f, g. Rationale: When applying our current procedure, both teams have committed “equal” offenses, but because the alternation possession happens to be pointing one way or the other, sometimes a team loses possession of the ball and sometimes it does not. If we change to the proposal we equally penalize each team, and resume play from the point of interruption. This way no team is subjected to the possibility of double jeopardy (charged with a foul, and loss of the ball).</p>		X	
15A	8-1-3b,c,d,e	<p>Utilizing the three marked lane spaces closest to the shooter rather than closest to the end line (i.e., the vacant marked lane space would be below the block).</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Many believe that more rebounds come off the ring above the block. b. Gives the defense more of a rebounding advantage. c. Puts a defensive player nearest the shooter to box out. <p>Cons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Puts a defensive player in the marked lane space nearest the shooter; more likely to disconcert or illegally contact the shooter. b. The original rule was written to give the offense (team fouled) an advantage by allowing them an unhindered, uncontested opportunity to score from 15 feet. To counterbalance or offset that scoring advantage given to the offense, the defense was given the most advantageous position for rebounding. This may give the defensive team along the lane too much of the intended rebounding advantage. 		X	
15B	8-1-3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) remains the same b) The first marked lane spaces (the lane spaces adjacent to the end line) shall not be occupied. c) The second marked lane space on each side are must be occupied by opponents of the free thrower unless the resumption-of-play procedure is in effect. These two spaces include the “block.” d) The third marked lane space on each side may be occupied by teammates of the free thrower. e) The fourth lane spaces (nearest the free throw line) may be occupied by opponents of the free thrower. f & g - remain as is. h) These restrictions end upon the release of the ball. <p>Rationale: 1. Inside players deserve to have the advantage of rebounding a missed free throw. This change would restore some of that advantage that has been lost. 2. This will clean up play under the basket, resulting in less rough play. 3. Allowing restrictions to end on the release is easier for players and officials. 4. Players can more easily block out their opponents when the restrictions end on the release. 5. Still maintains having less people in the lane as per the rule change put into effect this year.</p>		X	
16A	8-1-3b	<p>Free Throws: The person in the first lane space adjacent to the end line be allowed to stand on the low block. Rationale: It seems that the defensive players occupying the first lane space adjacent to the end line are at a disadvantage. The rule change would give the defensive player</p>		X	

		occupying that space more of an equal advantage securing a rebound. It would also keep the 4 th spaces (nearest the free throw line) unoccupied.			
16B	8-1-3b	When free throws are being attempted, allow the players in the first lane spaces the additional width of the 12” neutral-zone marking of the first space. Add the following sentence to 3b: During free throws the first marked lane space shall extend from the first mark closest to the end line to the further edge of the neutral-zone marks. Rationale: Since the intent of placing the defensive players in the first space is to have the advantage of obtaining the rebound following a missed free throw, this will allow the defensive players additional space to move into the lane without causing undue contact with the offensive players in the second lane space. Hopefully, this work along with the change made in 2003-04 to cut down on the rough play that occurs during rebounding action. This technique is presently being used at the NCAA Men’s level to minimize on rough play.		X	
17	9-2-11 Note	Change the interpretation from a held ball to a ball out of bounds by the player who holds the ball beyond a boundary line an opponent grasps the ball while it is still in the bands of the thrower-in by making the following changes. Following Note in 9-2-11, change “See penalty” to See Penalty 5.” There is no penalty specified for this note. Add Penalty 5: If the opponent touches the ball there is no penalty and the clock is not started if stopped. If an opponent grasps the ball, the ball shall be declared out-of-bounds o the player throwing in the ball. The ruling of casebook play 7.6.3F on page 56 would change to: “The ball is awarded to Team B for a throw-in. If the throw-in is an alternating possession throw-in, the arrow would be reversed.” Rationale: In all instances in which a player is in possession of the ball and is touching a boundary line the ball is considered to be out-of-bounds by that player. If a held ball were to occur when two players were in-bounds but one of the players was touching a boundary line, the ball would be considered to be out-of-bounds by that player. This situation is also similar to the clarification made in 1994 in which a player, whose is making a throw-in, throws the ball to an opponent who is touching the boundary line. Changing this interpretation would be consistent with Rule 7 Section 1 Art. 2a, which states, “The ball is out-of-bounds when it touches a player who is out-of-bounds.” Also it would reward the defensive player for making a good play and penalize the player making the throw-in for making a dumb play. This interpretation would agree with the NCAA interpretation of this play.		X	
18	9-10-3b	A closely guarded count shall terminate b. if the original defender(s) leaves the closely guarded position. If the offensive player in control of the ball is simultaneously approached and closely guarded by two defensive players the closely guarded count may continue if one of the two defenders fails to maintain a closely guarded status. However, if one defender subsequently approaches an already closely guarded offensive player and the original defender loses his/her closely guarded status, the closely guarded count would restart. Rationale: An offensive player with possession of the ball should be allowed to assume closely guarded counts will occur when defensive players are attempting to defend him/her. To “transition” or “pass on” a closely guarded definition to another defensive player and allow a closely guarded count to continue simply because of the possibility that even unaware defensive players happen to be within 6 feet of the offensive player, both feet on the playing court and facing the offensive player does not provide equal protection to the offensive player. In addition, it would be my opinion that this current rule is not adequately understood by most coaches and officials nor applied properly.		X	

