

NCAA Track & Field Rule Interpretations and Corrections

Updated: 1 October, 2010

Rule 1

1-1.1 THROWING CIRCLE (2005): Clarify the inclination allowed for the surface of a throwing circle so that allowance could be made for drainage.

RESPONSE: The circle must be as level as possible. Drainage can be accomplished by having small holes, along the inside edge of the ring, through the concrete surface to the ground.

1-1.1 RUNWAY INCLINATION (2009): Where are the two points on a Long Jump runway that are used to determine the maximum allowed inclination?

RESPONSE: Rule 1-1.1 and corresponding international provision states that the proper two points would be the 'start of the runway and the take-off line' or the last 40 meters, whichever is less. (01Jan09)

1-5.3, 1-5.4 POLE VAULT RUNWAY MARKINGS (2006): What types of marks can be painted on the runway to indicate distance from the back of the vault box?

RESPONSE: There are two types of marks. The first, which is required, is a series of seven lines in the center of the runway following the pattern described in Rule 1-5.3. The second, which is voluntary, is an indication of distance for the full length of the runway. These optional marks must be no larger than specified in Rule 1-5.4, must touch the line marking the edge of the runway, may be inside, outside or on the edge line and also apply to the runway for Long/Triple Jump (1-6.1) and Javelin (1-11.1). (30Jun06)

1-6.1 LONG JUMP RUNWAY (2005): Must the runway for a long jump pit be centered with the constructed landing area?

RESPONSE: Lacking specific reference in the NCAA Rules Book, an international provision indicates 'The landing area shall, if possible, be so placed that the middle of the runway coincides with the middle of the landing area.' When the runway is constructed off-center, the actual legal landing area boundary should be marked within the constructed landing area so the runway is centered for the actual landing area.

1-6.5 FOUL INDICATOR (2007): Can an electronic device be use to detect a foul in the Long or Triple Jump event?

RESPONSE: Yes. Such a device is authorized for judging but only if the detection is validated by an image capturing system used in conjunction with the electronic detection device. (28Jun07)

1-7.2 SECTOR / CIRCLE LEVEL (2007): The condition within the rule seems impossible to achieve for a sector constructed on a playing field with a crown. How is this rectified?

RESPONSE: There is reference to Rule 1-1.1, which provides tolerances. The maximum deviation from level in the downward direction must not exceed 0.1%. There is no maximum upward deviation specified, however deviation in the upward direction should be minimized. (30Sep07)

Rule 2

2-8.1 ILLEGAL IMPLEMENT (2001): While checking in the shot, the implement inspector feels movement inside the shot. The implement inspector impounds the illegal implement. Is this a correct decision?

RESPONSE: No. This shot is a legal implement. Movement within the shot is allowed.

2-12 DEVICE CALIBRATION (2006): How can the accuracy of a laser device be determined?

RESPONSE: Verification of the accuracy can be determined by comparing its measurement to that of a known surveyed distance, such as the 100 meters. (30Jun06)

Rule 3

3-4.2b REFEREE AUTHORITY (2004): The referee observes a competitor violating the lane running rule, Rule 5-5.2. No other official sees the violation. Does the referee have the responsibility to warn or disqualify the athlete?

RESPONSE: In meets in which a games committee has not been established, the referee does not have this responsibility and can only act upon the information provided by the appropriate meet official. However, if a games committee has been established for this meet, the referee has the authority to warn or disqualify the competitor for any violation of conduct rules, but not for administrative rules.

3-7.1 INTENTIONAL FALSE START (2006): What action is taken for an intentional false start?

RESPONSE: The actual false start is treated no differently than any other false start. The element of it being 'intentional' should be reported to the referee as a violation of unsporting conduct, Rule 4-2.1. (28Jun07)

3-19.2 MEDICAL REINSTATEMENT (2010): Is the referee allowed to use the medical determination of the rule as the reason to allow participation in the second of two declared events when the competitor does not compete in the first due to a medical reason?

RESPONSE: No. The referee may not use the rule in this manner. Medical personnel may only provide a determination as to whether a competitor is capable of competing from a medical point of view. The determination, by itself, may not be the reason to permit further participation. The referee must determine that participation would not violate other provisions of the rules. Generally, a scratch from a declared event is a violation of and has the consequences of Rule 4-2.2. The determination of whether a rule violation has occurred, as the result of a severe medical condition, shall be the responsibility of the referee. (30Jun10)

Rule 4

4-1 UNSPORTSMANLIKE CONDUCT (2001): A meet official observes an athlete shortly after competition throwing a baton (or any equipment) in a display of disappointment or anger. The official reports this observation to the referee. Does the referee have the responsibility to warn or disqualify the athlete?

