



Penalties – Judgment and Game Management



INTERNATIONAL
ICE HOCKEY
FEDERATION

Judgment

How do we “manage” a game? By using “good” judgment based on rule knowledge and the following criteria:

1. Was the action ***Obvious***?
2. **Benefit?** Did the action result in a ***Loss of Possession***? Did the action result in a ***Loss of Scoring Opportunity***?
3. Was the action ***Injury Potential***?

IF the action fits any of these criteria, ***THEN*** assess penalty.
Simple! Black & white...

- ☞ ...be “reactive:” you might anticipate what is about to happen but react only to what *actually* happens...



• The Standard – When To Call A Penalty

- OBI – Focus on the action not the consequence



Obvious



Benefit

☞ change of possession/
loss of scoring opportunity



Risk of Injury

☞ “injury potential” or
“reckless endangerment”

What is the correct call?

Making the correct call depends on:

- A. **Knowing the rules** ➔ IHF rule book, Section 10 – Description of Game Penalties
- B. **Being in position** ➔ Field of View

Did you see an infraction? If yes, then assess a penalty.

Especially at younger/lower classifications of hockey, little judgment needed. A penalty is always a penalty:

- high sticking: accidental or intentional → always a penalty
- slashing: accidental or intentional → always a penalty
- tripping: accidental or intentional → always a penalty

Important to consistently assess penalties in order to teach younger/newer players.

Judgment and Standard

“Marginal” infractions?

- “gray” area, do not quite meet the four criteria for penalties
 - Should you call these? The majority of these are not penalties, so, no.
- *Did* the player’s action meet one of the criteria? This is what you must decide (or “judge”).
- Successful referees as “game managers” promote flow of game without compromising fairness or safety. This starts with calling every infraction that clearly fits one of the four criteria...

IIHF emphasis:

- skating, puck possession, proper use of body to establish position for competitive advantage
- penalize aggressive fouls, restraining fouls

Standard

“Aggressive” vs “Restraining” fouls

- **aggressive:**
 - ☞ fall under injury potential criteria; black and white...call them every time...
 - ☞ How severe? Did the action recklessly endanger the opponent? Judgment: minor or minor + misconduct or major + game? (eg, high stick, check from behind, slashing)
 - If the infraction warrants (reckless endangerment/injury potential/flagrance), assess the penalty with the greater “impact” (eg, minor + misconduct for check from behind vs minor for cross-check)
- **restraining:**
 - ☞ generally, less serious than aggressive fouls; could even be a “good” penalty (eg, tripping, hooking)
 - ☞ A good first call? A tight standard early (eg, hooking) in the game will help avoid player frustration, chippy game.

A good first call:

- ☞ signals what the referee will and will not allow...sets a standard for the game... (same idea applies at the beginning of each period)
- ☞ a good first call should clearly fit one of the four penalty criteria, it should be “black and white”

Standard and Consistency

Maintaining an effective standard

- ☞ “you’re only as good as your last call...”
- ☞ each penalty you assess should be according to and reinforce the first call you made in the game...

What is “consistency?”

- ☞ Definition: penalizing those infraction that fall under the four criteria.

1. Situational:

- Calling similar situations within the same game the same way.
- Calling similar situations in similar games the same way.

2. For the above to happen the following must happen:

- ...within the same game by the same official
- ...within the same game by different officials
- ...from game to game by the same official
- ...from game to game by different officials