19A	9-14 New	<p>Permitting the use of a shot clock by state association adoption.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Permits a state to adopt a playing rule based on its own desired preferences without b. Affecting another state. c. Permits the seven states already using a shot clock to follow NFHS rules and be a part of the rules-making process. <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Takes the country further away from a set of national playing rules for high school basketball. b. States may feel pressured to adopt the rule if other neighboring states have adopted. <p>Creates unfamiliar playing conditions for teams playing in neighboring states that have adopted the rule.</p>		X	
19B	9-14 New	<p>By state adoption, allow the use of a 35 or 30 second shot clock, rule 9, section 4 “The team in control shall attempt a try for field goal within 35 or 30 seconds after gaining team control. The try shall leave the shooter’s hand before the expiration of time on the shot clock and the try shall subsequently strike the basket ring or enter the basket.” Rationale: We have used a 35 second shot clock in our class A boys’ division for five years, a 30 second shot clock in class A girl’s for one year and our coaches are unanimous in their support. The fan interest as indicated by attendance at our tournaments has been very positive. We have had calls from class B fans wondering if the clock will be implemented for their games as it more fun watching games with a shot clock. For class B people to speak positively about anything involving class A is a monumental step!</p>		X	
20	10-3-7d	<p>The rule should read “Purposely obstructing an opponent’s vision by waving or placing hands(s) near his or her eyes.” Rationale: The difference between whether this act is committed against an opponent not in control of the ball or whether the opponent has control of the ball should be removed. Guarding a players eyes should not be allowed as an effort to obstruct the players movement and borders on an unsafe act. It should be a Technical Foul regardless of which opponent it is purposely committed against.</p>	X		
21	10-4-4	<p>Replace 10-4-4 with the following: Leave the confines of the bench during a fight for or a confrontation between two or more players even if no fight actually occurs.</p> <p>Add the following to Summary of Penalties 8b(1): This penalty will also apply to those who leave the team bench when a confrontation occurs between players but no fight actually occurs. Rationale: There is no coverage in the rule book for the situation when two players may start jawing at each other but no fight occurs. These are volatile situations which can easily degenerate into a fight or worse by the presence of team members from the bench. The penalty should be the same as for leaving the bench during a fight.</p>	X		
21.1	10-5-1d	<p>Replace or remove a disqualified/injured player, or player directed to leave the game, immediately when a substitute is available, while within the confines of his/her bench. Rationale: This was an optional rule that was used in Illinois during the 02-03 season. It kept the game moving at a better pace, particularly late in the game. It would avoid a 30 second delay and getting substitutes in the game.</p>		X	
21.2	10-5-1d	<p>Disqualified, bleeding, or injured player substitutions - Team not be allowed to go to their respective bench area during the time allowed to replace a disqualified, bleeding, or injured player. Teams to remain on the court, in the area where play is to be resumed, no closer than the near</p>		X	

		lane line to the bench area. Rationale: Coaches delay replacing said player to use this period of time as an "unwarranted timeout".			
22	New Signal	Add signal for not closely guarded – use same signal as NCAA. Rationale: 1). Allows officials to use a signal that is already being used. 2). Most basketball fans know and understand this signal. 3). Helps the official to better communicate.		X	

