

# NCAA Convention

Saturday, January 14, 2023

San Antonio, Texas

## Division III Business Session



JIM SCHMIDT: Good morning, everyone. I thought the opening music was pretty good. What do you think? I'm just seeing if you're listening either to them or to me. We are going to call this convention to order.

Good morning, and welcome to this morning's Division III business session. My name is Jim Schmidt, and I'm the chancellor at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire and serve as chair of the Division III Presidents Council, and I will be chairing today's business session.

Joining me at the dais this morning are Michelle Morgan, senior director of athletics at John Carroll University who chairs the Division III Management Council; Georgana Taggart will be serving as our parliamentarian; Louise McCleary is the vice president of Division III; Bill Regan is the managing director of Division III; Jeff Myers is the director of academic and membership affairs for Division III; Tiffany Alford is the associate director of academic and membership affairs at Division III; and Megan Koch is the chair of the Division III National Student Advisory Committee.

All right. A court reporter is joining us again to create an accurate record of our meeting, so please remember to give your name and institution or conference affiliation anytime you speak at the microphone. I'll be asking you to turn off your cell phone or set it in silent or vibrate mode. We appreciate your cooperation on that.

Let me get things started by reviewing the agenda for today. Prior to today's legislative voting, as we did yesterday, we'll be testing the voting machines. We will then have an update from the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee on its recent initiatives and an announcement concerning SAAC's relationship with Special Olympics. We'll also receive an update of the state of Division III from Louise McCleary, vice president of Division III.

After these updates, we'll recognize key committee members. We will review and adopt the Division III convention notice. This process will consist of a series of

motions.

Once that process is completed, we will consider the proposals and the Presidents Council grouping which consists of resolution No. 3 and proposals Nos. 3 through 9.

We will then consider the general grouping, which consists of proposals Nos. 10 through 15.

We'll conduct roll call voting proposals resolutions along with any related amendments and motions.

We believe the voting process will take approximately two hours and 15 minutes. We estimate that we will be finished by 11:00 a.m., but we will take as much time as necessary to conduct our business thoroughly and efficiently. We have not scheduled a formal break.

Please remember that you will need both your voting paddle, your electronic voting unit for voting in today's business session. Our procedures dictate that all voting must be done by paddle or electronically rather than by voice or hand. Please note that all voting procedures and instructions are in the official notice of your registration packet.

In addition, the Presidents and Management Councils have adopted a policy to use electronic units to vote on all legislative proposals. In order to do that, it is best to conduct a test right now to make sure we resolve any issues right away. These units are very easy to use. The process is described in the flier that was in the convention registration packet. It is important to insert your school or conference smart card into the voting unit. When I declare it is time to vote, simply press the button 1 for yes, 2 for no or 3 to abstain. The number that you choose will appear in the LED window on the front of the key pad. It will only appear for a moment or two and then go out when your vote has been received by the system.

If any other number is pressed and appears in the LED window, please immediately notify one of our voting technicians. They're located just to the right of the dais. For roll call votes, a school-by-school and



conference-by-conference printout of the voting results will be posted on NCAA.org within a week after the conclusion of today's business session.

As a reminder, there will be no window of reconsideration for today's proposals.

Finally, please remember to leave your keypad, smart card and paddle at your seat when the business session ends this morning. If you happen to take them with you, please return them promptly to the registration area or contact NCAA staff.

Are there any questions today about the electronic voting process?

To be sure that our units are performing correctly, let's conduct a test vote. Anyone having any problems casting their test vote should come forward to the right of the dais for assistance. Please note if your vote is received, you should receive a yes received, no received, or abstain received message on the screen, as well.

Let's respond to the following question to test our voting unit. Always these fun facts: Did you know that next year's NCAA convention will be held in Phoenix? Press 1 for yes, 2 for no or 3 for abstain. The polls are now open.

The polls are now closed.

394 voted yes, 49 no, 13 abstention. So the vote was successful. Thank you.

If you believe you had any problem with your voting machine, please do come forward at this time.

At this time, please help me welcome the star of the show, Megan Koch, the chair of Division III National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee to the microphone to provide you an update on the recent Division III National SAAC initiatives with Special Olympics.

MEGAN KOCH: Good morning. Everyone. My name is Megan Koch and I'm a former cross country and track and field student-athletes from Colorado College, as well as the Division III National SAAC chair, proudly representing the Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference and the American Southwest Conference.

This morning I have the distinct pleasure of providing an overview of the recent Division III National SAAC projects and initiatives. We have 22 primary members and 22 associate SAAC members. As you know, we are proud to represent all 200,000 plus Division III student-athletes. The student-athlete voice in Division III is strong. It is in

this room today, and we encourage you to listen.

On behalf of National SAAC, I thank all of you this morning. You have dedicated numerous hours and years of commitment and service to promoting and supporting our Division III student-athletes. It is your commitment and passion that inspire all student-athletes and in particular the National SAAC to work hard and stay committed to improving and enhancing the student-athlete experience at the institutional, conference and national level.

Thank you for believing in us.

There is no better way for me to demonstrate how much you have inspired National SAAC than by providing you with the following updates on our work over the last year.

National SAAC is currently focusing on two key initiatives. The first is surrounding our social media efforts through our Division III SAAC Twitter and Instagram accounts. We have transformed our week-long mental health social media campaign into #mentalhealthmonday, where every Monday Division III SAAC will share mental health resources, best practices and other helpful information surrounding mental health.

In addition to mental health, please follow D-III SAAC's Instagram and Twitter accounts as we promote various causes and campaigns that are important to student-athletes.

Another SAAC initiative is titled SAAC University. The idea for SAAC University was born from National SAAC's desire to empower student-athletes with knowledge about the NCAA that could help them make the most of their student-athlete experience.

It is our hope that this initiative will allow student-athletes to be more engaged at the campus, conference and national level so they can contribute to critical conversations to help them not only enjoy the best possible student-athlete experience but also create buy-in to the positive change happening across the association.

Again, we ask the membership to please show Division III SAAC support with a follow, like or re-tweet in the coming months.

Division III provides a well-rounded collegiate experience, as evidenced by the division's six defining attributes: Proportion, comprehensive learning, sportsmanship, responsibility, passion and citizenship. It is my pleasure to show a video that features members of Division III Management Council and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee sharing their definitions of these attributes.



Thank you, and please enjoy the video.

>> Proportion to me is the lived experience of our Division III student-athletes. They balance life from an academic perspective and the rigors of competing at a high level, bonding with teammates and building lifelong friendships, but they're also involved in their communities. They work jobs and internships and volunteer. They've learned to be resilient. Diverse experiences are setting them up for the future.

>> Passion is love. Passion is love for what you do. I think when you face challenges, it comes down to how much you want it and how much you love it. Passion is what keeps you going forward. Seeing so many people that were like-minded and so hardworking in their sport and academics being surrounded by like-minded people makes you want to be more passionate. I think it pushes you to a different level that maybe you didn't think you had. You can do the best of both worlds and love all of it.

>> A good citizen is someone who wants to make a positive impact, both in their communities and in the world around them. The Division III approach is absolutely the best approach out there for amateur sport because it wants student-athletes to explore all parts of who they are, be successful in the classroom, be successful in competition, be successful in the community. Our student-athletes learn what it means to strive for and attain success but doing it the right way and being good citizens.

>> Comprehensive learning is being able to adapt to experiences and apply the things that I learned. Being an athlete and juggling academics helped me grow as a person, and things that I've learned I was able to apply in another field, putting them into everyday life. Developing comprehensive learning helped me prioritize certain things to make sure I get to where I want to be.

>> Responsibility is being accountable for your words and actions first and foremost, but it also is an obligation to be a positive influence in the communities around you. Being in a D-III program, you're going to have lots of different opportunities; you're not just an athlete, you're also involved in student life, your academics are extremely important.

We give a lot of our student-athletes responsibilities right from the start by giving them leadership opportunities, by having them engage in the community, be a positive influence. That's being a responsible person.

>> I believe sportsmanship is a mutual admiration and respect for your fellow competitors. We all go through a lot to reach the point where we compete against one another.

It's important to realize that so once we're finally on the field or on the court or on the starting block, we look at each other as fellow human beings and not just competitors. Being able to recognize the hard work that other athletes are putting in creates a more positive and inclusive environment.

MEGAN KOCH: At the 2011 NCAA convention, Division III SAAC initiated a partnership with Special Olympics that launched later that year. Over the last 11 years, this partnership has positively impacted and enhanced the lives of student-athletes and Special Olympics athletes across the country by providing a platform for all athletes of all abilities to experience sports and friendship together.

At this time please help me welcome Norm Arias, chief operating officer of Special Olympics Texas, who is here on behalf of Greg Epperson, the regional president and managing director of Special Olympics North America. He is also joined on stage by Daniel Bena, a Special Olympics athlete from San Antonio, to celebrate the new Special Olympics memorandum of understanding that will continue the division's partnership with Special Olympics over the coming decade.

Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: On behalf of Division III, I want to thank you, Megan, and the National SAAC members for your tireless work and commitment to the association, Division III and our partnership with Special Olympics. Let's give them one more round of applause.

At this time please help me welcome Louise McCleary, vice president of Division III to the microphone to provide a brief update on Division III.

LOUISE McCLEARY: Good morning. I'm Louise McCleary, vice president of Division III, and I will provide, I promise, a brief update on the state of the division as I see it, but before I get started, I need to give a great congratulations to Karena Groff, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the NEWMAC conference, for winning the Woman of the Year this year. Let's give them a round of applause.

I'm probably famous for giving stats that might be a little off, but I do believe that is the fourth time we've won the Woman of the Year in the last eight years, which says a lot about our division.

I want to also thank Megan for representing the Division III National SAAC, highlighting the committee's accomplishments and goals, and being a powerful voice for all Division III student-athletes. The governance structure

asks so much of National SAAC, and I, as well as everyone in this room, thank you for your service, and we're going to give you a round of applause.

How wonderful is it to continue and strengthen our partnership with Special Olympics. Supporting Special Olympic athletes through on-campus and virtual events is a hallmark of this division. To date we have engaged with more than 100,000 Special Olympic athletes.

Will you join us, and let's commit to engaging with another 100,000 over the next decade.

Last year I thanked you for all you had done on your campuses and within your conferences during a challenging time. While we have learned to manage the health and safety of our student-athletes in light of the pandemic, there are still significant campus challenges. Declining enrollments, smaller budgets, mental health concerns, staffing turnover and retention are real issues that you are managing every day.

In many cases you are probably being asked to do more with less. Those currently serving on Division III councils, committees and working groups share similar experiences and stresses, and as someone with a front-row seat to these meetings, I can confidently tell you that these individuals are working tirelessly on your behalf. They work together to accomplish, identify goals within our shared values. They listen to your feedback. They identify issues. They propose solutions. They approve policy changes. They propose legislation that not only addresses the current issues, but they look to be proactive to best serve the membership and the student-athlete experience.

