

# 2024-25 NJCAA Governance Committee

## 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."



---

## Meeting/Important Dates

|              |           |   |
|--------------|-----------|---|
| August 21    | 1 pm EST  | Governance Committee Meeting                                    |
| September 12 | 1 pm EST  | Governance Committee Meeting                                    |
| October 8-10 | Charlotte | Governance Committee Meeting                                    |
| October 17   | 1 pm EST  | Board of Regents Meeting  |
| November 7   | 1 pm EST  | Governance Committee Meeting                                    |
| December 5   | 1 pm EST  | Governance Committee Meeting                                    |
| January 9    | 1 pm EST  | Governance Committee Meeting                                    |
| January 16   | 1 pm EST  | Board of Regents Meeting  |
| February 13  | 1 pm EST  | Governance Committee Meeting                                    |
| March 6      | 1 pm EST  | Governance Committee Meeting                                    |
| March 11     |           | Final date to submit governance items for April BOR agenda      |
| April 13-17  |           | NJCAA Convention (Denton, Texas)/Board of Regents Meeting       |
| May 15       | 1 pm EST  | Governance Committee Meeting                                    |
| June 12      | 1 pm EST  | Governance Committee Meeting                                    |
| June 18      | 1 pm EST  | Board of Regents Meeting  |
| July 14      |           | Final date to receive governance proposals for October 2025 BOR |

## Committee Roster

### Name

|                               |                                |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Chair:                        | Darin Monroe                   |
| Vice-Chair:                   | Jake Ripple                    |
| Division I Reps:              | Dean Myrick<br>Alison Mohr     |
| Division II Reps:             | Ron Riggle<br>Melissa Grau     |
| Division III Reps:            | Amanda Haseley<br>Sadiah Jones |
| PAC Rep:                      | Derrick Worrels                |
| Senior Women's Administrator: | Mary Young                     |
| Senior Men's Administrator:   | Rob Nielsen                    |
| Ex-Officio:                   | Marci Henry                    |
| NJCAA Staff Liaison:          | Brett Monaghan and Rod Lovett  |

## Tier 1: In-Person Charlotte (Governance Only)

- Ejection Policies
  - Committee determined that ejection policies need a full evaluation and will work to make time in future Sports Governance meetings to review in 2024-25 for potential 2025-26 rollout, ejection percentages, presented by Rob Nielson, were approved. The only sport currently with a chart is Baseball and that will be updated and placed on resource page. We will also be moving forward with soccer next week and hopefully basketball in early October.
    - Sportsmanship Roundtable – violent vs. non-violent, collegial vs. non-collegial, bench
    - Ejections during scrimmages.
- Redshirt Policies
  - Reviewed NCAA communication, discussed football as the exception, need approval of NCAA to change by-law working alongside the Student-Athlete Experience Committee, Brett will communicate with NCAA, Michelle, Rod, and Jake Ripple to further that conversation and push request to NCAA Student-Athlete Experience Committee. Have what each sport % would look like in excel sheet.
- Transgender Policy Proposal
  - Submitted by Dean Myrick

## Tier 1: In-Person Charlotte (Joint Governance/Eligibility)

- JV, Prep, Club, Non-Member Contests
  - Seems to be standing agreement that prep schools should be eliminated from being a viable regular season opponent. Marketing reviewing steps with Presto to determine if contests against these opponent types can be pulled at end of season for record and stat purposes.
- Open Gyms, Camps, Clinics: **Possibly already created?**
- Eligibility
  - Minimum number of contests to be considered for post season eligibility
  - Minimum roster numbers submitted for eligibility to be certified
  - Recrutable student-athletes from discontinued or level changing programs

## Tier 1: Remotely

- Forfeiture of Games, Impact on non-guilty team
  - Need to review current language and sort out what, if anything, can be adjusted to accommodate those who were not charged with a by-law infraction and how they don't lose contests due to their schedule being affected by a program that must forfeit contests.

The group initiated a discussion regarding the consideration of forfeit victories being counted as part of a team's game tally. This led to a dialogue about the possibility of awarding a victory while also allowing the opportunity to participate in an additional game. Rod pointed out that forfeits cannot be attributed to circumstances such as a bus breakdown or illness among players. Jake Ripple recounted a similar incident from the previous year, highlighting the complications that arise when a team is penalized with two losses if another team does not secure a win. Darrin inquired whether a proposal for a modification to the sport code is necessary. Amanda suggested that the school might benefit from additional potential wins on their schedule through forfeit victories. Darin emphasized the objective of safeguarding the non-offending team, allowing them the option to compete against another opponent if they choose to engage in a game that resulted from a forfeit. Dean raised the issue of a team having sufficient players yet opting to forfeit, questioning who would be responsible for overseeing this situation. The group concluded that in such cases, the outcome would be a forfeit, which would preclude the possibility of playing another game. Additionally, a team's record would reflect games that were not contested, potentially providing them with a competitive advantage in terms of wins. Melissa concurred with Dean on the preference to engage in the game rather than accept a forfeit win, which would result in no game being played. Dean raised the issue of roster limits, suggesting a specific number of players, such as ten, who must participate, including designated pitchers or catchers. The method of monitoring this compliance remains uncertain; however, if a rule were to be implemented, it could potentially be exploited by coaches. Dean inquired whether a team that is not at fault for a forfeit could schedule another game and claim that victory. The conversation then shifted to the concept of staggering athlete suspensions to avoid penalizing the opposing team by forfeiting a game opportunity. A challenge arises in deciding which athletes should be suspended for each game, raising questions about who would sit out for the first game versus the second. Darin suggested the possibility of selectively choosing which players to bench based on the opponent, which could create an unfair advantage and raise concerns. Rod proposed a modification to the language, which was subsequently communicated via email and received consensus from the group. For certain schools, rescheduling games poses significant challenges; nonetheless, this approach offers a chance to make up missed games. It was noted that staggering suspensions during the postseason would be problematic, thus limiting this strategy to the regular season. Mary emphasized the necessity for teams to gain experience and practice against other teams, suggesting adjustments to the game format to allow play without it being officially counted. Jake and Sadiaa expressed their agreement to adhere to Rod's proposal.

