



## **Sports Governance Meeting Minutes**

**February 18<sup>th</sup>, 2026**

**Attendance:** *Darin Monroe, Kurt Kohler, Michael Landers, Alison Mohr, Melissa Grau, Mark Tucker, Dom Dimaggio, Derrick Worrels, Mary Young, Dean Myrick, Lorayne Chandler, Brycen McKeehan, Rod Lovett, Brett Monaghan, Andrew Givens*

### **Finalizing Eligibility Criteria for Sport Committees**

*The group's central objective was to lock in the final language governing eligibility for standing sport committees, ensuring clarity around who may serve and under what conditions.*

- *Eligible professional staff: The committee confirmed inclusion of regional directors, assistant regional directors, and board members—explicitly excluding the men's and women's senior administrators, board chair, and vice chair—from service on standing sport committees.*
- *Coaches' eligibility and roles:*

*Coaches may serve on divisional sport committees only if they hold an additional administrative assignment at their member college. Individuals who serve as head coaches should not be appointed as chair of the relevant division. The committee debated whether to narrowly define "additional administrative assignment" (e.g., limiting to AD/assistant AD) or to retain broader language. Members cited valuable non-AD roles (e.g., dean of student and athletics, coordinators) and favored flexibility, relying on regions and institutional context to assess "additional duties."*

*Consensus: retain the existing language for Section 1, Point 6 (coaches eligible only with an administrative assignment), accepting institutional and regional judgment to determine qualifying administrative responsibilities.*

- *Clarifying “current athletic administrators”:* The group revisited wording not finalized in December and affirmed practical guardrails. Concerns about committees becoming coach-heavy were balanced by structural oversight (senior women’s administrator, vice president, chair, vice chair).
- *Aspiring leaders’ role:* The committee confirmed aspiring leaders are permitted on committees in a non-voting, observational capacity—expected to listen during full calls and comment only when called upon by the chair.
- *Approval:* A motion was made and passed to accept the updated eligibility document language. The committee explicitly affirmed the language for Section 1, Point 6 as acceptable.

### **Deliberating the Game-Day Administrator Requirement**

*Proposal C introduced a requirement for a designated game-day administrator at events. While the committee previously aligned on “on site” language, significant uncertainties persisted around definitions, logistics, and enforceable responsibilities.*

- *Definitions and scope:*

*“On site” was defined as the physical presence of a designated individual within immediate and reasonable distance of the contest. Members acknowledged variability across campuses (e.g., one administrator reasonably covering softball and volleyball across campus) and the impossibility of similar coverage at neutral sites or all-day events (e.g., golf, tennis, track).*

*Current draft language explicitly targets “on campus events,” with discussion noting many “home” facilities are off campus (e.g., city parks). The group emphasized host-school responsibility regardless of location but cautioned against mandating administrator travel for neutral sites.*

- *Enforcement and logistics:*

*Proposed penalties (fines are per college, not per sport) for failure to comply:*

- *First offense: letter of reprimand to the athletic director and letter to the president.*
- *Second offense: \$500 fine, letter to the president, and required action plan.*

- *Third offense: \$2000 fine, letter to the president.*
- *Fourth offense: \$3000 fine, letter to the president.*

*Members highlighted challenges when multiple events occur simultaneously and the risk of inconsistent coverage leading to penalties.*

*The committee recognized that only physical presence is realistically enforceable; highly recommended protocols for administrator conduct would be guidance rather than sanctionable mandates.*

- *Legal considerations and staffing realities:*

*The emergency board meeting call raised questions about institutional liability, prompting caution. Administrators may tap non-athletic staff to fill coverage gaps; some argued an athletic trainer present on site should be eligible as administrator, given their focus on safety and practical ability to communicate.*

- *Decision: Due to legal and logistical complexity, the proposal was tabled until the next meeting, pending legal review and clarification by Jeff White. Supporting materials (bulleted duties, sample language) will be circulated to aid future deliberations.*

### **Revising Scheduling Policies for Non-NJCAA Opponents**

*The committee addressed persistent confusion around contests versus stat-counting against non-NJCAA opponents, honing in on scholarship-level programs while deferring non-scholarship considerations for a separate proposal.*

- *Scholarship-only scheduling restrictions:*

*New rule: NJCAA members shall only schedule regular season contests against NJCAA members, NJCAA-approved military programs, California Community Colleges Athletic Association members, or NAIA/NCAA-affiliated four-year varsity/JV programs. Scholarship programs are prohibited from scheduling club and prep schools.*

*JV game cap: JV contests are limited to a maximum of 10% of the allowable sports schedule as listed in the NJCAA sport procedure chart. Example: Baseball's 56-game allowance permits 6 JV games. If a team exceeds the*

*allowable 10% of JV games on their schedule, they will be subject to penalties (forfeits, reduction of games for the next season, etc.).*

*Per current practice, JV game stats entered in systems are excluded from at-large seeding and awards (e.g., Player of the Week, All-American), yet they remain in recorded results.*

- **Vote and implementation:**

*The motion to adopt the scholarship-only restrictions (ban on club/prep contests; JV max at 10%) passed.*

*Implementation date: Fall 2027.*

*Non-scholarship programs will craft a separate proposal, acknowledging different scheduling needs and practices.*

## **Approving Urgent District Realignment for Soccer and Other Sports**

*In response to 2026-27 and 2027-28 team declarations, the committee approved targeted district realignments to uphold competitive fairness and postseason viability, with detailed configurations for Division I Men's and Women's Soccer, and updates for Division II Women's Soccer and Division II Volleyball.*

- **Division I Men's Soccer (2026-27, 2027-28):**
  - *Issue: Three solo districts in the East (Regions 3, 19, 20) each had only one team, risking a three-team district with an automatic qualifier—unbalanced relative to other districts.*
  - *Decision: Consolidate East and Southeast into one East district; host site is Region 10 (predetermined). This reconfiguration yields a district aligned with the typical 12-team size.*
  - **Slots:**
    - *Regions 3, 19, 20 (combined) play for one spot.*
    - *Regions 8, 10, and 17 each receive one spot.*
  - **Matchups:**
    - *Fall 2026: 3/19/20 winner vs. Region 10 winner; Region 8 winner vs. Region 17 winner for the finals.*



- *Division II Volleyball:*
  - *No district changes for 2026-27.*
  - *Gulf South District growth: Now the largest overall district (26 or 27 teams).*
  - *Evaluation plan: After the 2026 tournament, the committee will assess whether Gulf South should receive a second bid, comparing it with the Southeast (Regions 10 and 7) and Midwest districts. A recommendation for bid allocation changes, if any, will be made no later than January 2027.*
  - *Rationale context: Central and Plains districts, although smallest with two bids, are among the strongest and most successful, so reallocation should strengthen—not weaken—the tournament. Divisional philosophies noted: Division 3 is geographic, Division 2 mixes geography and performance, Division 1 is primarily performance-based.*