RESPONSE: Yes, the referee can warn or disqualify due to the fact that the athlete displayed unsportsmanlike conduct, unprofessional behavior or misconduct.

4-1 REPORTING OF FALSE MARKS (2009): Clarify when the report of a false mark is misconduct, and what is the penalty?

RESPONSE: If a mark is requested and used as the determination of entry and/or placement into a race, the intentional submission of a false mark is misconduct. The penalty for misconduct is determined by the referee. (30Jan09)

4-2.1 UNSPORTSMANLIKE CONDUCT (2007): What are some examples of situations that constitute unsportsmanlike conduct?

RESPONSE: Unsportsmanlike conduct can take many forms. It can be flagrant and easily detectable or subtle. Profanity and abusiveness toward officials or another competitor is one form. A second form is failure to compete within the nature and spirit of honest or fair competition. Either is a discredit to the event and intercollegiate athletics, therefore either is a violation of Rule 4-1 and Rule 4-2.1. Examples in the second category include: intentional false starts, failure to compete in and/or complete an event in a competitive manner without cause, failure to compete in all rounds in which a position is earned. The penalty for such action is clearly stated in both Rule 4-1 and Rule 4-2.1. (30Apr07)

4-2.1, 4-2.2 HONEST PARTICIPATION (2007): A competitor is entered in the 1,500-meter run preliminaries and the 5,000-meter run on the first day of a two-day meet. She earns a place in the final of the 1,500-meter run on the second day. She starts the 5,000-meter run but leaves the track after one lap. Should the competitor be allowed to compete in the final of the 1,500-meter run on the second day?

RESPONSE: The act of 'participation' is judged separately from 'conduct'. There is no violation of Failure to Participate, Rule 4-2.2. There may be, upon investigation by the Referee, a violation of a provision of Rule 4-2.1 by not acting in an 'honest and sporting fashion'. If such violation is confirmed, then the competitor may be disallowed from further competition by the referee. (30Apr07)

4-2.2 HONEST PARTICIPATION (2007): A competitor starts the 5,000-meter run. After completing five laps, he steps off the track, tells the nearest official that he has severe stomach cramps. He then leaves the stadium. The next day, in the same competition, the same competitor is declared in and reports for the 1,500-meter run. Should the competitor be allowed to compete in the 1,500?

RESPONSE: Competitors must start in all events in which they are declared. This competitor did start the 5,000-meter run. The reason for not completing the event is not relevant under Rule 4-2.2 however, other rules, such as Rule 4-2.1, may apply. (30Apr07)

4-2.2 HONEST PARTICIPATION (2006): A listed long jump competitor checks-in and just prior to his first jump informs the judge that he will not be competing. In the middle of the second round, the athlete returns and informs the judge that he has changed his mind and now wants to compete. Should the athlete be allowed to compete in this and other events?

RESPONSE: The athlete did not pass the first jump, but scratched from the event. Re-entry to this event is not allowed, and participation in subsequent events is not allowed. (30Jun06)

4-2.2 HONEST PARTICIPATION (2007): If a combined-event competitor fails to start an event in the combined-event competition, is it a violation of Rule 4-2.2?

RESPONSE: No. The decathlon, heptathlon, etc. are single events on their own, comprised of many parts. A violation would only occur if the competitor did not start the first event of the combined-event competition. (28Jun07)

4-2.2 HONEST PARTICIPATION (2010): A competitor 'passes' all attempts in a field event. Has this competitor satisfied the participation provision of the rule?

RESPONSE: Participation does continue for the duration of and within the event, but exclusion from subsequent events is possible since a 'pass' is not a trial, Rule 6-1.1, therefore not part of the 'athletic challenge' of the event. (30Jun10)

4-3.1 UNIFORM (2001): A competitor reports to the start of the 100-meter dash with the straps of his uniform down and his chest exposed. An umpire issues a yellow-card warning. The competitor contends that he is in conformance with the rule since he did not lower his straps in the area of competition. Is the umpire's decision to issue the yellow-card correct?

RESPONSE: Yes. Before entering the area of competition, a competitor shall be responsible for wearing a legal uniform. When removing a jacket or shirt that is covering the running top, the uniform straps must already be on the competitor's shoulders. While it is best that the checking for conformity with this rule occur during competitor check-in, the closest observing official may issue a warning. Such warning must be reported to the referee for possible further action if the violation is not corrected.