This past year, you have accomplished a lot, from increasing our budgets to the extensive legislative slate you will shortly vote on.

During the next year, we'll continue to examine our Division III philosophy statement, create a working group to evaluate threats and risks, and plan for the future stability of the division, and you will look for ways to deregulate our rules to reduce the administrative burden on our institutions and conference offices.

We're also excited to celebrate the division's 50th anniversary, and by the end of today's business session, I expect we may be adjusting our governance structure that will allow us to best serve you, the membership.

There continues to be change and uncertainty within higher education and college athletics. You heard about it during the state of college sports. There are significant pressures, from court cases to state and federal legislative proposals,

that want to change college athletics in a manner that would negatively impact the Division III student-athlete experience.

While no one can predict the future, I can assure you that the governance structure, those councils, those committees, those working groups, will continue to work to be responsive and proactive to meet your membership needs.

Thanks to the hard work of your Division III councils, committees, working groups, and my colleagues, I know we will have a great session today as we continue to transform our division. Thank you for letting me share a few thoughts, and most importantly, thank you for being Division III.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you, Louise, for providing that update. I must say it is an absolute pleasure working with a professional with the experience, the care and the focus on our students as someone like Louise. Thank you again for your leadership.

At this time I'd like to acknowledge the important work of several groups during this past year. After these acknowledgments we'll begin our legislative agenda. First I want to thank the members of the convention planning committee. The subcommittee held several videoconference meetings during the year to help craft our meeting agenda and to be sure that it was responsive to your membership feedback and interests that you've expressed.

We are thanking them for the fruits of their labor right now. Please keep our convention format, content and timing in mind when you receive the complete post-convention evaluation form. The subcommittee relies on that feedback to make the next year's convention even a better experience for everyone.

The subcommittee is chaired by Kate Corcoran, director of athletics and recreation at Cabrini University. Would the subcommittee members along with Kate please stand and receive our appreciation for their good work.

Secondly, I'd like to thank the members of the Division III Advisory Council. This group of individuals continued the great work that the group that supported Division III representatives of the Board of Governors Constitution Committee. The Advisory Council was tasked by the Presidents Council to help manage the implementation of the requirements stemming from the new NCAA constitution and to review the issues identified by the Division III membership. This group has worked diligently with the governance structure to fulfill its charge. In fact,



several of the legislative proposals that we'll vote on later this morning were vetted by this group.

The council was chaired by Fayneese Miller, the president of Hamlin University. The council's roster appears on the videos screens. Would the Advisory Council members who are here today please stand and accept our thanks for their great work.

I'd also like to take the opportunity to thank members of the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, the Management Council and Presidents Council for their hard work during the past year. It has been an absolute privilege to work with our student-athletes and members of both councils. The great working relationship between these councils is important to Division III to serve it well.

In particular, I'd like to acknowledge the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee council members who are completing their terms of service at this convention. Please hold your applause until the end.

From the national student-athlete Advisory Council, Jess Ader from SUNY Potsdam; Anya Gunewardina from Johns Hopkins University; David He from Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Megan Koch from Colorado College; Mercy Ogutu from Trinity Washington University; Michael Paterson-Jones from Wilkes University; Ariana Pena from Neumann University; Rachael Scoones from SUNY Delhi; and Talia Williams from Carleton College; from the Management Council, Steve Briggs, president of Berry College; Chuck Brown, faculty athletics representative from Penn State Erie; Sarah Feyerherm, vice president of student affairs at Washington College; Scott McGuinness, director of athletics from Washington and Jefferson University; Michelle Morgan, senior director of athletics at John Carroll University and chair of the council; the outgoing members of the Presidents Council, Rich Dunsworth, University of the Ozarks; Eric Fulcomer from Rockford University; Robert Lindgren, Randolph-Macon College.

These individuals have literally spent hundreds of hours of their personal and professional time to meet the very important responsibilities of representing you in our governance structure. Please join me in giving them warm appreciation for taking the time, the dedication and leadership and commitment to making Division III work for you.

There are two other important groups that have assisted our National SAAC and councils during the past year, and I'd like to mention the Presidents and Chancellors Advisory Group and the SAAC associate members. The Presidents Advisory Group helps to ensure that presidents from every

Division III conference has an opportunity to assist the Presidents and Management Councils with their leadership and responsibilities, and likewise works with fellow conference presidents to address important athletic issues.

Presidential leadership remains a top priority for Division III and the Presidents Council. The Presidents Advisory Council continues to play a crucial role in ensuring the presidents are exercising appropriate leadership in intercollegiate athletics, especially among our 44 voting conferences. In particular I'd like to thank the departing members of the Advisory Group whose names appear on the screen.

I also want to thank the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee associate members. Those student-athletes work closely with National SAAC and we will miss those students ending their term of service this year.

I also want to acknowledge those who serve on NCAA governance structure beyond the Presidents and Management Councils. How many different groups do we have going, Louise? Like 857 of them. There's really -- it's a breathtaking number of organizations. If anyone doubts that NCAA is a membership-driven organization, looking at the sheer number of opportunities for people to participate is what makes it possible, and the NCAA could not work without everyone's efforts to make it work.

I'd like to ask any of you -- I guess that's in here, who are serving on over 130 standing committees and other special committees, would you please stand and receive our appreciation from the rest of us who are benefiting from the fruits of your labor. Please stand, on any committee.

Thank you again for your commitment to the association of Division III. Again, it is only through your efforts that we're able to make this association work for all of you.

As you may recall, under our governance structure, the Division III nominating committee initially solicits and identifies Management Council nominations. The Management Council and the Presidents Council then review these nominations and send to the athletic directors and conference commissioners for consideration.

Those individuals voted electrically this fall and approved the following five new Management Council members: Peter Bothner, director of athletics at Nazareth College; Jessica Brown, vice president of student affairs and athletics at North Central College; Marybeth Lamb, director of athletics at Bridgewater State University; Rob Larson, faculty athletics representative; Melinda Treadwell, Keene State College. Congratulations to our new Management Council members.

Please note that we have five recent appointments to the Presidents Council, inclusive of two immediate appointments approved by the Presidents Council and three appointments approved by electronic mail vote of the division's presidents and chancellors this fall. The new council members are Allan Belton, Pacific Lutheran University; Marc Camille, Albertus Magnus College; Hiram Chodosh, Clarmont McKenna College; Steve Mauro, Alfred State College; Kate McCann, Mount St. Mary College; Laura Trombley, Southwestern University. I want to formally welcome the new presidents to the Presidents Council and thank each of them as well as their retaining members for their leadership this past year.

If you are interested in committee service or have any question about possibly serving, I encourage you to contact the current committee members or Jen Roe, the NCAA liaison to the nominating committee, or another member of the NCAA staff. We'll be happy to help discuss things and those opportunities in more detail.

I got my start on the financial aid committee, and it was exciting, great work. So there's always a place you can start in this structure.

The final group I'd like to acknowledge are all those who have hosted NCAA championship competitions during this past year. The championships do not bring hundreds of NCAA staff to our campuses to make these work. It relies on local people.

This hard work by our local athletic offices and institutions make for quality championship experiences for our student-athletes. If you are on the staff of an institution or conference office that hosted any round of NCAA championships during this past year, please stand and receive the appreciation from this legislative body.

Last night we had our third annual Division III LGBTQ year award celebration. These awards honor academic achievements, athletic excellence, service leadership of LGBTQ student-athletes' service, leadership and LGBTQ administrator staff and coaches and institutions and conferences who have demonstrated proactive efforts to create and sustain an inclusive culture in all of Division III.

The following were this year's award recipients: The Centennial Conference was the LGBTQ Conference of the Year; Courtnie Prather is our senior associate director of athletics and senior woman administrator, LGBTQ Administrator of the Year; Elise Morris, soccer student-athlete at Middlesbury College, LGBTQ Student-Athlete of the Year. Let's give them all a round of applause for this recognition.

Finally, I want to recognize all of the students in attendance. You are truly the heart of this association and why we are here. Everyone in this room is working to provide you with an excellent student-athlete experience. We have the student immersion program participants, as well as many students interested in learning more about the NCAA convention and Division III.

For all of those who are interested in a career in athletics, I hope that you've made connections to assist you in your professional journey. On a personal level, I want to give a shout-out to the students who came up to me in the middle of a convention or reception to introduce themselves and ask me about those opportunities. I was so impressed by all the interactions I've had with student-athletes during this convention.

Finally, I'd like to ask my personal thanks to the Division III staff led by vice president Louise McCleary. The staff is hardworking, dedicated and responsive to the Division III membership. I would ask all of the NCAA Division III staff to please stand and receive our appreciation. You're what keep all of this going. Thank you so much.

Now, it is time to get to our legislative proposals. The resolution No. 3 and 6, proposals Nos. 4 through 9, are included in the Presidents Council grouping. The remaining proposals, Nos. 10 through 15, are in the general grouping. As a reminder, we'll be using voting units to conduct all roll call votes for all proposals and resolutions along with related amendments and motions.

The first order of business is to adopt a convention notice, which has been made available online. Any editorial corrections were incorporated into the notice and the legislative services database. It is my understanding that there were no corrections made this year.

As a reminder, the notices include two resolutions from the Presidents Council to establish special rules of orders for designated proposals that were acted on during yesterday's special rules of order business session. We will use the paddles to adopt the notice, unless we get a vote that seems too close to call.

When we vote to adopt the convention notice, we will vote on the proposals in the order they receive in those publications unless they are reordered or have been withdrawn. If you intend to move to reorder a proposal, it'll be the time to do so in just the next few minutes and I will highlight that process. Please note that reordering any of the proposals also must occur via roll call, since all proposals designated this year are for roll call vote.

We will use the voting units to deal with any reordering. Also please note that by adopting the notice, you are adopting all of the appendices found in the blue pages of the official notice. This includes four legislative appendices of note.

Since there are no emergency legislative proposals, interpretations or modifications of working, please note the grouping of non-controversial amendments in Appendix C, which starts on page 54.

The amendments in these appendices have been approved by the interpretations and legislative committee. The Management Council and Presidents Council have been published in LSDBI -- alphabet soup. We will not discuss any of them individually unless you ask to do so.

Is there any such request? If there are, we will place those specific amendments off to the side and vote to accept the rest of the package first by a majority paddle vote. We will then go back and discuss the individual proposals that were broken out for separate consideration, one by one, and vote on them on whether they should be approved.

Approval is debatable and requires a majority vote. Any proposals removed from the package for separate discussion that are not subsequently approved are automatically referred back to the Management Council for further consideration.

