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

**ATHLETIC DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES, MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2023**

|  |
| --- |
| **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Monica Mertle  | Cardinal Newman | Kenny Knowlton  | Santa Rosa |
| Richard Sanchez  | 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 |
| Scott McKeon  | Rancho Cotate |  |  |
|  |  | Joe Ellwood  | Commissioner |

 |
|  |  |
| **I.** | **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** |
|  | Motion to approve the agenda as presented. |
|  | *Motion: Santa Rosa**Second: Ukiah**Motion approved: 9-0* |
|  |  |
| **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: Ukiah**Second: Santa Rosa**Motion approved: 9-0* |
|  |  |
| **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. |
|  | There were no members of the public in attendance. |
|  |  |
| **V.** | **NORTH BAY LEAGUE AGENDA ITEMS** |
|  | **A.** | **NCS Commissioner Pat Cruickshank was a guest at this meeting.** |
|  |  |  |
|  | **B.** | **Football Realignment for 2024**  |
|  |  | 1. Bylaws and schedules
2. *The appeal of division by Napa High School was supported by the Alignment Committee and should be approved at the Board of Manger’s meeting on April 14.*
 |
|  |  |  |
|  | **C.** | **Cross Country question for Pat** |
|  |  | There are several sports that have individual boys’ and girls’ teams, but just one coach, for example in Cross Country. With regard to declaring teams a competitive anomaly, is it possible to declare the boys’ team a competitive anomaly, but not the girls’ team? Or, do you have to consider both teams a competitive anomaly. |
|  |  | *Commissioner Cruickshank said it would be difficult to separate boys/girls XC teams to declare one a competitive anomaly. He also questioned the necessity as all participants qualify for the NCS meet.* |
|  | **D.** | Thank you to Rancho Cotate for hosting the NBL Basketball Tournament |
|  |  |  |
|  | **E.** | **Addition of boys’ volleyball as an NBL team, beginning in the 2023-2024 school year.**  |
|  |  | Rationale:Student interest at a variety of schools.Another option for boys to participate on a team sport during the spring season of sport.Windsor, Ukiah, Cardinal Newman and Analy play on having boys’ volleyball next Spring. |
|  |  | Motion to add boys’ volleyball as a spring sport beginning in the 2023-2024 school year.*Motion: Windsor**Second: Ukiah**Motion to support: 9-0* |
|  | **F.** | **NFHS rulebook app**  |
|  |  | *Commissioner Elwood explained how the league purchasing rule books this year would be cost-prohibitive. Open to revisiting it next year. Encouraged schools to buy digital versions through the NFHS app.*  |
|  | **G.** | **NBL Winter Schedules** |
|  |  | *Winter schedules will be available soon*.  |
|  | **H.** | **NCS Eligibility Committee** |
|  |  | *New Valid Change of Residence Form will be available from NCS sometime before the end of the year for possible implementation next year. Encouraged ADs to attend CSADA Conference in Santa Clara this year.*  |
|  | **I.** | **Consideration of whether or not Cardinal Newman Varsity Girls’ basketball should be considered a competitive anomaly**. |
|  |  |  | Motion to recommend that the Cardinal Newman girls’ basketball team be considered a competitive anomaly. *Motion: St. Vincent**Second: Rancho Cotate* *Motion supported: 7-4* *Yes votes: Analy, Maria Carrillo, Rancho Cotate, Santa Rosa, Ukiah, Elsie Allen and Healdsburg.**No votes: Cardinal Newman, St. Vincent, Windsor, and Piner*Discussion points:* Maria Carrillo expressed that their players enjoyed playing Cardinal Newman this year.
* Ukiah expressed that they thought if the schools’ name was not known, it would be evident that they met the criteria for a competitive anomaly.
* St. Vincent thought declaring Cardinal Newman would be punitive in nature.
* Windsor was not supportive because they want to play the best team “Iron sharpens Iron.”
* Commissioner Cruickshank shared several examples of competitive anomalies in our section.
* Cardinal Newman is concerned with the timeline of approval. If NBL Principals vote in favor, it has to be taken to the conference for a vote and then to the NCS Alignment Committee for final approval. The next Alignment Committee meeting is not until May 25, 2023.
 |
|  |  |  |
|  | **J.** | **Spring Sport Bylaw Amendment Proposals** |
|  |  | **A.** | **Swim** |
|  |  |  | Motion to support the amendments to Swim Bylaw 10.304, shown below in red.*Motion: Maria Carrillo**Second: Rancho Cotate**Motion approved 11 – 0* |
|  |  |  | 10.304 | Schools may fill their varsity team based on level of experience, not based on the numbers in the varsity program (1/17/2010)Scoring for dual, double dual or triple dual meets: |
|  |  |  |  | a. | Maximum of ~~three~~ **two** entries per team |
|  |  |  |  |  | Relays: 6-3-2-1 Individual: 4-3-1-0 |
|  |  |  |  | b. | Maximum of ~~two~~ **three** entries per team |
|  |  |  |  |  | Relays: 8-4-2-0 Individual: 6-4-3-2-1-0 |
|  |  |  |  | c. | Maximum of four entries per team |
|  |  |  |  |  | Relays: 10-5-3-0 Individual: 8-6-5-4-3-2-1-0 |
|  |  |  |  | e. | Double-dual/dripple-dual: Scoring will follow entries per team as listed under dual meets. |
|  |  |  | *Rationale: Clean-up language that was incorrect in the bylaws.* |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **B.** | **Boys’ Golf** |
|  |  |  | Motion to support the amendment to Golf Bylaw 6.804, shown below in red.*Motion: Maria Carrillo**Second: Ukiah**Motion approved 11-0* |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 6.804 | ~~A player must play in a minimum of 50% of the league matches in order to receive NBL all-honors or participate in the NBL Qualifying Tournament. A player who does not qualify may petition to the NBL Executive Committee for exception, based on documented evidence of a condition beyond the control of the student-athlete.~~**A golfer must play in a minimum of four league matches to be considered for NBL Qualifying Tournament and for all-NBL honors. Additionally, the total scores for all golfers will be averaged against par for the course played.***Rationale:**The average differential to par will help; negate the impact of a Sugarloaf score where par is 63 compared to other courses where the par is 72.* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **C.** | **Softball** Motion to support the amendment to Softball Bylaw 9.802 shown below in red.*Motion: Ukiah**Second: Windsor**Vote: 11-0* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 9.802 | An all-league team shall be selected on the Monday following the completion of the league round robin. There shall be one Player of the Year and one Pitcher of the Year. Coaches may vote for their own player when voting for Player of the Year and Pitcher of the Year, but may not vote for their own player for the other teams. ~~First team and second team (if desired) shall consist of no more than four outfielders, four infielders, one catcher, one utility player and two pitchers.~~ **There will be twelve first-team all-league selections and twelve second team all-league selections**. A coach of the year may also be selected. There is no honorable mention team.**Voting:****When a coach proposes a player to be on the board, the coach is not required to provide any statistics, etc. The coach only needs to identify the player’s first and last name, grade level, and position. Each coach will nominate their school’s first team all-league recommendations and put them on the board. Coaches will then vote 5,4,3,2,1. The top six will be named to first-team all-league and then their names are erased from the board. Coaches may then propose more players if they wish to do so, or pass and vote again 5,4,3,2,1 and take the next six players with the most points. These twelve players will comprise the NBL First Team All-League. The process will be repeated to ascertain the twelve second team players.***Rationale:** *Less work to compile statistics by the coach*
* *Less work for the commissioner liaison to create the spread-sheet that was used instead of posting stats on the white board*
* *Coach request by the majority of coaches*
 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **D** | **Baseball** |
|  |  |  | Motion to support them amendment to Baseball Bylaw 2.802, shown below in red.*Motion: Healdsburg**Second: Santa Rosa**Vote: 11-0* |
|  |  |  | 2.802 | An all-league team shall be selected on the Monday following the completion of the league round robin. ~~First team shall consist of three outfielders, three infielders, one first baseman, one catcher, one utility player, three starting pitchers, two relief pitchers, one player of the year and one pitcher of the year. A second team is also allowed.~~ **Individual awards voted on at the all-league meeting will be one Player of the Year and one Pitcher of the Year.** A coach may vote for their own player in voting for Player of the Year and for Pitcher of the Year but may not vote for their own player(s) for the other teams. All voting shall be done by secret ballot.A coach of the year may also be selected, if desired.**FIRST TEAM**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Five Team League** |  | **Six Team League** |
| **League Finish** | **# Of all-leaguers** |  | **League Finish** | **# Of all-leaguers** |
| **First** | **5** |  | **First** | **5** |
| **Second** | **4** |  | **Second** | **4** |
| **Third** | **3** |  | **Third** | **3** |
| **Fourth** | **2** |  | **Fourth** | **2** |
| **Fifth** | **1** |  | **Fifth** | **1** |
|  |  |  | **Sixth** | **1** |