4-3.1 UNIFORM (2007): At the end of the women's 1500-meter race an official approaches a competitor, informs her that her singlet is in violation of the rules since she had a bare midriff during the race and issues her a yellow card. Is this correct procedure?

RESPONSE: No. The responsibility for checking the legality of a uniform rests with the clerk of the course at initial check-in. A singlet which meets or hangs below the waistband while the competitor is standing satisfies the conditions of the uniform rule. No official, other than the referee or a head field judge, has the responsibility to validate the legality of a uniform. (30Sep07)

4-3.1 UNIFORM (2006): A vaulter is denied the opportunity to compete by the event judge because the competitor is wearing a bicycle helmet instead of a vaulting helmet. Is this ruling correct?

RESPONSE: No. Helmets, like shoes, are not considered uniform, but equipment. NCAA rules do not have specifications for the helmet. Therefore, any type of headgear, or lack thereof, is permissible. See Rule 2-6.6. (30Jun06)

4-3.2 RELAY UNIFORM (2007): Two competitors from the same institution are visibly wearing sport bras underneath their singlets. One is wearing a black sport bra; one is wearing a yellow sport bra. Have they violated the rule that visible undergarments must be of an identical solid color?

RESPONSE: No. There is a distinction between undergarments and underwear. Sport bras are considered underwear; therefore, the competitors have not violated the uniform rule. An example of an undergarment would be a T-shirt or turtleneck. (28Jun07)

4-3.2 RELAY UNIFORM (2008): A relay team comes to the starting line with three members wearing identical tops and wearing pants, shorts or briefs of identical color(s). The fourth member is wearing a one-piece

body suit. The clerk tells the team that all members must have identical uniforms and cannot compete until all are dressed the same. Is this ruling correct?

RESPONSE: No. It is not necessary for all members to be in one-piece body suits, or in tops and pants, shorts or briefs that are identical in style or color. However, it is necessary for the clerk to determine through inspection that it is clearly visible that all members represent the same team. (30Jul08)

4-3.2 RELAY UNIFORM (2009): What is meant by 'clearly indicating ... that members are from the same team'? Are items such as hats, gloves and sox now considered 'outer garments'?

RESPONSE: The effect of the rule is that no imagination shall be required to justify a clear sense of belonging to the same team. Items such as hats, gloves and sox are not considered uniform. (31Jan09)

4-3.4 UNIFORM NUMBERS (2010): Must a hip number be wholly affixed to the side panel of the briefs?

RESPONSE: No. A hip number may be affixed to the leg. (30Jun10)

4-3.6 IMMEDIATE PROTEST (2010): How is an immediate protest in a field event to be made and received? If coaches are outside the competition area, how is the official to recognize a coach?

RESPONSE: A protest shall be any communication by a competitor to a judge of the event that questions the action of the judge. A coach may be at any location and also lodge a protest. The protest may be verbal. For a coach, the words used must be very clear that a protest is being lodged in order for the coach to be distinguished from other spectators and to eliminate doubt on the part of officials. This may mean that the official asks for clarification. The official must find a method to implement the rule, not avoid it. The best method to lodge an immediate protest is through the competitor at the direction of the coach. (30Jun10)

4-3.9 COMPETITION AREA (2009): Is the warm-up area part of the competition area?

RESPONSE: The games committee may define the warm-up area as part of the competition area. (31Aug09)

4-3.10 COMPETITION AREA (2009): Is an authorized coaches box, in the infield, part of the competition area?

RESPONSE: Yes. The rule indicates that a infield coaches box is a portion of the normal competition area. (31Aug09)

4-3.11 ELECTRONIC DEVICE (2001): During competition, a competitor is observed operating a cellular phone. When questioned, the competitor indicates that he is speaking with a friend who is not in attendance. Is this permitted?

RESPONSE: No. The viewing of videotape or photos, or the use of any wireless communication device, by a competitor during event competition is prohibited. This warrants a yellow-card warning, with disqualification to follow if another violation provided by the rules occurs during the meet.

4-4.4 EVENTS (2010): How is an event defined?

RESPONSE: An event, within a competition, is all groupings, divisions or sections pertaining to one running or field event discipline per gender. (30Jun10)

Rule 5

5-2 FALSE START (2005): If a competitor comes up on the command 'set', just keeps moving, comes out and never stops? Is that covered by the rules as a false start?

RESPONSE: Rule 5-2b covers this situation. "A false start may be charged against a runner who fails to comply promptly with the command 'on you marks' or with the various requirements of the command 'set' ", which is to assume their full and final set position (Rule 5-1.4). The option to charge is provided since it is possible that the start could have been cancelled by the starter. (01May05)

5-2 FALSE START (2008): Is a 'flinch' considered to be a false start?

