

NJCAA Mission

“The NJCAA’s mission is to promote, govern and foster a competitive environment for two-year college athletics. The NJCAA recognizes the diverse nature of its membership, providing at all times a consistent and inclusive governance structure that provides opportunities for all stakeholders and emphasizes the academic, athletic, and community involvement goals of all student-athletes.”

Tuesday, October 8

5 p.m. Joint Committees Discussion.

Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4792195784?pwd=Q1p1M2JlbG9ZZE9KOFNXV1RvVXgwdz09>

- Board Chair: Troy Tucker

“Open discussion”

Sadiaa Jones proposed the enhancement of rules, bylaws, and ejection procedures to facilitate a clearer distinction from the NCAA while also refining our operational processes. Dean raised concerns regarding the potential for a reactionary stance in our relationship with the NCAA. Dr. Parker reassured the group that the NCAA is willing to engage and foster relationships with the NJCAA. He highlighted the efforts of Kyle and Michelle as instrumental in strengthening this relationship. Michelle confirmed that the process of mending ties is progressing positively. Board members inquired about the perceived disconnect regarding GPA standards from the NCAA, which some felt was an attack on the NJCAA. Dr. Parker emphasized the availability of data and statistics to substantiate their concerns and to facilitate communication with the NCAA. Jeff White noted the increased conversations from governmental relationships that could enhance discussions concerning NJCAA student-athletes. Michelle and Troy addressed NCAA concerns regarding the Graduation Success Rate and Academic Performance Rate of NJCAA student-athletes. Troy elaborated on how NCAA football impacts the NJCAA, particularly the loss of players during playoffs if they sign with NCAA teams. He also mentioned that timelines are affected, leading to fewer coaches attending games, as recruiting has become more digital. This shift allows coaches to observe games from their offices rather than visiting NJCAA institutions. There is a noticeable decline in NJCAA student-athletes participating in NCAA sports, a trend that may get worse with the introduction of new roster limit regulations. While this situation presents an opportunity to retain NJCAA athletes, it also poses challenges in facilitating their transition to NCAA institutions. Troy Tucker discussed the necessity for uniform rules and guidelines across all levels, citing the disparity between schools that successfully produce Division I athletes and those that struggle to assemble a roster numerically. The group discussed the decisions that should be made at the level of individual institutions compared to those applicable to all institutions collectively. Mike Saddler addressed the necessity of eliminating all-encompassing regulations within the NJCAA, emphasizing that not all schools possess the same capabilities. There is sufficient turnover to justify the division of institutions and the establishment of rules that would facilitate student eligibility rather than ineligibility. Each campus has unique characteristics, making it challenging to implement uniform governance; however, it is essential to achieve the desired changes. Dean noted that many experienced athletic directors prefer a one-size-fits-all approach due to a lack of confidence in younger staff to adhere to and manage the rules effectively. Jeff introduced Honest Game, a software designed to serve as a clearinghouse for NJCAA bylaws and regulations. Further information will be provided shortly, but the primary objective is to assist smaller institutions in addressing concerns and obtaining NCAA approval. Currently, they collaborate with several high schools and only one NJCAA institution in California. The discussion shifted back to the issue of young coaches who may inadvertently violate rules due to a lack of awareness, which hampers their ability to contribute to the Honest Game software. During the conversation regarding potential rule discussions by division, Darin Monroe inquired whether a single division would be established for all sports. While this may raise certain concerns, it could also resolve numerous issues. The topic of regional realignment was acknowledged as potentially complicated. The group expressed a willingness to consider realignment in relation to post-season qualifications and the implications of such changes. Additionally, discussions encompassed the possibility of differentiating rules based on the level of competition or division, as well as the aspirations of schools to advance their student-athletes to higher levels of competition. It was observed that NJCAA student-athletes do not perceive divisions one, two, or three in the same competitive context at their level. The conversation then transitioned to the separation of rules and bylaws concerning scholarship versus non-scholarship models. While Division III initially supported this idea, opinions shifted as the vote approached. Multidivisional institutions had previously expressed their views on this matter but felt that their representation did not adequately reflect the entire region, but rather the perspective of a single board member. Several divisions are currently associated with Division II. A total of 13 votes were cast in favor of evaluating support based on institutional criteria, while only one vote favored a sport-specific approach. Alison Mohr addressed the trend of schools transitioning to Division II to enhance their competitive opportunities. Dean Myrick introduced the concept of differentiating between scholarship and non-scholarship athletes rather than focusing solely on division classifications, a notion that Mike Saddler supported. The group engaged in a discussion regarding the distinct governance and eligibility regulations that arise from the scholarship versus non-scholarship distinction. It was noted that this differentiation is already being implemented for athletes, many of whom aim to progress to Division I