 |
|  |  |  |  | **Each team will also get two second team players and one honorable mention (if desired).***Rationale:** *Coach request*
* *This method will shorten the all-league meeting considerably and will provide equity between finish in league and number of all-league team members.*
* *This method will also eliminate the need to compile detailed statistics.*
 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **E.** | **Badminton**  |
|  |  |  | Motion to support the amendment to Badminton Bylaw 1.801, as shown below in red.Motion: WindsorSecond: Maria CarrilloVote: 11-0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1.801 | If badminton operates as a single league, the league champion will be team with the most wins in the NBL dual meet competition. If two or more teams tie for the championship, those teams will be declared co-champions and each will receive a pennant. ~~For the purpose of determining the number of team wins within the league, a team is defined as having 8 individuals/doubles (i.e.—3 boys’ singles, 2 girls’ doubles teams, 1 boys’ doubles team, 1 girls’ singles team, and 1 mixed doubles). (5/17/22)~~**In order to claim a team victory in the dual meet competition, a team must win the majority of the fifteen matches that are played in the NBL. In other words, a team must win at least eight matches. In the case of incomplete teams, any matches not played would count as forfeits.****Examples:*** **If Team A has a mixed doubles team, but team B does not, team B forfeits that match and Team A gets a win.**
* **If neither Team A nor Team B has the player(s) for a match, then each team receives a forfeit and no team gets a win.**