You got all that, right?

I know it's a complicated process, so if there are any procedural questions before we begin, I'm sure the staff would be happy to answer them.

Seeing if there are any questions.

I will now ask for a series of motions from the floor to begin this process. First I'll ask for a motion and a second to adopt the official notice for Division III business session so that we can proceed with our work.

Second I'll ask for motions to reorder proposals and we will deal with them.

Third I will call for motions to remove items from the appendices, separate considerations, if any, and after we deal with all of those motions, we will then accept the notice if amended as necessary.

Is there an initial motion to adopt the convention notice?

Is there a second?

Thank you.

Reordering. Now let us see if there's any motion to do any reordering of the proposals.

Seeing none, we will move forward.

Now we will determine the order of the proposals, and if there are any motions to remove any of the items in the appendices for separate consideration. Any motions?

Okay, we're now ready to do final adoption of the notice, given there are no motions or amendments.

All in favor of adopting the notice, please raise your paddle.

Thank you.

All opposed?

The notice has been adopted. Thank you.

It is now time to consider our various 2023 legislative proposals. I will lead us through the Presidents Council grouping, the resolutions and proposals 1 through 9. The chair of Division III Management Council, Michelle Morgan, will then lead us through the remaining legislative proposals as a part of the general grouping.

Today we will consider a total of 12 legislative proposals, one resolution and related motions and amendments. These proposals, No. 3 through 15 in your convention notice, and we will conduct roll call electronic vote for each proposal and any motions related to it.

Again, please note that there are several questions and answers of interest that appear in the question-and-answer document that is located in the Division III convention resource website on NCAA.org. These questions and answers address every proposal and resolution.

We've covered the key issues during the legislative review and the Q & A portions of yesterday's issues forum. Also please note that several proposals were included in the "mootnicity" memo distributed earlier. We'll also note that several of those issues were done yesterday.

As we begin, I'd like to remind you of a couple of points of order. For the benefit of the court reporter and for historical record, please, again, state your name and institutions when you're recognized by the chair at one of the numbered microphones. Also please remember the delegates are limited to addressing a proposal twice, not counting answering questions directly posed to them by other delegates.

Finally, I'd like to review a couple parliamentary issues. Both the issues revolve around a motion to cease debate, commonly referred to as "call the question." Roberts' Rules of Order does not permit an individual to cease debate simply by walking to a microphone or shouting and reciting the phrase, "I call the question." Rather, a motion to cease debate must be a motion or something to move the previous question would be the formal way to do that, but it must be formally moved and seconded. If that motion is made, it is a non-debatable motion and requires a separate vote and a two-thirds majority for adoption.

If that motion is adopted, then we move immediately to a vote on the underlying proposal.

If the motion to cease debate is not adopted, debate continues on the underlying proposal. One more point: The chair considers it unfair for an individual to move to cease debate or call the question immediately after they've made several comments regarding the merits of the proposal. In other words, if you want to move to cease debate, you should not engage in the debate of the merits of the proposal as a part of your motion. If you do so, the chair intends to rule the motion out of order.

So thank you.

Microphone 9, I can almost see you in the back.

CHUCK MITRANO: Good morning, Chuck Mitrano, commissioner of the Empire 8. This morning I rise on behalf of the Empire 8, the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference and the Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference to move proposal No. 3.

JIM SCHMIDT: Is there a second?

All right, thank you very much. Please proceed.

CHUCK MITRANO: COVID presented many challenges for the entire world, as well as intercollegiate athletics. Such challenges also revealed weaknesses or opportunities for growth. COVID revealed the complex mental health challenges students endure, allowing us the opportunity to how we can best serve our student-athletes.

Mental illness is not specifically mentioned as a qualifying condition in our current bylaws. In 2005 it was adopted as a reference in the medical documentation section. 14.2.5 does not explicitly list mental health conditions as qualifying for hardship opportunity.

Needless to say, we have learned a lot about mental health in the past 18 years, and we continue to learn more and

have just scratched the surface. Adopting this resolution provides the membership an opportunity to create evolved policies that reflect the challenges the modern student-athlete faces and establish a mental health hardship waiver opportunity that is separate from that of a physical injury or illness and accounts for the unique circumstances presented by mental health.

When a student-athlete tears a knee or breaks a bone, it's very obvious, but individuals suffering with mental illness often don't realize they have a condition, and the stigma associated prevents them from revealing this to teammates and coaches or seek help.

As such, the criteria to qualify for mental health hardship waivers should also be unique and serve as a tool to further break the stigma.

We ask for your support to pass this resolution so the full force of the NCAA's resources, including the mental health advisory group of mental health professionals across the membership can be leveraged to collaborate with the membership and create an appropriate path for a mental health hardship waiver opportunity.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you. Is there any other discussion on this resolution?

JIM TROHA: Jim Troha, president, Juniata College.

As a membership of the Division III Presidents Council, I ask you to support this resolution. Our campuses, including our student-athletes, have been greatly impacted by mental health concerns. The NCAA's Sports Science Institute and the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee have identified mental health awareness as an issue of focus for student-athletes.

This resolution highlights a need to look at the intersection between the impact of mental health issues with our student-athletes and our current regulatory structure. We should use our resources and leverage the expertise of the association to work with the membership and develop a specific hardship waiver process that more directly addresses mental health.

Approving this resolution brings additional awareness to the issue and gives it the necessary attention for the benefit of our student-athletes. As a Presidents Council we support this resolution and ask you to do so, as well. Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: Microphone 6?

DONNA LEDWIN: Donna Ledwin, commissioner of the



Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference. I'm one of the co-sponsors of this proposal.

I would simply like to add that at yesterday's awards of excellence luncheon I had a lengthy conversation with our student-athletes at that table, and heard firsthand about all of the challenges around mental health that they are facing, and we need to do everything we can to support them within Division III.

I would tell you personally as a conference commissioner, I handle those medical hardship waivers for our conference. It would help me greatly to have more guidance that allows me to respond to these mental hardship requests instead of denying because I don't feel like I have the right documentation, kicking it to an appeal.

I think this is absolutely essential to help our student-athletes, but it's also helpful to us as administrators, and I encourage everyone to vote in favor of this proposal. Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you. Microphone 2.

MEGAN KOCH: Megan Koch, former cross country and track and field student-athlete, Colorado College.

The National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support resolution No. 3. Holistic sport of student-athletes means intentional protection of both mental and physical health.

The current hardship waiver is incompatible with diagnostic and monitoring practices for mental health conditions, and therefore is not an adequate avenue for preserving eligibility for student-athletes enduring mental health struggles.

A thorough and intensive exploration into mental health diagnosis, care plans, interventions and other relevant aspects of mental health treatment could allow for a hardship waiver more likely to match the intricacies of mental health issues in student-athletes.

National SAAC believes that no student-athlete should have to decide between tending to their mental health and participating in their sport. Developing a mental health-specific waiver founded on research and planning demonstrates due diligence for prioritizing student-athlete mental health.

For these reasons, we urge you to support resolution No. 3. Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you. Any further discussion? If not,

we'll move to a vote on resolution No. 3. Vote 1 for yes, 2 for no, and 3 for abstain. The poll is now open.

The poll is now closed. 459 yes, 8 no, and 2 abstentions.

Now we'll move on to resolution No. 4. Proposal? No. 10, yes, thank you.

RICHANNE MANKEY: I'm Richanne Mankey, president, Defiance College. As a member of Presidents Council, I move proposal No. 4.

JIM SCHMIDT: Please continue.

RICHANNE MANKEY: As a member of Presidents Council, I speak in support of and recommend proposal 4, providing our student-athletes with a voice via the Division III National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee during the business session at the NCAA convention is a pivotal move in the right direction for our division.

This opportunity aligns with the new NCAA constitution by providing the voice and influence of our student-athletes.

Further, Division III has always had a philosophy of seeking the student-athlete perspective and voice regarding Division III governance. The student-athlete advisory committee currently communicates a national student-athlete position on the proposed legislation.

Let us take the next step and allow National SAAC the opportunity to cast a vote on the legislation. For these reasons, I ask you to support proposal No. 4.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you.

Microphone No. 2?

JESSICA ADER: Jessica Ader, former volleyball student-athlete at the State University of New York at Potsdam. The National Student Advisory Committee urges you to support proposal 4. Including the student-athlete voice has always been a valuable part of the Division III governance process. Proposal 4 would further increase our voice and our representation in the division during the most important time of the legislative cycle.

You may be familiar with the role that National SAAC traditionally plays in Division III legislation. Each year as a group, we discuss the pros and cons of each proposal and do what I'm doing now, offer a National SAAC position at a business session with the intent of informing your opinions one way or another.

But what you may not know is the role that legislation plays



with National SAAC. We discuss it at every meeting, whether it be the cycle, how proposal becomes legislation, the ideas that are being considered for sponsorship or the pros and cons of proposals. We also review the official notice.

We understand and appreciate the process and recognize the uniqueness of assigning voting privileges to a governance committee and will not take the responsibility lightly.

In the last year, since the adoption of the new NCAA constitution, student-athletes have been empowered to become active participants in the governance process, and we see proposal 4 as an extension of that.

By having a vote on future legislative proposals, student-athletes would be able to contribute to the membership in an even greater way. We will no longer be just an opinion but a true voice in the process. For these reasons, we urge you to support proposal 4. Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you. Any further session?

Okay, we will move to a vote. Vote 1 for yes, 2 for no, or 3 to abstain. The polls are now open.

Polls are now closed. 461 voting yes, 7 no, 1 abstention. The proposal is adopted.

We will now move on to proposal No. 5. Microphone 3.

BOB LINDGREN: I'm Bob Lindgren, president of Randolph-Macon College, and as a member of the Presidents Council, I move proposal No. 5.

JIM SCHMIDT: Is there a second? There is a second. Please continue.

BOB LINDGREN: We are all here this morning to participate in an essential part of the D-III governance process by casting these votes on potential changes to our legislation. Another opportunity for us to participate in that process is to serve as a member of a D-III committee inside the division's governance structure.

This proposal represents a holistic way to make this important committee service more accessible to all members of Division III. Proposal No. 5 is before us because we listened when a year ago our membership, via the 2022 membership survey, which, by the way, was completed by 80 percent of our institutions in all conference offices, that survey indicated a strong desire to review our current composition and representation requirements, resulting in this proposal which considers not

just one or two but six of the governance committees most integral to the division's overall governance operation.

This proposal, should you adopt it, will provide greater geographical composition consistency across these six important committees, committees that literally shape the direction of Division III.

It is critical that committee members express region-specific concerns as they develop national solutions that affect us all.