- To Participate Unattached
  - Wrestling and Track & Field conversations. Brett will contact chairs of each committee to determine where these groups are at with potentially pushing some sort of language forward for SG review.

The group reached a consensus to postpone the discussion until Brett was available.

## Tier 2: Remotely

- Sports Gambling
  - SG Committee will create a position statement to go along with other like statements in the handbook. Will utilize NCAA policy to drive this documentation. **Develop a statement of awareness?**

Rod emphasized that the establishment of a rule must be accompanied by appropriate punishments and penalties. While there may be challenges in documentation, it is essential to provide a clear and coherent message. This message could either focus on the consequences of violations or

serve as an educational resource regarding gambling. Dean expressed a preference for an educational approach, noting that enforcement could prove challenging for all stakeholders involved. Darin proposed collaborating with Jeff and Brett to develop a concise message addressing the implications of betting, extending beyond the NJCAA to encompass the NCAA, particularly for athletes aspiring to transition to four-year institutions. This communication will be directed towards athletes, coaches, athletic staff, and all relevant personnel. Ron Riggle will be sharing a link related to sports betting.

- Uniform Sponsorship Rules: Rod Lovett

The group raised a question regarding whether the initiative for sponsorship opportunities related to uniforms would be pursued by the children or the schools themselves. Darin proposed that we should not wait for the NCAA to establish guidelines on this matter. Rod expressed concerns regarding the timing, noting that NCAA institutions acquire new uniforms annually, in contrast to NJCAA institutions, which do not follow the same schedule. Darin inquired about potential issues that might arise from uniform sponsorships. Sadiia recommended ensuring that the process is thoroughly vetted by the athletic staff and suggested limiting both the number and size of sponsor logos. She also advised that the situation should be closely monitored. Mary concurred with Sadiia, acknowledging that sponsorship will be an unavoidable aspect. Darin further suggested that commercial advertisements should not be permitted on uniforms.

- National Tournament/World Series Seeding, At-Large participation: should there be limits?

- National Championship host auto-bids

In the upcoming year, there will be no cap for both men and women. Sadiia addressed the situation in Division Three, expressing a preference for the absence of a cap at this time. Dean highlighted challenges faced in Division One, particularly from certain regions. Stronger regions supported the implementation of a cap, while weaker teams opposed it. Alison concurred with Dean, noting that the prevailing sentiment within their division is the necessity of having the best teams compete in the championship. Jake was in favor of eliminating the cap for basketball, reflecting the support from his region for this decision. Alison pointed out that this change might compel teams to seek competition outside their region to face stronger opponents. Mary Young discussed Division Two regarding the philosophical implications of the cap. Melissa echoed Mary's sentiments, indicating that the necessity of a cap varies by sport. Ron expressed that he would favor the absence of a cap if required to choose but emphasized that a uniform philosophy should be applied across all sports rather than on a case-by-case basis. Dean agreed, stating that expectations must be clearly communicated to ensure understanding of the criteria for at-large qualifications. Ultimately, the majority reached a consensus to eliminate the cap without differentiating by sport.

Darin concluded the meeting at 2:39 PM to provide a brief interval before the subsequent meeting, which is scheduled to commence in 20 minutes. The following meeting will take place in person in Charlotte, North Carolina.

- Allowable Meal Reimbursement – **more than 2x per year?**

- Darin will work with Mary Young to come up with language to present to the SG Committee.

- Post season facility requirements – updated district contracts to include language from Article IX and ask membership to update contracts where necessary **Communicate what post-season facilities requirements are. No change needed from governance.**
- Preseason polls: District rankings replace? Teams to watch?
- Vetting process for awards tied to individual names
- Forfeit/Non-Collegial Language

### Tier 3: Remotely

- All-American recognition/terminology
  - NJCAA Marketing team will evaluate numbers, language, etc. and report back to Sports Governance Committee including numbers at each level in each sport
- Divisional Sports DI & DIII vs. DI & DII
  - Current by law does not exist, Sports Governance will be able to evaluate these as they are presented to us **NEED DISCUSSION ON MEN's and Women's Tennis this fall for potential change to DI and DII in future.**
- Regular season contests following the beginning of post season play
  - Currently they can only be scrimmages.
- Coaches Dress Decorum at National Tournaments
- Travel out-of-state/ out-of-area for practices with no scrimmages or games.

12:01 Darin called the order to meeting

Discussed tiers broken down and reviewed goals or today: have a discussion with tier 1 as the main concern and moving on to tier 2 if time permits  
Proposals written to put in place the committee intent with topics discussed