2023-24 Men's and Women's Water Polo Rules - Survey Results

Methods

• This was a survey of head coaches, directors of athletics, senior woman administrators, conference commissioners and game officials. The purpose was to assess the impact of previous rules changes and to gather feedback on possible future rules changes.

• The survey was designed to take no more than 10-minutes and was administered online through the QuestionPro survey software.

• The survey was open from April 1 to April 14, 2024.

• The survey was distributed via email to head coaches and officials. The link to the survey was made available through an online survey dashboard designed for athletic directors, senior woman administrators and conference commissioners to provide rules feedback during the 2023-24 academic year. A notice about the use of the survey dashboard was emailed to all athletics directors, senior woman administrators and conference commissioners prior to the survey launch. A follow-up email was sent to those who received the survey via email and a notice about survey dashboard availability appeared in the *NCAA Weekly* each Monday while the survey was open. Of the 380 possible participants, there were 83 completed surveys (22 percent response rate).

2024 Men's and Women's Water Polo Rules Survey Report

QUANTITATIVE DATA

April 18, 2024

Title	Recorded	Possible	Response Rate
DI Men's Head Coach	13	28	46%
DII Men's Head Coach	1	7	14%
DIII Men's Head Coach	0	17	0%
TOTAL MEN'S COACHES	***14***	***52***	***27%***
DI Women's Head Coach	14	36	39%
DII Women's Head Coach	2	10	20%
DIII Women's Head Coach	1	18	6%
TOTAL WOMEN'S COACHES	***17***	**64**	***27%***
DI Head Coach (Both)	4	11	36%
DII Head Coach (Both)	0	4	0%
DIII Head Coach (Both)	3	11	27%
TOTAL COACHES (BOTH)	***7***	**26**	***27%***
DI Athl. Director	0	40	0%
DII Athl. Director	0	12	0%
DIII Athl. Director	1	20	5%
TOTAL ATHL. DIRECTORS	***1***	**72**	***1%***
DI Commissioner	3	7	43%
DII Commissioner	1	1	100%
DIII Commissioner	1	2	50%
TOTAL COMMISSIONERS	***5***	**10**	***50%***
DI Senior Woman Admin.	7	38	18%
DII Senior Woman Admin.	0	10	0%
DIII Senior Woman Admin.	1	18	6%
TOTAL SWAs	***8***	***66***	***12%***
GAME OFFICIAL	***31***	***128***	***24%***
TOTAL	83	380	22%

Note: the 'N' for head coaches, athletic directors, senior woman administrators and conference commissioners was pulled from the NCAA Member Reports application. Throughout the report, data are provided for groups in which the $n \geq 10$.

PROPOSED RULES CHANGES

1. Would you support a change to make the NCAA Water Polo rules mirror World Aquatics rules?
Rationale: Student-athletes that participate on their college and national teams are playing with different rules. World Aquatics has one set of rules, and the NCAA has a different set. Conforming the NCAA rules with those of World Aquatics will make it easier for players to transition to professional water polo and national team competitions.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*54%*	7	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*38%*	5	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*8%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	13	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*58%*	15	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*31%*	8	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*12%*	3	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	26	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 1 CONTINUED

SENIOR WOMAN ADMIN.	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*87%*	26
Oppose	*13%*	4
No Opinion	*0%*	0
TOTAL	*100%*	30

2. Would you support a change to restore the rules pertaining to a defender not showing their hands during 'dead time' being excluded for 20 seconds for a personal foul?

Rationale: This change will increase the pace of the game, allow for more movement, and decrease the amount of time defenders get away with holding suits.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*25%*	3	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*33%*	4	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*42%*	5	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	12	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*43%*	6	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*36%*	5	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*21%*	3	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	14	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 2 CONTINUED

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

SENIOR WOMAN ADMIN.	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*37%*	11
Oppose	*37%*	11
No Opinion	*27%*	8
TOTAL	*100%*	30