Proposal No. 5 is also inclusive in nature, of student-athletes whose invaluable voices would be added to three additional committees. The proposal is also more inclusive of institutional and conference staff, and it is more inclusive in regards to gender, race and ethnicity, and will encourage a more diverse and qualified candidate pool, more representative of Division III.

For these reasons, I encourage you to support proposal No. 5 and then take an even more active role in Division III governance. Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you. Is there further discussion? Microphone 1.

DAN IABONI: Dan Iaboni, soccer student-athlete, Anna Maria College. The National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support proposal No. 5. National SAAC supports proposal 5 because the language outlining each committee's representation requirements would be streamlined, the size of each committee would be standardized, and there would be student-athlete representation on three committees where a National SAAC member does not currently sit.

Our committee also supports the inclusive aspects of proposal 5. First, the language that outlines each committee's structure would be modified to reflect current terminology. Also, the titles of individuals who would be able to serve with student-athletes on these committees would expand, giving more opportunities to serve in the Division III governance structure and more voices of administrators who help shape our division.

For these reasons, we urge you to support proposal No. 5. Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you. Further discussion?

Microphone 10.

BETSY MITCHELL: Betsy Mitchell, director of athletics, the California Institute of Technology. Speaking as a

member of the Management Council, speaking in support of the proposal.

Last year when the membership expressed a desire to review the composition and representation of the current Division III governance structure, Management Council heard that loud and clear. A subgroup was formed to review the makeup of various committees and their histories, and the end result of that is proposal 5.

The council supports a proposal believing it will strengthen the governance structure. Proposal 5 recognizes the benefits of standardizing the composition, size and core requirements of standing Division III committees. It also respects the fact that certain committees oversee a significant proportion of the division's budget, which is why the proposal would see the championships committee and strategic planning and finance committee consist of more committee members than the other four. It also expands the number of at-large members on these two committees to allow for an even greater voice and diversity of member.

Finally, proposal 5 modernizes each committee's representational requirements language.

Please support proposal 5.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you. Further discussion?

Seeing none, we will move to a vote. Vote number 1 to say yes, 2 for no or 3 for abstention. The polls are open.

Thank you. Polls are now closed. 458 voting yes, 11 no, two abstentions. The proposal is adopted.

Move on to proposal 6. No. 6 becomes moot. I've got to read my script, folks. We are going to move on to No. 7, right? We're still in that order. Got it.

Is there a motion to move -- no? I need lots of help up here. There we go.

Yesterday the membership adopted resolution 23-1, which approved a one-time special rule of order allowing for proposal 7 and proposal 8 to be discussed collectively - how could I forget - as presented as alternate choices so that the membership would have the opportunity to discuss both proposals prior to a vote. After this discussion is complete, delegates will vote to decide which proposal they would prefer to be voted on first.

The proposal that you determine should go first will then be moved and seconded. To clarify our parliamentary procedures document, if that proposal is adopted, the other one is rendered moot.

First I will open the floor for discussion on proposals No. 7 and 8. Thank you, Jeff. That makes far more sense.

Microphone No. 4.

RENEE WACHTER: Renee Wachter, chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Superior. As a member of the Presidents Council, I speak in support of proposal No. 8 and amendment 8-1.

During the 2022 issues forum at the convention, you, our D-III membership, told the NCAA staff that you wanted to see changes in the governance structure. Then your responses in the 2022 D-III membership survey reaffirmed this desire to see changes implemented.

After gathering all of that feedback and data, the governance structure got to work reviewing and analyzing that information in order to create a solution that would both resolve your existing concerns and best position the councils to address the future needs of the division.

This proposal and its amendments are that solution. I know, you might be asking yourself, what makes this proposal so great. Well, for starters, it addresses the areas where you wanted change by providing greater geographic and conference representation, while not disturbing areas where the membership was already satisfied.

From a presidential perspective, that means maintaining a smaller and more consistent size for the Presidents Council, which allows the council to be nimbler and more strategic in its discussions.

It also means allocating the additional positions to the Management Council, which unlike the Presidents Council, permits a larger applicant pool of athletics practitioners to fill its open slots.

The Management Council also requires its members to serve as liaisons to other D-III and association-wide committees within the governance structure, therefore having a slightly larger Management Council composition would actually ease the individual council members' responsibilities.

In addition to keeping the current size of the Presidents Council the same, this proposal would also maintain the current selection process for the Presidents Council.

Both councils believe the current process is working well and that selecting members from the presidents advisory group, which is a group that has one representative from every conference not on the Presidents Council, allows its

new members to have familiarity with the governance process and a better understanding of the time commitment to serve.

For these reasons, I encourage you to support proposal No. 8 and its amendment, proposal No. 8-1. Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you.

Microphone No. 10.

JENN DUBOW: Jenn Dubow, executive director of the Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. I'm speaking in support of proposal 7, which would guarantee every multisport conference representation on either Presidents or Management Council at all times on a four-year rotating cycle.

This proposal has broad and representative national support from five co-sponsoring conferences, based on our shared principles of engagement and representation.

In our uniquely diverse division, it is critical to continue the transformational work towards our chief responsibilities to enhance equity and consistency, which is so critical to Division III. We should model these values at our highest level of governance as we do within our conferences and on our institutional campuses.

I'm very confident that every league and all membership institutions have someone not just capable but eager to serve on one of these committees. Also consider the enhanced planning and learning opportunities this can provide through a clear and transparent path to nomination.

While both proposals address representation, proposal 7 guarantees member institutions through their conference will not go longer than four years without access to these very important councils. Currently I have heard of conferences that have gone 10, 12, even 15 years without a representative on one of these councils. This is not fair or equitable.

Proposal 8 will still see some go eight years without a possible rotation on to Presidents Council. Taking a simple and proactive approach of proposal 7's rotation should result in a strong pool of candidates that allows our different constituencies to have a voice at the highest level of governance.

Thank you for your support for proposal 7.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you. Further discussion?

Microphone No. 2.

VAISHNAV SIDDAPUREDDY: Vaishnav Siddapureddy, football student-athlete, Pomona College.

The National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to choose and support the membership sponsored council proposal, proposal No. 7.

The council composition that proposal 7 is putting forward is similar to that which our committee uses for primary and associate members. It operates in a prescribed cycle to make sure that every Division III conference has its chance to serve.

National SAAC believes that this alternating cycle is positive, not only for the representation purposes, but also because it would offer conferences the opportunity to plan in advance the individuals they put forward in the nomination process.

Further, we feel strongly that student-athlete representatives who serve on Presidents or Management Council should only represent National SAAC without the added burden of considering the opinions of their full conference.

Because proposal 7 guarantees this structure, it is our committee's preferred option. For these reasons, we urge you to support proposal No. 7. Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you. Microphone 4.

FATHER PAUL TAYLOR: Good morning. I'm Father Paul Taylor, president of St. Vincent College and the current Presidents Council chair for the Presidents Athletic Conference.

On behalf of my presidential colleagues in the PAC and our partner conferences cosponsoring proposal No. 7, I also rise in support of this proposal. It accomplishes everything that Commissioner Dubow stated.

These are key tenets supporting what we strive to do on our campuses and in Division III. It also continues to effectively address themes which have driven our collective decision making for the past several years, namely, the concept of transformational change at last year's convention and reducing unnecessary areas of complexity, as we are currently tackling with the constitution and the manuals.

Last year, we passed a constitution which included Article 6, which states, "The control and responsibility for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics shall be exercised by

the institution itself and the division and conference of which it is a member. A member institution's president or chancellor has ultimate responsibility and final authority for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics program and the actions of any board in control of the program."

As presidents and chancellors, we have the ultimate responsibility and final authority for the conduct of our intercollegiate athletics programs. This proposal gives equal access and representation to all Division III presidents and conferences, which, while a subtle change, will be transformational.

So the fixed committee appointment schedule for both councils also gives each conference membership the opportunity to select and nominate its members for council inclusion, rather than the imposition of appointment with the possibility, and may I add, probability of exclusion, that exclusion which proposal 8 retains.

Finally, moving this selection process to the nominating committee for additional transparency reduces the perception of bias, especially what could be perceived as bias based upon ideological issues.

I thank you for your time and urge your support of membership proposal No. 7 in both the order of voting and for its official passage.

Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you. Microphone 9.

MICHELLE WALSH: Michelle Walsh, director of athletics, Vassar College.

As a member of Management Council and the subcommittee recommending this change, I speak in support of proposal No. 8, including its amendment. In addition to reviewing the feedback from the 2022 issues forum and the 2022 Division III membership survey, the subgroup also considered the thoughts and opinions of key Division III groups, such as the executive group of the National Association of Division III Athletic Administrators, more commonly known as NADIAA; conference offices; and the Division III advisory group, a 29-member group established to support and advise the councils regarding issues identified by the Division III membership.

Collectively, all that information identified two clear areas where the membership wanted to see change. First, the membership wanted greater geographic in conference representation on the councils, and second, the membership wanted a more holistic approach to inclusivity on the councils.

Proposal No. 8 and its amendment provide our membership with both things, for both things, without being overly prescriptive in its application.

As it specifically relates to geographic and conference representation, this proposal ensures that every multisport conference is represented on one of the two councils, while also ensuring that certain geographical requirements are met. Those requirements include ensuring that each council has at least three members from each of four defined geographical areas and at least one of the representatives from area 4 to be from California, Colorado, Oregon, Texas or Washington.

As noted with the committee proposal, it is critical to have balanced geographic representation so council members can hear region-specific concerns as they develop and propose national solutions. The same cannot be said for proposal No. 7 that has no geographic representation requirements.

Plainly, conference representation does not fulfill the demand for geographical representation that we heard in our listening sessions.

In addition, proposal 8 and its amendment is much less prescriptive in its assignment of conference representation.

It does not legislate a specific conference rotation on the councils but rather allows for flexibility to account for the numerous variables that impact a person's service such as changing jobs, changing conferences.

This flexibility will better prepare our councils for change. In our post-COVID environment, we have all learned the value and importance of flexibility.

Finally, with the inclusion of amendment 8-1, the governance proposal is on an equal playing field with the membership proposal in ensuring that the conference affiliation of SAAC representatives will neither satisfy representational requirement nor constitute multiple representation from a multisport conference.

When all these things are viewed in conjunction with commitment to diversity and use of inclusive language that is evident in proposal No. 8 and one of our core values in Division III, the choice becomes even more clear. It is for these reasons that I urge you to support proposals No. 8 and 8-1. Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you.

Microphone No. 1.

STAN WEARDEN: Thank you. I'm Stan Wearden, president of Methodist University in the USA South Conference. I stand in proposal No. 7 and I urge your support.

Seeing a membership-sponsored proposal put forth by five conferences from all over the country is tremendous to me and to other presidents I have spoken with. Its simplicity, minimal impact on structure but significant impact on membership engagement and representation is exactly the type of inclusive philosophy we should all have at the forefront of our minds.

