

Division II General Meeting Schedule

Tuesday December 16th 1:40pm

- I. Voting info session (Dave Svoboda)
- II. Introduce officers
- III. VP's take head count 133
- IV. Approve 2013 Convention General session minutes-Secretary John Papa approve minutes moved Loren Dehone, Troy Johnson second
- V. Convention Agenda Chairman Dave Osanitsch
 - a. Committee reports Meet Enhancement-Kevin LaSure ...committee will make decisions on track and field enhancement money this this week... cross country enhancement will be given out in May...looking to make changes in the current method of awarding enhancement money. The future may give a significant award to one site rather than smaller awards to several different sites with the hope of encouraging a large regional event.

Coaches Scholarship-Ryan Dall we were able to award everyone that applied for a scholarship. 14 event certification courses and 8 on line general certification course.

Old Business

- I. Addition of early one week NLI signing period in November approved....."unfortunately the February signing date was pushed back to April...this is going to be addressed by Division I they are going to put a new proposal together to move the second signing period back to February.

New Business

1. The resolution that was presented by our leadership this morning at the opening meeting has been made to let us know that some changes are coming soon. The NCAA meetings that will take place this January may have negative effects on our sports. We need to be proactive in order to be prepared to best deal with upcoming changes. We need to go to our administration and make sure we are aware of our mission statement. We all need to do what is the greater good for our sport. Generate talking points to present to your administration. TFCC is foundational, TFCC is a big participation sport, counter sport (cc, indoor, outdoor), minority participation, female participation, significant high school participation, Olympic exposure, cost per student/athlete low. Community service(SACC participants)

Resolution Statement:

Whereas, the board of directors of the US Track & Field and Cross Country Coaches Association recognizes that the intercollegiate athletics landscape is in a state of unprecedented uncertainty. We

believe that substantial, proactive change must occur within our sports in order to preserve and maintain our relevancy on our campuses.

Therefore the Board of Directors charges the membership to identify the key values that make cross country and track and field relevant over other sports to develop specific steps that will elevate our sports, and to work together respectfully while facing upcoming obstacles. Our immediate task is to establish who we are, what we do and why we matter.

Therefore, through your efforts we will produce a list of talking points on the strengths and values of our sports to be utilized in conversations with our institutions, administrators, sponsors, community members and other stakeholders.

- II. DI Sponsorship scheduling issue and effect on Division II Charnell Kemper easy fix and it will be taken care of.... score the track meet and it will be OK, just like cross country.
- III. Charnelle Kemper presented a brief overview of Division II governance structure.

Mark Misch question to Charnelle Kemper : a redshirts athlete who was coached at a track meet by the same university coach lost a year of eligibility. Charnelle is not familiar with this case. However she said that unattached athletes cannot travel with team, no hotels, no registration fees, food... also these athletes cannot be coached by university coach and the coach may not direct other athletes to coach these athletes. Charnelle also mentioned that if there was a desire to change this legislation then there needs to be a recommendation put forth to change that rule.

- IV. Bill Massoels Chair of Cross County and track and field committee report: their role is to oversee the conduct of championships, review championship bids and make site selections, make recommendations to championships committee, review misconduct issues, select teams and individuals to the championships, arrange and approve key championship officials, update and revise championship manuals, review and make calls concerning violations. Championship information can be found at www.ncaa.org
- V. Jeff Schemmel from College Sports Solutions there will be a report with recommendations after the NCAA convention in January...from there we will be able to move forward. Some of the recommendations may include how to make championships better. We hope that recommendations that are made will be carried out by the track and cross country body. We need to work together to make our sport more relevant and prominent. While some may think that the upcoming changes from the January NCAA meeting mostly affect Div I, they will have big impact on Div II and Div III as well.

Meeting adjourned 2:32pm Ray Hoffman moved, Mike Rohl second.

=====

Proposed legislation Wednesday Dec 17 meeting concerning coaching unattached athletes

Unattached Athlete Bylaw Interpretation Resolution

USTFCCCA Convention: Phoenix, Arizona

12/16/2014

Presented by: Joshua Coon (CCU), Mark Misch (UCCS), Mason Rebarchek (WSU), Chris Bradford (WSCU), Loren Ahonen (MSU)

Over the last year, interpretations from the NCAA national office to the RMAC and NSIC concerning NCAA Bylaw 14.7.3.4 have become of serious concern to coaches in these conferences. NCAA Bylaw 14.7.3.4 states:

14.7.3.4 Competition as Individual/Not Representing Institution. It is permissible for a student-athlete to participate in outside competition as an individual during the academic year in the student-athlete's sport, as long as the student-athlete represents only himself or herself in the competition and does not engage in such competition as a member of or receive expenses from an outside team.