sports within the NCAA framework. Athletes receive guidance tailored to their aspirations, with regulations designed to establish a foundational level of access rather than imposing restrictive upper limits, thereby facilitating entry for numerous athletes. Mike emphasized the necessity of maintaining a low threshold for rules applicable to all 500+ institutions, which would enhance the model and create additional opportunities for athletes to participate. The dialogue then shifted to the issue of schools not being fully aligned as full-time institutions, citing part-time entities such as technical colleges as examples. The Committee deliberated on the possibility for colleges to choose between full-time and part-time status. Concerns regarding a lack of commitment among women in sports were raised, distinguishing this issue from academic performance metrics such as grade point averages or credit hours. It was acknowledged that the NCAA has varying game limits across different sports. Additionally, the option for Division III NJCAA colleges to compete against preparatory schools was discussed, with the understanding that this would be exclusive to the Division III level. Sadaia Jones expressed that imposing the same standards as Division I might not be conducive to the success of Division III institutions. Furthermore, it was suggested that the procedural chart could be improved to highlight the differences among sports, including variations in season lengths and distinctions between part-time and full-time coaching roles. The committee closed the discussion with various proposed agenda items. The initial topic raised was the idea of implementing an automatic qualification for the host site. Although Jamestown Golf had previously voted against this, they are no longer receiving an automatic qualification. Last year, a one-time exception was granted to them. Other institutions have expressed interest in hosting, and Brett addressed the current bids, highlighting a concern regarding the absence of bids at this time. He proposed reviewing the fees, which are currently set at \$900 but are expected to increase to \$1500. A significant issue surrounding golf is the financial losses incurred by the host site. While Division III has some of its tournament fees covered, Division I colleges do not. There is a considerable risk that a host may withdraw if there is no guarantee of qualification. Another pressing concern raised was the challenge of filling the tournament field with sufficient teams. Historically, there were more participants, with 11 teams and 78 golfers competing last year. A motion was proposed to allow the host to qualify, which received a second. Rod Lovett pointed out that 120 players are required to adequately fill a golf tournament; however, exceeding 90 players may lead to time constraints as daylight diminishes. Additionally, the issue of incomplete fields arises from a high number of teams reporting inaccurate participant counts by the time the tournament commences. **At the end of this discussion, Dean retracted his motion.** There was a warning against altering sport codes without prior review by the sport committee. The group ultimately voted to maintain the existing sport codes, and the motion passed unanimously.

- LOI Discussion:
 - **Signing Date**

According to Article 6, Section 282, official visits are permissible; however, the Letter of Intent (LOI) section does not specify when a student-athlete may sign the LOI. The group concurred that this lack of clarity is problematic and warrants revision for a clearer definition. It was suggested that LOIs should not be signed for the current year until the student has graduated from high school. Division III institutions could potentially secure commitments from students earlier, even in the absence of scholarships. The proposed language indicates that when signing a high school senior for the current academic year, they must have either graduated or passed the official signing date for sports. A proposal was presented stating that high school students should be prohibited from signing Letters of Intent (LOI) for the current academic year until after their graduation. The timing of graduation may influence this decision, as different schools have varying graduation dates, and some students may require summer classes to complete their requirements. While this issue may not be perceived as significant by many, a recommendation was made to potentially conduct a trial period for Division III football to evaluate its effectiveness. Additionally, another motion was proposed to postpone the discussion, as any changes will not take effect until April. The vote was successful in deferring the matter for further deliberation and referral to the eligibility and football committees.

- **Cancellation of LOI**

The discussion commenced with student athletes declining to sign the release that was initially established to safeguard their interests. An addendum was incorporated into the Letter of Intent (LOI), indicating that they would not receive assistance, despite the fact that such assistance could not be allocated to another student athlete. While an addendum can be introduced to remove athletes, the situation differs when they voluntarily withdraw. Jeff proposed a motion to amend the language to clarify that the student has opted not to participate, which was unanimously approved by both the eligibility and sport governance committee.