If badminton is scheduled as two divisions, Oak and Redwood, the league champion for each division will be the team with the most wins in Oak and the team with the most wins in Redwood. If two or more teams tie for the championship, those teams will be declared co-champions and each will receive a pennant.*Rationale:** *Clarification of how the winner of a dual match is calculated.*
 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **F.** | **Track and Field** |
|  |  |  | Motion to approve the Track and Field bylaw addition shown below in red. |
|  |  |  | *Motion: Maria Carrillo**Second: Ukiah**Vote: 11-0***The 4 x 800 relay will be contested at the League Championships as a final event (after the 200 m trials), then advance like all other events to the Redwood Area meet (after the 200 m finals), then at NCS MOC (after the 200 m trials), with the top two from each gender advancing to the CIF State Championships.** |
| **VI.** | **NORTH COAST SECTION SPORTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS** |
|  | **IV.** | **CIF ITEMS** |
|  |  | **A.** | At the time of the NBL ADs meeting, this item was listed as a “First Reading” item on the SAC agenda. It was subsequently changed to an “Action” item. **CIF BYLAW 2901 FIRST READING; INFORMATION--CRUICKSHANK** |
|  |  |  | Proposal to implement a boys’ and girls’ CIF State Tennis Championship in the 2023-2023 academic year. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **Proposal Summary:** The CIF Staff is proposing the implementation of a CIF State Tennis Championship to begin in 2023-2024 school year. This proposal follows the approved State Championships Master Schedule timeline for implementation of new events for consideration. This event would bring the top teams from each region to compete in an even larger scale event than their own section and regional championships. It’s another opportunity for both boys and girls to have “state” level competition in the sport of Tennis as other sports currently do (Swim and Dive, Basketball, Cross Country, etc.). The event would allow the Northern Region and Southern Region tennis team champions in the state an opportunity to compete at the State level. This championship event is proposed as one match held one week after the Regional Championship. **Fiscal Impact:** The expense would be $2,000 for each of the two events. The staff has conducted an audit of regional tennis events and calculated the possible travel expense for teams to compete. Also, in partnership with the CIF, the USTA will continue with the same regional contribution for the state championship. **Background:** The Tennis Regional championships have been successfully conducted in the North since 1998 and in the South since 2012. The State Tennis proposal is slated first in the CIF Master Calendar of Events long-range plan.**Proposal for California Tennis Championship****New CIF Championship Events****Name of Event:** CIF State Tennis Championships **Proposed Event Dates**: The proposed dates of the event coincide with the next available weekend after the completion of regional finals. Week 21 for girls and Week 47 for boys. **Girls Schedule Following Regional Championships:** 2023: Saturday, November 25: (Regional Championships are Saturday, November 18) 2024: Saturday, November 30: (Regional Championships are Saturday, November 23) 2025: Saturday, November 29: (Regional Championships are Saturday, November 22) 2026: Saturday, November 28: (Regional Championships are Saturday, November 21) 2027: Saturday, November 27: (Regional Championships are Saturday, November 20) **Boys Schedule Following Regional Championships:** 2024: Saturday, May 25: (Regional Championships are Saturday, May 18) 2025: Saturday, May 31: (Regional Championships are Saturday, May 24) 2026: Saturday, May 30: (Regional Championships are Saturday, May 23) 2027: Saturday, May 29: (Regional Championships are Saturday, May 22) 2028: Saturday, May 28: (Regional Championships are Saturday, May 21) **Format:** The format will be a two (2) team match between the regional champions. **Section Entries**; North: CCS- 2; NCS- 2; NS- 1; OS-1; SJS- 2; SFS- 1 South: CS- 1; LACS- 1; SDS- 2; SS-4 **Qualifying to State Championships**: Teams must compete and qualify through the CIF Regional Championships to participate in the CIF State Championships. **Financial Criteria and Feasibility for Tennis State Championships Sponsored by the CIF**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1.** | **What travel, lodging, and meal reimbursement will be provided to participating schools (please use the CIF Adopted Criteria)?** |
|  |  | Reimbursement will follow the CIF’s currently adopted criteria for team championships. |
| **2.** | **Will this event place any CIF Section event at risk financially?** |
|  |  | This event will not place any CIF Section event at risk financially because it takes place after all section championships have been concluded. This event will possibly generate greater excitement in the sport tennis at the section level and generate additional profit. |
| **3.** | **Will this event be a burden on any CIF Section budget or the State CIF budget?** |
|  |  | This event will not place any burden on any CIF Section budget because it takes place after all section finals have been completed. The State CIF will work with interested host communities to keep championship expenses in line with the projections and use additional marketing opportunities to supplement the budget. |
| **4.** | **Please provide a detailed, specific, feasible cost estimate for the operation of this event. Below are the budget estimates for this event.** |