RESPONSE: A 'flinch' can be considered a false start using Rule 5-2b, since it is a violation of the various requirements of the 'set' command. The intent of rule 5-2c is not to automatically create a false start with a 'flinch', but to conform to the wording in other rule books and to clearly define the deliberate act associated

with a false start. The starter has the option to cancel the start, which has the effect of negating any possible violation or disruption caused by a 'flinch'. (30Jul08)

5-4.1 LANE VIOLATION (2009): The runner starts the 100 meters in lane one and crosses the finish line in lane three. The runner does not impede another competitor. The referee, after consulting with the appropriate officials, disqualifies the runner. Is this a correct decision?

RESPONSE: Yes, the referee can make this ruling since the runner must keep within their assigned lane from start to finish. However, the referee may also make the determination to not disqualify the runner, based on the other provisions of this rule. (30Jan09)

5-5.4a ASSISTANCE (2007): a) Is the use of a 'rabbit' legal? b) Is there a violation of Rule 4-2 in any way? c) Are there any disqualifications of teammates resulting from the use of a 'rabbit'? d) Is the 'rabbit' disqualified from further competition in the meet?

RESPONSE: A person in the race specifically for the purpose of being a 'rabbit' should be so designated before the race begins, and preferably have no affiliation common to the competitors in the race. There is no specific prohibition for the practice. There is no violation of Failure to Participate and no violation of Unsportsmanlike Conduct since a 'rabbit' sets the pace for the entire field, not just another individual or a single team, therefore, it is not a matter of illegal assistance. It would not be proper for the 'rabbit' to be a 'competitor' in a future race. (30Apr07)

5-5.4a ASSISTANCE (2008): Team A's coach is standing near the starting line of the 1,500-meter run and is announcing splits to his runners in the race. Meet management has established boundaries for the competition area. Team A's coach is outside this boundary. Is this illegal assistance?

RESPONSE: No. Meet management must establish the boundaries for the competition area. Announcing splits and giving encouragement from outside this boundary is permissible. (30Jul08)

5-5.4a ASSISTANCE (2009): Is the 'aid' being provided, as referred to in the rule, limited to aid that is provided by a defined group in a defined manner?

RESPONSE: Yes. The aid must be caused from within the defined competition area by any of the following: a coach; a teammate not participating in the race; or a non-competitor who has some connection with the competitor's team. Assistance within and by competitors in a race is addressed in Rule 5-5.3. (31Aug09)

5-5.4c ASSISTANCE (2008): Would the use of a prosthetic leg be a violation of this rule?

RESPONSE: There is nothing that prohibits a person with a disability from competing, but they must not use a device that 'provides the user with an advantage over another athlete not using such a device'. A negative determination of such advantage would indicate no violation. (28Feb08)

5-6 HURDLE DISPLACEMENT (2009): Should a competitor, within the normal execution of running the race, be disqualified for causing a hurdle to bounce into an adjacent lane and impede the progress of the competitor in that lane?

RESPONSE: No. Hitting a hurdle during a race is not abnormal. The rule indicates disqualification for a competitor who impedes. The competitor did not impede, the hurdle did. The competitor who causes the hurdle to bounce committed no violation simply by hitting the hurdle. Impeding may have occurred, but not by another competitor. Special consideration, by the referee, may be afforded to the impeded competitor. (28Feb09)

5-9f RELAY INTERFERENCE (2001): In the 1,600-meter relay, Team A wins the event. As the rest of the teams are finishing, a member of Team A steps out onto the track to celebrate the win and interferes with Team B's anchor runner five meters before the finish line, knocking the baton from his hand. Team B's anchor finishes the race without the baton. Should Team A be disqualified for interfering with Team B, and should Team B be disqualified for finishing without a baton?

RESPONSE: Team A is disqualified for interfering with Team B. No other disqualification takes place, because Team B was not afforded the opportunity to finish the race with the baton.

5-10.2 QUALIFYING (2009): If a qualifier for a semi-final is unable to compete, can a substitution be made for that qualifying position?

RESPONSE: No. An individual who has not legitimately earned a position in a subsequent round cannot be awarded that position as a substitute. (31Aug09)

5-10.5 BREAKING TIES (2009): Is there a different procedure for determining, processing and breaking ties for distance versus in-lane races?