- **Duplicates LOI**

The appeals committee has previously ruled differently on this matter. While athletes are required to provide the final signature on the Letter of Intent (LOI), any discrepancies may still arise from the administrator's actions. According to the bylaws, the consequence for student-athletes is that they become ineligible for the entire academic year. Jeff informed the attendees that this situation affects less than one percent of cases, indicating that it is not a significant concern. The discussion then shifted to the overall dependability of the search engine when entering first and last names. Jeff reassured the committee that the accuracy of the information entered is contingent upon the individual inputting the data, as errors are inevitable regardless of the search parameters. He noted that changing the search criteria from names to birthdates would not resolve the issue, although the date of birth could be incorporated into the search process. The committee voted to modify the search engine to incorporate date of birth while permitting appeals to address any related issues.

- Apparel for Signing Day.

The committee reached a consensus that this initiative could be advantageous from a marketing perspective and represents an excellent opportunity to support the students. A motion was proposed to permit an institutional policy allowing student athletes to wear apparel on signing day. This motion received unanimous approval.

- Amateurism

There exists a degree of ambiguity regarding the compensation status of international student-athletes. The group referenced FBS quarterbacks who, after earning substantial sums, could opt to transfer to NJCAA institutions. The dynamics of Name, Image, and Likeness (NIL) agreements differ significantly from those applicable to professional athletes and international competitors engaged in professional sports. The advantages of playing at a professional level surpass the financial benefits associated with NIL. This discourse has prompted considerations about raising the eligibility age to 20 or prior to college admission. Questions have emerged concerning the data that justifies the selection of ages 19 and 20. The committee explored the possibility of implementing a system akin to that in baseball, allowing athletes to compete professionally and subsequently return to collegiate play. A vote was conducted, resulting in 12 votes in favor and 3 against the proposal to adjust the age from 19 to 20. Following the vote, a question was posed regarding the rationale for not setting the age at 21, suggesting that this adjustment could apply across all sports.

- Requirements for Participating in Team Activities
- Recruitable student-athletes from discontinued or level changing programs

6:30 p.m. Dinner in National Office/Break

7 p.m. Governance Committee Meeting: Agenda Review and Initial Discussion

Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/7568146047?pwd=VU9tUFhuSFhCUlpsVjRXSFhUZThlZz09>

- Location: Downstairs Conference Room
- Topics: Agenda Review and Initial Discussion

8:30 p.m. Conclude meetings/Social Presented by Brett Monaghan

Wednesday, October 9

8 a.m. Breakfast available in Hotel.

9 a.m. Sport Governance Committee Meeting

Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/7568146047?pwd=VU9tUFhuSFhCUlpsVjRXSFhUZThlZz09>

- Location: Downstairs Conference Room
- Focus:
 - Ejection Policies

A motion was made and seconded to adhere to the NCAA rulebook regarding ejections. In the NCAA framework, ejections and suspensions are determined by the conference. It is unclear who establishes these rules, as no conference commissioner is responsible for them. Additionally, officials have expressed confusion regarding the distinction between violent and non-violent actions. Umpires do not dictate the duration of games; their role is to report incidents that occur. There is a challenge in obtaining timely reports of ejections from schools. The previous system, which required both schools to submit reports, was abandoned; under that system, the stricter penalty was enforced. A proposal has been made to focus solely on the ejection aspect while maintaining the current policies regarding non-collegial behavior and racial slurs. A question was raised regarding the necessity for a different approach, stemming from the belief that the NJCAA preferred to avoid suspending coaches who had not been ejected. The commissioner has the authority to make rulings based on the severity of incidents, but not every situation is treated the same; each athletic director would manage their respective cases. The discussion included the athletic director's capacity to make decisions regarding their institution's cases as well as those of others, a practice not currently observed by the NCAA SEC. There is a preference for an independent third party to review these matters. Rod noted that suspensions may vary depending on the number of games remaining in the season, contrasting situations such as week three with 27 games left versus week 27 with only three games remaining. The aim is to move away from doubling suspensions, allowing for a coach to be ejected and return to coach later the same day, while still addressing non-collegial behavior for significant infractions. A primary concern is the verification of suspensions. Education and confirmation regarding the ejection of student-athletes are essential. On the ejection form, athletic directors can indicate the number of games associated with the ejection, and the NJCAA will verify this by reviewing a chart for accuracy in the number of ejections. Reports from officials will be compared with those from coaches and athletic directors. It may be beneficial to include in the form a section indicating the number of ejections (0-4) and a drop-down menu specifying whether it is the first, second, or third ejection for the individual. There are some differences between the official form and the athletic director's forms. A question arose concerning the motion to adhere to the NCAA rulebook while maintaining the current process for submitting ejections, keeping non-collegial and racial slurs. This vote was seconded, and it passed unanimously. There is no penalty for coaches who fail to submit the ejection report form. A motion was proposed to maintain the current policy, which received a second, and the vote was passed unanimously. The group engaged in a discussion regarding the challenges of focusing on official reports, particularly during jamboree events where numerous games are officiated simultaneously. Several coaches are being trained and are rotating through these games. The athletic director possesses the authority to remove players who are not participating in the game. Rod advised the group to be cautious about eliminating the sight and sound rule. It should remain in effect for all sports on game days involving ejections. Football was cited as an example, particularly in relation to the targeting rule, which allows players to remain on the bench. The NCAA's stance on yellow cards aligns with that of the NJCAA. Additionally, the group highlighted the similarities in soccer regulations between the NCAA and NJCAA.

