

SKILL BASED:

ISSUE 1: Single full twisting layouts have no place in the level progressions

Sub issue: Single full twisting layouts are being overlooked by judges who only look for and score double fulls in level 5

Option 1: Add a maximum of three single full twisting layouts per routine in level 4.

ISSUE 2: Allow more in L1

Option 1: Level 1 Pyramids – Allow prep level 1 leg stunts to connect hand, arm or foot.

Stance: Makes for better progression to level 2 which allows it in their extended pyramid rules

ISSUE 2b: Allow more in L1

Option 1: Level 1 Dismounts F - No Dismounts are allowed from Extended Stunts.

Stance: In order to stay with progression, cradles or at least pop-downs should be allowed from two-legged extended stunts in a pyramid.

ISSUE 3: Allow more in L2

Option 1: Level 2 Pyramids - Keep all rules the same except only allow extended 1 leg stunts to connect to only 1 side

Stance: The minimum number accepted to constitute a team can not max out a score sheet in pyramids.

ISSUE 4: Tumbling Progressions

Option 1: Level 5 standing and running tumbling be limited to one twisting rotation. Thus reserving double full twist to Level 6.

Stance: This will eliminate the well known jump in tumbling progressions.

Stance 2: In each level from 1-4 we follow proper progression in tumbling until we get to Level 5. The full has become extinct although a level 5 skill. Level 4 to Level 5 should progress from a layout to a single full. This allows for athletes to properly progress in tumbling. There have been so many injuries incurred while teaching athletes to do a double full and a lot of them can no longer cheer. It doesn't seem to matter anymore if an athlete has a full. They are being pushed from a layout to a double full. Most of the double fulls I watch on the competition floor are not properly performed.

Stance 3: Our goal in the All Star industry is to set kids up for success and to gain respect as a sport. Having a skill that is allowed at the college level (fulls) and a skill that is not allowed at the college (doubles) does not allow for the most success possible. Doubles do not need to be performed in a level that is not "open". We are pushing kids, sometimes very young kids, to throw skills that are not even allowed at the collegiate level. The

section below is taken from the AACCA 2008-2009 college safety rules. As an All Star industry we follow rules 1, 2, and 4. Why do we not follow rule number 3? Other sports are taken seriously because they culminate with the collegiate level and with the possibility of earning a scholarship. If we move doubles to level 6, we will set our kids up for success at the college level, as well as gaining the respect as a sport we have been wanting for many years.

Section F - Tumbling

1. Tumbling skills performed over, under or through partner stunts, pyramids or individuals are prohibited.
2. Tumbling skills that exceed one flipping rotation are prohibited.
3. Tumbling skills with two or more twisting rotations are prohibited.
4. Dive rolls are prohibited.

Stance 4: I believe this would increase the number of teams that compete at Level 5.

Option 2: Remove standing fulls (except out of back handspring series) and double fulls from the level 5 division

Stance: Make level 6 the "top" division which would include double fulls and standing fulls. I feel that the jump from layouts to double fulls is too extreme and causes an unfair advantage to those of us in the "small gym/small towns" that can't obtain advanced tumbling coaching and do not have access to pits and other equipment that would allow us to safely teach these skills. In the past, I have competed double fulls and have had several torn ACL's and just do not wish to pursue that level of tumbling ever again. However, we would still like to compete in an advanced division where we can stunt at the advanced level.

CROSSOVERS:

ISSUE 1: Crossovers within a program encourage sandbagging.

Option 1: Only allow an athlete to crossover once during a competition.

Option 2: Limit number of crossovers to 5 per team.

ISSUE 2: Crossovers from program to program is an unfair advantage and diminishes the integrity of the industry.

Option 1: Do not allow gym to gym crossovers within the same competitive season.

SQUAD SIZES:

ISSUE 1: Gyms losing athletes due to limitations on squad sizes.

Option 1: Increase squad sizes. Move small from 20 to 24 and Large from 36 to 40.

ISSUE 2: Create more competition.

Option 1: Limit of 30 kids per team.

Stance: This will hopefully create more competition and less division splitting. If we have less divisions, it will help to legitimize our sport and allow more competition for the kids. This will help all the small gyms and medium size gyms. Obviously the big gyms won't like it but if all the small and medium gyms close, there will be no competition for anyone. We have to put the kids and their parents first, and at a time when our economy is collapsing before our eyes, all star cheerleading is a luxury that is getting cut from the family budget.

AGE RELATED:

ISSUE 1: Teams with Super Seniors have an advantage.

Option 1: Change age grid to 18 yrs and under and must still be in high school.

Option 2: Athletes must be attending high school (grade school) or in an equivalent program (determined by number of credits).

