Technical Specification & Operational Analysis: Youth Cheer Competition Architecture

1. Domain Overview and Strategic Context

The digital transformation of youth sports has largely focused on objective, high-frequency games like soccer, basketball, and baseball, where the data model is defined by discrete, binary events (goals, fouls, points). Competitive cheerleading, however, presents a fundamentally different challenge for systems architects and product designers. It is a discipline defined by a **subjective-objective hybrid model**, where artistic interpretation intersects with rigid, safety-based engineering constraints. Building a competition module for this domain requires not just a scoring calculator, but a complex compliance engine capable of navigating a fragmented regulatory landscape.

To design a robust data model, scoring engine, and analytics suite, one must first deconstruct the ecosystem into its atomic components. Unlike the monolithic governance of the NFL or NBA, the cheerleading world is a federation of overlapping, independent, and sometimes competing governing bodies. The "product" on the floor—the 2 minute and 30 second routine—is the result of a precise mathematical equation involving athlete age, team size, gender ratios, and skill difficulty "drivers."

This report serves as a comprehensive architectural blueprint. It synthesizes data from the primary governing bodies—the **U.S. All Star Federation (USASF)**, the **International Cheer Union (ICU)**, **USA Cheer**, and major event producers like **Varsity Spirit**—to provide the detailed logic required for software implementation. We will explore the granular mechanics of division eligibility, the algorithmic drivers of difficulty scoring, the "anti-score" logic of deductions, and the operational workflows that define the user journey from registration to the awards ceremony.

1.1 The Governance Taxonomy: Handling Fragmentation

The first hurdle in domain modeling is the lack of a single "source of truth" for rules. Your system must be polymorphic, capable of switching its logic engine based on the **Sanctioning Body** of a specific event. This is not merely a label; it dictates the fundamental validation logic of the application.

There are four primary pillars of governance that the system must accommodate:

1. **USASF (U.S. All Star Federation):** This is the dominant body for "All Star" (private club) cheer in the United States. Their rule set is the industry standard for age grids and safety

levels (1-7). A huge portion of the user base—private gyms—operates almost exclusively within this framework. Their data structure emphasizes "Club" affiliation over "School" affiliation and utilizes strictly defined "Age Grids" based on birth year. [1]

2. **NFHS (National Federation of State High School Associations) / USA Cheer:** This framework governs school-based cheer (High School, Junior High). The primary divergence here is philosophy. While USASF incentivizes maximum difficulty (e.g., highest tumbling passes), NFHS rules prioritize **Risk Minimization**. Consequently, the scoring rubrics for school cheer often weigh "Crowd Leading" (the use of signs, megaphones, and chants) as heavily as athleticism. A scoring engine built solely for All Star will fail for High School clients because it will undervalue the core objective of their discipline. [3]
3. **ICU (International Cheer Union):** This is the governing body for National Teams (e.g., Team USA, Team Japan) and the World Championships. Their scoring sheets are distinct, blending the technical precision of USASF with a broader "Overall Impression" score customary in international Olympic-style adjudication. If the app is intended for global use or "Worlds" bid events, it must support the ICU scoring sheets which differ in point distribution. [5]
4. **Varsity Spirit (United Scoring System):** While Varsity is an event producer rather than a governing body, their **United Scoring System** is the *de facto* standard for the vast majority of competitive events in the U.S. (including UCA, NCA, and The Summit). For a Minimum Viable Product (MVP), the logic engine should prioritize the United Scoring System, as it represents the largest addressable market. This system utilizes specific mathematical "drivers" (Majority, Most, Max) to calculate difficulty. [7]

Strategic Insight for Data Modeling:
The system requires a Competition_Profile configuration object. When an Event Director creates an event, they must select a "Rule Set." This selection should trigger a cascade of configuration settings:

- *Load:* Valid Age Grid (e.g., "USASF_2025_v2").
- *Load:* Scoring Rubric (e.g., "United_Scoring_System_L1-5").
- *Load:* Deduction Protocol (e.g., "Varsity_Standard_Deductions").

This decoupling of the event from the rules allows the platform to remain agile. When the USASF changes the age cutoff from Dec 31 to June 1 (as they frequently do), the platform can simply ingest a new configuration file rather than requiring a hard-code rewrite.

