# 2002 PROPOSED BASKETBALL *RULE* REVISIONS

| PROP # | PG | RULE | PROPOSED REVISION WITH RATIONALE | STATE/PERSON SUBMITTING | OTHER RULES AFFECTED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **Rule 1-Court and Equipment** | | |
| | | | *See discussion item from MN. | | |
| | | | **Rule 2-Officials and Their Duties** | | |
| 1 | 16 | 2-2-1 | State Associations by adoption may allow officials to use replay or television monitoring equipment when (if) available in making decisions relating to last second shots at the end of each quarter and each half. **Rationale:** This would allow officials to review controversial last second shots to increase their opportunity of getting the call right. The request for review must come from the head coach only. | **Missouri** (Oakes/Blase) State Office | |
| 2 | 18 | 2-8-4 | Add a requirement that the non-calling official remain at the table until a substitute enters the game after a player is disqualified. **Rationale:** The official calling the final foul to disqualify a player should not have to stay at the table waiting for a substitute to enter for the disqualified player. Removing the calling official from the table area would prevent any possible problems with an unhappy coach. Especially, if the disqualified player is his/her best player. This is the method that official are instructed to use. Adding to the rules would concur with a common and practical practice. | **New Jersey** (Iandoli, Cherry Hill) Rule Interpreter | Officials Manual |
| | | | | | |
| | | | **Rule 3-Players, Substitutes and Equipment** | | |
| 3 | 22 | 3-3-1 | Add to article: One set of substitutes allowed per team per substitution opportunity. No successive substitution for either team during any one dead ball period. **Rationale:** Avoid game delay. | **Minnesota** (Robinson) State Office | |
| 4 | 22 | 3-3-1 | "A player who desires to enter shall report to the scorers, giving his/her number and the number of the player who is being replaced." **Rationale:** The current rule, which does not require information regarding the player to be replaced, causes substantial difficulty for scorers, timers and statisticians. Problems that can arise that make the enforcement of the current rule uninformative and difficult to enforce are: 1.) Multiple substitutes on time-outs and opposing coach inquires as to which opponent is in the game. . . no way of knowing until they enter the floor. 2.) Replaced players have more of a chance to re-enter the game on the same dead ball. 3.) Three substitutes are beckoned into the game for Team A and they enter the floor. Before anyone leaves, a fight breaks out with 5 of the 9 on-floor players for Team A and 3 players from Team B involved. Should Team A Coach be assessed a technical foul? Should Team A Coach be assessed 3 technical fouls? How do the officials and scorer know which players were defined as bench personnel of the 8 players still on the floor for Team A? 4.) Team A player fouls out of the game. Team A Coach talks to a sub and within 15 seconds sends the sub in the game. Team B member requests a time-out. Should the officials assume the substitute for Team A was for the fouled out Team A player or should they inquire of Coach A if this substitute is for the fouled out player or should the officials wait for the | **Kentucky** (Boucher) Rules Committee | |