RESPONSE: No. In all running events, whenever possible, ties shall be resolved in accordance with Rule 5-12.2d by examining the photo-timing device to 1/1,000th of a second. Procedure for advancement, if a tie still exists after that examination, is provided within Rule 5-10.5. (31Aug09)

5-10.6 ADVANCEMENT TO FINAL (2009): Are the heat winners the only advancers to the final based on place? Must all others be advancers be based on time?

RESPONSE: No. Current rule already provides for more than just heat winners to advance by place. The heat winners must advance in all cases, and when more than two rounds are contested, additional advancers based on place is preferred. (31Aug09)

Rule 6

6-1.6 ABSENCE FROM COMPETITION (2001): The games committee for a competition has determined that the alternate procedure, Rule 6-3.1, will be utilized in the long jump. A competitor is in the first flight and requests to be excused from the jumping order to compete in the 400-meter relay. Is the competitor permitted to jump out of order?

RESPONSE: No. Since the games committee adopted the alternate procedure, the event is contested as a final with four attempts. The competitor must initiate an attempt in the predetermined order and within one minute after his name is called by the event judge.

6-1.6 ABSENCE FROM COMPETITION (2004): Competitor A is in the combined-event long jump. She leaves to participate in an open event. The combined-event official allows the 60-second clock to run down for Competitor A and calls the next competitor to the runway. Competitor A returns to the combined-event long jump and requests to take her jump out of order. The official does not allow her to take the jump and charges her with an attempt. Is this the correct ruling?

RESPONSE: Yes. The combined event is treated as a final event. When a competitor in a combined-event jump or throw is absent in order to participate in an open event, the event clock is started. If the competitor fails to report for the attempt within the allotted time, the competitor is charged with an attempt.

6-1.9b LONG JUMP FOOT PATTERN (2009): An official refuses a request from a competitor to indicate where their foot landed on the take-off board, creating a foul, since foot patterns are only allowed during warm-up. Is this a correct decision?

RESPONSE: No. The use of any type of foot pattern is not required to show the point of a foul. An indication of the point of contact which created the foul, as a response to a request, is valid for any questioning (protest) of an official's decision. (30Jan09)

6-1.10 TAPING OF FINGERS (2001): Is it permissible for a competitor in the shot to tape individual fingers to prevent injury?

RESPONSE: No. This type of taping is illegal. Tape can only be applied if there is an open wound.

6-1.10 TAPED FINGERS (2005): Does tendonitis qualify for consideration under the 'Physically Challenged' provisions? If it occurs in the fingers of a shot put athlete, would tape be allowed on the fingers, as it is on other parts of the body for a similar ailment?

RESPONSE: There is no rule which allows for use of tape, except for the hand and fingers specifically in certain events. No allowance is made nationally or internationally in any Athletes with Disabilities Rules. The answer to both questions would have to be no. A medical condition, in itself, is not a valid reason to suspend a rule.

6-1.10 TAPING OF FINGERS (2007): Is the use of tape, which is not allowed during competition, allowable during the warm-up period?

RESPONSE: Tape used and allowed during a competition must be shown to an official before the start of the event, which is at a published scheduled time. Warm-up is usually prior to that time, before the start of the event, therefore tape use not legal during the competition may be used during warm-up. (06Feb07)

6-1.10 TAPED WRIST (2006): Is the use of tape or a brace on the wrist permissible?

RESPONSE: Yes. The use of tape or a brace on the wrist, and only the wrist, is permissible. Any tape or brace that extends below the radiocarpal joint of the wrist so that it tends to immobilize any fingers or support the hand is not permissible. (30Jun06)

6-1.11 WARM-UP (2004): Two pole vaulters have not taken an attempt in one hour. Upon re-entering competition after a height change, Vaulter A uses only one of the two allowable warm-up minutes on the runway and landing area without the crossbar. Is Vaulter B allowed to use three minutes (one remaining minute from Vaulter A and the two allowable minutes)?

RESPONSE: No. Each competitor in the pole vault is allowed a maximum of two minutes on the runway and landing area without the crossbar at a height change with the permission of the event official. Subsequent competitors do not have the right to utilize the unused time of previous competitors. The same ruling applies to the high jump, except that a maximum time of one and one-half minutes is allowed per competitor for warm-up.

6-1.11 WARM-UP FOR GROUPS (2007): Is the 15 minute warm-up time maximum the total warm-up time allowed?

RESPONSE: No. When there are flights or sections of a field event with a general warm-up period, a flight specific warm-up, with a maximum of 15 minutes, must exist. This maximum does not apply when there is only flight specific warm-up scheduled. (06Feb07)

6-1.12 CERTIFIED IMPLEMENTS (2001): All certified implements become the property of meet management. May any competitor use these certified implements?