3. Would you support a change to Rule 1 (Field of Play and Equipment) and to other rules pertaining to the 2-meter line that would define a rectangular "Goal Area" in front of each goal? Currently, NCAA water polo rules refer to the '2-meter area' as the area bounded by the goal line, the 2-meter line, and the sidelines. Under this proposed rule change, the '2-meter area' will be supplemented by a 'Goal Area' defined as the rectangular area in front of the goal bounded by the goal line, the 2-meter line and lines located two meters outside of each goal post. It will no longer be a foul for an offensive player to go inside the 2-meter line ahead of the ball if the player is located outside the Goal Area. It will be a foul for an offensive player to go inside the Goal Area ahead of the ball. This change will require new markings on the field of play. Due to cost considerations, the requirement for new markings delineating the Goal Area will be implemented in a phased manner. During the first phase, beginning September 1, 2024, temporary markings such as, for floating goals, red tape, red paint, red foam markers, or red towel tied on the goal line lane at a distance of 2-meters outside of each goal can be used. For wall goals, a cone on the deck and/or red tape or a red paint stripe 2-meters outside of each goal post will be acceptable as temporary markers. Continuous red markings will be required by September 1, 2025. These markings will include, for floating goals, continuous red buoys on the goal line lane for a distance of 2-meters outside of each goal post. For wall goals, the continuous marking can be placed using red deck edge markers. Some schools have already provided these markings in conformance with other rule sets and in anticipation of the adoption of this proposal. This change will also require approximately a dozen revisions to rules pertaining to matters such as players moving inside 2-meters vs. the Goal Area, free throws when the ball is inside 2-meters vs. the Goal Area, and other details that have been identified and enumerated by the NCAA Water Polo Secretary/Rules Editor for use in the event that this proposal is adopted.

Rationale: Allowing offensive players to go inside the 2-meter line if the player is located outside the Goal Area will provide more room for the offense to use and allow for more movement. This will open new opportunities for scoring and will eliminate "inside the two" calls against players who are located at a narrow angle relative to the face of the goal. Among other benefits, it allows the officials to focus their attention to a greater degree on the action in front of the goal, where the intensity of contact is the greatest, instead of watching for matters that have less effect on the play of the game. Use of the Goal Area as proposed here has been implemented in World Aquatics competition since the beginning of 2023 and was adopted by USAWP effective this year. The results have confirmed that this change will add to the appeal of the game by creating new offensive strategies, promoting more scoring opportunities, and enhancing spectator appeal.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*83%*	10	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*8%*	1	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*8%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	12	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 3 CONTINUED

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*86%*	12	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*14%*	2	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	14	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

SENIOR WOMAN ADMIN.	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*100%*	30
Oppose	*0%*	0
No Opinion	*0%*	0
TOTAL	*100%*	30

4. Would you support a change to Rule 1, Section 25 (Numbers on Caps) to add the following to the end of Article 2: "A change in cap number shall be reported to the referees by the head coach. The referees shall notify the Game Secretary and the opposing team bench of the change. Failure to notify the referees of the change shall result in a warning for the first offense. For the second offense the referee shall issue the next available card to the head coach."?

Rationale: Cap number changes have become more frequent now that the goalkeeper is allowed to go past the halfway line. This rule change clarifies who is responsible for reporting a change in cap number, which is not currently specified. The requirement for the referees to notify the game secretary and the opposing team bench of the cap number change ensures that all participants are aware of the change. Currently no penalty for failing to report a cap number change is specified. This rule change provides that needed information.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*67%*	8	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*8%*	1	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*25%*	3	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	12	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*86%*	12	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*14%*	2	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	14	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 4 CONTINUED

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*86%*	25
Oppose	*7%*	2
No Opinion	*7%*	2
TOTAL	*100%*	29

5. Would you support a change to Rule 2, Section 6 (Method of Substitution) allowing, where facilities permit, direct substitution on the sideline where the team benches are situated between the goal line and the center of the field of play? This rule change would be implemented only in facilities that have at least 0.5 meters of space between the wall and the sideline lane line.

Rationale: This change will create a quicker game by allowing players to substitute more frequently, quickly, and easily without a goal being scored or a timeout being taken and without having to swim backwards to their own exclusion area. This will lessen player fatigue, increase the amount of playing time for players, and increase the opportunities for student athletes to play. Note: This proposal differs from the one below in that under the proposal below direct substitution would be allowed only if a limit is also imposed on roster size. This proposal does not address roster size.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*50%*	6	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*42%*	5	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*8%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	12	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*71%*	10	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*29%*	4	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	14	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 5 CONTINUED

HEAD COACH - Both	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	Overall	
Support	*70%*	21
Oppose	*13%*	4
No Opinion	*17%*	5
TOTAL	*100%*	30

6. Would you support a change to Rule 2, Section 6 (Method of Substitution) allowing, where facilities permit, direct substitution on the sideline where the team benches are situated between the goal line and the center of the field of play? This rule change would be implemented only in facilities that have at least 0.5 meters of space between the wall and the sideline lane line. Note: This proposal differs from the one above in that under this proposal direct substitution would be allowed only if a limit is also imposed on roster size. The limit on roster size would be implemented by a change to Rule 2, Section 1 (Number of Players, Illegal Player) limiting the number of players allowed to suit up and sit on the bench during a game. (No specific roster size limit was included with this proposal.)