B. Editorial changes:

#	Rules Reference	Proposed Editorial Change	Passed	Failed	No Action
1	1-5-2	Suggest you consider deleting the last sentence in 1-5-2: “There are four marked lane spaces on each lane boundary line.” OR delete the word “marked,” so that the sentence reads,” There are four lane spaces on each lane boundary line.” Rationale: This has caused some confusion with Rule 8, Section 1, Article 3e (page 52), that says they “...are not considered marked lane spaces for purposes of Rule 8 and 9-1.” Because of this, there is really no need to say there are 4 marked land spaces in Rule 1.	X		
2	1-14	Edit to: “A red light behind each backboard or an LED light on each backboard is permitted to supplement the audible timer’s signal...”	X		
2.1	2-8-4	Change sequence to notify the coach, timer, then player of the disqualification.	X		
3	2-9-2	Reverse items b and c to match Mechanics manual and actual practice. We always indicate direction then throw-in spot. Rationale: To match Mechanics manual and actual practice. We always indicate direction then throw-in spot.	X		
4	3-2-1	Added to the end of 3-2-1, “Failure to comply results in a technical foul. (See 10-1-1 Penalty)” Rationale: The penalties are ambiguous as written in the rule book. Some would interpret the rule to mean only one technical foul is assessed in total. Coaches don’t go through the Case Book, many don’t open the rules. It’s tough trying to explain the two technical fouls to a coach when they read this rule and not the Case Book. This simple clarification would prevent any dispute.	X		
5	3-3-1	Typo on the third line “15 seconds before the end of the intermission or a 60” should be “ for a 60.”	X		
6	3-3-6 Note	Add a new note after Article 6: “If players from both teams are directed to leave the game because of blood, both teams must request and be granted a time-out in order to keep each player in the game.” Rationale: This will clarify that a player from one team cannot take advantage of another team’s time-out.	X		
7	3-5-1	Editorial revision to more clearly define what/when knee and ankle braces can be worn. Add, “These braces may be padded or unpadded.” Rationale: The above is our interpretation but officials, coaches and trainers were confused. Many felt that “hard” braces had to be padded – that is not what the rule says currently. If that is the intent the rule still needs to be re-written and clarified.	X		
8	4-10	Change to: “A closely guarded situation occurs when a player in control of the ball in his/her team’s frontcourt, is <u>continuously</u> guarded by <u>any</u> opponent who is within 6 feet of the player who is holding or dribbling the ball.	X		
9	4-11-1	Art. 1...Change to: “Continuous motion applies to a try or tap for field goals and free throws, but it has no significance unless there is a foul by <u>any defensive player during...</u> ”	X		
10A	4-19-7a, b Notes	Delete Notes; already in 7-5.	X		

10B	4-19-9 Note	Delete note; already in 7-5.	X		
11	4-23-3a	Split current a. into: a. The guard may have one or both feet on the playing court or be airborne, provided he/she has inbound status. b. The guard is not required to continue facing the opponent.	X		
12	6-2-3 New	Add new article 3 to read: “The game and each extra period begins when the ball becomes live as specified in 6-2 for a jump ball, throw-in or a free throw.” Rationale: This change will clarify that the game and each extra period is started when the ball becomes live not when the clock starts.		X	
13	6-3 & 4	Switch Section 3 to Section 4 – Alternating Possession. Switch Section 4 to Section 3 – Jump Ball Administration. The content of each rule would remain the same. Re-number the casebook plays accordingly. Rationale: In the logical sequence of the game, the alternating possession procedure is established after the jump ball occurs. So why not present the rules in that sequence also. Change 3 to “Jump-Ball Administration” and Section 4 to “Alternation Possession.”	X		
13.1	6-7 Exc 4	Delete the last sentence in the exception; it is covered in Art. 9.	X		
14	7-5-7	Clarify that the team will retain the end line run after a violation or <u>common</u> foul. Change Case Book play 7.5.7 D to be consistent with this change.	X		
15	8-1-1 & 2	Rewrite Art. 1 and include a new Art. 2 (renumber remaining articles). Art. 1 ... When a free throw is awarded, the ball shall be placed at the disposal of the free thrower (bounced) by the administering official and the free throw count shall begin. Either or both teams may be charged with a violation. Art. 2... Following a time out or intermission, the resumption of play procedure may be used to prevent delay. The timer will sound the authorized warning horn and final signal. The administering official will sound the whistle to indicate play will resume. The ball shall be placed at the disposal of the thrower or placed on the floor and the count shall begin. Either or both teams may be charged with a violation. Following a violation by one or both teams, if the offending team(s) continues to delay, a technical foul shall be called. Rationale: As currently stated the rule intertwines the general administration of free throws with the resumption of play procedure. It is misleading to indicate that the administering official shall take the ball to the free-throw line when in the vast majority of free throws this is not the case and the resumption of play procedure is neither needed nor used.	X		
16	8-1-3b	Add a new sentence to the end. “No teammate of the free thrower may occupy either of these lane spaces.”	X		
17	8-1-3b	Delete at the end of 3b delete the words “unless the resumption of play is in effect.” Rationale: The terminology used seems to indicate that if the resumption of play procedure is in effect on a free throw attempt that the first marked lane spaces do not have to be occupied.	X		
18	9-1-2	Change to: “Teams shall properly occupy marked lane spaces according to number and space requirements (8-1-3).”	X		
19	9-1-10 New	Change the current 9-1-9 Note into new 9-1-10.	X		
20	9-1 Pen 3	Change to: “If there is a simultaneous violation by each team, the ball becomes dead and no point can be scored. <u>Remaining free-throws are administered</u> or play is resumed by the team entitled to the alternating-possession throw-in from the designated out-of-bounds spot nearest to where the simultaneous violation occurred.”	X		