If I understand the finer details correctly, although the nominating committee would nominate council members, the presidents and management councils will still have final approval of the nominees, so what reason would we have not to embrace greater transparency and allow those to whom we delegate every other professional aspect to do their good and thorough jobs presenting us with the best candidates we can generate.

As for the role of student-athletes, we strongly support their voice, but we also value appropriate professional conference representation in voting. I urge you to support proposal No. 7. Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you.

Microphone No. 9.

CHUCK MITRANO: Chuck Mitrano, commissioner of the Empire 8. I rise in support of proposal No. 7.

Previous comments alluded to the fact that this proposal does not include geographic requirement. As a conference that has not had a representative on Management Council for almost 25 years, we just finally got someone appointed, in more than 25 years, the geography tenet of the current legislation clearly is ineffective. This is a movement towards a larger voice, towards conference representation and balance.

Even in the competing proposal, to have a representative -- to lack the ability of a representative on Presidents Council for eight years is substantial. The average length of presidency for Division III institutions is probably much less than that.

Again, I stand to urge you to support our proposal, proposal No. 7.

JIM SCHMIDT: Further discussion?

Microphone No. 9.

CHUCK BROWN: Thank you. Chuck Brown, faculty athletics representative, Penn State Behrend.

As a member of the Management Council, I speak in support of proposal No. 8 and 8-1. A question on the 2022 Division III membership survey asked whether increasing and diversifying the pool of candidates for Division III committee service is important to the division. A resounding 85 percent of this membership either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

This data should not be surprising from a division that prides itself on diversity, equity and inclusion. It was this answer along with the other extensive feedback gathered by the Management Council subgroup which made it abundantly clear that any proposal to change the composition of any committee, including the councils, should include specific criteria aimed at advancing our diversity, equity and inclusion efforts.

Proposal No. 8 addresses D, E and I from all different facets of our division. What does this mean practically? It means requiring at least three members of each council to be individuals who identify as Black, indigenous, people of color. It means increasing the minimum number of members who identify as female and male respectively, from four to eight on each council. It means acknowledging that the views of our public institutions and conferences are important and necessary in a division that is 80 percent private, and ensuring that at least three members, approximately 15 percent of the Management Council, will always be present to provide that perspective.

In a representative governance structure, it is paramount that all of these voices be heard, and that is not just because I believe it myself but because we as a membership made it clear through our feedback from the 2022 membership survey.

If you adopt proposal No. 7, none of these safeguards would exist, and that is not in the best interest of Division III. For these reasons, I implore you to support proposal No. 8 and its amendment, proposal No. 8-1. Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you. Further discussion? Any further discussion?

We will move to a vote. Just as a reminder, this vote is to select which proposal would be voted on first. If you want to support No. 7 being voted on first, you vote 1. If you'd like to support motion 8, you vote 2. 3 to abstain.

As a reminder, we'll select the order, and if the first proposal is adopted, the second resolution would become

moot.

Voting is now open.

Polls are now closed. The vote is 280 votes to support moving No. 7 forward, 186 to move No. 8 forward, and five are abstaining. The body has decided to take proposal No. 7 first.

I will now ask if there's a motion to move proposal No. 7. Microphone No. 4, motion. Is there a second? There's a second. Please continue.

JOE ONDERKO: I'm Joe Onderko, commissioner of the Presidents Athletic Conference, and on behalf of our partner conferences, the Empire 8, the North Coast Athletic Conference, the Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, and the USA South Athletic Conference, I move motion No. 7.

First, let me just say thank you to all of you who voted to show support for this membership-sponsored proposal. We appreciate your confidence. I especially want to thank those members of both the National SAAC and the national FARA who voted to support our proposal.

Finally, I would also like to thank those on both Presidents and Management Council, the individuals who have shown support for proposal No. 7.

Voting for this proposal represents a new day in Division III governance. It's helping to create a more democratic and inclusive Presidents Council and Management Council, one that is representative of the entire Division III membership.

Thank you again, and I urge your support of membership proposal No. 7.

JIM SCHMIDT: Further discussion? Any further discussion?

If not, we will move to a vote. To vote yes, you'd vote No. 1; to vote 2, No. 2; to abstain, No. 3. The polls are now open.

Polls are now closed. Yes is 354 votes, no is 116 votes. Abstentions for proposal No. 7 is adopted.

We will now move to proposal No. 9. Is there a motion? Motion at microphone No. 4. Is there a second? There's a second.

Please continue.

DOUG LEE: Good morning. My name is Doug Lee. I'm president of Waynesburg University and a member of the Presidents Council.

I move proposal No. 9 for these reasons. First, by requiring conference affiliation for new members of Division III, this proposal will help those institutions avoid some of the common challenges associated with independent status. These challenges include meeting sports sponsorship minimums due to scheduling difficulties, finding championship opportunities for student-athletes, and financial obstacles for the overall athletic program.

By removing these potential challenges for new members, this proposal increases the likelihood that new member institutions will maintain successful, sustainable and competitive athletic programs at the Division III level and will therefore promote the long-term stability of Division III institutions and our conferences.

This proposal will also help facilitate a better student-athlete experience by providing competitive opportunities through more stable schedules, access to conference championship and consideration for postseason conference honors, as well as off-the-field opportunities such as access to a conference student-athlete advisory committee and conference grant programs.

For these reasons, the Presidents Council supports this proposal and asks the membership to adopt it today.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you. Further discussion on proposal No. 9?

Microphone No. 6.

DONNA LEDWIN: Donna Ledwin, commissioner of the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference, and I rise to express the concern of our conference with passing this proposal.

We think it's well-intentioned but an overreach. It seems like a solution to a problem that doesn't really exist. A prospective Division III institution does not enter the process lightly. There's significant expense and time and energy put into the exploratory and the provisional member process, and we have worked with two different institutions in this process so we know it well.

Conferences should be the gatekeepers whether or not an institution can get an invitation to Division III membership. If you think about it, why would we say yes to someone who has not gone through the very well-established vetting process that the exploratory membership process is.

We like to see that someone has gone through that process. They've got all the tools. They're walking in eyes wide open, as opposed to taking an institution that has not gone through all that and giving a leap of faith that they're going to do the right thing.

There's also some biases. I will say that if you're a women's college in search of a conference, you might be very hard-pressed for someone willing to take you because the fact is a lot of conferences want that balance on the men's and women's sports side. Good luck.

It also begs the question of, down the road, should we be saying, well, you shouldn't add a sport if your conference doesn't sponsor it. Do you have to have affiliate membership in another conference before you choose to sponsor that sport? I don't think we want to go there.

We rely on the institution to make the decision that's best for them.

I'll just close by saying that we really need to think about this. We would recommend that this get put on a back burner. If there are real issues that come up in the future, we can talk about them, but please let's -- this is a slippery slope, and we don't want to be making these decisions at the conference level for prospective new members. We'd request that you vote no to proposal 9. Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you.

Additional speaker at No. 6?

DICK KAISER: Dick Kaiser, commissioner, St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

There are very few in this room that remember when the NCAA used to have all three divisions sit in one room together and make decisions about what was good. We individualized it, went different divisions. Those were all real positive types of steps.

Now we are at a situation where we are asking or telling potential members of Division III, you are not welcome unless we invite you.

I would strongly encourage you to not support this. Having been an athletic director that took three schools through the process of joining the NCAA from another organization and now being the conference commissioner and having two schools currently in our process that are going through the NCAA membership process and the membership three- to four-year, it is behooving of our conference to accept them if we want to. The gatekeeper to accept is the

conference, but it should not be the gatekeeper to decide whether an institution wants to become a NCAA member.

Having taken institutions through that process as it was just explained to you is very costly. It's very time-consuming, and people do not jump into this very lightly. It is a major decision on their part.

Let the NCAA membership process, which is either a four- or a three-year type of thing, be the gatekeeper. Let them make that decision as to whether they are worthy, and then the conferences can then make a potential decision as to whether they're accepting.

As a conference, we look at the institution. We look at the process that they're going through, and would that be good members. How would you know, if they've not had that opportunity?

We have always prided ourselves as Division III of being institutional autonomy. Let the institutions make the decisions as to what's best for their institution. All of a sudden we are stepping up and saying, we'll tell you whether you're a good potential member or not. I think that's totally contrary to what our NCAA philosophical being and what we try to do.

Once upon a time, there was a great film called "Scent of a Woman," Al Pacino. He had a great line says, "I've been around." Well, I've been around, and I think this is really not where we want to go. I would strongly encourage you to defeat this particular proposal. Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: We haven't had a movie quoted yet today, so there we go.

Microphone No. 6.

DINO POLLOCK: It's hard to follow Al Pacino and "Scent of a Woman." I've been around, too, and I think this proposal stinks. My name is Dino Pollock, I'm the director of athletics at Western New England University, and I come to this particular issue through the prism of my last five years at my prior institution at UC-Santa Cruz.

When I got there we were a D-III independent. It was extremely difficult for us to get matches, contests across the country, largely because of our geographic isolation. The only other Division III member institution in northern California was Mills College. Mills was a single gender institution, and they are no longer a Division III institution because they've been absorbed by Northeastern University.

So our closest D-III colleagues were in southern California,

 . . . when all is said, we're done.®



a seven-hour bus ride away. So if we're not able to get into the SCIAC or the Northwest Conference, which are the two closest conferences in the western United States, where is our home? I don't think conferences, and I agree with my colleagues who spoke before me, should be the gatekeepers. We have a rigorous NCAA exploratory and acceptance process that we've all adopted and ascribed to and went through. I agree that that process should be the gatekeeping process if you're going to be a Division III member, and then allow people and institutions who are trying to live a D-III life and experience and give their student-athletes that kind of experience the opportunity to do so.

I find this provision absolutely exclusionary. It is not appropriate for conferences to serve a gatekeeping function in this manner when the NCAA already has a rigorous process to do so.

I inform this through that prism and that experience as personal. Every year we have to get a waiver, a 70 percent in-region waiver because -- I'm talking about UC Santa Cruz, because we just are geographically isolated, and we can't change that. That's an immutable thing. Why would we want to preclude other institutions who are similarly situated, either through geographic isolation, single gender institutions or other matters, to not allow them to be Division III family members.

I urge the membership to vote this measure down, and I hope that this will fail. Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you. Any further discussion?

Okay, we will move to vote on proposal No. 9. No. 1 for yes, 2 for no and 3 for abstention. Polls are open.

Polls are now closed. We have 307 votes for yes, 156 for no, 9 abstention. Proposal No. 9 is adopted. That concludes consideration of the proposals in the presidents groupings. I appreciate the spirited conversation we've had this morning.

