

## LAST YEAR'S MOST MISSED QUESTIONS

This is the time of year we take to review the most missed questions on the various exams from this past season. The open book exam answers and rule references appear in another section of this issue (the actual exam questions in the corresponding order appear on usahockey.com). This is an excellent time to review the questions that appeared to give you the most trouble and try to understand the reason why it may have been missed. Here are the top ten missed questions on the open book exam.

**#1** If a player deliberately dislodges an opponent's helmet during play, that player must be ejected from the game. The correct answer is False. USA Hockey does not have a game ejection penalty and a minor or major penalty could be assessed for either Head Contact or Roughing.

**#2** If the Captain and an Alternate Captain are both legally on the ice, only the Captain is entitled to confer with the Referee regarding a rule interpretation. This is False. The rule is specific in that only one "C" or "A" can converse with the referee during a stoppage, but does not specify it must be the Captain.

**#3** Shooting the puck directly out of the playing area from the defending zone is a minor penalty to both players and goalkeepers. This is False. Whereas the minor penalty is automatic for a goalkeeper, the decision to assess a delay of game minor penalty to a player is left up to the discretion of the referee and must be deemed to be deliberate for the penalty to be assessed.

**#4** A glove with a worn palm that exposes any part of the hand is considered illegal equipment. The correct answer is False. The rule is specific in that all or part of the palm has been removed or cut to permit the use of the bare hand shall be considered illegal equipment. Normal wear and tear of the palm that creates a small hole does not fit these criteria.

**#5** A minor penalty shall be assessed to a goalkeeper who freezes the puck anywhere between the goal line and the end boards. The correct answer is False as the goalkeeper is allowed to freeze the puck behind the goal line provided he is still in contact with the goal crease.

**#6** A linesman is not permitted to stop play if observing any "Injury Potential" infraction. This is True. The linesman is required to report such incidents to the referee at the next stoppage of play, but does not stop play.

**#7** A player who is unable to participate in the game may sit on the penalty bench as long as the team's jersey and all required face and head protection are worn. False. Non-penalized players and goalkeepers are not permitted to occupy the penalty bench.

**#8** Accidentally contacting a player in the head area is not illegal head contact. False is the answer as the glossary definition of head contact specifies "intentionally" or "recklessly" is deemed to be illegal. A player could be reckless and accidentally make contact and should be held accountable for that action.

**#9** If the puck is deliberately directed into the goal by an attacking player's skate, the goal is allowed if there is no distinct kicking motion. False. Whereas the NHL has this rule, USA Hockey's rules are still very specific in that any puck directed (by definition in the glossary by the skate would not be allowed).

**#10** Any player not then serving a penalty may be designated to take a penalty shot. False is the answer. The designated player to take the penalty shot must be on the ice at the time the infraction occurred.

**The following are the top three missed questions from the level 2 closed book exam.**

**#1** If play is on the opposite side of the rink from the Referee (three-official system), the referee's skating lane should be along the line of spots. The correct answer is false as the referee's skating lane will be 5-10 feet off the boards when play is on the opposite side of the ice.

**#2** For all face-offs at the end zone spots, both players' sticks must be completely outside of the perimeter of the spots. Once again, false is the correct answer. The players participating in the face-off must have their stick in contact with the white portion of the face-off spot.

**#3** If you observe a player who is injured and unable to get to the bench, you should:

- (a) stop play immediately.
- (b) wait until that player's team has control of the puck and then stop play.
- (c) allow play to continue unless the puck goes in that player's vicinity.

The correct answer is A. The fact the player is unable to get up and participate in play or skate to the bench indicates the injury may be serious enough to warrant stopping play immediately. USA Hockey would prefer that the officials always err on the side of caution when dealing with youth players in this instance.

**Finally, here are the top five missed questions on the level 3 closed book exams.**

**#1** A penalized player who fails to go directly and immediately to the penalty bench when ordered to do so by the referee shall be assessed a minor penalty. The correct answer is false

as the rule is very specific in that a misconduct is the proper penalty.

**#2** For a face-off at an end zone spot, the official at the blue line should be in the neutral zone. The correct answer is false as the back official is going to utilize the golden rectangle by moving off the boards and inside the zone until the puck is dropped.

**#3** The goalkeeper is assessed a minor penalty for shooting the puck directly outside of the playing area, whether or not that area is protected by glass or screening. False is the correct answer as the penalty would not be assessed if the goalkeeper

shoots the puck directly out of the rink in an area that is not protected by glass or screening, such as the bench area.

**#4** A major penalty for “high-sticking” also requires the assessment of a game misconduct penalty.

**#5** Whenever a major penalty for “boarding” is assessed, a game misconduct is also required.

Both of these are false. A major penalty can be assessed for both high-sticking and boarding without assessing a game misconduct penalty. The game misconduct comes into play when an injury results.

### MEETING REVIEW ... continued from page 1

Playing Rules Committee has recommended. There were four major proposals discussed by the group more thoroughly, including the two proposals specifically referred to the section. These included the proposals to recognize additional officiating system(s) (proposal 28A) and the mandating of visors to be worn by a select group of officials (proposal 29B).

After lengthy discussion the section voted 8-4 to defeat proposal 28A, which would have recognized the four-official system as an approved system within USA Hockey. The group felt greater emphasis needs to be placed on developing quality officials and is concerned that the development of another officiating system, along with the education materials necessary, may dilute the resources we already have available. The group agreed that this proposal does warrant future discussion. Proposal 29B, which would mandate all officials under the age of 18 to wear a half-shield visor was also recommended for defeat by the section.

The section also went on record in support of proposal 39 (eliminating the icing exception for a shorthanded team). Owen Thompson gave a report on the pilot program implementing this rule change for the past two seasons in

Massachusetts, which was very positive.

Applications for the upcoming programs have been distributed electronically to the District Referees-in-Chief. This includes the Chicago Showcase Development Program, Instructor Training Programs, Summer Development Camps and the Elite Officiating Experiences.

The North American Officiating Program of Merit was a huge success last summer and we will work in cooperation with the National Hockey League to conduct a similar program this summer.

As mentioned before, registration numbers are down. The group shared ideas or special programs that are occurring within their district to help recruit or retain officials. One area of concern continues to be the ability to assign younger officials to games as more and more associations are incorporating cross-ice programs for players at the levels our younger officials would normally be getting the feet wet.

It was noted that they do put young officials on the ice in Minot, N.D., for cross-ice games, which has proven to be quite successful. It has allowed these officials to get used to skating in lanes, establish field of vision, drop pucks and signal goals in a non-threatening environment. This has helped their

confidence and has prepared them well for future success when they graduate to full ice and more intense games.

The suggestion was made that much of the focus needed to be placed on making players in the 14-16 year-old age groups aware of opportunities afforded to them through officiating. Although we may not get them involved right away, they may be more apt to give it a try when their playing careers are over. The “Hockey For Life” video, produced by the NHL Officiating Department, would be an excellent tool to use at opportunities in hockey seminars conducted at player camps or by local associations.

The joint meeting with the Coaches-in-Chief was excellent. After several conversations with National Coach-in-Chief Al Bloomer, further discussions were made to have a referee representative attend all Level 2 & 3 coaching seminars and teach a section on officiating. We feel this is a major step in our two programs working together. The section felt the relations have changed in a positive way for our sections to work together to grow the game and to understand the concerns of each section.

*Mark Wilkins is USA Hockey's Referee Section Director.* 🇺🇸