1.2 The Evolution of Scoring: From Subjective to Calculated

To understand the "Why" behind the current scoring complexity, one must look at the sport's trajectory. Historically, cheer scoring was purely subjective—judges awarded points based on "how good it looked." This led to inconsistencies and accusations of bias. In response, the industry shifted toward a **Driver-Based Scoring Model**.

Today, a "Difficulty Score" is not an opinion; it is a calculation. It acts as a tiered threshold

system. To access the "High Range" of points (e.g., 4.5 – 5.0), a team *must* have a specific number of athletes perform a specific skill. If they miss that number by even one athlete, they are mathematically locked into a lower range (e.g., 3.5 – 4.0), regardless of how beautiful the performance was.

For the scoring engine, this means we are building a **Validation Machine**. The inputs are:

- Total Athletes on Floor (N)
- Number of Stunt Groups (G)
- Skill Class Performed (S)

The output is a verified **Range Eligibility**. This shift reduces judge variance but increases the burden on the data model to track granular details. It is no longer enough to know "The team tumbled"; we must know "16 out of 20 athletes tumbled."

---

2. Domain Modeling: Entities and Relationships

The foundation of the application is the schema. We must define the digital twins of the physical entities involved in a competition. The complexity here lies in the "Many-to-Many" relationships and the temporal nature of eligibility (e.g., an athlete is eligible for Junior division *this* year, but maybe not next year).

2.1 The Athlete Entity

The atomic unit of the data model is the **Athlete**. While seemingly simple, the compliance requirements necessitate specific attributes.

Attribute	Data Type	Relevance & Validation Logic	Sources
birth_year	Integer (YYYY)	**CRITICAL.** Eligibility is determined by birth year, not current age. The system must calculate "Competition Age" relative to the season (e.g., Season	[1]

		2024-2025).	
gender	Enum	Determines eligibility for "Coed" vs. "All Girl" divisions. A single male on an "All Girl" roster must trigger a validation error or auto-reclassificatio n.	[1]
us_saf_id	String	Unique identifier for USASF member verification (compliance integration).	[1]
waiver_status	Boolean	Gating mechanism. An athlete cannot be "Checked In" to the warm-up room if false.	[11]
cross_over_id	UUID	Links to other instances of the same athlete on different teams within the same event.	[12]

Deep Dive: The Crossover Problem

In cheer, unlike football, a star athlete can compete on multiple teams at the same event. This is called a "Crossover."

- **Conflict Detection:** The scheduling engine must query the Athlete table to find distinct Team_IDs associated with the same Athlete_ID within an Event_ID.
- **Constraint:** The industry standard requires a minimum of 15-20 minutes between performance times for crossovers to allow for costume changes and hydration. The scheduler must flag a "hard conflict" if this buffer is violated. [12]

2.2 The Team Entity

The **Team** is the container for Athletes. It is defined by its **Division**, which is the intersection of three constraints: Age, Level, and Size.

2.2.1 Age Divisions (The Age Grid)

The "Age Grid" is a matrix that changes annually. Your data model must support versioned age grids.

- **Tiny:** Birth years 2017-2020 (Approx ages 5-7).
- **Mini:** Birth years 2015-2019 (Approx ages 5-9).
- **Youth:** Birth years 2012-2019 (Approx ages 5-12).
- **Junior:** Birth years 2009-2018 (Approx ages 6-15).
- **Senior:** Birth years 6/1/2005 - 2013 (Approx ages 11-19).
- **Open:** Birth years 2011 or earlier (Ages 14+). [1]

Insight: Notice the overlaps. A child born in 2015 is eligible for Mini AND Youth. This strategic flexibility is a key feature for coaches ("roster optimization"). The app should highlight *all* eligible divisions for a given roster, helping the coach maximize their competitive chance.

2.2.2 Team Size (Quantity Drivers)

Divisions are split by size to ensure fair comparisons. A team of 30 has a visual advantage over a team of 10, so they rarely compete directly.