Stance: The age works for athletes who start school a year late so the current age rule would not affect athletes that are attending high school. This senior division has deterred athletes from going off to college and cheering in school or on a Level 6 team. Athletes that are in college not only can cheer in college and Level 6 but now many gyms are offering the International Open Level 5 division as well. There are many opportunities for these athletes at this age to cheer. Athletes are physically moving to be a member of a larger more nationally known gym just to cheer on their senior teams after they are graduating from high school. Allowing these athletes who are old enough to be in college on senior teams has skewed the fair play in the senior division. The message that has been sent over the past two years is hang around the gym to cheer on the senior team. I am strong proponent of training the athlete to prepare for college or Level 6 team.

ISSUE 2: Age cut off date does not coincide with most schools. Athletes on bubble are not allowed to compete with their friends and therefore, they are leaving the gyms.

Option 1: Change cut off date to Aug 31st.

ISSUE 3: Gyms losing athletes based off the senior minimum age limitations

Option 1: Get rid of the minimum age requirement on senior teams.

Option 2: Freeze the current minimum age requirement at 11 years old. Do not raise the minimum age past 11.

ISSUE 4: Create depth in Sr Levels

Option 1: Allow 18 & Under for Senior Levels 1 & 2

Stance: Would allow for 18 & under in Level 1 and create more depth in Senior 1 and 2 divisions. These levels are co-ed anyway so it would be in-line with Senior Open.

MISC.:

ISSUE 1: Spring floors have driven up the cost of production for Event Producers and in turn for gyms and families.

Option 1: Outlaw spring floors from competitions.

ISSUE 2: There are too many levels which delete competition.

Option 1: Eliminate level 2.

Option 2: Eliminate level 3.

ISSUE 3: (PURPOSE:) To give further clarification and guidance to event producers, amend the age grid to read as follows:

Option 1: The list above is a "menu" of divisions that may be offered by an individual event producer. An event producer does not have to offer every division listed above. However, a USASF/IASF -member event producer may only offer divisions from the grid above and/or combine/split divisions based the guidelines below, unless prior written approval is received from the USASF/IASF. Divisions/rules that are "less" or "more" restrictive than those listed are not permitted.

Stance: The use of the "more restrictive" clause by event producers continues to cause confusion and has the potential to negatively impact the standardization of rules/divisions that we have all worked for. The proposal above makes it clear that divisions/rules must follow those only offered on the age grid and/or in the level rules.

ISSUE 4: No Senior Open L5

Option 1: Add senior open level 5.

Stance 1: Small gyms trying to put together a level 5 team and the USASF upping the ages in senior division makes it even more difficult for the smaller gyms to field such teams.

Stance 2: This would allow for programs to have a level 5 team if they have youth age athletes that could not be on a standard senior team because of the age minimums and teams who cannot field a standard senior level 5 team but would like to compete at this level.

ISSUE 5: If there is going to continue to be small gym divisions the size of a small gym needs to be smaller

Option 1: Small Gym defined as 65 members

Stance: The unofficial "average size gym" is 100 members. It does not make sense to put the small gym number at an average size gym number. If there continues to be small gym there needs to be a drastic change in the number of athletes in a gym.

ISSUE 6: Help for Small Gyms

Option 1: Limit Senior Open to programs from Small Gyms

Stance: Large gyms have enough depth in their programs to be able to place athletes in standard divisions.

"If/Then" Vote: If you vote for Option 1 then you need to vote for the following option.

Option 1: Remove small gym Senior divisions IF Senior Open is Limited to Small Gyms.

Stance: This would provide for eliminating divisions and creating more depth in competitions. When senior open was first discussed among the rules committee it was created BECAUSE the standard senior divisions restricted smaller programs from being able to field teams. Although large programs have been able to enter these divisions we need to consider the reason why SENIOR OPEN was created in the first place.

ISSUE 7: Further regulate Small Gyms

Option 1: Make franchise/sister or satellite gyms not eligible for Small Gym Divisions regardless of individual gym size.

Stance: Programs and organizations that have the depth and resources to open multiple facilities should not be considered a small gym or program.

ISSUE 8: Division combining

Option 1: Eliminate mandatory division consolidation

ISSUE 9: Division combining/splitting

Option 1: Require that each division register as a single division and then allow Event Producers to split out according to numbers.

Stance: Example: Six Jr teams of all types sign up in the "Junior" division. From this list, the event producer splits them according to type (size and/or males).
Currently, the combining and splitting rules are confusing and frustrating. This will simplify the process and create consistency.

ISSUE 10: Fairness for small teams

Option 1: Drop the number from 15 to 10 teams needed to split a deep division into two.

ISSUE 11: Consistency in splits.

Option 1: Require only 2 teams instead of 3 for the ability to split out small gym divisions, coed splits and small large splits.

Stance: To have 2 teams required in some places and 3 teams in others creates confusion.