- Sportsmanship Roundtable – violent vs. non-violent, collegial vs. non-collegial, bench
- Ejections during scrimmages.

You are excluded from the remainder of the date unless it pertains to a non-collegial event. Darin inquired about what can be consistently controlled. Rod indicated that only non-collegial events are considered for scrimmages, to which the dean concurred. A motion was proposed by the dean and seconded to allow scrimmages solely prior to the official game date. Voting on non-collegial matters solely for scrimmages has been reported, with the submission of ejections approved by a majority of five votes to two.

- Minimum roster numbers submitted for eligibility to be certified

The group convened to discuss the certification of six student athletes at the onset of the season and explored a scenario concerning the potential lack of players. The conversation centered on the necessity of securing enough participants to establish a team. Implementing a penalty could assist schools in avoiding the frequent discontinuation of sports programs, which may present a divisional challenge. Troy raised the issue of the minimum number of games required and the possibility of appealing decisions if adverse weather conditions hinder game play. Brett proposed transitioning to a system of tiered sanctions, to which Amanda concurred. The discussion then shifted to the distinction between scholarship and non-scholarship athletes, as well as the Division I, II, and III models. A recommendation was made to initially categorize athletes as either scholarship or non-scholarship, subsequently delineating them into the three divisions. This approach would allow for a clear declaration of scholarship status. The Division III model may be more suitable for Division II institutions seeking a definitive stance. There exists a misconception regarding the lack of benefits associated with Division III. Sport governance endorsed the proposal to explore the separation of these categories, with Troy agreeing that the process should commence with the scholarship versus non-scholarship classification, followed by a breakdown into the three divisions.

- Minimum number of contests to be considered for post season eligibility

Play 50% of maximum allowable games vote ruled to leave in place. This could impact outdoor sports more with weather concerns and not being able to have enough make-up dates. Soccer constantly faces issues with weather and travel amounting to only six to nine games.