In the RMAC (Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference), a coach self-reported the coaching of an unattached student-athlete to the NCAA. This student-athlete had an entire year of eligibility taken away due to being coached. The conference requested that all the coaches self-report any activity concerning coaching of unattached athletes – no other reports were given. One statement from the conference compliance officer stated:

“Coaches cannot coach student-athletes that are participating unattached. I spoke with NCAA staff again this week and there is some additional flexibility within the bylaw for y'all: you may tell your SA if the bus is leaving early or if the time y'all are heading to lunch has changed – just don't do it right before they're about to run a 5K or in between jumps or throws or something. Also, you may assist an unattached SA that is seriously injured, e.g. broke his or her leg. Your Compliance Administrator will still have to report the violation afterwards, but NCAA staff are more likely to applaud you for being a decent human being than burden you and the SA with a penalty when that is obviously a mitigating circumstance.” (8/26/2014)

As well, the conference recently told the coaches:

“Multiple educational pieces and interpretations have been shared with coaches and administrators on this topic so there should be no confusion about where the line is drawn. Collectively we may agree that these interpretations are not in the best interest of the student-athlete and retention for our programs, but this is the rule and we will comply. Should we decide that changes are necessary the RMAC can be a leader in recommending those amendments. In the meantime, you are strongly encouraged to speak with coaches in the individual-team sports, once again, regarding the handling of unattached athletes at competitions.” (8/26/2014)

The coaches involved in the preparation of this document believe these NCAA interpretations regarding NCAA Bylaw 14.7.3.4 to be inhumane and irresponsible. We ask the body of coaches involved in the USTFCCCA to encourage the NCAA to review its interpretations of this rule for these reasons.

1. The rule does not actually address coaching of unattached student athletes.
2. We believe it ignores the health and welfare of the student athlete to not allow communication with the coach in the event of an emergency
3. We believe it ignores the health and welfare of the student athlete to not allow communication with the coach in more hazardous events (e.g. Pole vault, hammer, shot put)
4. Coaches work with unattached athletes at least 5 days a week at practice, and cannot just ignore an athlete they have committed to for the duration of their collegiate career. As human beings, it is senseless and cold-hearted to ignore an athlete.
5. The conference commissioner and compliance officer even acknowledge it may not be in the best interest of the student-athletes – yet demands we follow it in a strictest sense possible
6. The punishment does not fit the crime, an unattached student athlete losing a year of eligibility over having contact with the coach at the meet is irresponsible on the part of the NCAA. Our Student athletes deserve better.

We do not have an issue with the wording of NCAA bylaw 14.7.3.4 in and of itself. However, we do believe these interpretations from the NCAA regarding contact to be extreme and unwarranted. We ask the NCAA to address:

1. New interpretations regarding NCAA bylaw 14.7.3.4 regarding contact between unattached student-athletes and coaches at races that are more *humane and reasonable*.
2. Interpretations that acknowledge the student-athlete and coach relationship. This relationship cannot be ignored at a competition.
3. Interpretations that allow for the safety of a student-athlete at a competition
4. Finally, Interpretations that still preserve integrity of NCAA Bylaw 14.7.3.4 and protect the eligibility of an unattached athlete while also *acknowledging* the relationship of the coach and student-athlete.

In conclusion, we believe the majority of coaches have only the best interest for their student athletes. Demanding that coaches ignore their athletes at competition and then punish the student-athlete with an extreme penalty upon contact is completely unreasonable. It ignores the welfare of the student athlete and then punishes them disproportionately. We ask for a more reasonable and humane justification for the current interpretations of NCAA Bylaw 14.7.3.4.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

RMAC Coaches: Joshua Coon (CCU), Mark Misch (UCCS), Chris Bradford (WSCU)

NSIC Coaches: Mason Rebarchek (WSU), Loren Ahonen (MSU)

=====

Thursday December 18 General Session – voting 9:15am

VP's take head count 138

Presentation of retiring Chairman award to Damon Martin (Dave Osantisch)

Division II Voting

1 Ask NCAA to Review rule14.7.3.4 coaching unattached athletes

Accept 104 Reject 17 abstain 5

Adjourn Dave Osantisch 2nd Jim Vahrenkamp

9:42am