RESPONSE: A competitor may use another competitor's implement during competition, with the other competitor's permission. If meet management supplies meet implements, then anyone may use the meet implements.

6-1.13 ALTERED IMPLEMENT (2001): An athlete wants to use a weight or hammer, which has tape on the handle. Is this permissible?

RESPONSE: No. Modifications of implements are not allowed.

6-2.2 QUALIFYING COMPETITION (2009): Is a competitor in a qualifying competition permitted to take additional trials after achieving the determined qualifying mark? How is advancement to the competition proper determined?

RESPONSE: The purpose of a qualifying competition is to reduce the overall field size to that easily managed in a normal preliminary and final format. Once a competitor achieves a determined qualifying mark, advancement is achieved and additional trials are not permitted. Tie breaking rules for field event apply in order to achieve the desired number of advancers. (31Aug09)

6-2.3 ADVANCING TO FINALS (2008): Four teams are involved in a scored meet in which the top eight places will receive points. Entries are limited to three athletes per event per team. Before the competition, there is no agreement to use the alternate scoring system for four teams. Therefore, advancement to the finals will be the top eight performers in each event. Is this method of advancement correct, and what are the scoring limitations?

RESPONSE: No. Advancement to the final rounds and scoring are different issues. In all meets, one more than the number of scoring places, but not less than eight, advance to the finals. Within this group, only two from a single institution shall score, in compliance with Rule 7-1.1. Points are not reassigned to a lower finishing place. (30Jul08)

6-2.4 ADVANCING TO FINALS (2008): If there are less than nine competitors in a field event, can a competitor 'pass' each of the three preliminary attempts and still compete to the finals?

RESPONSE: No. There must be an actual attempt. A pass is not an attempt.

6-4.3 ORDER OF COMPETITION (2009): Must the original 'order of competition', as listed on the event sheet, be maintained when using the five-alive jumping method?

RESPONSE: No. The five-alive method is a replacement to the normal order of jumping. (31Aug09)

6-5.3, 6-6.2 VERTICAL JUMP FOUL (2001): A competitor in the high jump or pole vault aborts his approach. During the deceleration process, a body part or the vaulting pole passes through the vertical plane. The competitor did not make contact with any part of the landing area or ground beyond the plane. Does this constitute a missed attempt?

RESPONSE: No. It is permissible for a competitor to break the vertical plane above or below the crossbar, provided no contact is made with the ground or landing area beyond the vertical plane.

6-6 POLE VAULT FOUL (2001): A competitor completes an unsuccessful attempt in the pole vault competition. Immediately after the attempt, it is brought to the attention of the head event judge that the uprights were improperly positioned. Should the competitor be credited with a failed attempt?

RESPONSE: No. This is considered a no vault due to the official's error and the competitor should receive another attempt. If the attempt were successful, the competitor should be credited with a successful attempt despite the official's error.

6-6.2 POLE VAULT FOUL (2008): In the course of an attempt, a vaulter releases the pole, and without any doubt, completely clears the bar. After the competitor lands in the pit, therefore no longer vaulting, the pole then falls onto the bar and it is dislodged, falling to the ground. Is this a foul attempt?

RESPONSE: Yes. While it may be true that lack of physical contact with the pole makes it physically 'disassociated with the competitor', the movement, inertia or momentum of the pole, except as provided in Rule 6-6.3b, is not disassociated with the competitor and is a direct action of the competitor during the vault. (28Feb08)

6-6.2 POLE VAULT FOUL (2009): Is it a foul if the pole is planted on the runway at the base of the landing pad behind the box, and the vaulter continues the vault, clears the bar and successfully lands and exits the landing area?

RESPONSE: Yes. It is a foul. Neither the competitor nor the pole may touch the ground or the landing area beyond the vertical plane of the back of the box without first clearing the bar. (31Aug09)

6-6.3 POLE VAULT FOUL (2008): Is a competitor required to push the pole away from the bar in order to get a decision that the wind caused the pole to dislodge the bar?

RESPONSE: There is no specific rule or requirement to push the pole away; however it must be very clear that the competitor was not involved. Just releasing the pole is not sufficient to eliminate 'direct action' of the competitor. A push-away of the pole is a clear action which may justify determining lack of 'direct action'. (28Feb08)

6-6.5 CATCHING THE POLE (2006): Is it permissible for a competitor to catch their own pole?

