|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **NORTH BAY LEAGUE**  **Joe Ellwood, Commissioner**  [jellwood@wscuhsd.org](mailto:jellwood@wscuhsd.org); (707)484-8410  **Dean Haskins, Commissioner**  dhaskins@srcs.k12.ca.us; (707) 484-0271 |  |

**ATHLETIC DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES, TUESDAY, JANUARY 17. 2023, 10 AM**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTENDANCE** | | | | |
|  | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Joe Ellwood | Analy | Kenny Knowlton | Santa Rosa | | Monica Mertle | Cardinal Newman | Bryan Price | Santa Rosa | | Ry Basham-Mintz | Elsie Allen | Heather Campbell | St. Vincent | | Josh Cavanagh | Healdsburg | Stephen Summers | Ukiah | | Jerry Deakins | Maria Carrillo | Jamie Williams | Windsor | | Dean Haskins | Montgomery |  |  | |  |  | Joe Ellwood | Commissioner | |  |  | Dean Haskins | Commissioner | | | | |
| **I.** | **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** | | | |
|  | Motion to approve the agenda as presented.  Motion: Santa Rosa  Second: Ukiah  Motion approved unanimously (10-0) | | | |
|  |  | | | |
| **II.** | **APPROVAL OF THE NBL CONSENT AGENDA** | | | |
|  | There is no consent agenda item for this meeting. | | | |
|  |  | | | |
| **III.** | **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE PREVIOUS MEETING** | | | |
|  | Previously emailed and available online at [www.northbayleague.org](http://www.northbayleague.org)  Motion to approve the minutes of the previous meeting.  Motion: St. Vincent  Second: Windsor  Motion approved unanimously (10-0) | | | |
|  |  | | | |
| **IV.** | **PUBLIC COMMENT** | | | |
|  | Pursuant to Education Code Section 54954.3 and Education Code section 33353, any member of the public wishing to speak on any matter within the subject matter jurisdiction of the NBL, CIF, and NCS will be heard at this time. The time for such comment is no more than two (2) minutes per person on an item and no more than twenty (20) minutes total on an item or as designated by the Chair. No public input | | | |
|  |  | | | |
| **V.** | **NORTH BAY LEAGUE AGENDA ITEMS** | | | |
|  | **A.** | **BASKETBALL TOURNAMENT END SEASON TOURNAMENT** | | |
|  |  | 1st round is Tuesday/Wednesday and the finals will be Friday/Saturday. Redwood boys and girls will be Friday 6:00pm/7:30pm and Oak boys and girls will be Saturday 6:00pm/7:30pm. GoFan and cask will be available for ticket purchase at Rancho. | | |
|  | **B.** | **BOYS’ VOLLEYBALL** | | |
|  |  | Local teams: Analy, Cardinal Newman, possibly Windsor, RUP, RCP and Sonoma Valley. Conversation started about the possibility of creating a Boys volleyball league in the NBL. | | |
|  | **C.** | **NCS FALL SPORTS FEES** | | |
|  | **D.** | **DISCUSSION FROM THE FLOOR** | | |
|  |  |  | | |
| **VI.** | **NORTH COAST SECTION BOARD OF MANAGERS AGENDA ITEMS** | | | |
|  | **VII.** | **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE** | | |
|  |  | **B.** | **Region 2 Representative Election (Action)** | |
|  |  |  | With the resignation of Kibby Kleiman from the Executive Committee, the three leagues that make up Region 2 (BVAL, EBAL, TCAL) have presented the following nominations for election by the Board of Managers. | |
|  |  |  | BVAL | Carrie Wells, Principal, Heritage High School |
|  |  |  | TCAL | Leslie Marley, Principal, John Swett High School |
|  |  |  | EBAL | Piper Brewster, Athletic Director, Carondelet High School |
|  |  |  | Applications from each nominee are in Attachment C, located at the end of this agenda. | |
|  |  |  | Motion to send the NBL delegates to the NCS BOM Meeting unopposed and vote based on the discussion about the three nominations.  Motion: Ukiah  Second: St. Vincent  Motion approved unanimously (10-0) | |
|  |  |  | | |
|  | **X.** | **SPORTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE** | | |
|  |  | **I.** | **Proposal to modify NCS 101H Official Season of Sport (Action)** | |
|  |  |  | Motion to NOT support the modification of NCS bylaw 101H, which would result in changing the maximum number of contests for all sports.  Motion: Analy  Second: Ukiah  Motion approved unanimously (10-1)  Discussion:   * More time out of class * More expenses for officials * Already enough games with post season tournaments * Weather in the North Coast Section   **Vote from the League Regarding Proposal:** Unanimous (13-0)  **Date of Requested Implementation:**  Winter 2022-2023 Implementation 2023-2024 school year  **Description of Proposal:**  To edit North Coast Section 101H Chart of NCS Official Season of Sport:  Change the maximum number of contests for all sports in the North Coast Section to align with the California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) state maximum for each sport, respectively. For example, if the CIF sets the maximum number of contests for baseball at 28 games, the NCS would follow suit and set our maximum number of contests at 28 games as well.  **Rationale in Support of Proposal:**  The CIF sets the maximum number of contests per sport, and the overwhelming majority of CIF sections follow suit and align their maximum number of contests with the state maximums.  The North Coast Section currently sets the maximum number of contests in seven sports below the CIF state limit (see Attachment A). The NCS is one of two sections that sets the maximum number of contests for sports below the CIF state maximum. It should be noted that the other section that limits the maximum contests, the Central Coast Section, has additional bylaws that allow teams to play in tournaments and league championship tournaments and not count each game as a contest. In effect, these additional bylaws allow Central Coast Section teams to play more contests than listed below.  Limiting NCS teams to fewer games puts teams in our section at a disadvantage when playing opponents outside of NCS, particularly in postseason competition at the state level. It limits a school’s ability to obtain a qualifying record to apply for NCS playoffs. And, it reduces opportunities for our student-athletes to participate and compete in contests. Changing the maximum number of contests for all NCS sports to the CIF state maximums will provide NCS teams and student-athletes with an equal opportunity relative to their counterparts in other CIF sections.  *Softball/Baseball Example Information*   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Section** | **Practice Start Date** | **Last Contest Date** | **Maximum Number of Contests** | | North Coast | February 6 | May 12 | 24 | | San Diego | February 11 | May 12 | 28 | | Sac-Joaquin | January 30 | May 5 | 28 | | Central | January 9 | May 12 | 28 |   **Income/Expenses Related to Implementation:**  Additional expenses will be at the site level, as schools would need to cover the basic cost of a contest such as travel, officials, etc.  **Possible Objections to Proposal:**  Increasing the maximum number of contests will put additional strain on coaches and student athletes, as they will be dedicating more time to competition. Additionally, expenses will increase as there are basic costs to any contest such as travel, officials, etc.  A rebuttal to this objection would be that changing the maximum number of contests simply gives teams more opportunities to compete, it does not dictate that they must schedule that number of contests. Each program will still be in charge of their schedule and can make decisions on how many contests they have based on what is best for their program.  One additional objection to this change could be around the start dates of seasons. For example, if baseball/softball starts later in the NCS than other sections, it should play fewer contests because they have a shorter season. However, as shown below, other sections are not limiting themselves in that way. Each section below varies as to when they start (some have a shorter season than NCS, and some have a longer one), but each of them has a consistent maximum number of contests at 28. Why would NCS not maintain this same consistency?   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **CIF** | **CS** | **CCS** | **LA** | **NCS** | **NS** | **OAK** | **SSJ** | **SD** | **SF** | **SS** | | **Baseball** | 28 | 28 | 27 | 28 | **24** | 28 | 26 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | | **Basketball** | 28 | 28 | 24 | 28 | **26** | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | | **Badminton** | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | | **Beach VB** | n/a | n/a | 26 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | **Cross Country** | 14 | 14 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | | **Football** | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | | **Golf** | 24 | 24 | 18 | 24 | **22** | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | | **Lacrosse** | n/a | n/a | 20 | n/a | 20 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | **Soccer** | 28 | 28 | 20 | 28 | **24** | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | | **Softball** | 28 | 28 | 27 | 28 | **24** | 28 | ?? | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | | **Swim** | 14 | 14 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | | **Tennis** | 24 | 24 | 22 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | | **Track** | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | | **Volleyball** | 28 | 28 | 26 | 28 | **24** | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | | **Water Polo** | 28 | 28 | 24 | 28 | **24** | 28 | n/a | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | | **Wrestling** | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |   **Income/Expenses Related to Implementation:**  Additional expenses will be at the site level, as schools would need to cover the basic cost of a contest such as travel, officials, etc. | |