- Redshirt Policies

The group initiated a discussion to determine whether the issue at hand pertains solely to football or if it encompasses other sports as well. Should this proposal be approved, it would mark the commencement of a lengthy process, contingent upon the NCAA's acknowledgment. Brett, Rod, and Darin have convened to formulate questions for the NCAA, although they may not receive extensive responses. The conversation is particularly focused on redshirting, which remains a significant concern. The opportunity to participate in three games is advantageous and aligns with NCAA regulations. Any dissent regarding NCAA perspectives on redshirting will be addressed as changes occur, but the group intends to comply with NCAA guidelines if they are upheld. Football was cited as an example, illustrating that players can compete in up to three games during their first year without jeopardizing their eligibility. Most NJCAA student-athletes engage with JUCO programs for approximately two and a half years. The impact of COVID-19 was also discussed, highlighting how student-athletes lost eligibility due to adherence to NCAA rules. The dialogue then shifted to the ratio of games played versus the percentage of games that affect eligibility. Currently, in football, participating in even one game counts against eligibility unless a hardship is declared. The appeal committee has processed appeals over the past two years, allowing athletes to bypass the hardship requirement. Rod raised the issue of athletes who miss the midpoint of the season and struggle to recover from injuries successfully. Darin discussed the ruling that favors athletes, aimed at assisting student-athletes with medical redshirt considerations. He posed the question of whether we should evaluate 30% of the maximum allowable games or 30% of games played, specifically to each team. The conversation returned to the best interests of NJCAA student-athletes at two-year institutions and those transitioning to four-year colleges. Darin proposed a motion to adopt a reactive approach, contingent upon NCAA acceptance and subsequent board approval following NCAA confirmation. Alison emphasized that medical redshirts should be distinguished from other redshirt categories. It was acknowledged that the NCAA possesses numerous resources that are not available to us. Rod expressed concern that this situation might lead to student-athletes transferring after their entire team redshirts, potentially jeopardizing their next two seasons. Additionally, student-athletes may feel pressured by the NCAA to participate in games while attempting to preserve a year of eligibility. Jake proposed a motion to permit a three-game blanket redshirt for NJCAA football, which Alison supported for further discussion. Darin emphasized that the matter would not be presented to the board until the NCAA acknowledges our concerns. By engaging with the NCAA, we can initiate the process now and ensure we are well-prepared to present our case. Troy highlighted the relationship between eligibility and governance, noting that redshirt rules would also impact them. The NCAA would not grant approval without prior backing from the board. Rob expressed that this issue pertains more to sports governance and eligibility, particularly regarding credits. Brett raised a question about the implications for all sports if the NCAA endorses the 30% rule across the board. Currently, only Division I football is recognized, but if other sports were to receive blanket approval in the future, we would adapt accordingly. Troy pointed out the distinctions in California, where academic and athletic eligibility criteria differ. The redshirt rule is generally advantageous for junior varsity athletes, but it may not benefit starters who could potentially transfer to larger institutions and accept NIL deals. The group deliberated on concerns regarding playoffs and the potential for a student-athlete to leave. Adding three games could introduce additional complications. The discussion centered on balancing the protection of student-athletes with the interests of the institution. It was decided that this topic would be addressed in a joint discussion on eligibility later this afternoon. Football was seconded by Mary for consideration in the eligibility discussion. A conversation with the board will be initiated to move forward, with a later determination on whether this issue

falls under sports governance or eligibility. The vote in favor of football only redshirt was passed unanimously.

- 12 p.m.** Lunch in National Office
- 1 p.m.** Meeting with NCAA
- 2:30 p.m.** Joint Committee Meetings/Conversation Continued
Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4792195784?pwd=Q1p1M2JlbG9ZZE9KOFNXV1RvVXgwdz09>
- 4 p.m.** Sport Governance Committee Meeting
Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/7568146047?pwd=VU9tUFhuSFhCUlpsVjRXSFhUZThlZz09>
 - Governance Downstairs
 - Focus:
 - JV, Prep, Club, Non-Member Contests, USCAA

Teams may encounter difficulties in filling their schedules; however, it is essential to promote NJCAA competition. Dean proposed a motion to permit play without counting it towards statistics, such as All-American status. Darin addressed the maximum number of games that can be played, suggesting that a certain percentage, such as 10 or 20%, could be allocated to non-NJCAA schools. Amanda highlighted the challenge of losing three teams from a schedule within a week and the necessity of filling those games to maintain a complete schedule. Jake pointed out that Division III football might lose NJCAA programs if they are not permitted to compete against prep schools, some of which are highly competitive and maintain full schedules annually. Although athletes are informed that they do not forfeit a year of eligibility when attending prep schools, this issue does not concern the NJCAA. Amanda recommended adopting terminology that differentiates between games against prep schools and those against NJCAA institutions. Rod discussed the distinction between a scrimmage and a game, noting that certain sports allow for a total of 30 games, with 8 designated as scrimmages. Darin expressed concerns regarding the challenges of permitting junior varsity and/or prep competition. Teams sometimes choose not to compete against strong NJCAA opponents and instead travel to distant prep schools, bypassing multiple NJCAA institutions, yet their statistics are treated equivalently. Rod emphasized that committee oversight acknowledges ranked teams, and it is crucial to review their schedules early in the season rather than waiting until late in the year, which could result in the removal of ranked teams that have played against prep or junior varsity teams. Concerns were raised regarding the classification of junior varsity (JV) and preparatory games. The discussion commenced with the intention of providing teams opportunities based on their geographic locations, while also considering a different seeding approach that reflects the opponents faced in their schedules. A proposal was introduced to allow these games to be played, designating them as scrimmages or non-NJCAA contests on Presto, with rankings and statistics to include only NJCAA games. The committee should refrain from considering club, JV, or preparatory games—none of which are NJCAA sanctioned—when determining postseason rankings and seeding. Alison suggested that perspectives might vary by sport and division, potentially creating opportunities for district teams to compete against one another during the regular season. A motion was put forth stating that any non-member institution of the NJCAA would not be factored into rankings, seeding, or at-large bids, nor would they be eligible for postseason awards from a statistical standpoint. This motion passed with a vote of 5 to 1, applicable solely to team sports. Marci emphasized the importance of including military programs, while Sadiaa expressed concerns that Division I schools might be reluctant to compete against Division III schools due to the potential negative impact on their schedules, a sentiment echoed by Amanda.