| PROP # | PG | RULE | PROPOSED REVISION WITH RATIONALE | STATE/PERSON SUBMITTING | OTHER RULES AFFECTED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | expiration of 30-seconds to see if Coach A sends in another substitute for the fouled out Team A player before granting the time-out? 5.) Team A is shooting a free throw. Team A substitute reports to enter the game. No way of knowing who they are replacing and timer blows horn. It is then determined they are entering for the shooter. Coaches do not like horns blown that interrupt the free throw shooters concentration nor do they like the free throw shooter knowing they are going to be replaced. Should the timer blow the horn or not? I believe the rule change I am proposing (and it is a return to the way the rule read formerly) came into being in the 1960's and was added to deal with the problem of a player who was a poor free throw shooter being fouled, being "injured", being replaced by a good free throw shooter, and then returning after the free throw. I have never been much of a supporter of eliminating rules because they are not enforced. In addition, I believe the current rule has made it far more difficult on courtside administrative game personnel and the current depth of information being kept/required. | | |
| 5 | 22 | 3-3-6 | Permitting a player who is required to leave the game for blood or injury to remain in the game if the team calls a time-out and the situation can be corrected by the resumption of play. **Rationale:** The current rule can have a tremendous impact on the game when a key player has blood (which may not even be their own) and must leave late in the game, without the ability to return immediately | **NFHS Questionnaire** | 3-3-5? |
| 6 | 24 | 3-4-15 | Delete the rule requiring shirt tails to be tucked in and shorts worn above the hips. **Rationale:** Coaches and players don't like the rule, players break the rule, coaches don't enforce the rule, coaches chastise officials who enforce the rule and it is not being enforced at the NCAA level where kids see it on television. It doesn't seem fair that we continue "dumping" rules on officials, causing them to stand with little support. | **North Dakota** (Carlsrud) State Office | |
| 7 | 25 | 3-7-2 New | Require players to wear mouth guards. **Rationale:** To prevent dental injury. | **Sports Medicine Adv. Comm.** | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | **Rule 4-Definitions** | | |
| 8 | 26 | 4-3-3a Note New | Add a note to 4-4-3a stating "A jumper will not be considered to have control if the he/she catches the tapped ball before it touches the floor." Change the interpretation for the situation when the tap is caught by one of the jumpers. **Rationale:** Case Book play 6.3.1C specifies that after the ball is tapped on a jump ball, if one of the jumpers catches the ball that player has controlled the tap and has violated by catching the ball. This results in the opposing team getting a throw-in plus the arrow. This essentially results in a double penalty. Officials at the high school level have difficulty with this interpretation. Why not simplify it by only considering the violation by the player catching the tap. This will result in the opposing team receiving the throw-in at which time the arrow would be set for the team that violated. I think this would concur with the NCAA interpretation. | **New Jersey** (Iandoli, Cherry Hill) Rule Interpreter | Case Book 6.3.1C(d) |

# 2002 PROPOSED BASKETBALL *RULE* REVISIONS

| PROP # | PG | RULE | PROPOSED REVISION WITH RATIONALE | STATE/PERSON SUBMITTING | OTHER RULES AFFECTED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | 26 | 4-4-2 | **Re-write** to read: A ball which is in contact with a player **<u>or with the court</u>** is in the front court if neither the ball nor the player is touching the backcourt. **Rationale:** Adding "or with the court" eliminates player in the air with the ball. | **Minnesota** (Robinson) State Office **Connecticut** (Ferrigno, Willimantic) | |
| 10 | 27 | 4-7-1 | Blocking is illegal contact in which **<u>the torso</u>** impedes the progress of an opponent. **Rationale:** The word torso is needed because blocking involves contact with the torso. Too may officials are signaling, blocking for almost all contact which impedes the progress of an opponent. | **Connecticut** (Ferrigno, Willimantic) | |
| 11 | 27 | 4-7-1 | **Add - A)** Blocking an opponent with the ball. The guard must have both feet touching the floor and the guard's torso must be facing the opponent. There are no time and distance factors. The guard may be moving laterally or backwards provided two feet are touching the floor and he/she is facing the opponent. **B)** Blocking an opponent without the ball. The guard must give the opponent time and distance to avoid contact, up to two strides. If the opponent is airborne, the guard must have obtained legal guarding position before the opponent left the floor. No facing is required. The guard must be stationary unless both players are going in the same direction. **Rationale:** Since approximately 1978, when the rules committee omitted in the definition of blocking, an opponent *<u>without the ball,</u>* the present definition does not address the distinctly different criteria in blocking the path of a player *<u>with</u>* the ball and, one *<u>without</u>* the ball. This misunderstanding among players, coaches, commentators, and a significant number of officials, has caused much consternation among all in the world of basketball. Unless the definition for BLOCKING specifically delineates the distinct differences in the two plays, we shall continue to hear commentators refer to "feet not set" "feet not planted", "feet were moving", "guard did not have position", when addressing the play where the defensive player blocks the path of a player *<u>with</u>* the ball. We hear at our annual rules interpreters meetings that officials are calling too many "blocks"! | **Connecticut** (Ferrigno, Willimantic) | |
| 12 | 28 | 4-10 | Delete closely guarding while dribbling (same as NCAA Women). **Rationale:** Too much counting and hand changing while counting. Also, will eliminate the problem of having to continue a count when closely guarded player dribbles from one official's area of responsibility to the other official's area. Rule 9-10-1a, delete: "or dribble the ball for 5 seconds." With this deletion, 9-10-2 and 9-10-3 (page 56) are not needed; delete both. | **Minnesota** (Robinson) State Office | 9-10-1a<br>9-10-2<br>9-10-3 |
| 13 | 28 | 4-11-3 New | Add Art. 3 – Continuous motion does **not** apply if a teammate fouls after a player has started a try for a goal and before the ball is in flight. The ball becomes dead immediately.<br>**Rationale:** This change would eliminate any ambiguity about of the status of the ball when a teammate fouls after a player has started a try for goal. | **New Jersey** (Iandoli, Cherry Hill) Rule Interpreter | 6-7 Exceptions |