|  |  | **J.** | **Proposal to place schools in the NCS playoffs into Divisions as outlined below. (Action)** | |
|  |  |  | Motion to NOT support the placement of schools in the NCS playoffs into divisions as outlined below.  Motion: Cardinal Newman  Second: St. Vincent  Motion approved unanimously (10-0)  **Name of NCS Entity Presenting Proposal:** WACC  This proposal is to restructure the NCS playoffs in team sports  **Description of the Proposal:**  INTRODUCTION  The NCS SAC discussed an agenda item, a four-page proposal, at its December 5,2022 that would restructure how teams earned the right to participate in the NCS playoffs; how those playoffs would be structured; and how teams from the NCS earned the right to move on to the NORCALS and CIF bowl games.  There were myriad questions about the proposal. In the end, the NCS SAC members chose to focus on one question – should schools be placed into the NCS championships divisions based on their school size or their perceived competitive equity. The answer to this one question would help SAC delegates answer the myriad other questions. ***The agenda item below failed at the NCS level; 13-20 on one vote and 14-19 on another vote; larger schools generally supporting the item and smaller schools generally opposing the item.***    *MOTION/AGENDA ITEM*  Placing Schools in NCS Divisions for Playoffs  The seeding committee would place schools selected for the playoffs on one list based on the committee’s perception of competitive equity: strongest to weakest. Basketball for example would have one list of 104 schools ranked by competitive equity.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | a. | If the sport has an open division, the division shall be filled first with those schools that the committee feels are the strongest. | | b. | The next division of 6 or 8 or 12 or 16 schools shall be the next 6, 8, 12, or 16 strongest schools. | | c. | The next division of 6 or 8 or 12 or 16 schools shall be the next 6, 8, 12, or 16 strongest schools. | | d. | This process continues until all of the schools have been placed in divisions. |   The names of the divisions shall be based on the colors of the rainbow; red, blue, yellow, orange, purple, green.  *SCHOOL SIZE*  Is school size the dominant factor in whether a school is able to field a competitive athletic program in all sports?  School size is no longer useful in determining a school’s ability to compete in a given sport. Pick most any school size-based division in most any sport and look at present “rankings” from NCS partner companies – there is little relationship between school size and ranking. This causes many first round, and even second round mismatches in our NCS championships as the NCS divisions are sized-based; not competitive-equity based.  Why is this happening?   1. Changing demographic patterns throughout the section have had a positive effect on the athletic programs at some schools; a negative effect on others. Two schools of the same size may have very different financial resources with which to work. Two schools of the same size may have widely different transiency rates. 2. The CIF’s new “one free transfer with a sit-out period” rule has caused some athletically motivated school switching, not at all based on school size. 3. Some geographic areas have strong club teams that morph into school teams and the morph back into club teams with the same group of coaches and kids; other geographic areas have no readily available club teams or have student-athletes financially unable to afford to participate on club teams. 4. Some school districts have very developed middle school athletic programs that feed into local high schools; others have no middle school programs at all. 5. Two schools of the same size may have widely different academic ineligibility issues. 6. In addition, COVID-19 has had a very negative impact on the athletic programs at some schools; a neutral impact on others     *HISTORY AND BACKGROUND*  Over ten years ago, the previous NCS Commissioner, aware of the problem of disparate competitive equities with schools of the same size, proposed the following (abridged) in basketball:   1. We’ll take all 170 or so schools that play basketball and place them in NCS divisions at the beginning of the basketball season based on their rankings at the end of the previous season. The first 25 competitively-ranked schools will be placed in D I; the next 25 competitively-ranked schools in DII; and so on. 2. We’ll then take the 16 “best” team from each division at the end of the season for the NCS playoffs   This proposal failed as most leagues felt that placing schools in divisions based on previous year’s success was not a good idea.  Approximately ten years ago, the NCS developed a “competitive-equity” model that, in theory, moved the very best schools over a three-year period from their present sized-based division to the size-based division of the next set of larger schools. The mathematics of this system are a bit complex and this process has been tinkered with almost since its inception. The divisions with the larger schools are increasingly populated with smaller schools with dominant athletic programs.  