Rationale: This change will create a quicker game by allowing players to substitute more frequently, quickly, and easily without a goal being scored or a timeout being taken and without having to swim backwards to their own exclusion area. This will lessen player fatigue, increase the amount of playing time for players, and increase the opportunities for student athletes to play. Allowing this must also be accompanied with roster playing limits, because if a program is allowed an unlimited number, they could have an uneven advantage, especially against programs with fewer resources.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*33%*	4	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*42%*	5	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*25%*	3	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	12	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*43%*	6	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*43%*	6	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*14%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	14	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 6 CONTINUED

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*50%*	15
Oppose	*27%*	8
No Opinion	*23%*	7
TOTAL	*100%*	30

7. Would you support a change to Rule 2, Section 7 (Entry of Substitute) to add the following to the end of the section: "If a coach repeatedly delays in making substitutions after a goal has been scored, the referee may issue a warning to the coach. If the delays continue, the referee may issue the next available card to the coach for interfering with the progress of the game."

Rationale: Delays in substitution can be used to unfairly slow down a game and disrupt an opponent's momentum. This rule change will formalize the authority of the referees to control such unfair tactics.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*42%*	5	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*42%*	5	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*17%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	12	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*71%*	10	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*14%*	2	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*14%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	14	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 7 CONTINUED

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*93%*	28
Oppose	*3%*	1
No Opinion	*3%*	1
TOTAL	*100%*	30

8. Would you support a change to Rule 2, Section 12 (Use of Video) Article 2 to allow conferences to expand the use of video assisted review to include plays that occur during the game? Under this proposal as submitted, the protocol for use of video review would be the same as that used by World Aquatics.

Rationale: Currently, Rule 2-12-2 allows conferences to use video for only limited specific purposes. Video may be used after a game to determine if an incorrect student-athlete is serving a postgame suspension, to determine if flagrant misconduct occurred that was not detected during the game, or to further penalize a participant for unsportsmanlike conduct. This proposal would allow water polo to follow the example of other NCAA sports that use video review of plays that occur during the game and would take advantage of what has been learned using video review in international play. Implementation of video review is the next logical step in elevating the level of professionalism in the officiating of water polo. The proposal recognizes that because there will be costs incurred, the decision to use video review should be made at the conference level.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*50%*	6	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*42%*	5	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*8%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	12	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*57%*	8	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*29%*	4	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*14%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	14	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 8 CONTINUED

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*76%*	22
Oppose	*14%*	4
No Opinion	*10%*	3
TOTAL	*100%*	29

9. Would you support a change to Rule 3, Section 6 (Referees – Control Over Conduct) to eliminate the Yellow/Red combined card?

Rationale: The yellow/card does little to improve decorum on deck. A head coach who continues to yell at referees has the liberty to do it at least three times: a warning, a yellow card, and yellow/red card. The only punishment associated with the yellow/red card is the coach not being allowed to go past 2m when the coach's team is on offense. Elimination of the yellow/red card would more quickly affect coaches who push the limit during every game.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*33%*	4	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*42%*	5	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*25%*	3	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	12	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 9 CONTINUED

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*36%*	5	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*50%*	7	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*14%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	14	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*70%*	21
Oppose	*27%*	8
No Opinion	*3%*	1
TOTAL	*100%*	30

10. Would you support a change to Rule 3, Section 6 (Referees – Control Over Conduct) that requires the head coach to remain seated after receiving a Yellow/Red card?

Rationale: Presently the coach can stand after receiving a Yellow/Red card, but can only go out to the 2-meter line when their team is on offense. The officials are down on the other end and cannot tell where the coach is standing, and having to turn their head to see where the coach is standing is a distraction when they are focusing on calling the game. It would be easier to enforce the requirement if the coach had to remain seated, and the punishment associated with the Yellow/Red card was more significant and meaningful.

QUESTION 10 CONTINUED

HEAD COACH -Men's	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	*33%*	4	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*50%*	6	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*17%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	12	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	*50%*	7	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*21%*	3	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*29%*	4	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	14	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	Overall	
Support	*70%*	21
Oppose	*17%*	5
No Opinion	*13%*	4
TOTAL	*100%*	30

11. Would you support a change to Rule 3, Section 6 (Referees – Control Over Conduct) and Rule 3, Section 7 (Removal from the Pool) such that anyone (i.e. coach, bench personnel, student-athlete) who is excluded from the remainder of the game for Misconduct or who receives a Red Card shall be removed from sight and sound of the venue both for the remainder of the current game for any subsequent suspended game(s) - as determined by the NCAA playing rules or by conference mandate?