# 2002 PROPOSED BASKETBALL *RULE* REVISIONS

| PROP # | PG | RULE | PROPOSED REVISION WITH RATIONALE | STATE/PERSON SUBMITTING | OTHER RULES AFFECTED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | 29 | 4-15-3 | **Re-write** article to read: Batting the ball to the floor**, <u>or in the air</u>**. **Rationale:** It is legal to start a dribble by pushing, throwing, or batting a ball in the air. | **Connecticut** (Ferrigno, Willimantic) | |
| 15 | 29 | 4-15-6 New | Add Art. 6 – During an interrupted dribble: a) A three-second lane violation count shall not begin or shall be terminated. b) A closely guarded count shall not be started or shall be terminated. c) A player control foul can not be committed. d) A time out request shall not be granted. e) Out-of-bounds violation does not apply on the player involved in the interrupted dribble. **Rationale:** This change would accumulate all of the items that apply to the interrupted dribble in one location within the body of the rules. | **New Jersey** (Iandoli, Cherry Hill) Rule Interpreter | |
| 16 | 30 | 4-19-1 | **Re-write** to read: A personal foul is a player foul which involves illegal contact with an opponent while the ball is live, or by or on an airborne shooter when the ball is dead. **<u>The player who causes the contact, which results in an advantage or disadvantage, or leads to rough play, is responsible for the contact</u>**. **Rationale:** As Jack Loube, IAABO Executive Director has said, "it is the result of the contact, not the *<u>nature</u>* of the foul that is the determining factor in calling or not calling a foul. The intent and purpose of the Rules, in the first paragraph of the NF rule book , speaks of advantage and disadvantage. The present language, normal offensive and defensive movements", is vague. Adding the proposed language changes would enlighten spectators, coaches, players, and some officials as to when a foul occurs. When contact occurs, officials would consider only which player caused the contact, advantage-disadvantage, rough play, and not "absolutes", which consider the *<u>nature</u>* of the contact, and not the *<u>result</u>* of the contact. | **Connecticut** (Ferrigno, Willimantic) | |
| 17A | 31 | 4-19-9 | **Re-write** to read: "A simultaneous foul (**<u>technical or personal</u>**) by opponents. . ." **Rationale**: There is no definition of a simultaneous personal foul. | **NFHS** (Struckhoff) Rules Editor | |
| 17B | 32 | 4-19-14 New | Include verbiage/coverage of "simultaneous" personal fouls under rule 4. Is omitted currently. It is mentioned in 6.3.3g in the Case Book and in rule 10 in the Hand Book. **Rationale:** It is also covered briefly in the Rules Book summary of fouls on page 64. | **South Carolina** (Derr, N. Augusta) | |
| 18 | 32 | 4-23-2c New | Include new item c: To obtain an initial legal guarding position on a player moving with the ball: a. The guard must have both feet touching the floor. b. The front of the guard's torso must be facing the opponent**<u>. c. No time and distance factors are required</u>**. **Rationale:** The only time officials consider, "two feet touching and facing", is when guard jumps in front of a rapidly moving player with the ball. | **Connecticut** (Ferrigno, Willimantic) | |