RESPONSE: Yes. The competitor, who has completed the vault, or an official, may catch the pole provided that the catching is not to prevent the pole from dislodging the bar. (30Jun06)

6-7.2 TAKEOFF BOARD (2001): In a dual-meet competition, a competitor in the triple jump wishes to change the takeoff board being used for the finals. Is this permissible? Secondly, would it be permissible between days in a meet where there is a qualifying round on the first day and the preliminaries / finals on the second day?

RESPONSE: In the first case, No. The competitor must declare the board to be used throughout any single day of competition. The competitor may change boards between day one and day two.

6-7.3 FOUL BY NON-UNIFORM APPAREL / ACCESSORY (2001): A competitor in a horizontal jump is wearing glasses, gloves, hair ties, etc., that fall off during an attempt and land beyond the foul line, outside or on the runway, or in the landing pit. Is this a foul? Is it a foul in a throwing event if it were to land outside the throwing circle?

RESPONSE: No. In horizontal jumps, a legal jump is measured from the nearest break in the landing area made by any part of the competitor's feet, hands, body or uniform. In throwing events, a foul occurs if the competitor touches the outside of the throwing circle, the foul line or run-up lines with any part of the body. A foul is not created by non-uniform apparel or accessory falling from the body of the competitor. Applicable Rules: 6-8.3d, 6-9.3c, 6-10.4b and 6-11.3b.

6-7.4 EXITING LONG JUMP (2005): A long jumper completes the jump inside the landing area and then steps out of the landing area nearer the takeoff board before the jump is ruled fair. Is this a legal jump?

RESPONSE: No. The jump is declared a foul. The jumper must exit the landing area no closer to the takeoff board than the mark made in the landing area. (25Jun05)

6-8.2 TAPING OF FINGERS (2001): See 6-1.10

6-8.3 EXITING A CIRCLE (2001): After completing a successful throw, a competitor leaves the throwing circle with one foot on either side of the line dividing the circle from front to back. The first step was taken out the back half of the circle. The event judge calls this a foul because the competitor did not exit through the back half of the circle with both feet. Is this ruling correct?

RESPONSE: No. The competitor has completed a legal throw by the legal first exit from the circle. This also applies to the Shot Put, Discus (6-9.3), Hammer and Weight (6-11.3) throws.

6-8.3 EXITING A CIRCLE (2005): Must an athlete be 'in control' when exiting the circle in a throwing event?

RESPONSE: No. This, by itself, is not cause for a foul under NCAA rules. This also applies to the Shot Put, Discus (6-9.3), Hammer and Weight (6-11.3) throws.

6-8.3 SHOT PUT ATTEMPT (2005): Is there any foul if an athlete in the Shot Put enters the circle, walks to the toe board, puts the implement down inside the circle, leaves the circle from the front half, re-enters the circle, picks-up the implement, and then proceeds to complete the put, if all done in the allotted time?

RESPONSE: No. The attempt must start from a stationary position with the implement positioned properly. All foul situations occur 'after entering the circle and starting the put'. The start of the put had not occurred before the front exit, therefore no violation occurred.

6-10.1 JAVELIN THROW (2010): An athlete throws the javelin. Upon landing, the metal head hits the ground first, just above the tip, before any other part of the javelin. The properly positioned field judge calls the throw a foul (flat) by raising the red flag. Was the official's call correct?

RESPONSE: No. The javelin did fall metal head first, as required, differentiated from the tip or point. (30Jun10)

6-10.1 JUDGING A JAVELIN THROW (2007): Can a judge standing inside the sector make any determination of a fair or foul throw regarding the landing of the javelin?

RESPONSE: The legality of the landing shall be made by a judge 'outside the sector, perpendicular with the landing, and low enough to the ground to determine which part of the implement made first contact with the ground'. The same judge may not mark the implement landing and also determine a fair or foul landing. 'Not withstanding any other provisions, ... a javelin making obvious and irrefutable first contact with the ground other than with the metal head shall be ruled a foul.' Therefore, it would not be normal for this judge to make any fair or foul call on the landing of the implement. (28Jun07)

6-10.2 TAPE ON JAVELIN GRIP (2009): Is the use of adhesive tape on the javelin grip legal?

RESPONSE: No. The cord grip shall be of uniform thickness and not exceed the diameter of the shaft by more than 8 millimeters, per Rule 2-11.2. Tape would alter the grip in a way that would violate this provision. (31Mar09)

6-11.2 HAMMER THROW GLOVE (2001): Is it permissible during the hammer throw for an athlete to compete wearing a glove that fully conceals any or all fingers?

RESPONSE: No. This type of glove is illegal for both the Hammer Throw and the Weight Throw (Rule 10-9.5).