This means that an increasing number of middle-sized and larger schools are “stuck” in these divisions, unable to realistically have a chance of earning an NCS playoff berth or being blown out in the first round. In addition, an increasing number of schools who’ve “earned” the right to participate in NCS championships are choosing not to do so because they’re aware that they will be placed in a first-round game with an opponent against which they are not competitively equitable. This causes empty brackets spots in several sports.  The CIF sections of our size (Central Coast Section, San Diego Section and the Sac Joaquin Section) have already moved away from school-sized based divisions in favor of placement into competitively-equitable divisions; all unique to their own specific needs.  The CIF doesn’t use size-based “divisions” anymore in placing NCS schools that have earned the right to participate in the NORCALS into their NorCal divisions and bowl games. The various Section commissioners are asked to rank their NORCAL entrants. For example, the NCS Commissioner “ranks” all 25 basketball entrants for the CIF committee that then places schools into Bowl unit divisions based on perceived competitive equity, not school size.    *PROBLEMS WITH THE PRESENT SYSTEM*   1. Many first round NCS playoff games are therefore not competitive; an increasing number of second round NCS playoff games are not competitive. This is most visible in football with huge disparities in first round games. (Please see the attached charts). 2. An increasing number of schools are stuck in divisions in which they are not competitive. 3. The present system is causing some schools that “qualify” for NCS playoffs to opt out of participation because they are aware of the competitive inequities in their division. They know that they will lose big in the first round, or have health and safety concerns for their student-athletes, and chose not to participate, leaving open spots in many brackets. 4. It is difficult for schools to schedule games on a two-year home/away basis when they don’t know what NCS division they’ll be in or their opponent will be; divisions may change every year and who you play in non-league games becomes crucial for NCS division placement. 5. The competitive equity point system has not been able to solve the competitive equity problem and, for some schools, is actually exacerbating problems. Moving a smaller school to an NCS division composed of larger schools based a team success they had the previous two or three years ignores a basic fact that most schools occasionally have a super group of athletes that move through school; then graduate. 6. The increasing number of “super-leagues,” and “football only” leagues show that schools and leagues are aware of competitive equity issues and are trying to resolve them at the local league level. The NCS is not doing this at the NCS level.     *CLARIFICATION*   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **1.** | **The agenda item deals only with the team sports of baseball, basketball, football, lacrosse, soccer, softball, volleyball, and water polo.** | | **2.** | **Sports where individual scores are used to generate a team score are not affected: badminton, cross-country, golf, swimming and diving, tennis, track and field, and wrestling.** |   **REMAINING QUESTIONS THAT WILL NEED TO BE ANSWERED**  NCS playoffs are really divided into three aspects. This agenda item deals with only one part of one of these three--how are NCS playoffs structured. The remaining questions can only be answered after we agree on how schools are placed in NCS playoff divisions.     |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 1. | How do schools qualify for NCS playoff consideration and how are  they selected? | | |  | a. | Do we need to place schools in divisions ahead of seeding Sunday? | |  | b. | Do we continue with our “even steven” requirements to  qualify? Does this need to be adapted? | |  | c. | What is the role of leagues? Do they continue to get one  automatic? Maybe two automatic entries? | |  | d. | Do we continue to place schools in divisions based on school size?  