At this point, Michelle Morgan, chair of the Management Council, will lead you through the remaining proposals.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Thank you, Chancellor Schmidt, and good morning. We'll now proceed with the six proposals in the general grouping, and again, we will consider these by roll call using the voting units.

Yesterday the membership adopted resolution 23-2, which adopted a one-time special rule of order, allowing proposal No. 10 and proposal No. 11 to be discussed collectively and presented as alternative choices so that the

membership shall have the opportunity to discuss both proposals prior to any vote.

After the discussion is complete, the delegates will vote to determine which proposal they prefer to be voted on first. The proposal that is determined to go first will then be moot and seconded as clarified in the parliamentary procedures document that the proposal is adopted. The other will then be rendered moot. First I will open the floor to discussions on proposals No. 10 and 11.

Microphone No. 6.

MICHELE DOMBROWSKI: Good morning. I'm Michele Dombrowski, the SWA at the University of the South, in addition to being the head women's lacrosse coach assistant coach for field hockey. Each of us in this room, all of our coaches back home, and the many student-athletes that we are here to represent value the flexibility we are given in our daily lives, yet we fear the responsibility that comes with that freedom. Then we spend days frustrated by restrictions placed upon us. We fear that our neighbors may find a loophole that we don't see, a shortcut on the path.

Let's trust ourselves. Accept responsibility for the student-athletes we care for daily, weekly, monthly and longer. Many of the arguments against proposal 10 hinge on concerns regarding fewer restrictions than exist in the current status quo or proposal 11. Assuming flexibility will be used to the detriment of student-athlete well-being or to gain an unfair advantage is misguided if we trust the leadership in this room and our division.

Neither proposal 10 nor 11 add additional days. What they do add is flexibility in when and how permitted dates are used. Disregarding the benefits of increased flexibility and the simplicity of proposition 10 due to fear over fewer restrictions ignores reality. People who flirt with rules will do it whether we keep the status quo or pass one of these proposals.

We should embrace autonomy in managing our dates. Limitations in staffing and facilities are institutionally unique, and the most flexible solution to these challenges should be permitted within the dates allowed as per proposal 10.

I trust the people in this room, the coaches at our institutions will use increased flexibility in positive ways to support the health and well-being of our student-athletes and staff. Voting for proposal 10 is not a vote for no limits; rather it is a vote of trust in institutional controls and responsible decision making.

For some of you, I recognize a vote for proposal 10 may be a change from the discussions you had with your conferences yesterday. But the point of today is to give due diligence to these proposals. Look at the people you sat with for hours debating these proposals. Do you trust them to make decisions in the best interest of your university and your student-athletes? You should.

To all of you and the SAAC, do we expect our student-athletes to trust their leaders? We do. Reflect that trust in your vote. Flexibility has ruled the day so far.

I don't have an Al Pacino quote, but I urge everyone in this room to support deregulation that reflects our unique experiences and the needs of our individual institutions by supporting and adopting proposition 10. Thank you.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Microphone No. 4.

MATT HILL: Good morning, colleagues. I'm Matt Hill, director of athletics at the University of Northwestern in St. Paul. As a member of the Management Council, I request that you support the Management Council proposal playing season. Proposal 11, vote it first and then vote it in.

As a member of the Interpretations and Legislative Committee where this proposal originated, I was closely involved in the process of getting this concept in front of all of you. As a committee, we engaged in extensive membership outreach to develop an option responsive to your concerns, those concerns as expressed most specifically in the recent membership survey that indicated 80 percent of us believe there's a better alternative to the week structure in defining a season, and 65 percent of us said that the current structure is too restrictive, especially in light of the COVID operations when we were afforded greater flexibility.

The Management Council proposal eliminates the week structure and provides for more flexibility to engage in activities with our student-athletes.

The committee gave considerable thought to the appropriate flexibility in relation to the principle that student-athletes should have a meaningful opportunity to engage in other pursuits, which is a tenet, principle under our current philosophy statement.

Proposal 11 reflects an appropriate balancing of these concerns by providing greater flexibility outside the season in all sports, yet maintaining certain guardrails to protect the student-athlete's time. This proposal eliminates the inflexible weeks model, provides additional days in the non-traditional segment, and a broader opportunity to use those days.

Finally, by switching to a days model for winter sports, it allows institutions to manage the winter break period more effectively to benefit the student-athletes without materially increasing the overall time commitments for the student-athletes.

This model recognizes each sport and each season are unique, and the regulations should reflect that uniqueness.

On behalf of the Management Council I request that you vote proposal No. 11 as the preferred proposal and then adopt proposal No. 11, establishing a new practice and playing season framework. Thank you.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Microphone No. 7.

BRAD FIELDS: Brad Fields, director of athletics, Center College, and a member of the Southern Athletic Association.

For several minutes this morning, we overwhelmingly supported the notion of more geographic representation in our governance structure. Now, just a short time later, we have an opportunity to take tangible action to prove that wasn't just lip service, that we care about the unique needs of our members and conferences that are geographically diverse.

Proposal 10, the membership proposal, was crafted with this in mind. As a member of a conference that has weekly bus trips of six-plus hours, proposal 10 was created with flexibility to allow these conferences to address their unique travel challenges while allowing more compressed conferences to institute what works well for them without penalty.

Every institution and conference has the opportunity to maximize their 114 days with their unique needs, be it staffing, facilities, weather or location. It is permissive in nature.

In proposal 11, the NCAA governance structure proposal, there are negative impacts on spring sports at conferences that must adjust their conference championships, due in large part to geographic makeup. These conferences could lose as many as 10 days or more from their seasons due to the new counting method.

To be sure everyone understands, in the current 19 weeks model, as well as proposal 10, the start date for spring sports is not connected to the NCAA championship selection, but instead at the end of conference postseason play, as NCAA championship play is exempt. But in proposal 11, this method of counting back to find the start



date changes to NCAA championship selection.

Spring sports at conferences who finish championships sooner than NCAA championship time, be it graduations, geography or other reasons, can no longer have the full benefit of their fall and winter colleagues or their colleagues around the rest of the country.

Our spring sports already face some uphill climbs due to where they fall in the academic year. Why needlessly add another barrier to their experience?

I urge you to support proposal 10 and allow all our members the opportunity to figure out how to meet their unique challenges.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Microphone No. 2.

TALIA WILLIAMS: Talia Williams, former volleyball student-athlete, Carleton College.

The National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to choose and support the governance-sponsored playing season proposal, proposal No. 11. A tenet of Division III and a reason why many of us chose our institutions is the distinct seasons where practice, competition and other athletically related activities can take place. This separation allows us to pursue jobs, internships, study abroad programs and other experiences that contribute to us graduating as well-rounded individuals.

Because of this, we believe that proposal 11 is the best balance of the flexibility of a days model with our desire to maintain clearly defined seasons. National SAAC also believes that if adopted, proposal 11 will benefit student-athlete health and safety because it will permit teams to take recovery days as needed and without the pressure of, quote-unquote, wasting an entire week.

This we can see resulting in fewer injuries, less overuse and a positive effect on student-athlete mental health.

For these reasons, we urge you to support proposal No. 11. Thank you.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Microphone No. 7.

STEVE BRIGGS: Steve Briggs, president, Berry College, chair of the Presidents Council and the Southern Athletic Association.

I support both proposals 10 and 11 because both provide institutions more flexibility and freedom to manage their resources to the benefit of student-athletes, coaches and

athletic staff.

I support both, but I strongly prefer proposal 10 because it offers the greatest flexibility and freedom to our individual institutions, and that is what I wanted to emphasize.

In Division III we have often called for and championed the principle of divisional autonomy and freedom, and equally as important, the principle of institutional freedom when it does not cause competitive inequity. This is fundamentally about an institution's freedom to manage its own resources in its own context.

Proposal 10 offers the greatest flexibility. It allows an institution to adopt a 114-day approach, but it also allows an institution to choose to stay with the status quo approach or adopt a modified weeks approach along the lines of proposal 11. Proposal 10 is simple to state, flexible, and responsive to the needs of the individual institution. It's far simpler to understand than the complicated format, the changing format of proposal 11.

If passed, proposal 10 does not take away your choice. It allows you to make the choice that best fits your need. Proposal 10 allows institutions the flexibility to work with student-athletes and coaches to optimize practice schedules and facilities, to ensure reasonable workloads for sports medicine staff. It allows institutions to be responsive to unpredictable weather patterns. It allows institutions the flexibility to develop practice schedules that increase the amount of recovery time for student-athletes and allows student-athletes to manage and balance their participation with other campus activities.

That's separate from what we just heard from SAAC. It actually increases the opportunity for schedules that allow for recovery time.

Proposal 10 does require athletic directors to work with coaches and student-athletes to organize institutional resources to your best advantage, and I'm confident that you are competent and willing to do so.

I've heard that some schools don't have flexibility with regard to facilities or sports medicine staff. I have good news for you: Proposal 10 does not require you to change. I've heard some schools don't think they can change but don't want other schools to gain some advantage or supposed advantage.

Some suggest that proposal 10 will usher in the Wild West. That's erroneous. Proposal 10 allows us to be responsible decision makers. It allows institutions to make responsible decisions based on the best interests of its own student-athletes, coaches and sports medicine staff.

Your review of the Division III principles state that the purpose of the NCAA is to assist members in developing the basis for consistent, equitable competition while minimizing infringement and the freedom of individual institutions.

Proposal 10 provides no new competitive advantage, no competitive advantage that doesn't already exist. Voting against a proposal that increases flexibility because you're not sure you can use that flexibility, well, that calls into question our belief in the foundational principle of institutional freedom.

Proposal 10 offers the most institutional flexibility and freedom. It is, in fact, its flexibility that allows each institution to choose which model they want to implement.

Think of this vote then as a referendum on our collective commitment to the freedom of individual institutions.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Microphone No. 4.

SCOTT McGUINNESS: Thank you. Scott McGuinness, director of athletics, Washington and Jefferson College.

As a member of Management Council, I recommend proposal No. 11 as the preferred option. Restructuring the entire playing season framework is not insignificant, and having two different proposals attempting to do that provides an important decision for our future as a division.

I think it is important to highlight some key elements that are significant. First, proposal No. 11 greatly simplifies the traditional segment for fall and spring sports. There is a defined start date and end date, no counting of weeks, no counting of days. You just need to maintain one day off per week.

The non-traditional segment in those sports also provides more opportunities for contact with student-athletes and provides greater flexibility to use those days so as to better manage around institutional calendars, which often vary within conferences, let alone the entire division.

While winter sports would require monitoring of days, this proposal allows for greater flexibility of scheduling around the winter break in a manner that makes sense for your institution and your student-athletes.

Further, it allows for limited earlier interaction with student-athletes to gradually get them acclimated to campus life.