|  |  | **Projected Girls’ State Tennis Championships based on Regional****Championship historical revenue and expense figures.** |
|  |  |  | Revenue | Expense | Partner Spending |
|  |  | Personnel Expenses |  | $325 |  |
|  |  | Misc. Expense/Staff Travel |  | $500 |  |
|  |  | Misc. Expense/Staff Travel |  | $1500 |  |
|  |  | Awards (CIF Trophy) |  | $350 |  |
|  |  | Awards (USTA Plaques) |  |  | $350 |
|  |  | Facility |  |  | $2000 |
|  |  | Total |  | $2675 | $2350 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **Projected Boys’ State Tennis Championships based on Regional****Championship historical revenue and expense figures.** |
|  |  |  | Revenue | Expense | Partner Spending |
|  |  | Personnel Expenses |  | $325 |  |
|  |  | Misc. Expense/Staff Travel |  | $500 |  |
|  |  | Misc. Expense/Staff Travel |  | $1500 |  |
|  |  | Awards (CIF Trophy) |  | $350 |  |
|  |  | Awards (USTA Plaques) |  |  | $350 |
|  |  | Facility |  |  | $2000 |
|  |  | Total |  | $2675 | $2350 |
|  |  | **Projected Boys’ & Girls’ State Tennis Championships based on Regional****Championship historical revenue and expense figures.** |
|  |  |  | Revenue | Expense | Partner Spending |
|  |  | Personnel Expenses |  | $650 |  |
|  |  | Misc. Expense/Staff Travel |  | $1000 |  |
|  |  | Misc. Expense/Staff Travel |  | $3000 |  |
|  |  | Awards (CIF Trophy) |  | $700 |  |
|  |  | Awards (USTA Plaques) |  |  | $700 |
|  |  | Facility |  |  | $4000 |
|  |  | Total |  | $5350 | $4700 |
| **5.** | **Please demonstrate using both costs in #4 above and anticipated event revenue how this event may be sustained economically over many years.** |
|  |  | This event will run at a deficit that can be annually absorbed by the CIF budget |
| **6.** | **Is the current CIF State Office staff capable of managing this event** |
|  |  | Yes. The current CIF State Office staff can manage this event. |
| **7.** | **Is there capable staff available to support the CIF State Office in the operation of this event?** |
|  |  | Yes. The State office staff currently has adequate resources to staff the event. |
| **Philosophical Criteria for New Events:** |
| **1.** | **How does this event contribute to the goals of the CIF (i.e., a new event may enhance gender equity, economic stability and enhance the awareness of values taught through sport)?** |
|  | This event would bring the top teams from each region to compete in an even larger scale event than their own section and regional championships. It’s another opportunity for both boys and girls to have “state” level competition in the sport of Tennis as other sports currently do (Swimming & Diving, Basketball, Volleyball, Wrestling, etc.). |
| **Qualifying Participation Criterion for a Regional Championship:** |
| **1.** | **Do 50% of all CIF sections participate in the sport in the same season?** |
| **Other Questions:** |
| **1.** | **How will this event benefit participating schools and students?** |
|  |  | This event will give boys and girls the opportunity for post-region championship opportunities not currently available in Tennis. |
| **2.** | **Do the proposed dates conflict with state mandated testing?** |
|  |  | The proposed dates are currently used for playoff opportunities in other sports. No conflict with state testing is anticipated. |
| **3.** | **Does the event cause additional loss of instructional time? If so, has any thought been given to mitigated this loss (Saturdays, evenings, vacation time)?** |
|  |  | The State event will follow a schedule like4 many of the other state level events. Depending on travel, there may be some loss of instructional time, but every effort will be made to minimize lost class time. |
| **4.** | **If the proposal is for a sport that is played now in more than one season in the state, what dates are selected and why?** |
|  |  | Fall Girls’ State Championships (CCS, NC, SJS, NS, OS/SFS)Spring Boys’ State Championships (CCS, NCS, SJS, NCS, 0S/SFS, SS, SD, LA, CS)The proposed dates of the event coincide with the next available weekend after the completion of regional finals. Week 21 for girls and week 47 for boys. |
| **5.** | **How, specifically, will this event be a demonstration of the values of participation in high school athletics?** |
|  |  | In choosing teams or individuals for an event, is there any criterion such as demonstration of respect, sportsmanship, citizenship, achievement through effort and cooperation, full compliance to CIF code of ethics, rules, regulations, guidelines, etc.?*All CIF events are conducted with the above in mind. This event can give CIF member schools another opportunity to demonstrate that competition can be played fairly and with great sportsmanship. It is also an additional avenue for our member schools to promote the best values of educational athletics.* |
| **6.** | **Will the proposed event lend itself to a partnership between the State CIF and a CIF Section? If so, the nature of the partnership must be detailed. What are the duties and responsibilities of the State and Section entities.**  |
|  |  | If there is to be a risk/profit sharing, what are the proposed financial details? If resources, other than financial, are to be used as part of a partnership, what are the anticipated resources?*Any proposal that considers a Section/State partnership should consider whether or not an event should be rotated, upon request,*  |
| **7.** | **Will there be any ancillary activities associated with the event to make it more attractive and reflective of the goals and mission of the CIF (i.e., training for coaches, sportsmanship activities for schools)?** |
|  |  | None anticipated. |