To do so can guarantee schools of all sizes are equally able to  qualify and be selected. | |  | e. | If so, do we keep the present “competitive equity” model that  moves schools out of their school size division? | | 2. | How are the actual playoffs structured? | | |  | a. | What size should divisions be? 6,8,10,12,16? | |  | b. | How many divisions per sport? Sport specific? | |  | c. | Do we give automatic entries a first-round home game? A  second-round home game? | |  | d. | Do we keep “open” divisions in some sports? Expand them to  all sports? Eliminate them? | | 3. | How are NCS representatives, based on playoff results, chosen  for NORCAL and CIF bowl games? NCS receives 6-25 entrants,  depending on the sport. | | |  | a. | In some sports, seeding committee decisions affect/select  NORCAL entrants. Do we continue this practice? | |  | b. | Schools can lose NCS games and still be selected. | |  | c. | Are open division entrants given extra weight in NorCal  selection decisions. | |  | d. | Are schools of all sizes equally able to qualify for  NorCal consideration. |   **Date of Requested Implementation**: July 1, 2022  **Income and Expenses Related to Implementation:** It is our belief that the NCS would see greater income with playoffs based on competitive equity than they do now with playoffs based on school size. More brackets would be filled; there would be more competitive games. | |
|  |  |  |  | |
|  |  | **K.** | **FOOTBALL ACCLIMATION PROPOSAL** | |
|  |  |  | Motion to support the football acclimation proposal.  Motion: Maria Carrillo  Second: Ukiah  Motion approved unanimously (10-0) | |
|  |  |  | **Vote from the League Regarding Proposal**: 11-0  **Date of Requested Implementation:** 30 days prior to the first official day of an allowable scrimmage  **Description of Proposal:** (include bylaw revision, if appropriate)  NCS Sports & General Rulings Handbook Bylaw, state law (AB 2127), Education Code 35179.5 and CIF 1901.  Proposal for acclimation period. Beginning 30 days prior to the first official day of an allowable scrimmage, teams may institute an acclimation period, where student-athletes will have the use of a helmet throughout much of the summer. No live contact drills will be allowed- all allowable drills per the NCS in a normal summer period will be permissible; this would simply give teams the option of adding a helmet to normal allowable summer activity to better prepare them for the season.  **Rationale in Support of Proposal:**  Safety. To put a student-athlete directly into full padded practice without any acclimation period with gear is troublesome. Heat, comfort, and familiarity with gear are all obstacles that face student-athletes during this period. To allow them an adjustment period with a helmet to better prepare them for full contact practice would help promote the safety of these student-athletes once full practice resumes.  For example, some freshman student-athletes have never even put on a helmet and are completely unaccustomed to both the helmet and the heat impact that wearing one provides; to put them into live contact drills without any familiarity is troublesome.  This is not only a freshman level initiative, however; JV and Varsity athletes still need time to acclimate to the advent of gear, especially in typical summer heat, which is often in the 90 and even 100-degree mark. Much of the additional heat impact occurs when wearing a helmet, so allowing students time to acclimate can help keep them safe. Additionally, allowing student-athletes to grow more comfortable and accustomed to traditional movements throughout much of summer will only increase comfort and allow student-athletes more time to become accustomed to the heat. The CIF heat prevention course mentions this type of activity with frequency; by not allowing any use of gear prior to the first day of the season is problematic.  **Possible Objections to Proposal:**  There will naturally be a concern that this will increase contact- this is not the intention of this proposal. No contact drills are permissible during summer per the NCS, and normal summer rules would apply during this period. Essentially, the student-athletes would be running their normal summer activities, but have the ability to adjust to normal movements while wearing a helmet. No contact drills are allowed, so there will be no increase in contact for the student-athletes. There will also not be added practice time- teams that are conducting summer practices can continue to do so, and teams that choose not to conduct practices certainly do not need to start. A concern about added time for trainers, administrators, and coaches seems unfounded; again, there are no contact drills allowed and no additional time added to the summer- teams that are conducting workouts may continue, while teams that choose not to participate can continue to do so.  **Income/Expenses Related to Implementation: None**  ***Passed SAC 20-13*** | |
|  | **XIV.** | **CIF ITEMS** | | |
|  |  | **A.** | **Girls’ Flag Football, Fall Sport proposal (Action; SAC 30-0; Executive Committee 7-0)** | |
|  |  |  | Proposal from the CIF Southern Section to add the sport of girls’ flag football as a CIF sanctioned sport in the fall season.  Motion to support Girls’ Flag Football as an CIF sanctioned sport in the fall season.  Motion: Santa Rosa  Second: Maria Carrillo  Motion approved unanimously (10-0) | |

**NEXT AD MEETING: MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2023**

**Lewis Learning Center, 10 AM**