# 2002 PROPOSED BASKETBALL *RULE* REVISIONS

| PROP # | PG | RULE | PROPOSED REVISION WITH RATIONALE | STATE/PERSON SUBMITTING | OTHER RULES AFFECTED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | 33 | 4-23-4 | Guarding a stationary opponent with or without the ball. **Eliminate present a. and b. Add new a. No facing is required. The guard must have attained a spot on the floor in the path between the opponent and the basket, or the path between the opponent and the ball. Rationale:** This is the way the game is played. Also the present rule language in Section 23, does not include an "opponent moving with the ball." | **Connecticut** (Ferrigno, Willimantic) | |
| 20 | 38 | 4-42-2 | Change Art. 2 to read: A successive time-out **shall not be granted to either team during regulation time or any extra periods. Rationale:** In most cases, if not all, very little coaching or game management is instructed to players. It is used as a delay of game in most cases when free throws are involved to ice the shooter or prolongs the ending of the game. | **Kentucky** (Mallory, Louisville) | 5-12-3 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | **Rule 5-Scoring and Timing Regulations** | | |
| 21 | 40 | 5-2-1 | Clarify the status of the ball on a three point try that is touched by a teammate of the shooter who is inside the three point arc while the ball is in it's upward flight toward the basket. Include in Case Book play 5.2.1C "the ball is legally touched by B1 or **A2 . . . .**etc" The ruling would be unchanged. **Rationale:** This would establish the fact that if team touches the ball, three points would be scored and the try would not end until it is unsuccessful. | **New Jersey** (Iandoli, Cherry Hill) Rule Interpreter | Case Book 5.2.1C |
| 22 | 41 | 5-5-2 | Delete limits on teams below grade nine to playing six-minute quarters. **Rationale**: With the exception of the NFHS Track and Field Rules, no other NFHS rules address middle level/junior high. Do you know why the basketball committee chose to include middle level/junior high in the basketball rules? Washington has long had a rule to allow the middle level/junior high teams a choice of playing either six or eight-minute quarters. Not realizing until this year that that was a deviation from the rules. If the committee chooses to retain the language limiting middle level/junior high to six minute quarters, is it considered an exception to the rule to play eight minute quarters? | **Washington** (Adsit) State Office | |
| 23A | 41 | 5-5-4 New | Permitting the clock to run in the fourth quarter (except for time-outs) when a specified point differential is reached/maintained (i.e., 25 points). **Rationale:** Speed up a lop-sided contest, improve sporting behaviors, consistent with other NFHS rule codes. | **NFHS Questionnaire** | 5-8, 5-9 |
| 23B | 41 | 5-5-4 New | State Association by adoption may institute a running clock when a specified point differential is reached at a specified time in the game. Should the point differential drop below the specified number, normal timing procedures would resume. (NFHS Basketball Rules Committee to establish point differential and specified time in the game). **Rationale:** Missouri is experiencing significant numbers of basketball games with very large point differentials between the two competing teams. It is becoming more prevalent that in these games there is a deteriorization in sportsmanship of the fans, coaches, and players and in may cases the number and intensity of fouls increase thereby putting player's safety in jeopardy. We believe it is time for basketball to join the other teams | **Missouri** (Oakes/Blase) State Office | 5-8, 5-9 |