Proposal No. 11 represents an appropriate balance for the

student-athletes, athletic staff, most notably, sports medicine teams, and I encourage you to vote for proposal No. 11 as the preferred playing season proposal. Thank you.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Is there any other discussion regarding these proposals?

Microphone No. 9.

DONNA HARMON: Hi, Donna Harmon, director of athletics at WPI.

Yesterday we spent time on our philosophy statement, and that was for a reason. We are not the division that doesn't give athletic scholarships. We are the division deeply committed to the student part of the term "student-athlete." I believe these two proposals fundamentally are not committed to the student.

As a reminder, the banner at the front of the room is not to discover how to spend time throughout the entire academic year with your coach, develop your relationship with your coach throughout the year, or dedicate time to your sport throughout the year. But that is what these proposals will allow.

Yes, we learned a lot during COVID. Needing to have change from weeks to days was necessary due to a global pandemic and the changing landscape around the country on how to manage it. I am very proud of my colleagues in this room on how we were able to hold things together and make adjustments then to keep things together day in and day out.

But we all have craved letting go of COVID-adopted processes, return to normal, if you will, getting back to the good work that we do on behalf of our student-athletes.

Yes, we learned how to do things differently, and we can fix a day counting as a week, but these proposals are an overreach, not in our best interest of our staffs or facilities, nor D-III philosophically sound. These proposals will increase the physical and mental commitment of our student-athletes to their coach. That is not D-III but a D-I, D-2 approach, which is still an option for schools who want that engagement.

I urge you to defeat both of these proposals, to reaffirm that D-III is about balance and the commitment to the student and not the culture of year-round engagement with their coach. Thank you.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Any other discussion?



All right, then I think we are ready to go to a vote, between No. 10 and No. 11 on which one we should vote on first. Please cast your vote. 1 for proposal No. 10, 2 for proposal No. 11, and 3 to abstain. The polls are open.

The polls are closed. The vote for this proposal, 144 support proposal No. 10, 317 votes to support proposal No. 11, 14 abstentions, so we will vote on proposal No. 11.

I will ask now for microphone No. 3.

**BRIAN WIGLEY:** Good morning. I'm Brian Wigley, faculty athletic representative, Shenandoah University, and member of the Management Council. As a member of the Management Council, I move proposal 11.

**MICHELLE MORGAN:** Is there a second? Proceed.

**BRIAN WIGLEY:** We've had extensive conversation regarding the playing season's proposals, and I will not reiterate those here. I'll simply mention that this proposal was developed from significant membership outreach including membership survey and feedback from coaches, athletic directors and conference commissioners.

Therefore for the reasons stated previously, I urge you to support proposal No. 11.

**MICHELLE MORGAN:** Any other discussion?

Okay, then I think we can proceed. We'll open the polls for proposal No. 11. Please cast your vote, 1 for yes, 2 for no and 3 to abstain. The polls are open.

The polls are closed. The results of this vote for proposal No. 11, 332 votes for yes, 132 votes against, six abstentions, so proposal No. 11 carries.

Just as a reminder, proposal No. 10 is now moot, so we will move to proposal No. 12.

Microphone No. 7.

**KERI ALEXANDER LUCHOWSKI:** Good morning. Keri Alexander Luchowski. I'm the executive director of the North Coast Athletic Conference. On behalf of the NCAC, the New Jersey Athletic Conference, and the Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, I move proposal No. 12.

**MICHELLE MORGAN:** Is there a second? Please proceed.

**KERI ALEXANDER LUCHOWSKI:** Each fall, students flock to our campuses eager for their seasons to start. For

many, though, that excitement is tempered by dread. Why? Three-a-day practices, scrimmages on day 2 or 3 of preseason, injuries and exhaustion from being pushed too hard, too fast.

We know that the challenges and the layout of the fall season sometimes forces our coaches into thinking that scrimmages and strategy are more urgent than making space to appropriately transition their student-athletes.

Our own NCAA Sports Science Institute recognized this problem and produced the recommendations outlined in the prevention of catastrophic injury and death document. These recommendations based on scientific research and endorsed and affirmed by 13 independent medical organizations seek to protect our student-athletes' mental and physical health.

We've had that document since 2018-19, and just last year, we overwhelmingly adopted a new constitution which compels us all to protect, support and enhance the physical and mental health of our student-athletes.

We know all this, and we also know our current rules are permissive. Any single institution or conference could decide to do something on this order to protect their student-athletes. They could adjust their season, perhaps start later than September 1, perhaps reduce the number of contests they play to make sure their students have time.

We know our rules allow this, but we look around and we know that our rules don't ensure it happens except for football and men's water polo student-athletes.

Proposal 12 operationalizes the guidelines from our association and from our constitution. It ensures the time and space necessary to protect our fall students, all of them, as they deserve. This proposal is the start of what we have to do to start looking after the health and well-being of our student-athletes. We know this is the right thing to do.

For these reasons, I urge you to support proposal 12.

**MICHELLE MORGAN:** Microphone No. 5?

**SARAH FEYERHERM:** Sarah Feyerherm, vice president of student affairs at Washington College.

As a member of Management Council, I speak in opposition of proposal No. 12. While this proposal is well-intentioned, Management Council does oppose it. Our fall sports have different needs and different schedules, and institutions should have the flexibility to conduct their

preseason uniquely for each sport.

The one-size-fits-all model does not account for differences and does not provide the flexible framework some of our fall sports require.

If this proposal is defeated, it does not mean the membership is foregoing an opportunity for health and safety. Institutions have already been successful using the transition period guidelines from the NCAA's prevention catastrophic injury and death in collegiate athletics document. Those guidelines in our current legislation provide institutions with the flexibility to conduct preseason for each sport safely and with the best interests of the student-athletes in mind.

Because our current legislation already allows for health and safety recommendations to be implemented and because each institution can already conduct transition periods in the best interest of all student-athletes, we oppose this one-size-fits-all proposal.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Microphone No. 6.

GARY SMALL: Gary Small, the commissioner of the New Jersey Athletic Conference.

On behalf of the members of the NJAC, I rise to speak in support of proposal 12. The NCAA's Sports Science Institute says that scientific research shows that a minimum of seven days is optimal to transition to competitive activity after a break period.

In Division III we have no such rules or policies related to any of our fall sport athletes back to campus other than football. In fact, under our rules, teams can engage in scrimmaging and competition on the very first day of their preseason training, regardless of the physical shape that they return to campus in or the possible extreme heat conditions at the time that they return.

While you might say these are just recommendations from the Sports Science Institute, not requirements, I would argue that we all moved heaven and earth to adhere to NCAA recommendations regarding COVID from the Sports Science Institute. In fact, as silly as it seems, many of us spent time, myself included, trying to figure out how our student athletes could practice tennis and volleyball without touching the same ball during their return to competition. Remember those fun times?

Is there a cost to the extra days that this proposal would trigger in the preseason? Yes, there is. But again, I would counter that we all somehow figured out how to cover the costs associated with student-athlete COVID testing,

officials testing, PPE, extra buses. We did so because it was important for the health and safety of our student-athletes. This is no different.

Some individuals are likely going to stand up and say that acclimatization can be done without this proposal. They are correct, but if a program truly wants to adhere to this concept, they probably should not be playing contests until the middle of September at the earliest.

We all know that that will not happen without this proposal because the time needed to prepare our fall preseason student-athletes is just too short.

I don't blame our coaches for trying to maximize every possible minute of fall preseason because of the tight time constraints our divisional rules put them under. This proposal gives them the extra time needed to ramp up to physical activity in the same manner as football.

For the health and safety of our fall sport student-athletes, I urge you to vote yes on proposal 12.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Microphone No. 9?

MATTHEW WEBB: Matthew Webb, director of athletics, Houghton University, and a proud member of the Empire 8 Conference.

This proposal is based on legislation specifically intended for football. We have not seen the scientific data to support the need for similar treatment for soccer, field hockey, volleyball, cross country, tennis, et cetera.

In addition to taking students away from summer employment early, in a time where higher ed costs and inflation are making higher ed more and more expensive, not to mention the added costs to our own institutions to support this proposal, it would likely force some of our institutions to push back the start of our seasons rather than bring the athletes back sooner, thus losing dates of competition and negatively impacting the student-athlete experience.

Regarding concerns of three-a-days and the impact on the students, institutions can and should control those issues internally themselves. I respectfully ask you to join me in opposing this proposal.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Microphone No. 2.

JACK LANGAN: Jack Langan, baseball student-athlete, Cornell College.

The National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges



you to support proposal No. 12. Returning to athletic activity after any prolonged break can be both a mental and physical adjustment. This is especially true for all sports student-athletes who get thrown into a new academic year and a new season all at once and after a long summer off.

As such, we support proposal 12 because it prioritizes the health, safety and well-being of these student-athletes. Our committee believes that the result of an expanded preseason and a defined acclimatization period will be an increase in the student athletes' performance over the course of their season and a potential reduction in injuries due to the more rushed return-to-play protocol. This enriches the overall student-athlete experience because by having a healthier season, we set ourselves up to have a better season.

Although our committee to discuss concerns regarding the no-equipment requirement during walk-through periods and the fact that an extended preseason would ask fall sport student-athletes to stop their non-athletic pursuits a bit sooner, ultimately we believe that the proposal's benefits to student-athletes health and safety outweigh any potential negative impact.

For these reasons, we urge you to support proposal No. 12. Thank you.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Microphone No. 7.

STEVIE BAKER-WATSON: Good morning. My name is Stevie Baker-Watson. I serve as the associate vice president for student wellness and the Theodore Katula director of athletics and recreational sports at DePauw University.

I appreciate the debate that we've had on this and generally support institutional autonomy to make decisions about our student-athletes and our programs. Unfortunately, in talking to colleagues and what I've observed, I'm not sure that we've actually empowered our sports medicine staff and our institutional health professionals in order to protect the health and safety of our student-athletes.

I remember that the Sports Science Institute has created a document for guidance, and in many ways we have taken steps in order to codify that and place it within our bylaws to protect our students. This is one more step in that direction.

I respect the fact that we don't want to interfere with internships, orientation or summer employment opportunities for our student-athletes, but the fact is in

reality, we are pushing our student-athletes too far, too much when they initially return back to campus.

In speaking to many well-respected individuals in this room about this proposal, one individual had said to me, But my student-athletes come back to campus on their own a couple weeks before preseason starts to take care of this; we don't need this.

I would say that's exactly why we need this, because our coaches and our administrators are not always exercising enough control.

I respect what our coaches do, and I'm not here to say anyone in this room does not place a priority on health and well-being of our student-athletes, but we need to move to a space where we are all working towards student-athlete health and safety and relying upon the medical experts.

