

NCAA Convention Division II Issues Forum

Tuesday, January 17, 2023

San Antonio, Texas

NCAA Convention Division III Issues Forum Presentation

JIM SCHMIDT: Good morning, everyone.

How about a nice big Division III "good morning"? You can do it. One, two, three.

FROM THE FLOOR: Good morning.

JIM SCHMIDT: Boy, there's more coffee in the back. So feel free to get up and get some more coffee. We need a little energy in this group. But welcome to today's Issues Forum. My name is Jim Schmidt, I'm the chancellor

of University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, and I have the privilege chair of the Division III Presidents Council. I will chair today's session.

Joining me on the dais this morning are: Michelle Morgan, Senior Director of Athletics at John Carroll

University. She also chairs the Division III Management Council; Louise McCleary, Vice President for Division III; Bill Regan, Managing Director for Division III; Jeff Myers, Director of Academic and Membership Affairs for Division III; Tiffany Alford, Associate Director of Academic and Membership Affairs for Division III; and parliamentarian, Georgana

Taggart, Professor Emerita at Mount St. Joseph University.

It takes a whole village to make this thing work. Thank you all for your support during today.

And Jim Troha, my partner, is our vice chair for the Presidents Council of NCAA as well, for Division III.

Additional membership representatives will join us on the dais throughout the course of the morning. We will be sure to introduce them at that time. We have secured a transcription service to create an accurate record for our meeting.



So please remember, when you go to the microphone, give your name and institution or conference affiliation when you speak. I'd ask you at this moment to silence your mobile devices, put them in silent or vibrate. Or at least have a really entertaining ringtone to help us alleviate whatever we're discussing at the time.

Our agenda this morning is divided into three sections. First, you'll hear from president Jim Troha, who will provide an overview of the Division III budget and process to create the budget. The second presentation will include a roundtable discussion and feedback.

There's extra seats up front. I just want you to know we have really good facilitators. So don't be bashful because these roundtables will go better if we have people kind of spread out a little bit.

This roundtable discussion will be on feedback on the Division III's Philosophy Statement. It is in response to the current transformational period of the division and intercollegiate athletics, and the governance structure has engaged in a review of each statement in the division's Philosophy Statement in relation to current and future policy and practice within the division. We want to focus in ways the Division III can position itself better for tomorrow.

This morning, you'll hear an update and provide feedback concerning that review. We'll conclude the issues forum with a review of our legislative proposals that we will consider during our two business sessions.

The first is the Special Rules of Order Business Session which will occur immediately at the conclusion of the Issues Forum and then tomorrow's business section. This review will be led by our academic and membership affairs staff.

This morning's format will consist of short presentations, polling of questions when appropriate, roundtable discussions and a question-and-answer period. If you have a question, you should walk to the microphone to ask your question. The presenters will answer as many questions as possible. They have a team of folks who will



help identify you when you get up to the microphone so I call you on.

We have allotted approximately two and a half hours for these presentations and will end by 10:30 so we can begin the Special Rules of Order Business Session at 10:30.

Again, this year, in an attempt to limit the number of handouts and the trees we sacrifice, all of the information is covered during the Issues Forum, including the PowerPoints, was sent to you last week and is available on the Division III Convention resource page on NCAA.org.

Wireless Internet access is available in this room. The password information is listed in the Convention app, as well as posted on signage in the room.

Again, we are scheduled to adjourn this Issues Forum at 10:30 so we may conduct the Special Rules of Order Business Session from 10:30 to 11 a.m. We have not scheduled any formal break, so I encourage you to take your personal breaks as needed.

All right. Before we get started, we would like to test the polling system. We are using a software called "Poll Everywhere" for the Issues Forum so that everyone can, not just voting members, can participate in the polling questions.

The software allows you to answer polling questions. The polling responses are anonymous.

First, at this time, everyone should log into the system if you're interested in participating later this morning. The instructions are on the screen and at your table.

So pull out your cell phone and text D-3-2-0-2-3 to 22333. Text D-3-2-0-2-3.

If your text was successful, you will receive a message that says, "You've joined NCAA Convention Session D32023." If you don't receive a text saying you've joined the NCAA Convention session (D32023), please try logging in again. We will give you another 30 seconds. We'll do a little test to see if that's working. Text D32023.

If you're having trouble, come up to the right side of the dais and a staff member will assist you.

All right. Let's test to make sure that the system's working. At this time, we'd ask everyone to text your response to the following question: These are little educational exercises. So we hope that you enjoy that.

So the question we're asking is, did you know that 360

Proof, the division's interactive tool that addresses high-risk drinking, is accessible via MyApps on the NCAA.org website.

Please text A for Yes, B for No or C for Abstain.

The voting is now open. Let's give this a try.

Did it work? Do we have a sense of how many came in? We're up to almost 700.

If you're taking a look in the bottom right-hand corner, we've already had 707 answering. Pretty awake group. We had 438 people that knew that. The test was successful.

If you believe your phone didn't register, again we've got great folks right up here who can help you figure out everything you need on that.

Also regarding the 360 Proof, there was a flyer in your registration packet providing more details on

How you can access the Personalized Feedback Index.

Alcohol use is still one of the most significant issues on campuses, and the 360 Proof program tool is located on the NCAA.org via MyApps and has shown to have a significant positive impact on reducing student's use of alcohol. It is a free tool that can be administered and taken multiple times. I urge you to check it out in order to add another tool to your tool chest to help reduce the consequences of student alcohol use.

At this time I get to invite my colleague, Jim Troha, president of Juniata College and vice chair of the Division III Presidents Council and chair of the Division III Strategic Planning and Finance Committee.

JIM TROHA: Thank you, Chancellor Jim. Boy, what better way to start your morning than a Strategic Planning and Finance update. Right? All the energy you just started, I am about to drown out. Just joking.

Hope everybody is fully caffeinated as we start today. It's great to see so many friends and colleagues out there gathering here in San Antonio. I hope you've had a great time, and bless you all as you make your way back safely tomorrow. Hopefully airports and airlines are friendly to all of you.

It's not in my script, but I can't think of a better time while we are gathered here as Division III to say thank you to Louise McCleary and her entire team here. How about a round of applause for the NCAA staff?