21	9-11	The specific items in 9-11 should be moved to 4-6 and deleted from 9-11 (see Travel, 9-4). Text in 9-11 changed to: “A player shall not commit basket interference (4-6).”	X		
22	9-12	The specific items in 9-12 should be moved to 4-22 and deleted from 9-12 (see Travel, 9-4). Text in 9-12 changed to: “A player shall not commit goaltending (4-22).”	X		
23	10-1 thru 5	Restructure the technical foul sections to indicate the penalty of each article at the end of the article instead at the end of the section. See attached examples. Rationale: By specifying the penalty at the end of each article it will be easier to associate and remember the penalty of the article instead of going back and forth to the end of the section and back to the article.	X		
24	10-4 Pen Note	Change to be consistent with other NFHS rule codes regarding where adult bench personnel must go when ejected.	X		
25	10-5-1 b&c	Combine articles 1b&c and include the additional time-out requirement. 1b would then read: “Confer with personnel at scorer’s table to request a 60-second time-out (<i>or one 30-second time-out if that is the only type of time-out remaining</i>) for a correctable error as in 2-10 or to prevent or rectify a timing or scoring mistake or alternating possession mistake. Change article d to article c. Rationale: Combining these paragraphs would result in the rule reading the same as Rule 5-7-4. The additional time-out type should be added to concur with the editorial change made to Rule 5-11-3 in 2003-04.	X		
26	10-5-1d	Do we want to give 30 seconds to replace someone directed to leave the game for a uniform violation? This may need to be clarified.			X
27	Signal Chart	Illegal use of hands adjusted from an open hand to a closed fist across the arm.	X		

C. Case Book

The committee discussed interpretations of specific case situations.

D. 2004-05 Points of Emphasis

1. Closely Guarded
2. Time-out Administration
3. Legal Player Positioning
4. Specific Unsporting Acts

7. **SUBCOMMITTEE WORK**

Committee members were divided into subcommittees and worked on their assigned duties.

8. **2005 QUESTIONNAIRE**

A. PART II – Observations – Have you seen in your area?

1. Spectators’ rushing the court after the final horn has sounded.
2. An increase in free throw disconcertion.
3. Has there been a decrease in officials properly administering the closely-guarded rule.
4. Has there been a decrease in officials properly calling the jump stop.
5. Has there been a decrease in officials utilizing proper NFHS signals and mechanics.
6. Has the new free-throw rule jeopardized the ability of the defense to block-out the shooter?
7. Has the new free-throw rule given the defense too much of an advantage?
8. Has the new free-throw rule decreased rough play on free throws?

- B. PART III – About the rules for 2005-06, would you favor?
 - 1. Double fouls (personal & technical) administered at point of interruption?
 - 2. Permitting the use of a shot clock by state association adoption?
 - 3. Changing the current lane to the international trapezoid lane?
 - 4. Changing the current three-point line (19'9") to the international three-point line (20'6")

9. 2003-04 BASKETBALL MEETINGS

- A. Rule Interpreters – September 30, 2004 (topic suggestions: closely guarded presentation, jump stop)
- B. Rules Committee – April 16-19, 2005

10. OFFICIALS EDUCATION PROGRAM UPDATE

The NFHS and Human Kinetics continue to develop the NFHS Officials Education Program. The first course, Officiating Principles, has been launched and the Officiating Basketball Course is scheduled to be released in the fall of 2004.

11. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 20, 2004.