 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | **V.** | **NCS ITEMS** |
|  |  | **A.** | **DIVISIONS (R, D, A) NIEMI AND PHILLIPS** |
|  |  |  | Motion to support the recommended divisions, as proposed by the NCS.*Motion: Ukiah**2nd: Cardinal Newman**Vote: 11-0*Proposal to adopt divisions in the following sports for the 2023-24 academic year: football, fall soccer, girls’ volleyball, cross country, tennis, golf, water polo, wrestling and badminton. |
|  |  |  | Note: Divisions are located on the NBL website. NBL changes listed below. |
|  |  |  | Football* Windsor from D3 to D2 (based on competitive division criteria)
* Cardinal Newman from D4 to D3 (based on competitive division criteria)
* St. Vincent from D7 to D6 (based on competitive division criteria)

Cross Country* Santa Rosa (1689) will be in D3 (1334-1796)

Boys’ Water Polo* Cardinal Newman from D1 to D2. Not valid until BOM approval in Spring
 |
|  |  |  |
|  | **VI.** | **NEW BUSINESS** |
|  |  | **A.** | **BOYS’ AND GIRLS’ WATER POLO (R, D, A) EBAL** |
|  |  |  | Motion to support the EBAL Proposal for boys’ and girls’ water polo.*Motion: Ukiah**2nd: Rancho**Vote: 11-0* |
|  |  |  | **League Submitting Proposal:** East Bay Athletic League **Vote from the League Regarding Proposal**: 10-0-0 **Date of Requested Implementation**: Fall 2023 **Description of Proposal:** (include bylaw revision, if appropriate) Our proposed solution is quite simple, and the only change to the schedule is that there would be six (6) games in round 1 of the Division 1 bracket, opposed to the current four (4). In the first round for Open Division, the first 2 teams eliminated from the “top 6” (4v5, 3v6) would fill in the respective #1 and #2 seeds for the Division 1 bracket. The “first round bye” would disappear within the Division 1 bracket, which is where the change in the tournament occurs with a new total of six (6) games. Only the #1 and #2 seeds from Open Division (true #1 and #2 seeds) would get a first-round bye. This process enables the first 2 teams who lose within the Open division to continue to play for an NCS Division 1 title, and a NorCal CIF birth. This would encourage more competitiveness and sportsmanship within the tournament, as opposed to the current “death sentence” feeling teams get when they lose in the first round. It also creates the opportunity for NCS to guarantee that there will be a true top 5 of the top 6 NCS programs represented in the NorCal CIF tournament from Open Division and Division 1. Division 2 will still have representation in NCS and the CIF tournament, and there would be no change to their division. The only changes would occur most notably in the Division 1 bracket, by the addition of two (2) extra games added in the first round, and the first two (2) teams that lost in Open to fill in the #1 and #2 seeds in Division 1. This can be implemented within both boys and girls NCS water polo. See FIGURE 1 for an overview/template, and FIGURE 2 for a historical/hypothetical example from this year’s NCS tournament. **Rationale in Support of Proposal:** With the current NCS seeding system, it leaves multiple teams at a disadvantage when being considered for the CIF tournament. For example, Northgate and Archie Williams were both voted as a top 6 team, putting them in the open division in 2022 where they would lose in the first round. This first round loss eliminates them from being able to compete within the remainder of NCS, and a CIF qualifying position. However, teams seeded 7-18 (1-12 for D1) get to continue to compete and place in the CIF tournament. This makes zero sense and is unfair to those two (2) teams that lose in the first round of Open Division NCS, especially when the voting process is highly inconsistent each year. The current structure also does not bring the 6 most competitive teams from NCS to compete for a CIF title. It brings the proven top 4 from Open, then the #7 or #8 seed (winner of Division 1) and winner of Division 2 (I have no issue). It is truly a “lose-lose” situation for the first two teams eliminated from the NCS open division, and not giving them the opportunity to at least continue play for a division 1 title and CIF birth. NCS has an obligation to send the top six (6) most competitive teams within the region to the NorCal CIF tournament, but the closest they get to is four (4). **Possible Objections to Proposal:** None that we can think of, as this would allow for continued competition for open division teams. NCS already does this with the open/D1 for football. Income/Expenses Related to Implementation: None Attachments: Sample Bracket based on 2022 NCS playoffs |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **B.** | **8-PERSON FOOTBALL (R, D, A) CMC** |
|  |  |  | Motion to support the NCS 8-person Football Divisions*Motion: Rancho Cotate**Second: Elsie Allen**Vote: 11-0* |
|  |  |  | **Proposal**: NCS 8 Person Football Playoff with two (2) divisions. **Description of Proposal:** Each division would have a four (4) Team Bracket. These divisions would be based on competitive equity.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Division 1** | **Division 2** |
| Branson | Anderson Valley |
| California School for the Deaf | Cornerstone |
| Calistoga | Emery |
| Elsie Allen | Laytonville |
| South Fork | John Swett |
| Stuart Hall | Potter Valley |
| Tomales | Roseland University |
|  | Round Valley |