(Applause.)

Who just do an amazing job pulling all this together and supporting the work of all of you and all in support of our student-athletes.

So thank you, Louise, and your team.

Okay. So periodically during the Issues Forums we have provided budget updates. Last year, you participated in roundtable discussions regarding how the division should use anticipated new revenue for this year.

The governance structure heard your feedback and implemented several new initiatives and programs that I will highlight in just a few minutes.

As you know, so much has occurred and changed over the past several years, from the impact of the pandemic to the adoption of the new NCAA constitution at last year's convention.

I am thankful that I have this opportunity to provide this brief update and overview of the Division III budget for all of you.

We, and I mean the governance structure of Division III, have heard you in that you desire transparency and consistent communication regarding the Division III budget. That was clear.

This update is one way that the governance structure is responding to your desire for transparent and consistent communication concerning the NCAA Division III budget.

Our division has always worked to maximize its budget, and even with a pandemic that reduced the budget by 80 percent two years ago, Division III right now is in a stable position, thanks to the work of the Championships and the Strategic Planning and Finance Committees, and the Management and Presidents Councils.

I think most of you know that with the adoption of last year's NCAA constitution, the division's annual budget remained constitutionally guaranteed. This year, the division's budget is \$35.3 million.

This annual revenue is generated from a couple of different sources but primarily broadcasting and marketing rights and Championship ticket sales, with the primary contributor, over 80 percent coming from broadcast agreements

With CBS and Turner for the Division I basketball

championship.

I think most of you know and understand that. The current broadcast contract started in 2010 and ends in 2023-24. However, the NCAA signed an extension that goes for an additional nine years through 2032. It's good news for us in that the budget will continue to grow over the next nine years. In fact, it will be \$10 million more than it is this year, and our strategic Planning Committee and the Championships Committee, along with the council and others will continue to seek your feedback to refine our budget priorities to create memorable student-athlete experiences. And as all of us know, that's what it's about.

The NCAA also is working on renewing several additional broadcast agreements, for example women's basketball and softball, and anticipates agreements in both of these.

Division III is guaranteed a percentage of any of this new revenue. Finally, let me re-emphasize that Division III has a voice on the NCAA Board of Governors as well as a representative on the Governor's Finance and Audit Committee.

This committee works closely with the NCAA president and chief financial officer as broadcast agreements are structured and finalized.

Fortunately, or unfortunately, I am currently the Division III representative on this committee with the Board of Governors and happy to hear from you about how these budgets are created and developed.

After that high level overview, let me discuss how Division III budget more specifically is impacting all of us. Division III is currently in year two of a three-year budget cycle.

Throughout the year, the Strategic Planning and Finance Committee closely reviews the division's revenue and expenses and, as needed, makes recommendations to the councils. The councils review the budget at every meeting.

In the spring of 2024, the division will enter a new budget planning cycle and plan for a new two-year budget cycle that will run from September 1, 2024 to August 31, 2026.

Division III typically has a two-year budget cycle, and the Presidents Council only recommended our current three-year cycle to get to the end of the current CBS/Turner broadcast agreement that ends next year.

Last February, the governance structure sent a membership survey to provide Division III institutions and conference offices an opportunity to express their opinions concerning the current and future policies and priorities of



Division III.

There was an entire section of the survey just simply on the budget.

With over 80 percent of the division completing the survey, the feedback was extremely beneficial. And we appreciate you taking the time to complete the survey.

Based on the feedback, the Strategic Planning and Finance Committee recommended several budget policy changes to the council. And I'll briefly review them right now.

Number one, it recommended \$3 million in new championship initiatives such as a day of rest between the semifinals and championship; payment of local ground transportation, for example, when a team flies to a championship and needs local transportation; guaranteeing no conference opponents in the first round of the NCAA championships; and increasing the per diem.

While these enhancements may not cover all championship costs, the Presidents Council believes it's a step in the right direction to enhance the student-athlete experience and close the budget gap for the teams participating in our national championships.

I believe, personally, that was a huge step in the right direction.

Second, the survey feedback noted that almost 90 percent of institutions receive funds from the Conference Grant Program.

To that end, the committee recommended an additional million dollars to support the Conference Grant Program and the division's strategic priority of advancing women and individuals who identify as Black and indigenous people of color.

Further, the Division III ethnic minority and women's internship salary were increased to \$30,000 in fiscal 2024.

Annually, the division awards 23 internships to institutions and conference offices. This diversity grant has started the career of a number of today's athletics administrators and continues to positively impact our division.

To provide a visual, if your institution or conference has received one of these internships, or if you currently are or were an intern, will you please stand. All right. Look at that.

(Applause.)

It's a great program. We're going to try to enhance that even further.

The last recommendation from all of you was to update the division's strategic plan to reflect the division's priorities more accurately.

This updated plan is located on NCAA.org and is also a link on the 2023 Division III conference convention resource page.

Included in your packet -- and I find this such an incredibly helpful document. If you haven't looked at it, take a look at the budget facts and figures for Division III. It's also located on NCAA.org.

This resource provides budgets for the division's 28 national championships as well as budgets for Enrichment Fund initiatives and programs such as the Conference Grant Program, the division's diversity grants and programs such as the student immersion program that is occurring during this convention.

Regarding the actual budgeting process, Division III Championship Committee receives and reviews sports specific budget requests from the various Division III sport committees and forwards those recommendations to the Strategic Planning Finance Committee. Typically in February, no later than early June.

In addition to reviewing Championship Committee requests, the Strategic Finance Planning Committee also reviews the budget for Enrichment Fund initiatives and various programs.

All budget recommendations, championships and enrichment funds are forwarded to the councils for their review and are implemented with the start of a new budget cycle, which is September 1st, which I talked about earlier.

Typically, budgets are not adjusted beyond built-in inflation and outside of the designated budget cycle.

Several governance committees, the Championships Committee, the Strategic Planning and Finance Committee and Management and Presidents Council have worked tirelessly to identify, address and implement short- and long-term solutions to maximize the Division III budget.

So what is next? Even with increasing inflation, the division budget is currently extremely sound. As the division plans for its next budget cycle, various governance committees will engage with membership to identify possible new initiatives to introduce in fiscal year 2025.