The Sports Science Institute created a document endorsed by 13 different medical organizations. I don't think we have that many medical physicians in this room to be able to counter that information, but we need to provide more structure to what we are offering our student-athletes in order to help them.

Thank you.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Additional speaker at No. 7.

MIKE FRANZEN: Thank you. Mike Franzen, president at Wittenberg University and proud member of the North Coast Athletic Conference.

This proposal brings much-needed health and safety equity to all fall sports. Students return to campus in varying stages of fitness, as there is no structured required athletically related activity over the summer, nor should there be.

While we would like to believe that all student-athletes return in mid-season shape, we know that doesn't always happen. This proposal allows us to build in the needed time and structure for student-athletes to safely ramp up to competition.

Current legislation does not ensure seems take the appropriate time to acclimatize. Current legislation is permissive, meaning that teams could choose to begin their seasons with a similar framework, but they are not required to do so.

We know that the majority of the division does not begin their practices this way due to the limited time allowed and the fear of not playing as many contests as possible.



The additional structure and time allow all institutions to equitable implement the guidelines, leveling the playing field across the division.

This proposal was directly based on the NCAA guidelines in the prevention of catastrophic injury and illness document which has been available since 2018-19, yet as a division, we still have not acted on the recommendations of our own governing body three and one half years later, recommendations compiled and endorsed by multiple respected medical and scientific organizations.

Not only does this put our student-athletes at risk physically and mentally, but it also puts our institutions at risk from a liability standpoint. The proposed changes help limit risk to institutions by providing the space to meet the guidelines published by the NCAA.

I urge you to support proposal No. 12.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Thank you. Any other discussion?

Okay, then I think we are ready to go to a vote on proposal No. 12. Please cast your vote, 1 for yes, 2 for no, 3 to abstain. The polls are open.

The polls are closed. Proposal No. 12, the results are 141 votes to support, 318 to oppose, 14 to abstain. Proposal No. 12 fails.

Our next proposal is proposal No. 13, and I will look for a speaker at microphone No. 2.

ANGELA MARIN: Angela Marin, director of athletics, University of Texas at Dallas. As a member of Management Council, I move proposal No. 13.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Is there a second?

Please proceed.

ANGELA MARIN: This proposal was recommended by the Committee on Women's Athletics and sponsored by Management Council. Since that initial recommendation and sponsorship, new information has been made available, and therefore the council recommends that this proposal should be referred back to committee to evaluate that new information.

Consequently, I move to refer to proposal back to the Committee on Women's Athletics to evaluate the new information and provide a recommendation to the Management Council by their summer meeting as to whether --

MICHELLE MORGAN: Angela, sorry, can I interrupt you?

Is there a second to refer? Thank you, please proceed.

ANGELA MARIN: Thank you. The committee on women's athletics monitors sports that apply for the emerging sports for women program. The committee has engaged in extensive review of stunt for several years, resulting in the recommendation to grant it emerging sport status.

After formal sponsorship by Management Council, new information became available concerning legal complaints alleging sexual abuse. The complaints are filed against various entities, including the governing body that supports stunt.

Because this information was not available at the time of sponsorship, the committee recommended and Management Council agreed, that the proposal should be referred back to the Committee on Women's Athletics to give the committee time to further review and monitor the situation.

For these reasons, the Management Council believes the prudent course is to support this motion to refer.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Thank you. Any other discussion or comments?

Seeing none, I think we will proceed to a vote. We're voting -- we're prepared to vote to refer proposal No. 13 back to the Committee on Women's Athletics for future consideration. Please cast your vote, 1 for yes, 2 for no, 3 to abstain. The polls are open.

The polls are now closed. The vote on proposal 13 is 409 in favor, 30 against, and 25 abstentions. Proposal No. 13 to be referred has been adopted.

Our next proposal is proposal No. 14, and microphone No. 3.

BILL STILES: Thanks, Michelle. Bill Stiles, director of athletics, Alvernia University. As a member of Management Council, I move proposal No. 14.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Is there a second? Please proceed.

BILL STILES: In 2019, this membership voted to allow coaches to connect with prospective student-athletes via social media. This proposal keeps most of the principles from that 2019 social media exception and only changes the date. This proposal would permit coaches to engage in



public communications after January 1st of their senior year in high school instead of May 1st for prospective student-athletes who have submitted their financial deposit.

Using January 1st as the new permitted date should help alleviate the unintentional violations that occur when a prospect commits in the winter before the current May 1st permissible date. If this proposal passes, it means coaches who comment on an acceptance post or tag the prospect in a commitment tweet will no longer commit violations, provided it is after January 1st and there has been a financial deposit.

For these reasons, I urge you to vote in favor of proposal No. 14.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Microphone No. 1?

ARIANA PENA: Ariana Pena, former volleyball student-athlete, Neumann University. The National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support proposal No. 14.

Recruiting is a vital part of developing a collegiate sports program, and social media is at the forefront of communication. Adapting and utilizing social media as a platform creates a useful communication line for coaches to optimize recruitment and develop their relationships with prospective student-athletes.

Permitting earlier public communication on social media will be beneficial to both the prospective student-athlete and the institutional coaches, helping them to further develop relationships to affirm that everyone is making the best decision before the prospective student-athlete arrives on campus.

In addition to an earlier date of public communication, National SAAC supports proposal 14 because it maintains the requirement to have secured a financial deposit from the prospective student-athlete before the communication can take place.

We strongly believe that a financial deposit shows commitment, interest and consent from the prospective student-athlete to be communicated with on social media. It acts as a safeguard for recruits who may not be entirely decided about their future academic and athletic journey.

For these reasons we urge you to support proposal No. 14. Thank you.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Any other comments or discussion?

Okay, I think we're prepared to vote on No. 14, proposal No. 14. Please cast your vote, 1 for yes, 2 for no, 3 to abstain. The polls are now open.

Polls are now closed. The results on the vote on proposal No. 14 are 451 yes in support, 18 votes no, and one vote in abstention. Proposal No. 14 is adopted.

We're in the home stretch here. Our next proposal is proposal No. 15. I will ask for a motion. Microphone No. 7.

STEVE BRIGGS: Steve Briggs, president of Berry College. As an outgoing member of Management Council, I have the privilege and good fortune to move proposal No. 15.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Is there a second? Loud and clear. Please proceed.

STEVE BRIGGS: This proposal requires little by way of justification. The response to a strong consensus among the Division III membership and conferences that the obligatory submission of the institutional and conference self-study guides is no longer helpful.

This was the consensus -- this consensus was apparent in the 2022 Division III membership survey, and it's confirmed by a waiver submitted from 31 active multisport conferences requesting the suspension of the required submission for their conferences and institutions.

The waiver noted that it is inherent to the responsibilities of the administrators to internally track the items contained within the self-study guides, and therefore eliminating this requirement would not remove the responsibility to monitor this data but simply relieves the significant administrative chore that many find burdensome and outdated. This would allow athletic departments and conferences to instead focus their energy on the experience of their student-athletes and the sustainability of their departments.

This proposal is therefore a straightforward response to what the governance structure has heard from our membership.

Finally, while this proposal eliminates the reporting requirements for most of our membership, it maintains the requirements for institutions in their provisional membership process as well as for new multisport conferences as part of their application and review process. Therefore this proposal keeps in place the core purpose and key safeguards for those institutions at the point of time when they can most benefit from them.

For these reasons, Management Council supports this



proposal and urges the membership to adopt proposal 15 with alacrity.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Thank you. Any other discussion? Then let's go to a vote on proposal No. 15. I'll remind you that No. 1 is a vote for yes, No. 2 a vote for no, and No. 3 is a vote to abstain. The polls are now open.

The polls are now closed. The results of the vote on proposal No. 15, 468 yes, 4 votes no, 0 abstentions. Proposal No. 15 is adopted. You're welcome.

That concludes our legislative action. I will now turn the gavel back over to Chancellor Schmidt.

JIM SCHMIDT: Well done, Michelle. I haven't seen that kind of response in a long time.

At this time I'd like to ask Matt Hill to say a few words. Matt is making his way to microphone No. 4.

MATT HILL: Thank you, Chancellor Schmidt, and thank you to the individuals today who volunteered for the various committees, which is many of you.

There's one person we need to recognize. For the last four years serving on the Management Council and this past year as our chair of this council, Michelle Morgan has tirelessly served this membership. Besides the fact that she is the senior director of athletics at John Carroll for her day and night job, she has added countless hours and meetings to her weekly responsibilities in order to support the efforts of us 439 institutions and approximately 200,000 student-athletes in our division.

I've had the honor of working alongside Michelle this past year as the vice chair, and I can tell you she cares deeply about the present and future of our division. For her efforts she was actually the recipient of the 2022 ESPY Administrator of the Year award for advancing sport on her campus and beyond.

Michelle now what are you going to do with all your free time? Thank you for serving our schools and students these last four years, Michelle, and would you please join me in thanking her, too.

MICHELLE MORGAN: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you for entrusting me with such a large role and a large responsibility and the opportunity to serve as your chair this past year. It truly has been a privilege.

Over the last four years, we've certainly lived through some challenging and some transformative and frankly some downright crazy times, and there isn't a team of colleagues

that I'd rather go to bat with than the ones that were right next to me and I was fortunate to serve with beside in this role.

Thank you to all of you in the room that have helped to guide me, who have lent me an ear, and to those who have challenged me in reframing how I approach issues.

The growth and journey to success isn't always pretty, and it certainly isn't always comfortable, but our journey together has left a mark on my memory, my consciousness and my heart, and I will take that with me as I go forward.

Thank you to Matt Hill for being my partner in crime and serving as the vice chair of this role this year. Thank you to the national office staff for always ensuring that we were overprepared with the abundance of scheduled meetings that we have. To my council colleagues, current and former, it certainly has been a pleasure, and I thank you.

To Holly, our incoming chair, I'll offer you this advice: Make sure that the caffeine supply is plentiful. You have a tremendous team of colleagues in this room that are always - usually always - willing to help, and remember to look back and marvel at how far we've come on the part of the work of the people that are in this room, and most importantly, you got this.

The future of our industry will continue to change at lightning speed, but through hard work, due diligence, creative solutions and collaboration, I'm confident that we will go far.

Thank you again for this tremendous privilege. It's been an honor.

JIM SCHMIDT: We now open the floor to any comments or questions you might have to share. No topic is out of bounds, and we'll do our best to answer any questions you might have, knowing that we may need to follow up on the topic if we don't have the expertise on the dais. Happy to open the floor for any questions or comments.

Anyone wanting to go through all the proposals one more time?

With that, I have enjoyed our convention. I want to, again, thank all the staff and the volunteers who have made this convention possible. I want to appreciate everyone here for getting through all these complicated issues in a really terrific manner.

Have a great rest of your day and safe travels. The meeting is now adjourned.