- **Small:** 5 – 22 members.
- **Medium:** 23 – 30 members.
- **Large:** 31 – 38 members.
- **Extra Small (XS):** Used in Worlds divisions (5 – 15 members). [1]

Data Integrity Check: If a coach removes an athlete from the roster due to injury, the system must re-validate the "Team Size" attribute. If a "Medium" team drops to 22 members, they typically must be re-classified as "Small" or compete with a penalty. The system should automate this alert.

2.3 The Level Object (Skill Constraints)

The **Level** (1-7) acts as a specialized rule set for the Scoring and Deduction engines. It dictates the Valid_Skills_List.

- **Level 1:** Ground-bound skills. No tosses. Stunts at prep level (shoulder height).
- **Level 2:** Handsprings. Single-leg stunts at prep level. Tosses allowed (straight ride).
- **Level 3:** Tucks (flips). Extended single-leg stunts.
- **Level 4:** Layouts.
- **Level 5:** Full twists.
- **Level 6/7:** Elite acrobatics (double fulls, free flipping). [10]

Implication for Deductions: The deduction interface needs context. If a judge selects "Level

2 Team," the button for "Illegal Back Tuck" should be active. If "Level 3 Team" is selected, that button should be disabled (as back tucks are legal).

---

3. The Scoring Engine: Logic and Mathematics

This is the core intellectual property of the application. We are not summing simple integers; we are executing a logic tree. The **United Scoring System** (Varsity) is the baseline model.

3.1 The Difficulty Formula: Majority, Most, and Max

To determine a team's **Difficulty Score**, the system must apply "Quantity Drivers." These are thresholds based on the number of athletes on the floor.

Definitions:

- **Majority:** $50\% + 1$ of the team.
- **Most:** Defined by a specific table (usually ~75%).
- **Max:** The maximum number of groups possible (Total Athletes / 4). [7]

3.1.1 The Stunt Quantity Table

This table must be embedded in the backend logic. It converts "Team Size" into "Required Stunt Groups."

Team Size (Athletes)	Max Possible Groups (N/4)	Requirement for "Majority"	Requirement for "Most"	Requirement for "Max"
5 - 11	1-2	1	2	3
12 - 17	3-4	2	3	4
18 - 22	4-5	3	4	5
23 - 30	5-7	4	5	6
31 - 38	7-9	5	6	7

Note: Data derived from.[9]

3.1.2 Scoring Logic Tree (Example: Level 3 Stunts)

How does the system calculate a score range?

- **Scenario:** A team of 20 athletes (Medium Division).
- **Inputs:**
  - Team Size: 20
  - Stunt Groups Performed: 4
  - Skill Performed: Extended Lib (Level Appropriate)
- **Logic:**
  1. Look up "Most" requirement for size 20: Table says **4 groups**.
  2. Check Input Groups: 4 groups. Requirement Met? **Yes**.
  3. Check Skill Level: Level Appropriate? **Yes**.
- **Result:** The team qualifies for the **Mid Range** (3.5 – 4.0 points).
- **Upside Logic:** To reach the **High Range** (4.0 – 5.0), the team would need to perform *Elite* Level Skills (e.g., Twisting transition to Lib) with the same quantity.

Developer Requirement: The app needs a "Calculator" view for coaches.

- *Input:* "I have 19 athletes."
- *Output:* "You need 3 groups for Majority, 4 for Most. To score a 4.5, you need 4 groups hitting an Elite skill."

3.2 The Scoring Rubric Components

The Score_Sheet object aggregates scores from multiple categories. Each category has its own distinct drivers. [8]

A. Building Categories (The "Stunt" Judge)

1. **Partner Stunts (15-20 pts):**
   - *Difficulty:* Derived from the Logic Tree above.
   - *Execution:* Subjective (0-5 or 0-10). Scores "Technique" (body lines) and "Stability" (wobbles).
2. **Pyramids (15-20 pts):**
   - *Driver:* **Structures**. To score High Range, the pyramid must include 2+ distinct "structures" (connected shapes) and use "Level Appropriate" transitions (e.g., tick-tocks, inversions).
   - *Logic:* Count the transitions. $Count \ge 2 \rightarrow$ Range Eligible.
3. **Tosses (5-10 pts):** (Not applicable for Level 1). Drivers are height and body position.