The governance structure also will hire an outside consultant to review the Enrichment Fund initiatives and programs to provide an assessment of the programs and whether the programs are achieving their intended purposes and still align with the division's strategic priorities.

Finally, as we all know, the higher education landscape and athletics landscape is ever-changing and turbulent. To that end, the Division III Presidents Council believes it is very prudent to discuss the division's budget priorities, assess any budget risks if there's any disruption to the annual revenue and outline courses of action to maintain the division's financial stability.

We met just earlier this week to begin dialogue on what this will look like and the types of issues that we will begin to tackle.

This is a bit of a risk mitigation conversation that we're going to begin to have division-wide. We only need to look to the pandemic as an indication of what might happen and how our business is impacted by the unknowns. And we want to get ahead of that and be proactive in case something like that were to happen again. We will continue to provide budget updates and seek membership input so our governance structure can make budget policy decisions in the best interests of the entire division on behalf of our student-athletes.

Thank you for your attention, and I hope you found this update beneficial. And enjoy the rest of your conference. Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you, Jim. At this time we're going to begin our discussion of the Division III Philosophy Statement. There will be two individuals presenting on this topic this morning.

The first will be Stephanie Dutton, Commissioner of the United East Conference, and Eric Hartung from the Division III staff.

Let me introduce commissioner Dutton, who is a member of the Strategic Planning and Finance Committee.

STEPHANIE DUTTON: Good morning, everyone. Nice to see so many of your faces this morning.

I'm Stephanie Dutton. Division III has had opportunities to reflect on its mission and philosophy as well as plan for the future. Today, we have this opportunity. The past two years have included a global pandemic and the adoption of a new NCAA constitution. These events have challenged

us in unique ways. However, it also gives us a chance to reflect on our division and strategically discuss and position ourselves for tomorrow.

Today's roundtable discussions and your feedback is another step in our current endeavor to review our division's philosophy statement.

To facilitate the review of the philosophy statement, the Strategic Planning and Finance Committee created a working group.

This group was tasked with considering the validity of each principle in relation to current and future policy and practice. Potential outcomes of this work may result in a confirmation of the current philosophy or the revision of the current philosophy statement.

The members of our group include Jeff Abernathy, president at Alma College; Chuck Brown, FAR at Penn State Behrend. Maria Buckel, former athletics director from Fontbonne University; Bob Lindgren, president at Randolph-Macon, Chuck Mitrano, commissioner of the Empire Eight; and Sabienea Winston, student-athlete from Geneva College.

The group commenced its work in August. The timeline includes a survey of the membership that was just completed and the roundtable discussions we're about to take part in today.

The roundtable discussions may lead to potential concepts for the councils to review in April and potential recommendations for the councils to consider during their summer meetings.

That all leads to the opportunity for the membership to fully debate and vote on any proposed amendments next January at the 2024 NCAA Convention.

It's important for you to know the review of the historical review. I'm sorry -- it's important for you to know what the working group has been up to over the past four months.

We began with a comprehensive historical review of the Philosophy Statement using the NCAA archives.

We also carefully assessed the alignment of the current Philosophy Statement with the new NCAA constitution. Relative findings from the 2003, 2009, 2013, 2018 and 2022 Division III membership surveys were also reviewed.

This work resulted in a draft of a Revised Philosophy Statement. That is the document you have at your tables this morning. And it's also located on the Division III



Convention resource page on NCAA.org.

With that draft in hand, the working group then designed a survey instrument to help gather feedback from all of you, the membership.

I'd like to turn things over to Eric Hartung, Director of Division III, to speak to you more about the survey and its findings. Eric.

ERIC HARTUNG: Thank you. Stephanie.

The goal was to seek membership input on potential changes to the Division III Philosophy Statement. The survey was structured to solicit responses to one key question: Should this principle be included in the Division III Philosophy Statement.

We employed a six-point scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree. The opportunity for comments was included for each principle.

The Web-based survey was sent to all Division III presidents and chancellors, campus and conference athletics administrators and coaches, FARs, and members of the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Council.

Let's turn to a review of the findings.

At your table and on the Division III Convention resource Web page, you have a Summary of Findings Report.

Given the response rate, the structure of the survey instrument and the administration of the survey, it's safe to say the findings are valid and reliable.

This information, along with the findings disaggregated by position and the comments provided the working group with the information it needed to move to the next phase, today's roundtable discussion.

To identify the three items for discussion today, the working group first focused on the Division III specific principles.

Captured in the sections on the student-athlete collegiate experience, the student-athlete athletics experience and the section on member responsibility and oversight.

Next, it identified items where some of the responses in the strongly agree and agree categories was less than 75 percent.

A review of the findings disaggregated by position and the comments further justified the selection of these three

items.

Let's review the response rate in those items.

1,211 survey responses were received and are reflected in the findings. The first item selected by the working group was the following statement:

Seek to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete's athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of their educational experience with a focus on intercollegiate athletics as primarily an undergraduate experience.

This item received 73 percent in the strongly agree and agree categories. The comments provided by more than 100 respondents specifically identified the phrase, "With a focus on intercollegiate athletics as primarily an undergraduate experience," and noted the potential inconsistency of this statement given the allowable participation of graduate level students at Division III institutions. Now, additional comments noted the phrase is restrictive and questioned the value of including it in the Philosophy Statement at all.

The second item, encourage participation by providing a broad-based athletics program received 69 percent in the strongly agree and agree categories.

The comments provided by more than 100 respondents again questioned the value of including this principle in the statement overall. Specifically, the phrase "broad-based athletics program" was identified, noting the ambiguous meaning of broad-based. Additional respondents questioned the value of the principle without a clear definition of that phrase "broadbased."

The third item, the athletics program should support the institution's educational mission by financing, staffing and controlling the athletics program through the same general procedures as other departments of the institution received 64 percent in the strongly agree and agree categories.

The comments, provided again by more than 100 respondents, raised the question of including the principle in the Philosophy Statement at all, noting the autonomy of member institutions in the areas of finance, staffing and control of the athletics department.

I'd like to turn the podium back over to Stephanie, and she's going to guide you through the roundtable discussions. Thank you very much.