Rationale: A coach, bench personnel, or student-athlete who is excluded from the remainder of the game for misconduct or receives a red card is often highly emotional as a result of the situation and should be taken to a location out of sight and sound of the venue that will allow them an opportunity to collect and calm themselves. They should not be allowed to remain in the stands or on the bench for the current contest or subsequent suspended contests. Water polo is one of very few NCAA sports, if not the only NCAA sport, that currently allows an ejected person to remain inside the venue in the stands or on the bench for the remainder of the current game and subsequent suspended games. Most, if not all, other NCAA sports require an ejected person to be removed from sight and sound of the venue (most commonly a locker room or a location in an adjacent building or facility). This change would be consistent with other sports and would aid the game officials in their ability to officiate the remainder of the contest without the potential of further disruption. It also removes the opportunity for fans to engage with the ejected individual and aids host personnel in avoiding any potential game management issues. Some water polo conferences already have this enhanced rule in place; however, some do not. Instituting this rule change would provide consistency across all conferences as well as for any institutions that may be competing as independents.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*45%*	5	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*36%*	4	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*83%*	10	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*8%*	1	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*8%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	12	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 11 CONTINUED

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*97%*	28
Oppose	*0%*	0
No Opinion	*3%*	1
TOTAL	*100%*	29

12. Would you support a change to Rule 3, Section 11 (Correctable Errors) that adds the following as a new Article 3? "During an extra player situation, if: a. A warm-up ball enters the field of play where the extra player situation is being played, b. A goal comes loose and moves or is blown over by wind, c. The game is stopped for lightning, a clock malfunction, or a similar event that affects play, the game shall be stopped. The game clock shall be reset to the time of the exclusion, and the shot clock shall be reset."
Rationale: The procedure to be followed under these circumstances is not currently specified in the NCAA water polo rules. This rule change will address these situations.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*82%*	9	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*100%*	12	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	12	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 12 CONTINUED

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*97%*	28
Oppose	*0%*	0
No Opinion	*3%*	1
TOTAL	*100%*	29

13. Would you support a change to Rule 3, Section 11 (Correctable Errors) that adds the following as a new Article 4? "If a signal is not given at the proper time by the exclusion secretary for the entry of an excluded player, and a goal is subsequently scored, the game shall be stopped, the game clock shall be reset to the entry time, the shot clock shall be reset to the appropriate time, the goal shall not be counted, and play shall resume from the entry time with the excluded player in the exclusion area until play restarts." Note: The error in the time that the signal is given for the entry of an excluded player must be large enough that it affected whether the goal would have been scored. The referees have the authority to determine if the error affected whether the goal would have been scored."

Rationale: The procedure to be followed to correct the error of a late entry signal for an excluded player is not currently specified in the NCAA water polo rules. Furthermore, no provisions exist in the rules under which the referees can determine the action to take if the delay in the entry signal is clearly not significant enough to affect play. This omission in the rules has resulted in goals being taken away in situations where the delay in the entry signal was not significant enough to affect play. This rule change will address these issues.

QUESTION 13 CONTINUED

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*64%*	7	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*64%*	7	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*27%*	3	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*90%*	26
Oppose	*0%*	0
No Opinion	*10%*	3
TOTAL	*100%*	29

14. Would you support a change to Rule 3, Section 11 (Correctable Errors) that adds the following as a new Article 4? "If a signal is not given at the proper time by the exclusion secretary for the entry of an excluded player, and a goal is subsequently scored, the game shall be stopped, the game clock shall be reset to the time of the exclusion, the shot clock shall be reset, the goal shall not be counted, and play shall resume from the time of the exclusion with the excluded player in the exclusion area." NOTE: This proposal differs from the preceding proposal in regard to how the clocks are reset, how the re-entry of the excluded player is addressed, and whether the referees have the authority to determine if the error affected whether the goal would have been scored.

Rationale: The procedure to be followed to correct the error of a late entry signal for an excluded player is not currently specified in the NCAA water polo rules. This rule change will address this issue.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*27%*	3	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*36%*	4	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*36%*	4	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*36%*	4	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*55%*	6	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 14 CONTINUED

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*45%*	13
Oppose	*41%*	12
No Opinion	*14%*	4
TOTAL	*100%*	29

15. Would you support the following change to Rule 3, Section 16 (Goal Judges – Balls): Identify the current text of Rule 3, Section 16 as Article 1 and add the following paragraph as Article 2: "If the bench repeatedly delays in throwing the ball in for the counterattack, the referee may issue a warning to the coach. If the delays continue, the referee may issue the next available card to the coach for interfering with the progress of the game. If the bench delays in throwing the ball in for a corner throw, the provisions of Rule 8, Section 7 (Team Official Preventing Goal) may apply."