B. Tumbling Categories (The "Tumble" Judge)

1. **Standing Tumbling (10-20 pts):**
   - *Driver:* **Sync**. High scores require the "Most" or "Max" of the team tumbling *in synchronization*.
   - *Input Field:* "Number of Athletes Sync Tumbled."
2. **Running Tumbling (10-20 pts):**

- *Driver:* Difficulty of the pass. (e.g., Level 3: Round-off BHS Tuck).

C. Overall Categories (The "Head" Judge)

1. **Jumps (5-10 pts):**
   - *Driver:* **Variety**. Must perform 2 *different* jumps (e.g., Toe Touch + Pike).
   - *Driver:* **Connection**. Must be connected (whip approach). [9]
2. **Dance (5-10 pts):** Energy, formation changes, visual appeal.
3. **Routine Composition:** Creative use of the floor, flow, pace.

3.3 The Comparative Scoring Model ("Ordinals")

At elite events like **The Cheerleading Worlds**, the scoring shifts from "Absolute" (getting a 95/100) to "Comparative" (ranking 1st, 2nd, 3rd). [19]

How it works:

- Judge watches Team A. Gives Stunt Score: **Low Range (12 pts)**.
- Judge watches Team B. Team B is clearly better.
- Judge *must* give Team B a score **> 12 pts**.
- **System Requirement:** The judging interface must display a **"Ranking Ladder"** on the side of the screen.
  - *Current Rank 1:* Team C (14.2)
  - *Current Rank 2:* Team A (12.0)
  - *Current Team:* Team B. The judge enters "13.5".
  - *System Action:* Slots Team B into Rank 2 automatically.

This prevents "Score Creep" (where scores get artificially higher later in the day) and ensures the ranking reflects the true hierarchy.

3.4 Tie-Breaking Logic

Ties are common and must be broken systematically. The app needs a "Tie-Breaker Engine" that runs automatically when Total_Score_A == Total_Score_B.

Standard Tie-Breaker Hierarchy (Varsity/ICU):

1. **Least Deductions:** The team with the "cleaner" routine wins.
2. **Highest Execution Score:** If deductions are equal, the team with better technique wins.
3. **Highest Difficulty Score:** (Rarely used as 3rd tier).
4. **Judge's Choice:** (Last resort). [20]

---

4. The Deduction Engine: The "Anti-Score"

While the scoring judges look for what went *right*, the **Safety Judge** looks for what went

wrong. Deductions are objective penalties that are subtracted from the final raw score. This is where the app needs precise "Live Tagging" functionality.

4.1 Deduction Types and Values

The data model must include a Deduction_Event entity with specific types. These values are standardized across most major producers (Varsity, USASF). [21]

Code	Deduction Type	Value	Definition
AB	Athlete Bobble	**-0.25**	Hands/knees touch down during tumbling or jump. Stunt balance check.
AF	Athlete Fall	**-0.50**	Athlete body (hip/back) hits the floor in tumbling.
BB	Building Bobble	**-0.50**	Stunt wobbles significantly but is saved.
BF	Building Fall	**-2.00 to -2.25**	Stunt drops to a cradle or load-in position early (controlled fall).
MBF	Major Building Fall	**-3.00+**	Stunt drops to ground; top person hits floor; multiple bases fall.
PF	Pyramid Fall	**-4.00**	Multiple connected stunts fall (Collapse).
OOB	Out of Bounds	**-0.50**	Stepping off the mat with one full

			foot.
TIME	Time Violation	**-1.00 / 5s**	Routine exceeds 2:30 limit.
SAFETY	Rule Violation	**-5.00+**	Illegal skill performed (e.g., Level 2 basket toss).
IMG	Image Policy	**-0.25**	Inappropriate uniform, music, or choreography.

4.2 Operational Workflow: The Safety Judge

The Safety Judge does not write notes; they **tag events**.

- **Interface:** A representation of the 9-panel mat.
- **Action:** When a fall occurs, the judge taps the location on the screen.
- **Data Captured:** { type: "BF", value: -2.0, time: "01:14", location: "Panel 5, Center" }.

Video Integration: This timestamp is critical. Coaches often dispute deductions ("That wasn't a fall, it was a dismount!"). The system should link this timestamp to the competition video feed, allowing the "AccuScore" official to instantly replay the exact second of the alleged error.