STEPHANIE DUTTON: It's now time for you to discuss these three items. We have secured table facilitators for

each table. These individuals will help to record your overall feedback, which we will submit to the members of the working group.

We have allotted approximately 20 minutes for each item. At the end of each 20-minute segment we'll present you with several polling questions.

Please begin your first discussion on if the Philosophy Statement should include the principle that it seek to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete's athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of their educational experience with a focus on intercollegiate athletics as primarily an undergraduate experience.

Your table facilitator will guide the discussion. If you are at a table without a facilitator, please move to a different table so we have a chance to receive your feedback. Thank you. Everyone, you have about four minutes left to wrap up your conversations. One more minute.

All right, everyone, our time has wrapped for the first roundtable discussion. Let's come back together to answer some polling questions.

At this time, let's answer the following polling question: Should this portion of the principle "establishing and maintaining an environment in which a student-athlete's athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of their educational experience" be part of the division's overall philosophy statement?

Remember that your answers are anonymous. Please text A for Yes, B for No, or C for Unsure. The Poll Everywhere is now open.

FROM THE FLOOR: Okay. We have a quick clarifying question. Is this a paraphrase of the entire statement? Or are we truly asking at the end of educational experience there be a period there and we believe that that should be a part of the principle? Clarifying question.

STEPHANIE DUTTON: Can you repeat your question, please?

FROM THE FLOOR: I will. So the statement that is up there is being paraphrased of the entire statement. So what we have, in quotes, are we answering the question to say, at the end of their educational experience there would be a period, and we are saying yes, no or unsure to that, or are the quotes taking in the entire statement and you're just giving us a portion of it to know exactly what we're talking about? Therefore, possibly answering differently if I don't want to have the additional caveats behind educational

experience.

ERIC HARTUNG: What we want to know is, the portion of the statement that you see in quotes, do you want this in the philosophy statement?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And nothing after it? Beautiful.

ERIC HARTUNG: Correct.

STEPHANIE DUTTON: We're good? The polling is now closed. The results to the straw poll question are: 652, Yes; 81, No; and 30, Unsure.

Now for the second question: Is it necessary to define the educational experience as primarily an undergraduate experience? Please text A for Yes, B for No or C for Unsure. The poll is now open.

The polls are now closed. We have 267, Yes, 455, No, 40, Unsure. Now for the third question: Do you want to include a revised version of the undergraduate experience principle in the Philosophy Statement? Please text A for Yes, or B for No. The poll is now open. Folks, we had a little bit of a technical glitch. So we had the wrong question up there. So we're going to pop up the correct slide. If you can, if you can revote.

So the question we are asking you, again as a reminder, is do you want to include a revised version of the undergraduate experience principle in the Philosophy Statement. When it pops up on the screen we'll give you the A-okay. Microphone 5, can you identify yourself by name and institution, please.

DONNA HARTMAN: I'm Donna Hartman, Director of Athletics, WPI. Question for you. Since we're voting by our phones, that vote is not representative of one school/one vote. So I'm hoping that when we take a look at this information, that we recognize it's not a true consensus of what's happening maybe particularly with our institutions. Is there a particular reason we did not use the provided voting mechanism so we would learn one school one vote? Thanks.

STEPHANIE DUTTON: Thank you. Thank you for the question. It's excellent. I know when the Strategic Planning and Finance Working Group, since we have close to 1100 individuals in this room -- in the past, with the issues forum, we wanted to give the opportunity to everyone to participate.

Your point is absolutely correct. This is not a definitive decision that's being made, but it is providing feedback along with your table facilitator notes to the working group

to then be able to go back to the membership to get additional information with a possible final vote by only voting delegates at next year's convention.

Excellent question. Thanks for it.

We have the correct question up there. We're ready to roll.

Again, do you want to include a revised version of the undergraduate experience principle in the Philosophy Statement. Text A for Yes and B for No. The polls are now open.

Microphone 4, can you identify yourself, please?

KATE FOSTER: I'm Kate Foster, president of the College of New Jersey. For those people in the room who may have appreciated the principle as originally written, is your answer yes here, or is your answer no here.

STEPHANIE DUTTON: No, your answer would be no.

KATE FOSTER: But would that mean that we're signalling that we don't want this included in the Philosophy Statement.

STEPHANIE DUTTON: No, this is just asking if you would like a revised version of the current principle.

KATE FOSTER: Okay. Thank you.

STEPHANIE DUTTON: The polls are now closed. We have 382 - yes, 311 - no. Thank you for your participation there.

Let's now begin discussion of our second topic. Should the Philosophy Statement include the following: "Encourage participation by providing a broad-based athletics program."

The discussion topic will pop up on the slide. And your time is now beginning. (Discussion Session)

You have about five minutes left.

You have one more minute to wrap up your discussion. All right. That concludes our discussion on roundtable topic number two. Let's come back together to answer the following polling question. Should the Philosophy Statement include a principle that encourages participation by providing a broad-based athletics program. Text A for Yes, B for No, C for Unsure. The polls are now open.

Microphone 6, please identify yourself.

DAN SCHUMACHER: Dan Schumacher, UW-Eau Claire,

athletic director. Define "broad-based athletic program."

STEPHANIE DUTTON: We don't currently have a formal definition for "broad-based athletics program" so that's why we're asking you if we want this included in the Philosophy Statement.

Microphone 6, please identify yourself.

DICK RASMUSSEN: Dick Rasmussen, executive director at the University Athletics Association. In terms of the definition, with respect to broad-based and other elements of it, we do have definitions. They exist in our bylaws.

The bylaws operationalize the definitions of them. So if you look at our sports sponsorship requirements, our requirements around sponsorship of men's and women's sports and so on, those are the elements that operationalize the definition.

These are philosophy statements. Philosophy statements are generally intended to be broad and not necessarily very specific but to allow for flexibility in how an organization develops its operational definitions, and I think that's where we rely on it.

If you're not comfortable with the current membership requirements, then I would suggest changing that definition. But at this point, in one sense it provides a guidance.

The real true meaning is in our bylaws and how we operationalize these broad-based statements.