- Scrimmages, Jamborees, Exhibition

Darin addressed the distinctions in terminology among jamborees, exhibitions, and scrimmages. Troy emphasized the importance of maintaining consistency in the use of these terms. In basketball, exhibitions are recognized, while jamborees are classified as scrimmages. Rod brought up the terminology related to ejections during scrimmages compared to games. Darin articulated a perspective that once a season commences, all activities are considered games, with any events prior categorized as pre-season. A question arose regarding the purpose of conducting scrimmages during the season, to which Jake responded that teams prefer to engage in a scrimmage before the onset of conference play. Another inquiry was made about the necessity for distinct definitions between scrimmages and exhibitions. The group deliberated on whether "exhibition" is a term that is acknowledged. Alumni games and intersquad matches are all classified as exhibition games. Additionally, Presto requires modifications to align with our terminology regarding scrimmages and exhibitions. The group reached a consensus to engage in discussions with Presto to amend the language and update the bylaws accordingly. Rob commented that scrimmages do not necessitate eligibility, proposing the establishment of three categories: scrimmage, exhibition, and game. The group will proceed to obtain a response from Presto to facilitate a decision.

- 6 p.m.** Meetings Adjourned
- 7 p.m.** Dinner Off-Site/Social
- Thursday, October 10**
- 7:30 a.m.** Breakfast available in Hotel.
- 8:30 a.m.** Sport Governance Committee Meeting
Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/7568146047?pwd=VU9tUFhuSFhCUlpsVjRXSFhUZThlZz09>
 - Location: Downstairs Conference Room
 - Focus: Review and Final Discussion for Proposals for:

- Ejection Policies
- Redshirt Policies
- JV, Prep, Club, Non-Member Contests
- Minimum roster numbers submitted for eligibility to be certified
- Minimum number of contests to be considered for post season eligibility
- Uniform Sponsorship
- National Tournament/World Series Seeding, At-Large participation
- Forfeiture of Games, Impact on Non-Guilty Team
- Sports Gambling

10:30 a.m. Eligibility/Governance Committee Updates
Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4792195784?pwd=Q1p1M2JlbG9ZZE9KOFNXV1RvVXgwdz09>

11:30 a.m. Meeting Adjourned

A summary of the motions and votes that were approved on October 8, 2024, is presented below.

- 1) Adhere to the NCAA rulebook regarding ejections.
- 2) Maintain the policy on non-collegial racial slurs.
- 3) A review of sight and sound on game day will be conducted by Rod, Tyler, and Brett.
- 4) Continue the policy of non-reporting for coaches through double suspension.

Proposed next steps include updating the compliance exam regulations or providing a link for each sport code pertaining to sport-specific ejections. These items, along with those mentioned above, can be approved at the board meeting in April. The group deliberated that it might be more equitable to postpone decisions until August. Changes to policy and procedure can be implemented immediately without requiring board approval. Dean recommended consulting the board on whether to proceed now or defer until later. Alison proposed imposing a fine for non-reporting. The group expressed a preference for initiating these changes at the start of the next season rather than involving financial penalties. This initiative will be presented to the board for winter sports in October.