Rationale: Delays in throwing in the ball for a counterattack can, under some circumstances, create an unfair advantage for the offense by delaying the start of the shot clock. Delays in throwing the ball in for a corner throw can take advantage away from the offense. This rule change will formalize the ability of the referees to control such unfair tactics.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*55%*	6	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*36%*	4	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*73%*	8	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*27%*	3	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 15 CONTINUED

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*97%*	28
Oppose	*0%*	0
No Opinion	*3%*	1
TOTAL	*100%*	29

16. Would you support a change to Rule 3, Section 17 (Game Timer—Duties), Article 2, Paragraph a as follows: "a. Start the game clock at the beginning of each period when a player touches or gains possession of the ball and stop the clock each time the whistle blows."

Rationale: Rule 3-17 and Rule 3-18 are inconsistent with each other regarding when the timer should start the clock at the beginning of a period. The addition of the words "or gains possession of" will make the two rules consistent and will address the situation that occurs when the sprint at the beginning of a period is not contested.

HEAD COACH - Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*82%*	9	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 16 CONTINUED

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*97%*	28
Oppose	*3%*	1
No Opinion	*0%*	0
TOTAL	*100%*	29

17. Would you support a change to Rule 3, Section 18 (Shot Clock Timer—Duties) and to Rule 6, Section 15 (Keeping the Ball Without Shooting) such that if the attacking team recovers the ball following a shot, or if an exclusion is called with less than 20 seconds on the shot clock, the clock is reset to 20 seconds? If an exclusion is called with more than 20 seconds on the shot clock, the clock would not be reset. This would be effective for the 2025-26 academic year.

Rationale: As demonstrated over the last four years in international competition, this proposed change would significantly speed up the game by forcing the offense to attack quickly after a missed shot or after earning an exclusion. It would also create a better balance with regard to how long a team is on defense following a missed shot. The argument against this proposal in the past has been technology and equipment, i.e., that not everyone has a system with this capability and can afford to acquire such a system. However, research by the advocates of this proposal is reported to have shown that all water polo timing systems are simply computers with multiple buttons that perform a function when pushed, and that all these systems have buttons that are never used. Thus, what is done with systems that do not have this option (such as handheld and portable consoles) is to simply reprogram the system to make an unused button reset the shot clock to 20 seconds. This is a simple procedure without expense.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*60%*	6	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*30%*	3	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*10%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	10	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*82%*	9	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 17 CONTINUED

COMMISSIONER	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	Overall	
Support	*90%*	26
Oppose	*3%*	1
No Opinion	*7%*	2
TOTAL	*100%*	29

18. Would you support a change to Rule 4, Section 8, Article 1, Subparagraph b (Starting After Regular Timeout) that specifies that if the team that just scored (now the defense) calls a timeout after a goal is scored, the team just scored upon (now the offense) may put the ball in play anywhere in the field of play?

Rationale: When the team that just scored calls a timeout, they are also allowed to take up defensive positions anywhere in the field of play, including bringing the goalkeeper out past the halfway line, while the offense is restricted to putting the ball in play at or behind halfway. This result is advantageous to the defense relative to what the situation would have been if the timeout had not been called, and it is contrary to the concept of advantage inherent in the offense having possession. To maintain offensive advantage, the offense should be allowed to put the ball in play anywhere in the field of play. However, the extension of advantage (putting the ball in play anywhere in the field of play) would not be granted if the team just scored on (now the offense) called the timeout.

HEAD COACH -Men's	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	*73%*	8	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	*82%*	9	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 18 CONTINUED

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*69%*	20
Oppose	*14%*	4
No Opinion	*17%*	5
TOTAL	*100%*	29

19. Would you support a change to Rule 4, Section 21 (Goals – How Scored), Article 1 that revises the Note at the end of Article 1 to expand the cases in which a player with a corner throw can take a direct shot following removal of the ball from the pool? The revised note would read as follows: "Note: This includes after a correctable clock error and after the referees stop play and remove the ball from the water prior to a corner throw for any administrative reason."

Rationale: The current rules limit the direct shot on a corner throw when the ball is removed prior to the throw only to correction of a clock error, replacement of a cap, or the zipping up of a suit. Because there is usually no offensive advantage prior to a corner throw, that time is often well suited for use by the officials for other administrative reasons, such as addressing an issue at the desk or a clock question. The proposed change will provide administrative flexibility for the officials by allowing a direct shot of the ball is removed for any administrative reason prior to the taking of a corner throw.

QUESTION 19 CONTINUED

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*91%*	10	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*91%*	10	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*100%*	29
Oppose	*0%*	0
No Opinion	*0%*	0
TOTAL	*100%*	29

20. Would you support a change to Rule 4, Section 26 (Leaving the Field of Play) that adds the following language to the end of the rule before the interpretations: "If the player reenters improperly, the provisions of Rule 7-15 (Entering the Field of Play Improperly) shall apply."