**Rationale in Support of the Proposal:** Schools in division 2 cannot compete with the schools in division 1, based on ranking by competitive equity, enrollment and games won in the previous years. For example, last season in the NCS first round playoff game, School A played School B. The final score was 90-12. With this proposal School A would be in division 1 and School B would be in division 2 you would not have this type of outcome. **8 PERSON FOOTBALL GUIDELINE FOR PLACEMENT OF TEAMS**1. League would maintain equal number of teams, when an odd number the extra team will remain in the lower division (NCL III).
2. League Champ from lower division (NCL III) will be required to advance up to the top division (NCL II), and the last place finisher in the top division (NCL II) will drop down into the lower division (NCLIII) for the next season. If both divisions finish the season with 8 teams each, then the top two lower division (NCLIII) teams will advance up, along with the two last place finishers in the top division (NCL II) dropping down for the next season.
3. Teams will be placed in divisions considering both league and overall record. Tie Breaker will be Head-to-Head, then it goes to the Tie Breaking #'s drawn at the beginning of the year, with the lower number having the choice to accept the division change or differ it to the other team they tied with.
4. Automatic Playoff Qualifiers will be league champs.
5. This will be a year-to-year review.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **NCL II** | **NCL III** |
| Branson | Anderson Valley |
| California School for the Deaf | Cornerstone\*\*\* |
| Calistoga | Emery |
| Elsie Allen | Laytonville |
| South Fork | John Swett |
| Stuart Hall | Potter Valley |
| Tomales\*\* | Roseland University |
| \*\* League Champ from NCL II | Round Valley |
|  | \*\*\*Last place finisher NCL II |

**RANKING BY COMPETITIVE, EQUITY, ENROLLMENT AND GAMES WON**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NCL II** | **ENR.** | **RECORD** |  | **NCL III** | **ENR.** | **RECORD** |
| Branson | 320 | 42-7 |  | Anderson Valley | 158 | 8-28 |
| CSD | 275 | 27-18-1 |  | Cornerstone\*\* | 116 | 32-14 |
| Calistoga | 150 | ***7-11*** |  | Emery | 174 | 0-10 |
| Elsie Allen | 1157 | 1st year |  | Laytonville | 103 | 7-28 |
| South Fork | 254 | 34-16 |  | John Swett | 374 | ***5-12*** |
| Stuart Hall | 424 | 29-18 |  | Potter Valley | 78 | 16-24 |
| Tomales\* | 146 | 21-24 |  | Roseland Univ. Prep | 472 | ***7-12*** |
| \*NCL II Champ |  |  |  | Round Valley | 119 | 23-20 |
|  |  |  |  | \*\*Last Place NCL II |  |  |
| Records in bold red italic are for two years of 8-person football. All records are for five years of 8-person football. |

 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | **VII.** | **NCS CHAMPIONSHIPS/COMPETITIVE EQUITY** |
|  |  | **A.** | **NCS PLAYOFF STRUCTURE** |
|  |  |  | Motion to support the adoption of a new playoff structure in football, volleyball, water polo, basketball, winter soccer, lacrosse, baseball and softball.*Motion: Ukiah**Second: Maria Carrillo**Vote: 11-0**Note:* *Commissioner Cruickshank assured us that the NBL would get 3 Automatic Qualifiers is this is adopted. One more than currently. The league would decide how to allocate the 3rd AQ. He also stated that the NCS would work closely with MaxPreps to ensure the process works for the section.*  |
|  |  |  | **League Submitting Proposal:** NCS Staff **Date of Requested Implementation:** 2024-2025 School year. This gives one calendar year to work out any issues such as the algorithm, D6, and look at brackets in 23-24 to prep for unintended consequences that may arise from the proposal. We would then be aligned with the new alignment cycle. **Description of Proposal:** (include bylaw revision, if appropriate) Bylaws affected include 510H, 511H, 513H **NORTH COAST SECTION PLAYOFFS SPORTS****SPORTS:** Football (FB), Volleyball (VB), Water Polo (WP), Basketball (BSKB), Winter B & G Soccer (Soc), Lacrosse (LAX), Baseball (BSB), Softball (SB) **BASE DIVISIONS:** Base Divisions would be established each year (as done now) using competitive equity points. **AUTOMATIC QUALIFIERS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **FB, LAX, WP** | **VB, BSKB, SOC, BSB, SB** |
| Leagues of 10+ | 2 | 3 |
| Leagues of 6-9 | 1 | 2 |
| Leagues of 4-5 | 1 | 1 |

**QUALIFYING**1. League Champions
2. Additional League Automatic Qualifiers
3. .500 or better overall
4. .500 or better in league
5. .500 or better in base division
6. All teams must still apply through CIFHome

**HOSTING**  League Champions or Higher seed in first round; higher seed after that. **BRACKET DEVELOPEMENT** * Brackets are created using MaxPreps rankings. Note: MaxPreps Algorithm or Ratings Percentage Index “RPI” to be determined.
* Seed beginning with Open or D1 and continue seeding brackets using MaxPreps NCS rankings.
* If a team does not qualify (above) regardless of their rank, they are not seeded in any bracket.
* A school cannot be placed in a bracket more than two divisions higher or lower from their base division. (ex. If they are a D1 school they cannot be seeded lower than D3, A D5 school cannot be seeded higher than D3.)
* **EXCEPTION:** Open teams can be selected using MaxPreps Rankings from any division, including football’s Open/Division1 bracket.
* The total number of qualifiers will be spread evenly over each bracket. Example: 90 teams – 6 brackets of 15, Example: 87 teams – 3 brackets of 15 and 3 brackets of 14.
* Brackets would be set using MaxPreps Rankings but seeding committee could move teams within brackets based upon seeding criteria.
* *NCS Staff and the Seeding Committee can adjust the seeding for the good of the tournament.*
* *If this passes, Division 6 (GVB/BSKB) would need to be looked at prior to implementation in regard to becoming a solely enrollment-based division.*

**SEEDING CRITERIA** The criteria for seeding brackets in the competitive equity sports listed shall be a balance between: 1. Record Overall
2. League/Place Co-Champion
3. League Playoff Finish/Record
4. Non-League Record
5. Strength of Schedule
6. MaxPreps Ranking (MP)

**CIF QUALIFIERS** 1. All sports as done now except Basketball.
2. Basketball would be: 6 Open teams and D1-5 Finalists plus the highest remaining semifinal loser from each division.
3. D6 qualifiers would be determined as we currently do in GVB & BSKB. Schools with an enrollment of 200+ cannot qualify in D6 for the CIF Regionals.