# 2002 PROPOSED BASKETBALL *RULE* REVISIONS

| PROP # | PG | RULE | PROPOSED REVISION WITH RATIONALE | STATE/PERSON SUBMITTING | OTHER RULES AFFECTED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | sports of football, soccer, baseball, and softball in establishing the potential of a "mercy rule" of some kind. If coaches are concerned about reduced playing time for their substitutes, they could put them in the game earlier so perhaps the specified point differential would not be reached. | | |
| 23C | 41 | 5-5-4 New | By state association adoption a point differential may be established whereby at the end of the first half if one team has gained the established point differential or if a team secures such a differential during the second half, the established guidelines for a running clock shall be in effect. **Rationale:** Allow state associations to establish a point differential (running clock) for basketball contests. Sportsmanship and coaching ethics are key concerns. | **Michigan** (Hampton) State Office | 5-8, 5-9 |
| 23D | 42 | 5-8-1 | Exception – After the first half is completed and one team is ahead by 25 or more points, the third and fourth quarters will consist of a running clock except as in Articles 2 and 3. If the lead goes under 25 points, the clock will be stopped as normal. **Rationale:** 1. Avoid further undo embarrassment to losing team. 2. Emotions of losing team could and have caused physical reactions. 3. Most other sports have a "slaughter" rule. | **Delaware** (Baly) Committee Member | 5-5-4 New |
| 24 | 43 | 5-8-3 Note New | Add a clarifying note: If an oral request for a time-out from the player's bench area is granted but it is not desired by the head coach, the time-out shall be rescinded. **Rationale:** This change would assure that only the head coach may request and be granted a time-out from the bench area. The present interpretation requires that a time-out be granted which would result in the team use a team out that is not needed. This would also concur with what is done at the college level. | **New Jersey** (Iandoli, Cherry Hill) Rule Interpreter | |
| 25 | 43 | 5-8-3 | Not permitting an airborne player to call a time-out. **Rationale:** Is the player truly in control? Should they be able to avoid a possible violation from this position. | **NFHS Questionnaire** | |
| 26 | 43 | 5-8-3 | Not permitting a player to call a time-out to prevent a violation or held ball. **Rationale:** Should a player be able to avoid a possible violation by calling a time-out? | **NFHS Questionnaire** | |
| 27 | 44 | 5-12-6 New | Charging a team with a time-out for repeated uniform violations (more than two). **Rationale:** There needs to be a more severe penalty for not adhering to uniform requirements. | **NFHS Questionnaire** | |
| 23E | 44 | 5-13 New | Add a new article. Mercy Rule, with the following procedure. When a team becomes 20 points behind in the score continue the game by awarding that team a throw-in at the division line opposite the scoring table until that team reduces the difference in the score to 10 points or less. If a turnover were to occur, that team would be awarded a throw-in at the spot closest to the turn over. Once the score is reduced to points or less, the game would continue in it's normal manner until the differential in the score again becomes 20 points or greater. The process of awarding a throw-in to the team is 20 points behind in the score would then be reinstated. This process would be continued through the reminder of the game. Any fouls that may be committed will be penalized as specified. **Rationale:** The intent of this rule is to instill competitiveness in a tam that becomes behind in the score. It will also make the team that is ahead in the score play more defensively to maintain their lead. This rule would also eliminate embarrassing score differences and would curtail any possibilities of "running up" the score. | **New Jersey** (Iandoli, Cherry Hill) Rule Interpreter | |
| | | | | | |

# 2002 PROPOSED BASKETBALL *RULE* REVISIONS

| PROP # | PG | RULE | PROPOSED REVISION WITH RATIONALE | STATE/PERSON SUBMITTING | OTHER RULES AFFECTED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **Rule 6-Live Ball and Dead Ball** | | |
| 28A | 45 | 6-2 | Determining the opening (and overtime) possession with a coin-toss (instead of a jump ball). **Rationale:** Officials are no longer as skilled at jump balls, due to lack of frequency. Gives teams an equal opportunity to gain the first possession of the game. Consistent with some other NFHS team sports in which changes of possession occur frequently (FB, VB, SOC). May give additional meaning to the captain's meeting before the contest. | **NFHS Questionnaire** | 1-3-1, 4-28-1, 6-1-2a, 6-3-1, 6-4, 9-6 |
| 28B | 45 | 6-2-2 | Use the alternating- possession procedure to begin any extra periods. **Rationale:** Rule 5-7-3 states that extra periods are an extension of the fourth quarter. Teams do not change baskets, all fouls and time-outs carry over, why not the A-P arrow. Why is this an exception to 5-7-3. | **Via e-mail** (Michael Thomspon) | 5-6, 5-7, 6-3 |
| 29 | 45 | 6-3-3a | Add a note following 3a. A held ball occurs. **Note:** When a held ball occurs, allow the defensive team that creates the held ball an option to resume play through the result of the alternating possession arrow or a throw-in. **Rationale:** This procedure would reward the team for making a good defensive play. | **New Jersey** (Iandoli, Cherry Hill) Rule Interpreter | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | **Rule 7-Out of Bounds and the Throw-In** | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | **Rule 8-Free Throw** | | |
| 30A | 51 | 8-1-3 | Re-write to read: During a free throw when lane spaces may be occupied: **a. A maximum of six players (four opponents of the free-thrower and two teammates of the free-thrower) shall be permitted on the lane. All other players shall be behind the free-throw line extended and behind the three-point field-goal line. b. The bottom two lane spaces closest to the basket have been eliminated for use. c. The first spaces above the block closest to the end line are designed lane spaces on either side of the lane for opponents of the free-thrower and must be occupied. The next available spaces closer to the free-throw line are designated for teammates of the free-thrower. The last two available spaces on either side of the lane closest to the free-throw line are designated for opponents of the free-thrower. d. Teammates of the free-thrower shall not occupy lane spaces designated for opponents of the free-thrower; opponents of the free-thrower shall not occupy lane spaces designated for teammates of the free-thrower. e. Not more than one player may occupy any part of a marked lane space. f. Only the marked lane spaces may be occupied. Rationale:** There always seems to be an emphasis on reducing rough play, especially in the lane area. One of the ways to help remedy this situation is during a free throw. The bottom lane space has become one of disadvantage in recent years. The only way to equalize this disadvantage is for the player in that space to force his/her way toward the adjacent space which in turn causes that person to push back or go over the back of the player in front. Eliminating the bottom lane space and reducing the number of players on the lane will | **Kentucky** (Camacho, Crittenden) | 9-1-2<br>8-1-4 |