Rationale: Rule 4-26 currently does not specify which rule is applicable if a player who voluntarily leaves the field of play reenters in a manner other than that specified. This rule change will clarify this issue.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*73%*	8	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*27%*	3	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*91%*	10	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 20 CONTINUED

GAME OFFICIAL	Overall	
Support	*96%*	27
Oppose	*0%*	0
No Opinion	*4%*	1
TOTAL	*100%*	28

21. Would you support a change to Rule 5, Section 2 (Goal Throw – Where Taken) that adds the following as the second sentence?: "If the ball is outside the 2-meter line as a result of a rebound from outside the field of play, the goal throw may be taken by any player at the location of the ball."

Rationale: This change has been implemented in World Aquatics, where it has shown that it avoids unnecessary slowing of play resulting from bringing the ball back inside the 2-meter line.

HEAD COACH -Men's	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	*73%*	8	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	*91%*	10	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 21 CONTINUED

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*79%*	22
Oppose	*11%*	3
No Opinion	*11%*	3
TOTAL	*100%*	28

22. Would you support a change to Rule 5, Section 10 (Free Throws – Where Taken) that changes all but the last sentence of this rule as follows: "A free throw shall be taken at the location of the ball, except: a. If the foul is committed by a defending player within the defender's 2-meter area, the free throw shall be taken outside the 2-meter line. b. If the foul is committed anywhere in the field of play by an offensive player, the team awarded the ball must first pass it to their goalkeeper. The goalkeeper will then put the ball into play from where the goalkeeper is when the ball is received; or c. Where otherwise provided in the rules."

Rationale: Physicality is increasing in the backcourt and on the perimeter because the officials hesitate to call offensive fouls. This is because if a referee calls an offensive foul on the former center defender for kicking off the center during a counterattack, or calls an offensive pull-by on the perimeter, the call results in a 2 on 1 or 1 on the goalkeeper situation - a 90% scoring opportunity. However, the advantage that the former center defender gained by kicking off the center 22 meters away or that a driver gained by pulling 8 meters away from the goal does not result in a commensurate scoring opportunity. Requiring the ball to go back to the goalkeeper for offensive fouls would give the defense time to cover and would reprimand the offensive act with a change in possession, not a 90% scoring opportunity.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*36%*	4	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*45%*	5	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 22 CONTINUED

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*55%*	6	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*36%*	4	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*48%*	14
Oppose	*38%*	11
No Opinion	*14%*	4
TOTAL	*100%*	29

23. Would you support a change to Rule 5, Section 11 (Free Throws – Time Allowed) that adds the following note between the first and second paragraphs of the rule? "Note: When there is a counterattack, a player with a position of advantage does not have to give up the advantage to go to the ball and take the free throw. The player on that team who is next closest to the ball can take the free throw as long as there is no undue delay."

Rationale: This note formalizes something that has been informally accepted as common practice for many years, i.e., that a player in a counterattack with a position of advantage should not be required to go toward their own goal or toward the sideline to take a free throw and give up the advantage simply because that player is closest to the ball. Instead, the player who is next closest to the ball can take the free throw. It would still be the case that a player who is next to the ball when the ball is awarded to the defense or who swims past the ball on a counterattack and does not put the ball into play would be called for undue delay in taking the free throw.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*82%*	9	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 23 CONTINUED

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*93%*	27
Oppose	*3%*	1
No Opinion	*3%*	1
TOTAL	*100%*	29

24. Would you support a change to Rule 5, Section 12 (Free Throws – How Taken) that puts the making of a "water polo move' back into the rules as a method for putting the ball into play?

Rationale: The officials should not have to split their attention between whether the ball has been put into play and things such as drives, hand checking, ducking under on a drive, suit holding, and the many other actions that happen after a foul has occurred.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*55%*	6	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*27%*	3	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*82%*	9	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 24 CONTINUED

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	Overall	
Support	*59%*	17
Oppose	*28%*	8
No Opinion	*14%*	4
TOTAL	*100%*	29

25. Would you support the following change to Rule 6, Section 9 (Impeding)? Delete the third sentence of the rule and move the content of that sentence into subparagraph d by revising it as follows: "d. Ducking under, when done by an offensive player to gain a position of advantage, is impeding and should be called as an ordinary foul. Ducking under by a defensive player to take away a position of advantage is addressed in Rule 7, Section 7."

Rationale: Currently, the NCAA Water Polo Rules make no distinction between the offense and the defense regarding the penalty for ducking under to gain or take away a position of advantage. This rule change, in combination with the proposed change to Rule 7, Section 7, which addresses ducking under by a defensive player to take away a position of advantage, will clarify this discrepancy.