**Rationale in Support of Proposal:** * The ongoing discussions with SAC committee and the Ad-Hoc committee in 2021-2022 brought several concerns and ideas to the forefront.
* Divisions based on enrollment no longer equate to competitive championships.
* Small schools throughout the NCS do not want a system that does not give them the opportunity to compete in section championships.
* Increasing the number of automatic qualifiers from leagues allows every league to be well represented.
* Hosting for league champions is very important and would remain the same as done currently.
* Competitive Championships are important. Real time brackets could potentially make for more competitive brackets instead of brackets based upon past history.
* Teams not being forced to play schools that are much smaller or much larger than them. This can create a competitive inequity at times.
* CIF qualifiers are important to a majority of our schools.

**Possible Objections to Proposal:*** All the reasons in support may also be objections from member schools.
* Use of current Algorithm or RPI.
* Decision of how to handle Division 6.

**Income/Expenses Related to Implementation:** Since this model would not affect the number of schools participating in the championships, and since games are potentially more competitive, the financial impact, although unknown, could be positive. **Suggestions:** If this proposal should pass, a sub-committee shall be established to investigate and determine the best algorithm or RPI to be used. The sub-committee would also look at Division 6 and determine the best way to develop Division 6 base divisions and brackets in the sports of basketball and girls’ volleyball. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **B.** | **OPEN DIVISION CHAMPIONSHIPS (R, D, A) BAC** |
|  |  |  | Motion to have the SAC reps listen to the discussion and make a decision in the best interest of the NBL.*Motion: Santa Rosa**Second: Rancho Cotate**Vote: 11-0* |
|  |  |  | In an effort to work towards a system that allows for competitiveness throughout the various NCS Divisions, and places NCS schools in a position of strength as they work their way through the NCS tournaments and into the CIF NorCal tournaments, the Bay Area Conference has unanimously supported the following proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. | Offer an Open Division tournament bracket for Women’s Volleyball, Men’s Basketball, Women’s Basketball. |
|  | a. | Bracket size will be 9 teams. All 9 teams automatically qualify for the CIF NorCal tournament. |
|  | b. | The Open Division teams will be selected by an NCS selection committee. These 9 teams can only be selected from schools that are slotted in NCS divisions 1, 2, 3. |
|  | c. | The Open Division bracket will include a consolation side, to ensure that each school in the Open Division plays a minimum of 2 games over the course of the tournament dates. |
| 2. | Automatic berths to the CIF NorCal tournament will be as such |
|  | a. | Open = 9 spots |
|  | b. | Divisions 1,2, and 3 = 2 spots (same as currently offered.16-team bracket, with the 2 finalists gaining automatic berth to the NorCal Tournament. |
|  | c. | Divisions 4 and 5 = 3 spots each (1 fewer spot than is currently available)16-team bracket, with the 2 finalists gaining automatic berth to NorCal. The semi-final losing teams will play in a third-place game, the winner of which will advance to the NorCal Tournament. The highest remaining seed of the two semi-final losers will host the third-place game. |
|  | d. | Division 6 = 4 spots16-team bracket, with the four semi-finalists advancing to the NorCal Tournament. |

 **Rationale in Support of Proposal:*** A larger Open division should increase the number of competitive games in the Division 1, 2, 3 NCS tournaments, as the top teams will be placed in the Open Division.
* Teams placed in the Open division will face the top competition in the section, as they head into the NorCal tournament.
* Open teams will get a minimum number of games with a consolation bracket, so that they will not miss out on playing opportunities at the NCS level, prior to advancing to NorCal. It is assumed that results from the Open division consolation bracket will be used to determine seeding and placement in the NorCal tournament.
* The number of allocated spots for the NCS tournament in divisions 1, 2, 6 are not affected.
* The addition of a 3rd place game in Divisions 4 and 5 should create some excitement, and will hopefully produce additional revenue for the NCS.
* More games offered in the Open division should result in greater interest and revenue.

**Possible Objections to Proposal:*** Loss of one guaranteed spot in the NorCal Tournament for schools in Division 4 and 5.
* Creation of a 9-team bracket is a challenge.
 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **C.** | **NCS COMPETITIVE EQUITY SYSTEM (Modification #1)** |
|  |  |  | Motion to support the proposal to amend NCS 507H (Modification #1)*Motion: Santa Rosa**Second: St. Vincent**Vote: 11-0* |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | This proposal is not to replace or completely overhaul our existing competitive equity bylaws, but rather provide two modifications.**Modification #1*** Eliminate the wording that requires a promoted team to stay in a new division for three years before being eligible for promotion to a higher division.
* Instead of specifically wording the required points to advance as an eight-year average over the last three years, change wording to the following: Any team accumulating 24 or more points in the most recent three-year period. Points may also be accumulated in just two years; in which case the team would also be moved up a division.