| PROP # | PG | RULE | PROPOSED REVISION WITH RATIONALE | STATE/PERSON SUBMITTING | OTHER RULES AFFECTED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | reduce the amount of physical contact, thereby reducing rough play. | | |
| 30B | 51 | 8-1-3a | When free throws are being attempted, allow the players in the first lane spaces the additional 12" marking of the first space. **Rationale:** This is presently being used at the NCAA level. This will allow those players in the first spaces a more advantageous position to obtain a possible rebound without causing undue contact. That is why they are put in those spaces. Hopefully, this will cut down on the rough play that occurs during rebounding action. | **New Jersey** (Iandoli, Cherry Hill) Rule Interpreter | |
| 30B | 51 | 8-1-3a | Add-The defensive player in the first lane space may use the 12" neutral zone block that separates the first and second lane spaces. **Rationale:** 1. It will lessen the bumping during rebounding of missed free throws. 2. Allows defense more room for rebounding. 3. Brings NFHS Rules in line with NCAA Men's Rules, which allow this activity. | **Delaware** (Baly) Committee Member | |
| 30C | 51 | 8-1-3b | Delete the wording: **"and to each other alternate position along each lane line."** Add the wording in a note: **"Only a total of two teammates of the free thrower are permitted in lane space." Rationale:** This change would limit the number of teammates of the free thrower along the lane during a free throw allowing the non-shooting a better opportunity to secure the rebound. It should also cut down on the rough player during rebounding action. | **New Jersey** (Iandoli, Cherry Hill) Rule Interpreter | |
| 30D | 51 | 8-1-3b | Players on the free throw lane. Modify rule 8-1-3b and limit the number of people on the free throw lane to six: four defensive and two offensive players. Also allow players to enter the lane upon release of the free throw. **Rationale:** This helps clean up the congestion in the lane after a missed free throw and will make it a cleaner game. | **Minnesota** (Robinson) State Office | 9-1-9 Note |
| | | | | | |
| | | | **Rule 9-Violations and Penalties** | | |
| 31A | 53 | 9-1 Pen | Only penalizing the first offender when opposing players both violate during a free throw (if simultaneous, the alternating-possession procedure would still be used). **Rationale:** This situation really only affects when a defensive violation occurs first. Does it really matter that an offensive player subsequently enters the lane too soon? No advantage is gained as it is a delayed-violation. If an offensive player violates first, it is an immediate dead ball anyway. | **NFHS Questionnaire** | |
| 31A | 53 | 9-1- Pen | Double Free Throw Violation: When the defense violates first (even if the offense violates after), the official shall signal a delayed dead-ball. If the basket is missed re-administer the free throw. **Rationale:** With the present rules, the defensive team could try to use this situation to create an advantage and take away a free throw. | **Minnesota** (Robinson) State Office | |
| 31B | 53 | 9-1 Pen | On a double free throw violation, re-administering the free throw(s) and continuing play with an alternating-possession throw-in. **Rationale:** The free-throw shooting team is potentially penalized twice, when both teams have violated. This would be similar to when double violations/fouls occur at other times during the game. | **NFHS Questionnaire** | |
| 31B | 53 | 9-1- Pen | When a simultaneous violation occurs, the ball becomes dead, the lane is cleared and the free throw(s) are re-administered. Play then continues via the AP. **Rationale:** Since a team is entitled to | **Minnesota** (Robinson) | |