STEPHANIE DUTTON: Thanks, Dick.

Microphone 3, please identify yourself.

ANDREW TRUONG: Andrew Truong [phonetic], University of California - Santa Cruz. I was wondering if there was going to be a review regarding "encourages participation" portion of this bylaw, and if not, then would it be possible to open one?

STEPHANIE DUTTON: Can you repeat your question one more time, please?

ANDREW TRUONG: Is there going to be a review on the portion concerning "encourages participation" of this bylaw, and if not, would there be a possibility of opening a review.

STEPHANIE DUTTON: Yes is the answer to your first question.

The polls are now closed. 316, yes. 286, no. 130, unsure.

Folks, we're going to move on to the next question. The second question on this topic, please answer this question: Is it necessary to define broad-based within this principle? A, yes. B, no.

The polls are now open.

The polls are now closed. 457, yes; 248, no. With that, we will move on to our third roundtable discussion topic and our final one for today.

For our final roundtable, please discuss if the Philosophy Statement should include the principle that an athletics program should support the institution's educational mission by financing, staffing and controlling the athletics program through the same general procedures as other departments of the institution.

Again, the topic will be on the screen and you will have 20 minutes to discuss.

(Discussion Session)

STEPHANIE DUTTON: About five more minutes left. Less than a minute to wrap up your conversations. All right, folks, we'll come together for our final polling questions today.

For this final topic, let's answer the following polling question. Should this portion of the principle, "an athletics program supports the institution's educational mission" be part of the division's overall Philosophy Statement?

Text A for yes. B for no. C for unsure. Polls are now open.

The polls are now closed. The results of this question: 604, yes; 65, no; 33, unsure.

Moving on to our second question. Please answer the following: Should this portion of the principle that "an athletics program be financed, staffed and controlled through the same general procedures as other departments of the institution" be included in the Philosophy Statement?

Text A for Yes, B for No, C for Unsure. The polls are now open.

The polls are now closed. The results: 226, Yes; 417, No; 65, Unsure.

We have one final question for you today: Do you want to include a revised version of the finance, staffing and

control principle in the Philosophy Statement?

Text A for Yes, B for No.

The polls are now closed.

The results are 361, Yes; 298, No.

Thank you all for your thoughtful engagement and discussion this morning. The feedback gathered at your tables today will be very beneficial to the working group as it considers recommendations to forward to the councils.

That concludes our discussion of the Philosophy Statement. Thank you.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you again for your participation in this important activity of relooking at our Philosophy Statement.

It is now time to pivot the piece you've all been waiting for. It's time to review the 13 legislative proposals. We want to make sure that you have a good understanding of all of them going into the special Rules of Order Business section later this morning.

Your conference meets this afternoon and of course prior to the Business Session tomorrow.

There's a lot to comprehend. So let's fasten our seatbelts and let's move on.

Jeff Myers is the Director of Academic Membership Affairs, and Tiffany Alford is our Associate Director in Academic and Member Affairs, and they will be presenting this information.

We're also joined by Georgana Taggart, who will serve as our parliamentarian and she's ready to assist with any of those parliamentary issues. So thank you.

JEFF MYERS: Good morning. It's good to see all of you this week, and it's good to see all of you in this room today and the active engagement.

We are going to have a voting session here in a few moments at 10:30. So we will get through this material and then again turn it over to all of you as we consider these special rules of order and then tomorrow our legislative proposals.

I want to start with a review of the resources. This again is important. We have minimal time here today to go into great detail to these proposals. With some of them, there's a lot there. As a reminder, the Official Notice, again all

available on NCAA.org, it contains all the proposals you'll be voting on today and tomorrow in these sessions.

Most importantly, I want to point you to these two charts. These charts compare our competing proposals. I think you're all aware we have two sets of competing proposals, one that addresses council composition and one that addresses playing season structure.

These charts will give you the information to compare those proposals to the current rule. I'll give you time to look at those details more so we can do those today. I'll point you to those and have you use those as a resource.

Our parliamentary procedures document as well. Usually -- we issue it every year -- it is relatively blank. This year we made it exciting. There's a lot of parliamentary issues involved this year. That will help explain it as well.

I want to start with a Special Rules Order Business Session we'll engage in together at 10:30 today. It will establish special rules or not special rules depending on your vote for the Business Session Saturday.

Specifically, what will you be voting on? Two resolutions. The first resolution will establish a Special Rule of Order for Proposal 7 and 8, the council composition proposals.

The second would establish Special Rules of Order for Proposals 10 and 11, the playing season proposals.

First, to pass these special resolutions, Special Rules of Order, it requires a two-thirds vote. These are the only proposals this weekend that require that two-thirds vote.

To understand why we're doing that, I think we first need to look at the current rule. Our current parliamentary procedures dictate that the proposals will be taken in the order presented in the Official Notice.

When a proposal is presented, we may discuss that proposal, the merits of the proposal and only that proposal. That proposal is voted on and then proceed to the next.

If there's two proposals that address the same subject matter, the first one is voted on and adopted, the second one is rendered moot. So under that procedure, there are possibilities where one proposal may never be discussed and may never be considered by the membership.

These Special Rules of Order would change that in a couple key ways. If you pass a Special Rules of Order for these proposals, what you would have Saturday is, when the competing proposals come up, either the council composition or the playing seasons, both will be discussed

collectively, The merits, the benefits, detriments, whatever on those proposals, may be discussed.

At that point in time, then you as a membership will determine the order. So first a discussion and then you will take a vote: Do I prefer Proposal 7 to go first. If you do, you'll press 1. If you prefer Proposal 8 to go first, press 2, or to abstain, press 3.

And again that order is important because if the first one is adopted, the second one is rendered moot.

If you pass these proposals, these resolutions, you'll have an open discussion regarding the proposals, then a vote to determine the order, and then you will address each of the proposals.

So what does this look like from a visual perspective? First, today, the resolutions. If you defeat those resolutions, then we will treat these as we typically do, the current rule which I just explained, we'll address them in the order and only those proposals.

If adopted, then we move over to the other column. If adopted, we'll discuss collectively, vote for your preferred. The one that goes first, that will then be moved and seconded. If there's additional discussion that can occur, it will be voted on.