NCAA joint meeting

- Transgender policies discussion at the NCAA level

No individual is compelled to adhere to policy unless mandated by state legislation. In the absence of such legislation, schools and conferences retain the authority to make their own determinations. The health and safety committee comprises 25 members who possess expertise in this area. The NCAA will remain in phase 2 of the policy until further notice, as developments in state legislation continue to unfold. Although somewhat ambiguous, phase 2 stipulates that individuals must undergo hormone suppression. In 2022, updates indicated that testing would be conducted to align with sport-specific testosterone levels, with medical documentation reviewed and thresholds established. Dean inquired about policies in states with zero tolerance laws, citing Alabama as an example. He also questioned how organizations navigate state legislation where such policies are prohibited. The NCAA representative clarified that state law takes precedence over NCAA regulations. The challenges of visiting schools often result in unsatisfactory responses from those institutions. Schools may collaborate with their conference offices. Additionally, the NCAA is actively addressing language related to diversity, equity, and inclusion, as well as transgender policies. The NCAA encourages compliance with state law while advising consultation with general counsel. An anti-discrimination policy has been implemented by the NCAA to protect transgender student-athletes when competing in states with prohibitive laws.

- **D3 eligibility**

Legislation stipulates that if a student is enrolled in an institution, they are subject to the regulations of the season. Graduates from non-Division III institutions who enroll as graduate students must adhere to Division III legislation. It is important to note that undergraduate transfers are exempt from Division III regulations. A question was raised by the group regarding student-athletes who transfer from Division III schools to junior colleges (JUCO) as freshmen but subsequently return to Division III after practicing beyond the first competition. The NCAA representative clarified that if these athletes only participated in practice at JUCO, they would not forfeit their eligibility.

- **Eligibility review**

Goal of reviews prioritize fair competition while focusing on academics. Athletic eligibility, financial aid and sport wagering are topics to be discussed and pushed forward to division I council. Redshirt and seeding will all be included in the review

- **Prep school /post grad**

Certain regulations within the NCAA are specific to individual sports, yet they typically indicate that participation against prospects is prohibited. If a junior college (JUCO) considers preparatory school as a year of eligibility, how would the NCAA interpret this? A representative from the NCAA replied that eligibility would be activated solely by participation in JUCO. They would permit a one-year grace period, after which immediate enrollment would be required. The NCAA is currently evaluating this situation to ascertain how they will address gaps in eligibility, particularly concerning the time elapsed since the student-athlete graduated from high school, which may present complications.

- **Scrimmages**

The competitive season is distinct from transfer eligibility regulations. According to the two-year college rule 12-8-3-1-1, athletes are permitted to participate in two scrimmages without these being counted as a season of participation. PTD (progress towards degree) can be affected when considering part-time student-athletes. In terms of transfer eligibility, if an athlete has only engaged in practice, they are still accountable for the part-time term.

- **4-2-4 transfer eligibility**

Redshirt policies are currently under consideration to determine whether football regulations should be extended to other sports. The NCAA is expected to provide information shortly regarding the eligibility review process. The initial review will focus on athletic performance, while the subsequent review will assess academic qualifications. It was also mentioned that there is no differentiation between non-championship and championship seasons.

- **Share what d1 council is discussing**

The following are several topics and discussion points currently being addressed by the Division One Council.

- 1) The implications of settlement and future prospects.
- 2) The eligibility model moving forward.
- 3) The potential for a five-year eligibility period and the removal of redshirt regulations. This subject is still in its preliminary stages and cannot be definitively addressed at this time.
- 4) A comparison of the current NIL situation with the potential differences for international student-athletes participating in semi-professional sports and their desire to transfer back to collegiate play. While there is no distinct standard, the complexities involved pose challenges. For instance, the classification of semi-professional status raises questions about whether it is considered amateur and whether athletes receive compensation.
- 5) Presently, there are three distinct manuals for each NCAA division. Rob Chaney inquired about the major differences when all three are compared. The NCAA representative indicated that these differences stem from the varying levels of regulation each division chooses to implement and their underlying philosophies. The Division One manual is significantly more extensive than those of the other two divisions. While the playing and practice seasons vary, the academic philosophies remain largely consistent across all divisions.