| PROP # | PG | RULE | PROPOSED REVISION WITH RATIONALE | STATE/PERSON SUBMITTING | OTHER RULES AFFECTED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | a free throw, why should we take away that opportunity because of a violation that happen after a foul? | State Office | |
| 31C | 53 | 9-1 Penalty 3 | Make the penalty for a double violation during a free throw offsetting. Change penalty 3 to read: "If there is a violation by each team, the ball becomes dead when the violation by the free thrower's team occurs, no points can be scored and resume play by re-administering the free throw." **Rationale:** The present penalty requires that when both teams violate during a free throw the ball becomes dead when the **violation by the free** thrower's team occurs. Officials seem to be reluctant to call this the way the rule is written. They seem to only honor the first violation. There is the belief that the non-shooting team violates hoping to draw the shooting team into violating. I would like to suggest making this an offsetting act similar to simultaneous personal and technical fouls. Give the ball back to the free thrower to attempt his/her free throw and continue the game. | **New Jersey** (Iandoli, Cherry Hill) Rule Interpreter | |
| 32 | 53 | 9-1-9 Note | Please return the foul lane rule so that a player may enter the lane on the release of the foul shot. **Rationale**: I don't know a coach who likes the present rule. The present rule make the little advantage the inside player has, even less. | **Vermont** (Bashford, Brattleboro) | |
| 33 | 57 | 9-13 New | Change the penalty for excessively swinging arms or elbow(s) to a violation (from a technical foul). **Rationale:** The current rule of a technical foul is very seldom called as the penalty is very severe: 2-shots, ball goes to the opponent, player charged with one tech, which also counts toward that players five for disqualification and the team foul count; all without any contact to the opponent. If the goal is to reduce the potential toward rough play, a violation call would be an enforceable penalty that would also likely achieve the desired results. Consistent with NCAA rules. | **NFHS Questionnaire** | 10-3-8g |
| 34 | 57 | 9-13 New | NEW – By state adoption, permit the use of a 35 or 30 second shot clock, "The team in control shall attempt a try for field goal within 35 or 35 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 four 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! | **North Dakota** (Carlsrud) State Office<br><br>**Washington** (Adsit) State Office | 6-7-9 |
| | | | **Rule 10-Fouls and Penalties** | | |
| 35A | 60 | 10-3-11 Pen | Change goaltending during a free throw. **Rationale:** Delete verbiage that makes it a technical foul to commit basket interference on a free throw. (Point scores, make it the same as the college rule). | **South Carolina** (Derr, N. Augusta) | 9-12 |
| 35A | 60 | 10-3-11 | Delete the penalty of a technical foul for goaltending during a free throw. In article 11 delete the wording **"Goaltend or"** **Rationale:** The penalty of a technical foul for goaltending during a free | **New Jersey** (Iandoli, Cherry | |

# 2002 PROPOSED BASKETBALL *RULE* REVISIONS

| PROP # | PG | RULE | PROPOSED REVISION WITH RATIONALE | STATE/PERSON SUBMITTING | OTHER RULES AFFECTED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | throw was added when the players along the lane were allowed to enter the lane on release of the free throw. With the present requirement, if a player enters the lane, a lane violation should be called before the goaltending violation would occur. Therefore, the technical foul penalty is now a useless rule. | Hill) Rule Interpreter | |
| 36 | 62 | 10-5-1d | Change to: 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:** In many cases, coaches are using the 30-second time period as an additional time-out or to confront officials. Directing coaches to replace a disqualified or injured player immediately helps the coach focus on finding a substitute. Illinois has experimented with this rule during the 2001-02 school year and highly recommends its adoption as a new NFHS rule. | **Illinois** (Hickman) Rules Committee<br><br>**NFHS Questionnaire** | |
| | | | **Signal Chart** | | |
| 37 | | | Add signal for not closely guarded. When the defensive player is not within six feet of player holding the ball of dribbling, the official with no count would spread both hands and arms apart in front of their body. **Rationale:** Communication (Same as NCAA). Note: This signal would not be needed for while dribbling if the closely guarded player while dribbling count was removed (as in item one above) | **Minnesota** (Robinson) State Office | |
| 38 | | | Add signal for intentionally kicking the ball. **Rationale:** Many officials use the signal now. Better communications as everyone knows that the signal means. | **Minnesota** (Robinson) State Office | |
| 39 | | | Add a new signal for excessive swinging of arms and or elbows. A signal should be adopted. That being, the calling official would stop the clock with the foul signal, then the technical foul signal, followed with the moving both elbows. **Rationale:** Better communication for all concerned; fans, team benches, and scorer table. | **Minnesota** (Robinson) State Office | |