If it's adopted, the second one is rendered moot. It will not be voted on or discussed. If it's defeated, and only if it's defeated, then we go to the second one.

Again, the second one will be moved, seconded, can be discussed. If that is defeated, then we're at the status quo, the current rule. If it's passed, then that becomes the rule.

I want to pause there, that's a different process than we typically have, to see if there's any questions. We're going to move on to the Saturday Business Session. And again the process is going to be determined what your vote is today, but there are a few things we know.

We will have 12 proposals and one resolution to vote on at the Saturday Business Session.

What we also know -- and I know you're all familiar with this -- we go through a process, a process of approving the Official Notice and a series of motions that's considered with that. So you have the opportunity to approve or reorder the proposals. You have the opportunity to pull any of the consent package. Those noncontroversial proposals that have been passed the previous year.

If you want to pull one of those for consideration, set it to



the side and deal with that, and then, ultimately, we'll approve that final notice and move on to the proposals.

Proposals are divided into presidential grouping and general grouping. The Presidents Council identifies those proposals that are important for presidents. Proposals that address philosophical concerns, have a significant budgetary issue or otherwise strategic in nature.

I'm going to go through the presidential grouping and then Tiffany will follow up with the general grouping.

The first proposal that will be addressed on Saturday is a resolution sponsored by member conferences that would direct the governance structure to work collaboratively with the membership and national SAAC to establish a hardship waiver process specific to mental health concerns.

Currently there is a hardship waiver process. It addresses injuries and treats a broken leg in a similar way they would treat mental health concerns. This proposal would say there needs to be a separate process.

And so it would direct the membership, direct the governance to address these issues.

Proposal 4, sponsored by the Presidents Council. This would establish a Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, provide them a vote at Convention.

So currently Student-Athlete Advisory Committee provides positions on proposals. They have speaking privileges at Convention. That would not change with the proposal. It would, however, add one vote at Convention, per vote at Convention.

Proposal 5. Proposal 5 is sponsored by the Presidents Council and would address the composition of six standing Division III committees.

Again, we don't have considerable time to go into this in detail, but this addresses the six committees that it would change. It would standardize the two committees that deal primarily with our budgetary issues, our championships and Strategic Planning and Finance Committee at 12 members and the remaining committees at 10 members.

It would require a student-athlete on each of these committees. That's not currently the composition. It would require geographic representation as well, and including requiring at least one member from either the state of Colorado, Washington, Oregon, Texas or Colorado. Also require a conference office staff member and an FAR on each of these committees.

Okay. Proposal 7, and this is our first potential Special Rule of Order. Again, if you vote for Special Rule of Order today, it will impact Proposal 7 and 8, the first of our council composition proposals.

This one is sponsored by member conferences. And we're going to go to the next one here. Proposal 8 would also impact councils. And this is sponsored by the Presidents Council.

Both proposals would change the composition to require that each multi-sport conference is represented on the councils.

They both do it differently. Take a look at that. And start with Presidents Council. First of all, the size, and that's the first key difference here. With the membership sponsored proposal, the size of the Presidents Council and Management Council would be the same.

The membership sponsored one has four-year rotating terms. So your conference would have four years on Presidents Council, the next four years on Management Council and back to Presidents Council.

The Presidents Council sponsored proposal would cap Presidents Council size at 20 members, which is what it is now. 18 presidents or chancellors, two student-athletes.

Other key difference is how the presidents are nominated to councils. The current process is a presidential council subgroup nominates those presidents.

Under the Presidents Council proposal, that would remain the same. Under the membership sponsor proposal, that function would go to the nominating committee.

Ultimately, in both proposals, the rest of the process would remain the same. Council would approve those nominations, and they would be sent to presidents and chancellors for a vote on those nominations.

Finally, a key difference, student-athletes. Under the proposals, under the membership one, the student-athletes would not count towards conference representation. Under the Presidents Council it would.

However, very key caveat, there is an amendment that would change that to say, "Under the Presidents Council proposal as well, student-athletes would not count towards conference representation."

With the Presidents Council proposal, there's also geographic representation required as well. That's reflected on the chart.

Management Council, again with the membership sponsor proposal, the size would be roughly the same as Presidents Council. It's half the conferences are represented on Management. Half on Presidents Council.

With the Presidents Council proposal, since Presidents Council would be capped at 20, the remainder of the conferences to be represented would have to be on Management Council. That would be a larger group.

The geographic representations are the same for Management Council. The nomination process, which currently is under the Nominating Committee, would not change under either the proposals as well.

And here's the amendment referenced. 8-1 would say, with respect to the Presidents Council proposal, student-athletes would not count towards the conference representation.

I think it's important to recognize the process. If Proposal 8 is ultimately moved and seconded, then the amendment would be moved and seconded. And the first vote would be do you want to amend Proposal 8 as set forth in 8-1. If the answer is yes, then the second vote will be, do you want to adopt Proposal 8 as amended. If you vote against the amendment, your second vote do you want to adopt Proposal 8 as originally submitted.

I know the Philosophy Statement discussion must have wore you out because there's usually a lot of questions about that.

Proposal 9, which is our last Presidents Council sponsored proposal, presidential grouping proposal, has been sponsored by Presidents Council and it addresses the new member process.

Currently, an institution that wants to become a Division III member must go through a process, must submit an application. This proposal would add a condition to that that they, prior to application as a condition of application, they have an invitation from a multi-sport conference. And then ultimately they could not become an active member unless they were part of a multi-sport conference.

So with that, I will turn it over to Tiffany to go over the general grouping.

TIFFANY ALFORD: Good morning, everyone. All right. We're going to start the fun stuff. So the first two proposals in the general grouping are going to redefine the structure of the Division III playing and practice seasons.

The first proposal, which is Proposal No. 10, is membership sponsored, and this proposal would permit flexibility in defining the timeframe for when athletically related activities could occur. That definition would be each sport having 114, or 144 days instead of weeks, days of the season would be able to be used nonconsecutively and they would maintain the requirement for one day off per week.

Proposal No. 11, which also addresses the playing season, is sponsored by the Division III Management Council. This proposal would restructure the playing seasons for all sports except for football by eliminating weeks as a measure of defining the seasons, establishing a fall and spring traditional segments by start and end date. And increasing the number of nontraditional segment days for fall and spring sports from 16 to 24.