---

5. Operational Workflow: The Event Lifecycle

A cheer competition is a logistical machine. Teams move through a strict sequence of events. The app must manage this **Schedule Flow**.

5.1 Pre-Event: Registration and Compliance

- **Roster Upload:** Coaches upload CSV rosters.
- **Validation:** System checks birth years against the Event_Division.
  - *Edge Case:* "Playing Up." An athlete is technically "Youth" but rostered on "Junior." System checks if this is allowed (usually yes) vs. "Playing Down" (usually no).
- **Waiver Management:** Digital signatures for liability.
- **Music Compliance:** Uploading music files and verifying licensing (a major legal issue in

cheer).

5.2 The Warm-Up Room (Backstage Logistics)

The "Warm-Up" is a timed assembly line. Teams rotate every 5-7 minutes. [24]

Station Sequence:

1. **Check-In:** (Roster verification via QR code).
2. **Stretch Mat:** (Static stretching).
3. **Tumble Strip:** (A long spring strip for tumbling warm-up).
4. **Stunt Warm-Up:** (A partial floor for stunts).
5. **Full Floor:** (The "Dress Rehearsal" - Full routine with music).
6. **On Deck:** (Holding area).

System Feature: The app needs a **"Pacing Dashboard"** for the "Pit Boss" (Backstage Manager). If "Team A" is late, the Pit Boss marks them "Delayed." The system calculates the ripple effect: "All subsequent teams are now +4 minutes late." This updates the "Estimated Performance Time" on the public-facing app for parents.

5.3 Post-Event: The Review (AccuScore)

Once the routine ends, the clock starts for the coach.

- **Score Sheet Release:** Scores are pushed to the coach's app (or printed).
- **Challenge Window:** The coach has ~20 minutes to file a "Review Request" (AccuScore).
- **Resolution:** The Head Judge reviews the video (using the timestamped tags) and accepts or rejects the challenge. The score is then finalized.

---

6. Analytics and Insights: Teams and Individuals

This section moves beyond "management" to "intelligence." This is where the app provides unique value. By structuring the data around **Quantity Drivers** and **Deductions**, we can generate high-value KPIs.

6.1 Team Analytics: The "Hit Zero" KPI

"Hit Zero" is the holy grail. It means a routine with **0.00 Deductions**.

- **Metric:** Hit_Zero_Percentage
- **Visualization:** A trend line of "Deduction Points per Competition."
    - *Insight:* "Your team averages -1.5 deductions in the first 3 competitions. Teams that Hit Zero are 85% more likely to podium." [26]

6.2 Score Sheet Maximization (Gap Analysis)

- **Concept:** Compare the team's *Actual Difficulty* vs. the *Theoretical Max* for their division.
- **Algorithm:**
  - *Input:* Team has 20 athletes. Performs 3 Elite Stunt Groups.
  - *Current Score:* Mid Range (3.8).
  - *Potential:* If they add **1 more group**, they hit "Most" (4 groups) and jump to High Range (4.5).
- **Feature:** A "What-If" Calculator. "If we turn this Double-Base stunt into a Single-Base stunt, does our difficulty go up?"

6.3 Individual & Stunt Group Analytics

The app should allow defining **Stunt Groups** (sub-units of 4 athletes).

- **Entity:** Stunt_Group {Flyer: Alice, Base: Bob, Base: Carol, Spot: Dave}.
- **Data Point:** When the Safety Judge tags a "Building Fall," they can attribute it to "Center Group" (mapped to Alice's group).
- **Insight:** "Alice's group has fallen in 3 consecutive events. The falls happen at minute 2:15 (Pyramid section). Possible stamina issue." [27]

6.4 High Performance & Injury Prevention

Using data from research [29]:

- **Load Monitoring:** Track the number of "Full Out" routines performed in a week.
- **Fatigue Correlation:** Correlate "Building Falls" with "Time of Routine." (e.g., "80% of falls happen in the last 30 seconds").
- **Concussion Proxy:** If an athlete logs a "Head Injury" deduction, the system should flag them for a "Return to Play" protocol, blocking them from being rostered until cleared.