**Rational in support of this proposal:**The goal and philosophy behind competitive equity bylaws has been to advance perennially dominant teams into higher divisions, while allowing teams who have struggled in their current divisions a chance to move down as stronger teams move up. This would speed up that process, but only in the case of the most dominate programs. The only way in which this modification would apply is if a team reaches the title game in consecutive seasons, winning at least one of those games.Recent examples include both Marin Catholic and Cardinal Newman in Division IV football. Both teams accumulated 25 points in a two-year period, but had to wait a third year before getting moved up a division. Predictably, both teams reached the championship game again in that third year. |
|  |  | **D.** | **NCS COMPETITIVE EQUITY SYSTEM (R, D, A) BVAL (Modification #2)** |
|  |  |  | Motion to support the proposal to amend NCS 507H (Modification #3)*Motion: Santa Rosa**Second: Rancho Cotate**Vote: 11-0* |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **Modification #2*** Decrease the threshold for a team to return to a previous division from an 8-point average over the last three years to a 6-point average over the last three years.
* Currently, we see teams quickly drop back to a previous division, sometimes while still demonstrating post-season success in the higher division. This creates the potential to overload the lower divisions as teams are first relegated and then the team promoted drops back down.

**Rationale in support of this proposal #2:**A six-point average would still mean that a team is, on average, reaching the section semi-finals. A team which is able to consistently reach the section semifinals or better does not seem like a candidate to drop; to a lower division. This would also ensure that any teams reaching an Open Division would be earning points above this threshold, not equal to the threshold.Teams which truly struggle in the higher division would still be able to drop back to their previous division, in a similar time frame. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | **VIII.** | **OLD BUSINESS** |
|  |  | A. | N/A |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | **IX.** | **ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION** |
|  |  | **A**. | **GIRLS’ FLAG FOOTBALL (WACC)** |
|  |  |  | Discussion regarding which leagues will participate in girls’ flag football next fall. How many programs in your league? How will you schedule games? |
|  |  |  | * Rancho Cotate is holding an interest meeting in the near future. ADs agree it is a good idea to hold interest meetings on our own campus.
 |
|  |  | **B.** | **ADJUSTED ENROLLMENT & NCS DIVISIONS (BAC)** |
|  |  |  | * Cardinal Newman is supportive this discussion item.

Discussion regarding a return to enrollment-based placement of NCS schools, with adjustments noted below. |
|  |  |  | **Background**The recent discussions around how to restructure NCS Championships have generated significant thinking in the Bay Area Conference. One of the issues we have heard surfaced briefly from time to time is the challenges faced by public schools relative to private schools. We are a Conference consisting primarily of private schools, but the concern has resonated with us. We also have discussed the assertion that wealth in a community is a predictor of athletic success. We believe this has been actively discussed in other states. This also has resonated with us even though the majority of BAC Members are from communities deemed above average socioeconomically. We disagree with the assertion that size is irrelevant in the organization of NCS Championships. We believe that school size does matter. But we also believe that school size is not the only thing that matters. **Current Situation**The North Coast Section has moved away from a strict annual enrollment-based placement of schools. Our understanding is that schools were placed in D1 to D6 in 2019 based on their then enrollment numbers. The 3-year model based on past NCS Championship results then causes schools to be moved up or down. **Proposal (for discussion only at this time)**We believe it could be helpful to have a discussion about a return to specific enrollment-based placement of schools with adjustments as follows: * 1. Public schools would have their enrollments reduced by 25%. This would be the case for all public schools except those with socioeconomic placement in the upper 50% of NCS schools (see #2 below). This is to recognize that public schools from wealthy communities are in a very, very different place than are public schools from below average wealth communities.
	2. We would rank all NCS schools by the percentage of their student bodies that qualify for the government’s free lunch program. Schools that fall into the bottom 25% by this ranking would also see their enrollment reduced by 25%.

For example, a public school with a lower quartile socioeconomic ranking with 2400 students would see their adjusted enrollment fall from 2400 to 1800 and then again from 1800 to 1350. This would likely place them in D3 for sports like basketball. A school of 2000 with the same situation would see an adjusted enrollment of 2000>>1500>>1125 which would place them most likely in D4. There are obviously many ways to iterate around these numbers. An analysis to replace NCS schools using adjustment factors like this would be very helpful. For now, we thought it might represent a direction of real appeal to NCS schools and was worthy of discussion. We also recognize that the CIF might have thoughts on this as this action by a single Section might turn into pressure at the State level. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | **X.** | **STAFF REPORTS** |
|  |  | A. | Commissioner |
|  |  | B. | Associate Commissioner |
|  |  | C. | Assistant Commissioner |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | **XI.** | **ADJOURNMENT** Motion to adjourn the meeting at 12:29 PM.*Motion: Maria Carrillo**Second: Rancho Cotate**Vote: 11-0*  |

**The next NBL AD Meeting is scheduled for**

**Tuesday, April 4 at 10:00 AM.**