It would also measure winter sports by 114 days, with flexibility to use eight of those days before or after the season and measure period sports, so your golf, rowing and tennis, by 114 days.

So this is very small. There's a lot on these charts. But you have these resources available, and Jeff has already mentioned them. But these next three slides kind of show -- excuse me, this slide and the three after will show you the differences between each of the proposals, and I'll summarize a few of those.

So for fall sports, under Proposal 10, the playing season will consist of 114 days. And under Proposal 11, the traditional segment would be defined by start and end dates, plus the 24 nontraditional segment days.

The start date under the current rule is a 16-unit practice formula from the first scheduled contest. Under the 114-day model, this would remain unchanged.

Under the start and end date model, this formula would be calculated from the first permissible contest date instead of the first scheduled.

Under the current rule, the traditional segment ends at the conclusion of the NCAA championship. The 114-day model would not change this, and the start and end date model would have the traditional segment end with the championship selection date.

And then finally, for the nontraditional segment for fall sports, under the 114-day model, the nontraditional segment would take place from the conclusion of the NCAA championship through five days before finals for the spring term.

Institutions would be permitted to use any of its remaining days during the time period and engage in one date of competition.

Under the start and end date model, the nontraditional segment would be from the first date after January 1st through five days before spring finals. It may consist of up to 24 days, including one date of competition, and no more than four days could be used per week.

The bottom of this slide you'll see that the start-end date model does not make any changes to the sport of football. Proposal 10, the 114-day model, would change football's playing season to 114 days.

It would maintain the current rule of 16 days for the spring period and permit institutions to use any unused days only for strength and conditioning.

And now we're going to move on to winter sports. So under the current rule, the length of the season is 19 weeks and 24 weeks for indoor and outdoor track and field. Under both proposals, the season would consist of 114 days with 144 days for indoor and outdoor track and field.

Proposal 10 would permit the season to begin on the seventh day after the first day of classes. For hockey, teams would be limited to on-ice training -- would be limited to conducting on-ice training until the second Monday in October; and for wrestling, teams would be limited to strength and conditioning workouts until October 10th when they could begin practice.

Proposal 11 would maintain the current rule. And under the current rule the winter season concludes with the national championship. Proposal 10 would maintain that current rule, and Proposal 11 would change the end date for the season to be the NCAA championship selection.

And finally, a current rule allows all sports except for basketball and ice hockey to use any remaining weeks after the NCAA championship and through five weekdays before spring finals.

The 114-day model would permit winter sports to use any of their remaining days for practice, up until five weekdays before spring finals, and would permit all sports except for basketball and ice hockey to compete during that timeframe if they have contests remaining.

Start-end date model would permit teams to use eight of their 114 days before and after the season. Teams would not be permitted to compete outside the season.

Spring sports, 114-day model gives you 114 days, go

figure. Proposal 11, the traditional segment would be defined by start and end date, plus the 24 nontraditional segment days.

The 114-day model would change the start date to January 15th. And Proposal 11 would change the start date to 15 weeks before NCAA championship selection.

Teams would also be permitted to use 12 of their 24 nontraditional days beginning 17 weeks before selection.

The current rule has a traditional segment, NCAA championships. 114-day model would remain the same. And under the start and end date model that would be counted back from championship selection.

And then finally, under the 114-day model, nontraditional segment would run from the seventh day after the first day of classes through January 14th, and then resume from the end of the traditional season through five weekdays before spring finals.

Teams would be permitted to use any remaining days including the date of competition and on any day except for during vacation exam periods.

Proposal 11 would be from September 7th of the first day of classes through five days before fall final exams. And 24 days would be able to be used, including when date of competition with no more than four days being used per week.

Most of the spring period sports or the period sports remains unchanged. Or, excuse me, both proposals are doing the same thing. So both proposals would change the rule to define the season as 114 days. Both proposals would maintain the current start and end dates.

Proposal 10 would maintain the current rule regarding the end of the spring period, while Proposal 11 would change that end date to NCAA championship selection.

And Proposal 10 would permit teams to use their remaining days from the conclusion of NCAA championships through five week days before spring finals while Proposal 11 would maintain the current rule.

Proposal 12 is a membership-sponsored proposal that would amend the preseason legislation for all sports except for football and men's water polo to calculate the first start date by counting back 18 days, requiring acclimatization period during the first seven days of preseason; require one day off of physical activity per defined week of the preseason, including the acclimatization period, and require student-athletes, including those who arrive at

preseason practice after the first day of practice to undergo the seven-day acclimatization period.

This chart shows you what that change would look like. So from a start date perspective, from acclimatization period perspective, institutions would have two options for day one of their acclimatization period, which would result in a total of four hours of athletically related activity being permitted.

During that walk-through session, that's one hour in limit, there's no equipment that can be used, and student-athletes would be required to have three hours of recovery time.

Days two through four, teams would be limited to one practice not to exceed three hours in length and one walk-through. The team would have three hours of recovery time.

And through days five through seven, teams will be permitted to engage in weight training but would be prohibited from engaging in outside competition. Teams would be permitted to conduct up to two practices and one walk-through per day, and they may use up to five hours per day of activities with a single practice not exceeding three hours.

Teams must have a three-hour recovery period during which time no meetings or athletically related activities would be permitted.

And then golf has its own restriction related to a five-hour practice day but still must adhere to the three-hour recovery period.

Proposal 13, which is sponsored by the Management Council through recommendation from the Committee of Women's Athletics, this proposal would establish stunt as an emerging sport in Division III.

Stunt is not currently classified as a D-III sport. Under this proposal, stunt would be established as an emerging sport for women in Division III. This proposal would also establish legislation related to the playing and practice season for stunt, along with sport sponsorship requirements.

This proposal will be moved by the government structure and a motion will be made to refer it back to CWA.

New information became available in September that wasn't evaluated earlier and raised questions that require additional follow-up. This information is related to student-athlete health and welfare.

The Committee on Women's Athletics thinks it's important to create opportunities for further discussion and monitor these issues before forwarding their recommendation.