---

7. Technical Architecture Recommendations

7.1 Offline-First Syncing

Cheer competitions often occur in concrete convention centers with saturated networks.

- **Requirement:** The Judge's iPad app must be **Offline-First**. Scores are saved to a local SQLite/Realm database.
- **Sync:** Data syncs to the central cloud via local Mesh Network or when connectivity is restored.
- **Conflict Resolution:** Use "Last Write Wins" or a timestamp-based merge strategy.

7.2 Technology Stack Suggestions

- **Backend:** Node.js or Python (Django) for the complex logic engine.
- **Database:** PostgreSQL (Relational is best for the rigid Division/Team/Athlete structure).

- **Frontend:** React Native or Flutter for cross-platform mobile apps (Coaches/Judges).
- **Video:** Integration with AWS MediaConvert for processing routine videos and linking JSON timestamps.

7.3 Data Privacy (COPPA/GDPR)

Since this app manages data for minors (Age 5+), strict privacy controls are mandatory.

- **Access Control:** Only rostered coaches and verified parents can see athlete-level data.
- **Anonymization:** Public leaderboards should show "Team Names," not "Athlete Names."

---

8. Conclusion

Building a youth cheer competition module is a sophisticated undertaking. It requires a system that is part **calculator**, part **legal ledger**, and part **logistics manager**.

The success of the platform will depend on its ability to handle the "Edge Cases" of the domain: the Crossover athletes, the shifting Age Grids, and the nuanced "Drivers" of difficulty scoring. By implementing the "Stunt Group" granularity and "Hit Zero" analytics defined in this report, the application will transition from a simple scoring utility to an indispensable strategic tool for the modern cheer ecosystem.

9. Appendix: Reference Tables

9.1 Standard Deduction Values (Varsity/United Scoring)

Code	Type	Value	Context
AB	Athlete Bobble	**-0.25**	Individual error (tumbling land on knees).
AF	Athlete Fall	**-0.50**	Individual major error (body hits floor).
BB	Building Bobble	**-0.50**	Stunt wobbles significantly.
BF	Building Fall	**-2.00**	Stunt drops early (controlled).

MBF	Major Building Fall	**-3.00**	Stunt drops to ground (uncontrolled).
PF	Pyramid Fall	**-4.00**	2+ connected stunts fall.
SAFETY	Safety Violation	**-5.00**	Performing illegal skill.

9.2 Stunt Quantity Drivers (Example for Medium Team: 20 Athletes)

Range	Requirement	Score Cap
Low	Less than Majority (< 3 Groups)	3.0 - 3.5
Mid	Majority (3 Groups)	3.5 - 4.0
High	Most (4 Groups) + Elite Skill	4.5 - 5.0

Note: The "High" range requires both quantity ("Most") AND quality ("Elite Skill").

Works cited

1. CHEER AGE GRID - USASF, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.usasf.net/files/USASF_Cheer_Age_Grid_25-26pdf.pdf
2. 2025-2026 IASF Division List Age Eligibility - IASFworlds.net, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.iasfworlds.net/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/iasf_agegrid_25-26.pdf
3. Risk Minimization Focus of 2025-26 High School Spirit Rules Changes - NFHS, accessed December 9, 2025, https://nfhs.org/stories/risk-minimization-focus-of-2025-26-high-school-spirit-rules-changes
4. Spirit Rules Changes - 2024-25 - NFHS, accessed December 9, 2025, https://nfhs.org/resources/sports/spirit-rules-changes-2024-25
5. ICU and IASF: What's the difference? - Cheer Aspirations, accessed December 9, 2025, https://cheeraspirations.com/icu-and-iasf-whats-the-difference/
6. USASF, IASF, USA Cheer & ICU - What Are They and What's the Difference? - TheCheerBuzz, accessed December 9, 2025,