HEAD COACH -Men's	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	*73%*	8	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 25 CONTINUED

HEAD COACH -Women's	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	*82%*	9	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	Overall	
Support	*97%*	28
Oppose	*0%*	0
No Opinion	*3%*	1
TOTAL	*100%*	29

26. Would you support a change to Rule 7, Section 2, Article 4 (Method of Leaving Field of Play) to reduce the penalty for an excluded player leaving the water instead of swimming to the exclusion area from exclusion from the remainder of the game to exclusion for 20 seconds for a Minor Act of Misconduct?

Rationale: The current severe punishment for this infraction does not match the level of impact it has on the game. In most cases this happens with a new player or one who is confused about the number of fouls already received, rather than one attempting to gain some sort of advantage. While there still needs some type of consequence to eliminate contact with the officials on deck and keep appropriate bench decorum, exclusion for the remainder of game is too severe.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*73%*	8	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*82%*	9	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 26 CONTINUED

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*62%*	18
Oppose	*21%*	6
No Opinion	*17%*	5
TOTAL	*100%*	29

27. Would you support the following changes to Rule 7, Section 7 (Holding, Sinking, Pulling Back)? Add the following definition of holding after the first sentence of the rule: "To hold is to restrict the free movement or action of a player who is not holding the ball. In women's competition, holding the suit of a player who is not holding the ball is holding the player. Hand checking to prevent free movement of a player not holding the ball is holding, i.e., restricting free movement or action. Ducking under, when done by a defensive player to take away a position of advantage, is also considered to be a form of holding." Clarify the current second sentence of the rule as follows: "Holding the ball is lifting, carrying or touching the ball, but does not include dribbling the ball."

Rationale: Holding is not defined under exclusions and needs to include 1) the holding of the suit in women's competition and 2) the use of hand checking to hold back drivers or prevent free movement of a player not holding the ball. In addition, the NCAA Water Polo Rules currently make no distinction between the offense and the defense regarding the penalty for ducking under to gain or take away a position of advantage. This rule change, in combination with the proposed change to Rule 6, Section 9, which addresses ducking under by an offensive player to gain a position of advantage, will clarify this discrepancy.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*64%*	7	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*91%*	10	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 27 CONTINUED

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*90%*	26
Oppose	*3%*	1
No Opinion	*7%*	2
TOTAL	*100%*	29

28. Would you support a change to Rule 7, Section 7 (Holding, Sinking, Pulling Back) Interpretation b as follows? b. In women's competition, a defender shall be excluded for 20 seconds for grabbing on offensive player's suit. An offensive foul shall be called when an offensive player grabs a defender's suit. Referees must note the importance of calling suit grabbing before it escalates to the point of breast exposure. If a player grabs an opponent's suit and causes breast exposure, the offending player shall be excluded for 20 seconds regardless of whether they are on offense or defense. If a player grabs her own suit and exposes a breast, a 20 second exclusion shall be called.

Rationale: This change is needed to emphasize further the importance of calling suit grabbing in the women's game and of calling it before it escalates to the point of breast exposure.

QUESTION 28 CONTINUED

HEAD COACH - Men's	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	*55%*	6	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*45%*	5	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Women's	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	*91%*	10	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	Division I		Division II		Division III	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	Overall	
Support	*90%*	26
Oppose	*0%*	0
No Opinion	*10%*	3
TOTAL	*100%*	29

29. Would you support a change to Rule 7, Section 10 (Simulation) that would change the penalty for simulation with the following, which is similar to the language in the 2020-2022 rules book: "A player on defense who commits an act of simulation shall be excluded for 20 seconds. If a player on offense or a player swimming for a loose ball commits an act of simulation, possession will be awarded to the opposing team.

Rationale: The current rule is unique compared to high school and USAWP/World Aquatics rules. Simulation should be called more often than it is. Make the punishment for simulation simple and it will be called/enforced.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*45%*	5	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*36%*	4	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*64%*	7	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*27%*	3	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 29 CONTINUED

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*90%*	26
Oppose	*10%*	3
No Opinion	*0%*	0
TOTAL	*100%*	29

30. Would you support a change to Rule 7, Section 13 (Flagrant Misconduct, Including Fighting), to provide that the player who commits an act of flagrant misconduct or who engages in fighting shall be excluded from the remainder of the game with a penalty throw awarded to the opposing team, and that the player may be substituted only after four minutes of actual play have elapsed?

Rationale: Currently, the maximum number of goals that an offended team can score as a result of this violation is two – one from the penalty throw and one from the extra player. This punishment does not seem to fit the seriousness of this violation. The proposed change would bring the NCAA rules in line with the USAWP and World Aquatics rules, where the severity of the punishment serves as a deterrent for this kind of behavior.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*55%*	6	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*45%*	5	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*73%*	8	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 30 CONTINUED

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*83%*	24
Oppose	*7%*	2
No Opinion	*10%*	3
TOTAL	*100%*	29

31. Would you support a change to Rule 7, Section 17 (Failure to Take Position on Goal Line) that would revise the section as follows: New section title: "Failure of Defenders to Take Position During a Penalty Throw." Revised first sentence as follows: "For the defending players, including the goalkeeper, to fail to take the proper positions during the taking of a penalty throw as required in Rule 9, Section 2."