6-11.2 SUBSTANCE ON HANDS (2001): Is it permissible for competitors in the weight and/or hammer throws to apply a suitable substance to their hands or gloves?

RESPONSE: Yes. Competitors may apply a suitable substance to their hands or gloves. See Rules 6-8.2, 6-9.2 and 6-10.2 for other throwing events.

Rule 7

7-1.6 VERTICAL JUMP JUMP-OFF PROCEDURE (2007): Is it permissible for a competitor to 'pass' an attempt, or not make an actual attempt, during a jump-off?

RESPONSE: No. Passing is not allowed during a jump-off. Failure to attempt a jump is also not allowed. Each competitor 'must jump on each occasion'. Failure to jump is considered a withdrawal from the competition and has the effect of losing the jump-off. (28Jun07)

7-1.6 POLE VAULT JUMP-OFF (2008): In the pole vault, Competitors A and B are the final two vaulters in the competition. Both made 4.88 meters as their best height. Competitor A attempts to clear 5.03 meters three times, but fails at each attempt. Competitor B passes 5.03 meters and fails at all three attempts at 5.18 meters. They are tied on the number of jumps and the number of failures. This forces a jump-off for first place. At what height is the bar placed to begin the jump-off?

RESPONSE: The jump-off begins with the bar at 5.03 meters, which is the next height in the original progression after the height at which the competitors tied. (30Jul08)

Rule 8

8-2.2b HAY BALES (2001): May hay bales be placed on a cross country course for a collegiate meet?

RESPONSE: No. Obstacles and other hindrances shall be avoided throughout the course.

8-6.2 XC Finish Placing (2005): Is the use of a photo/video based placing system required in all XC races?

RESPONSE: No. The judges at the finish have the primary responsibility to determine finish placing determined by the torso of each competitor. A photo-finish system may be substituted as the primary system. A video verification method for determining finish places is recommended for all XC events. (30Jun06)

8-6.2 XC Finish Placing (2010): Can a system using the finish time of each competitor be used to solely determine Cross Country finish placing?

RESPONSE: No. A finish placing system, based on time or an attached chip, may not be substituted as the primary system. Some video method must be used to verify any place, as determined by the torso of each competitor, for any finish time within 1/10 seconds of another finishing time. A video verification method for determining finish places is recommended for all XC events. (30Jun10)

8-7 XC UNIFORM (2006): Two runners on the same cross country team are wearing a different dye-lot color T-shirts under the school issued singlet. Have they violated the rule that any visible undergarments must be identical solid color?

RESPONSE: Undergarments of the same color but a different dye lot should be considered to be identical in color for the purpose of this rule. (30Jun06)

8-7 XC UNIFORM (2007): Can one member of a team wear detachable sleeves, or must all members wear them, and do they have to be identical or of the same color?

RESPONSE: Detachable sleeves are not part of the uniform, nor are they undergarments, therefore detachable sleeves are not subject to the uniform requirements of Rule 4-3.2. (30Nov07)

8-7 XC UNIFORM (2008): Is the use of briefs, black in color but some with a white logo and others with a white piping and no logo, legal for use by a team in XC.

RESPONSE: Yes, it can be legal. The determining factors for a legal uniform include color, logo and overall design, but not any single issue of being identical. The uniform worn and visible must clearly indicate that members are from the same team. (30Jul08)

Rule 9

9-2.6 HURDLE LANES (2005): When should alternating or consecutive lanes be used in the short hurdles in combined event competition?

RESPONSE: The decision rests with the games committee and would probably be decided on the basis of facility, field size, length of race, and quality of the competition.

9-8 ABANDONING COMPETITION (2001): An athlete starts, but does not complete, an event in a combined event competition. Is the athlete permitted to continue to compete in the combined event competition?

RESPONSE: Yes. The athlete is not considered to have abandoned the combined event competition.

Rule 10

10-2.3 Indoor Facility (2005): For an indoor facility, can the lanes around the oval be 30 inches?

RESPONSE: Yes. The rule indicates the recommended width of lanes around the oval on an indoor facility. There is no restriction to using lanes of other width.

10-9.4 Indoor Weight (2006): Is an implement for the Women's Weight which weighs 20 pounds legal?

RESPONSE: Yes. Rule Books prior to 2006 listed 9.080kg and 20 pounds as equivalent measures. There was no intent to change this with the 2006 Rules Book, but to promote the use of metric as a primary standard of measure. It was assumed that the conversion was correct and that the 20 pound implement would be legal when weighed metrically. (05Jan06)