https://www.thecheerbuzz.com/the-usasf-iasf-icu-what-are-they-and-whats-the-difference/
7. 2024 - 2025 UNITED SCORING SYSTEM Scoring Rubric ALL ..., accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.varsity.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/24-25-Varsity-All-Star-Traditional-Recreation-Scoring-Rubric.pdf
8. 2024 - 2025 UNITED SCORING SYSTEM Scoring Rubric ALL TRADITIONAL RECREATION DIVISIONS - Varsity.com, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.varsity.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/24-25-United-Scoring-Rubric-Traditional-Recreation-1.pdf
9. 2025 - 2026 UNITED SCORING SYSTEM Scoring Rubric, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.unitedscoringpartners.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/25-26-United-Scoring-Rubric-Level-1-5-Tiny-Mini-Youth-Junior-Senior-excluding-Coed.pdf
10. 2024-2025 Recreation Cheer Division Grid, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.cheeranddanceextreme.com/uploads/3/0/8/3/30837539/2024-20245_cde_recreation_cheer_divisions.pdf
11. Youth/Rec Divisions & Scoring - Varsity.com, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.varsity.com/youth-rec/competitions/divisions-and-scoring/
12. The Summit Championship Information Guide - Varsity.com, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.varsity.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/VAS_INT_Summit_InfoGuide_25-2.pdf
13. DANCE AGE GRID - USASF, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.usasf.net/files/USASF_Dance_Age_Grid_25-26.pdf
14. 2024-2025 USASF Dance Age Grid - AWS, accessed December 9, 2025, https://usasfmain.s3.amazonaws.com/Rules/2024-25/USASF_Dance_Age_Grid_24-25.pdf
15. CHEER RULES - USASF, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.usasf.net/files/USASF_Cheer_Rules_25-26.pdf
16. A Guide to Understanding the United Scoring System Scoresheet - Cheer Theory, accessed December 9, 2025, https://cheertheory.com/the-united-scoring-scoresheet-explained/
17. universal cheerleaders association school / rec score sheet, accessed December 9, 2025, https://irp.cdn-website.com/37db6f89/files/uploaded/25.26-UCA-Performance-Score-Sheets-5.14.pdf
18. 24-25 HS Scoring.xlsx - Varsity.com, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.varsity.com/uca/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/UCA_AllGirl_School-Rec_ScoreSheets_05-06.pdf
19. A Guide to The Cheerleading Worlds 2025 Scoresheets - Cheer Theory, accessed December 9, 2025, https://cheertheory.com/a-guide-to-the-cheerleading-worlds-2025-scoresheets/
20. RULES/SCORING - ICC, accessed December 9, 2025, https://w-cheer.net/rules-and-scoring/

21. 2022 - 2023 DEDUCTIONS - Varsity.com, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.varsity.com/uca/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/22-23-UCA-Cheer-Deductions.pdf
22. What Is a BB, AF and Major BF in Cheerleading? + 6 More Deductions - TheCheerBuzz, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.thecheerbuzz.com/what-is-a-bb-af-and-major-bf-in-cheerleading/
23. aau cheerleading prep, accessed December 9, 2025, https://image.aausports.org/sports/cheer/2021/PrepScoring/DeductionsExplanations.pdf
24. Planning for Perfection: A Cheer Coach's Guide to Organizing Practice Sessions Effectively, accessed December 9, 2025, https://ippmusic.com/planning-for-perfection-a-cheer-coachs-guide-to-organizing-practice-sessions-effectively/
25. What Happens During 'Warm-ups' At Competition? - Cheer UP Athletics | All Star Cheerleading RI, accessed December 9, 2025, https://cheerupathletics.com/what-happens-during-warm-ups-at-competition/
26. Quick Guide: What Does "Hit Zero" Mean In Cheerleading? - TheCheerBuzz, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.thecheerbuzz.com/quick-guide-what-does-hit-zero-mean-in-cheerleading/
27. How to Spot Cheer Stunts Safely, accessed December 9, 2025, https://thecheerkin.com/how-to-spot-cheer-stunts-safely/
28. Stunting : r/Cheerleading - Reddit, accessed December 9, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/Cheerleading/comments/1gt6wrs/stunting/
29. Assessment of fatigue and recovery in elite cheerleaders prior to and during the ICU World Championships - PubMed Central, accessed December 9, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10025303/
30. Protecting Athletes: The Link Between Cheerleading and Concussions, accessed December 9, 2025, https://biausa.org/public-affairs/media/protecting-athletes-the-link-between-cheerleading-and-concussions