Rationale: Rule 7, Section 17 as currently written applies only to a defending goalkeeper who fails to take the required position on the goal line. This change expands the requirement to apply also to all other defensive players who fail to maintain the required minimum distance from the player taking the penalty throw.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*64%*	7	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*91%*	10	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 31 CONTINUED

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*93%*	27
Oppose	*3%*	1
No Opinion	*3%*	1
TOTAL	*100%*	29

32. Would you support a change to Rule 8, Section 3 (Kicking or Striking Within 6-Meter Area, Flagrant Misconduct or Fighting) as follows: New section title: "Kicking, Striking or Other Physical Misconduct Within 6-Meter Area, Flagrant Misconduct or Fighting." Revised first paragraph of the rule as follows: "For a defending player within the 6-meter area to kick or strike an opponent or commit any act of physical misconduct against an opponent, or for a player at any location in the pool to commit an act of flagrant misconduct or to engage in a fight."

Rationale: This rule change will add violations that constitute physical misconduct, such as overaggressive fouls, to the list of penalty fouls in the 6-meter area and will give the referees the authority to exclude the offender from the remainder of the game when appropriate. This will provide the referees with an additional tool to control excessively physical play.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*45%*	5	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*36%*	4	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 32 CONTINUED

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*45%*	5	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*36%*	4	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*83%*	24
Oppose	*10%*	3
No Opinion	*7%*	2
TOTAL	*100%*	29

33. Would you support a change to Rule 8 (Penalty Fouls) that adds the following language as a new Section 9: "It shall be a penalty foul for a defending player to foul or impede from behind an attacking player who has the ball and an open path to the goal within the 6-meter area regardless of whether the player is holding the ball. The only way a defender can defend in this situation is to touch only the ball or the hand holding the ball. If the defending player's actions prevent the attacking player from continuing the action, a penalty must be called."

Rationale: The new section would conform the NCAA Water Polo Rules with all other rules sets in regard to awarding a penalty throw to a player inside 6-meters who has the ball with a defender behind and an open path to the goal. Currently, the NCAA rules provide that players in this situation cannot have a penalty awarded if they are holding the ball, with a few exceptions such as kicking or striking or flagrant misconduct. Athletes coming to college will have played with this proposed rule for several years under USA Water Polo/World Aquatics and high school rules. Furthermore, the current difference between the NCAA rule and the other rule sets for this situation is so significant that for even the best referees who officiate both USAWP and NCAA the difference has been the largest source of collegiate officiating inconsistency over the last four years. Adopting the proposed rule change will improve consistency and will improve player safety by reducing physicality in the 6-meter area (e.g., where pulling a player's arm from behind while they are holding the ball increases the possibility of injury). The change is also consistent with the principle of offensive advantage - reward the offense for good play by calling the penalty.

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*73%*	8	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*64%*	7	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 33 CONTINUED

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*93%*	27
Oppose	*0%*	0
No Opinion	*7%*	2
TOTAL	*100%*	29

34. Would you support a change to Rule 9 (Penalty Throws), Section 2 (Position of Other Players and Goalkeeper) that would revise the first sentence of Section 2 as follows: "All players shall leave the 5-meter area and shall be at least 3 meters from the player taking the throw."

Rationale: Given the size and quickness of many water polo players today, a requirement to be at least 2 meters from the player taking the penalty throw is no longer sufficient to ensure that the defenders closest to the player taking the throw do not interfere. Increasing the distance required to 3 meters, as demonstrated in international play over the last year, will significantly reduce the likelihood of interference with the penalty throw. In addition, it will make the process of positioning players for the throw easier and quicker, thereby reducing the opportunity for the defense to "ice the shooter."

HEAD COACH -Men's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*45%*	5	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*36%*	4	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*18%*	2	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

QUESTION 34 CONTINUED

HEAD COACH -Women's	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	*91%*	10	-	-	-	-
Oppose	*0%*	0	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	*9%*	1	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	*100%*	11	-	-	-	-

HEAD COACH - Both	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

ATHLETICS DIRECTOR	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

COMMISSIONER	**Division I**		**Division II**		**Division III**	
Support	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oppose	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Opinion	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-

GAME OFFICIAL	**Overall**	
Support	*93%*	27
Oppose	*3%*	1
No Opinion	*3%*	1
TOTAL	*100%*	29