The committee also would like to receive feedback from institutions that sponsor stunt to understand the impact of these issues.

The Committee on Women's Athletics will report back to the governance body by their September meetings. Both CWA and the council remain in support of providing opportunities for women but believe it is prudent to follow up on these issues before recommending the proposal move forward.

Proposal 14 is Management Council sponsored. It would change the date that institutions can have public communications via social media with PSAs from May 1st to January 1st of the senior year of high school.

Under the current rule, public communications may only occur after May 1st and financial deposit. This proposal would change that date to January 1st and financial deposit.

And then finally, Proposal 15 would eliminate -- it's a Management Council sponsored proposal -- and would eliminate the requirement for active member institutions to an active -- multi-sport conferences to submit a comprehensive self-study guide at least once every five years. This has an immediate effective date. So those who did not do it, you wouldn't have to anymore.

Currently this is an every five-year requirement that you guys dread and this proposal would eliminate that requirement.

If you all have any questions, please feel free to come up to either of the mics or any of the mics in the room and Jeff and I will do our best to address those. All right. Microphone 5, please.

KERI ALEXANDER LUCHOWSKI: Good morning. Keri Alexander Luchowski, Executive Director of the North Coast Athletic Conference. And I just want to -- we've been getting a lot of questions about Proposal No. 12.

And so I want to make just really quick clarification, as you head into your conference meetings, about equipment.

And so the intent of the proposal, when it talked about equipment, is to talk about what walk-throughs are. And so for those walk-through sessions, you can use tools related to the sport such as a soccer ball, a volleyball, a field

hockey ball and a stick, but what the walk-throughs are not meant to be is conditioning or training opportunities.

And so those types of equipment would not be used. Those definitions refer to walk-throughs and not practice sessions. So hopefully that clarifies.

If there are questions, happy to answer. Please find me. But as you start talking about the proposal or continue talking about it, hopefully, know that we never intend you to have a soccer practice without a ball. I was a soccer player. That's torture.

So it is meant to define the walk-throughs, just like the football legislation we already have does. Thank you.

TIFFANY ALFORD: Seeing no other questions, I appreciate your time. Oh.

DINO POLLOCK: Hello, Dino Pollock from Western New England. I have a question regarding the proposals around Bylaw 17 and the redefining the planning and practice seasons from weeks to days.

Is that legislation -- are both of those proposals, if passed, would that be permissive or would that be mandatory for member institutions?

TIFFANY ALFORD: If either of those proposals are passed, that would be the new legislation and that would be the way you conduct your season. So I guess mandatory since that would be legislated.

DINO POLLOCK: Thank you. That makes a big difference.

TIFFANY ALFORD: No problem. Microphone 1.

TOM HART: Tom Hart, Commissioner, USA South Athletic Conference. When Jeff was reviewing all the legislation, we went from 5 to 7. We had the black screen of death there on top. So we never went through No. 6.

I was wondering if we could perhaps talk about No. 6, or what's happening. But we didn't review that one.

TIFFANY ALFORD: No problem.

JEFF MYERS: My apologies, Tom. The black screen of death did throw me off. My apologies.

Proposal 6 would amend the nominating committee. It would, similar to Proposal 5, it would change it from eight to 10 members. It would maintain much of the compositional requirements, but -- except for the

geographic piece. It would take those ten members from what's being called conference-based geographic regions, 10 of those. Modeled somewhat after the 10-sport region.

So that's what it would establish. If Proposal 5 was adopted, it would render Proposal 6 moot. Thank you, Tom. Again, my apologies.

TIFFANY ALFORD: Microphone 6.

STEVE BRIGGS: Steve Briggs, Berry College. Question you've just answered about permissive versus restrictive, was that around Proposal 10 and 11?

TIFFANY ALFORD: About how the seasons would be defined, yes.

STEVE BRIGGS: So is it true that -- I think both of those are more flexible than the current model so that they would allow you to retain the current model if you wanted to because they're more flexible. So it's permissive in one sense -- it's a mandatory requirement, but it's a more permissive mandatory requirement which gives you options then within that structure.

TIFFANY ALFORD: Sure. I think that's a fair assessment of that, President Briggs. Thank you. Microphone 6.

DINO POLLOCK: I'm sorry. I need more clarity because I'm confused now. Because does this legislation, if passed, if either of those passed, does it permit an institution to retain the weeks model if they so choose?

TIFFANY ALFORD: You could structure your season under either proposal. So proposal -- let's say Proposal 10 goes down and it gets adopted and you've got 114 days. If you choose to structure your fall playing season or spring playing season in a way that still maintains a week's model but is using those 114 days appropriately, you can do that.

It's just that from a legislative perspective, we would no longer be defining using the term "weeks" to define what the playing seasons are.

DINO POLLOCK: Okay. Thanks.

TIFFANY ALFORD: No problem.

Thank you very much. Appreciate you.

JIM SCHMIDT: Thank you, Jeff and Tiffany. Given the relatively few questions, that says you did a great job presenting it.

I'm sure we all have benefited from this review and the

charts. I think people are coming along.

Couple of announcements about tomorrow. We will be convening back in this room. There will be luggage storage tomorrow morning in this hotel. So look for signage throughout the hotel for the specific location.

It would be best to check out of your rooms and bring your luggage in before we start our business session.

Finally, let me remind everyone that immediately -- we're going to take just a minute or two to kind of switch things over. But within a minute of adjourning this session, we're going to move directly into our business session.

That's all we have. So we are adjourning from this information session. Give us just a minute to switch things over and we'll be moving directly into our business session.

[Adjourned at 10:37]

CERTIFICATION OF COMPLETION

I, DENISE HINXMAN, Certified Court Reporter, do hereby certify;

That on Friday, January 13, 2023, I was present and took verbatim stenotype notes of the Issues Forum entitled herein, and thereafter transcribed the same into typewriting as herein appears;

That said meeting was taken in stenotype notes by me, a Certified Court Reporter, and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction as herein appears;.

That the foregoing transcript is a full, true and correct transcription of my stenotype notes of said meeting.

Dated at Reno, Nevada, this 17th day of January 2023.

DENISE HINXMAN, RDR, CRR