Kyle Kallander discussion

The proposal to allow athletes to participate for five years across five seasons is currently garnering significant interest, as it promises to streamline various processes. This change would remove the hardship waiver and address other complexities. While the earliest implementation could occur next year, it may also be postponed. The discussion regarding five-year participation has not yet reached the NCAA committee, as it remains confined to conversations within Division I. However, it is possible that this initiative could extend to Divisions II and III. Notably, Divisions II and III tend to respect the guidelines set forth by the NJCAA. The involvement of professional teams and the resulting pushback may lead to increased decentralization and a reduction in universally applicable regulations. The second phase of this initiative will concentrate on transfer eligibility criteria, potentially prompting a thorough examination of athletic eligibility standards. Regarding the adoption of NIL rules, it is important to note that there are still specific signing dates and periods dictated by NCAA legislation. A release will not be necessary, as transfer student-athletes cannot sign until they enter the portal. Discussions surrounding the House settlement and the state of Division I are still in their early stages, but it is anticipated that the regulatory framework for Division I will undergo significant changes. The top tier of 70 Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) institutions will have greater autonomy in their operations. Aligning with Division I will become increasingly challenging due to the distinct rules that will emerge within the division. While roster limitations will be implemented in Division I, institutions will have the discretion to choose whether to adopt these limitations. This could result in smaller rosters in other sports, such as baseball. Schools opting in will have the option to compete against those that have chosen to do the same, even if they decide to opt out.

The group engaged in a discussion regarding the practice of coaches keeping players ineligible to facilitate their inclusion in scrimmages. Additionally, there was a conversation about categorizing a competition as a game if won, but labeling it as a scrimmage in the event of a loss. Presto maintains a record of when changes occur, although these alterations are only identified when someone actively checks the records. A proposal was put forth for the sport of soccer to prevent manipulation, suggesting that only one scrimmage be permitted after the official start date. A motion was made and seconded to allow one scrimmage following the first competition date, which was unanimously approved. The group also deliberated on the possibility of adding scrimmages after an ejection, noting that the consequences would apply to the next game rather than an additional junior varsity game.

- **Dual semester mid year transfer**

Regarding dual semester mid-year transfers, the group acknowledged that it is reasonable to consider student-athletes who have not participated at another school, particularly in cases where injuries have resulted in a loss of players and a need to bolster numbers. This situation would not pose a challenge for filling rosters at Division I schools. The group ultimately voted against allowing dual semester mid-year transfers, agreeing that eligibility should be determined by the official start date. For sports such as basketball or wrestling that do not have a fall season, mid-year transfers would be permitted. A motion was introduced stating that transfers should not be allowed, with the decision based on the official start date of the school rather than the schedule's commencement. Exceptions were made for indoor track and bowling, which have limited dates in the fall, and the motion was amended to exclude specific dates. Individual sports were granted exceptions, while team sports were not. A vote was conducted, and the proposal passed, stipulating that if the official start date is in the fall, transfers cannot be permitted.

- **Recap**

The group engaged in a discussion regarding the exclusion of nonmembers from considerations for rankings, seeding, at-large bids, national rankings, and awards, which are metrics that influence postseason accolades. An amendment was proposed to include NJCAA-approved four-year military academies, which received a motion and a second. This motion was passed unanimously. Subsequently, the group turned its attention to mid-year enrollments, noting that the current bylaw disqualifies student-athletes who are not enrolled by the first game, rendering them ineligible for the entire season. The discussion centered on whether there should be a pathway for these student-athletes to achieve eligibility if they do not meet full-time status at the season's commencement. From a governance standpoint, the aim is to safeguard against mid-year transfers in sports that span two semesters. The group deliberated on the implications for transfers wishing to join junior colleges and raised questions about whether NCAA athletes would forfeit NIL opportunities to participate for half a season at the junior college level. The discussion concluded with a consensus that part-time status should be established by the 18th day and full-time status by the season's start. Concerns were raised regarding Division III, while Division I appeared unaffected. It was noted that if a team begins the season with an 0-3 record, students might transfer to a new coach or institution to regain a year of eligibility if redshirting is permitted. Currently, participation in even one game results in a loss of eligibility, although students may continue through the season. This situation may become less problematic with the NCAA's five-year proposal. Additionally, discussions on regional realignment will be necessary to facilitate division separation in the future. Darin articulated a vision for a division between two committees, one focusing on scholarship and the other on non-scholarship athletes. It was recommended to initiate discussions in February to establish a subcommittee, a proposal that received unanimous support from both committees.