

# REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION III MEN'S LACROSSE COMMITTEE JUNE 17-18, 2024, ANNUAL MEETING

### KEY ITEMS.

- 1. Automatic qualification. The approval of conference automatic qualification.
- **2. Bench Personnel.** The men's lacrosse committee would like to seek approval to allow each participating institution to bring as many student-athletes as they have on their current roster to the championships and be permitted in the bench area.

### ACTION ITEMS.

- 1. Legislative items.
  - None.
- 2. Nonlegislative items.
  - a. Automatic qualification.
    - (1) Recommendation. That the following 27 conferences be afforded automatic-qualifying status to the 2024 NCAA Division III Men's Lacrosse Championship: Atlantic East Conference; Centennial Conference; Coastal Lacrosse Conference, College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin; Conference of New England; Empire 8; Great Northeast Athletic Conference; Heartland Collegiate Men's Lacrosse Conference; Landmark Conference; Liberty League; Little East Conference; Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association; Middle Atlantic Conference Commonwealth; Middle Atlantic Conference Freedom; New England Small College Athletic Conference; New England Women's and Men's Athletic Conference; North Atlantic Conference; North Coast Athletic Conference; Northern Athletics Collegiate Conference; Ohio Athletic Conference; Old Dominion Athletic Conference; Presidents' Athletic Conference; Skyline Conference; Southern Athletic Association; State University of New York Athletic Conference; United East Conference and USA South Athletic Conference.

The anticipated pool allocations for the 2024 championship are as follows: Pool A - 27 and 13 at-large.

- (2) Effective date. September 1, 2024.
- (3) <u>Rationale</u>. Each conference meets the requirements of NCAA Bylaw 31.3.3 and has completed the automatic-qualification declaration form. (Note: Pool allocations may be adjusted based on 2024-25 sponsorship numbers.)

- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) Student-athlete impact. None.

### b. Bench personnel.

- (1) <u>Recommendation</u>. The committee would like to revisit feedback presented to the championship committee back in April and September 2022, February of 2023, and September of 2024. Per those discussions, feedback, meeting report and survey results the men's lacrosse committee would like to seek approval to allow each participating institution to bring as many student-athletes as they have on their current roster to the championships and be permitted in the bench area.
- (2) Effective date. September 1, 2024.

### (3) Rationale.

- a) These student-athletes are a part of the team all season, but when they make the NCAA championship selected student-athletes are regulated to sit in the stands away from their teammates. This is a situation that no coach, administrator or athlete looks forward too. For those teams that make it to the NCAA championship tournament, it immediately turns into one of the lowest moments of the year for the coaching staff, administrators and of course the selected student athletes and parents. They should all be celebrating and preparing for their next opponent, when the focus then turns to 'how am I going to tell these kids they are sitting in the stands'? Please refer to attachment A.
- b) Coaches are instructed by their presidents and directors of athletics to maintain higher roster sizes than in the past due to the high education financial climate. The ability to ensure a full championship experience will only contribute the overall experience of the student athletes. This will in turn provide a higher rate of retention of those student-athletes. Please refer to attachment B letter from the Intercollegiate Men's Lacrosse Coaches Association (IMLCA).
- c) The men's lacrosse committee agreed with allowing the women's lacrosse institutions to match the bench limit of fifty to match the men's lacrosse bench limit as it provided the women's programs full access for their athletes. This is something we are all striving for. However, the committee feels that decision does not accurately and equitably reflect the current roster landscape of the men's lacrosse teams. The substitution patterns, positions, equipment, field dimensions, and the

\_\_\_\_

playing rules are all completely different, unlike soccer, basketball, hockey, tennis and volleyball that lacrosse is possibly being grouped in with.

- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) <u>Student-athlete impact</u>. This would provide a positive experience for all competing student-athletes.

### INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

- **3. 2023 annual meeting report.** The committee approved the 2023 annual meeting report as submitted.
- **4. 2024 championship review**. The committee reviewed the 2024 championship, pointing out the successes and some of the challenges during the event. The committee commended the Drexel University and Philadelphia Eagles staffs for their outstanding work at the championship site.
  - **a. Surveys.** The committee reviewed the survey results and discussed them throughout the various sections of the agenda. The number one topic in the survey results was around student-athletes in the bench area rather being placed in the stands.
  - **b. Bench personnel.** The committee discussed bench personnel size and strongly recommends that teams be allowed to bring as many student-athletes as they have on their current roster to the championship and be permitted in the bench area. This would allow for a better overall student-athlete experience for all institutions that participate in the championship. These coaches are charged by their presidents and directors of athletics to maintain high roster sizes and this policy would assist with the retention of student-athletes. These student-athletes are a part of the team all season but when they make the NCAA championship these student-athletes are regulated to sit in the stands away from their teammates.
  - **c. Selection show.** The committee discussed the quality of the selection show. The committee would like for staff to collaborate with our streaming company on initiatives on enhancing the selection show.
  - **d.** Format. The committee discussed the back-to-back game format for the second/third rounds and quarterfinal/semifinal rounds. The committee and staff continue to receive feedback through surveys and conversations with our participating institutions. Many of the institutions are seeing through their sport tracking devices significant drops in bursts, speed and energy on the second day of the back-to-back games.

- 5. 2025 championship planning in Foxborough, MA. The committee began to plan for the 2024 championship in Philadelphia, PA. Game times will be at 4 and 7 p.m., with Division II playing in the first contest followed by the Division III championship. The Division I women's championship game will be played at noon prior to the start of the Division II men's championship game. The committee discussed the bracket increase from 38 to 40 teams in the 2025 championship.
- **6. NPI.** The committee reviewed different dials based on the last three years of championship data. The committee will finalize their dial recommendations by August 1, 2024.
- **7. Rules.** The committee met with men's lacrosse rules committee liaison to discuss the different rule proposals discussed at the June 2024 men's lacrosse rules committee annual meeting.
- **8. Bids.** The committee reviewed bids submitted for the 2027 and 2028 bid cycle. The committee will provide recommendations along with the Division I and II men's lacrosse committees.
- **9. Sport sponsorship for 2024-25.** The committee reviewed and discussed new sport sponsoring members and their placement in their respective regions.
- **10.** Committee and regional advisory committee (RAC) rosters. The committee reviewed the national and regional advisory committee rosters and noted upcoming vacancies on the regional advisory committees. There will be three new members on the national committee for the upcoming year.
- **11. Committee chair election.** The committee voted unanimously that Dave Carty, head men's lacrosse coach at Moravian University be appointed chair of the committee.
- 12. 2025 annual meeting. The committee agreed to meet virtually on June 16-17, 2025.

Committee Chair: Scott McVean, Rochester Institute of Technology, Liberty League

Staff Liaison(s): Will Hopkins, Championships and Alliances

NCAA Division III Men's Lacrosse Committee
June 17-18, 2024, Annual Meeting
Attendees:
Celine Cunningham, Bates College.
Dave Carty, Moravian University.
Scott McVean, Rochester Institute of Technology.
Pete Rosaschi, Franciscan University of Steubenville.
Absentees:
Jay Mayes, University of Northwestern-St. Paul

Report of the NCAA Division III Men's Lacrosse Committee Annual Meeting June 17-18, 2024 Page No. 5

## **Guests in Attendance:**

None.

### NCAA Staff Liaison (or Staff Support if subcommittee) in Attendance:

Will Hopkins, Championships and Alliances.

## Other NCAA Staff Members in Attendance:

Mitchell Bailey, Championships and Alliances.

2024

	Men			2024	Women			
<u>Institution</u>	Roster	<u>Coaches</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Institution</u>	Roster	<u>Coaches</u>	<u>Total</u>
Aurora	50	5	55		Aurora	23	4	27
Babson	61	2	63		Babson	32	3	35
Bowdoin	52	4	56		Cabrini	19	5	24
Cabrini	27	3	30		Capital	17	2	19
Centre	52	3	55		Catholic	28	5	33
Chris. Newport	62	4	66		Colorado Col.	24	3	27
Denison	50	4	54		Chris. Newport	32	3	35
Dickinson	56	5	61		Colby	37	3	40
Endicott	47	5	52		Denison	38	3	41
Farmingdale St.	28	6	34		Endicott	31	3	34
Grove City	38	6	44		Farmingdale St.	16	4	20
Норе	39	4	43		Franklin & Marshall	30	3	36
Illinois Wesleyan	45	3	48		George Fox	16	3	19
John Carroll	28	4	32	1	Gettysburg	35	3	38
Lake Forest	44	4	48	1	Grove City	18	2	20
Lynchburg	58	5	63		Haverford	28	4	32
Middlebury	48	4	52		Норе	20	2	22
Pfeiffer	54	4	58		Ithaca	27	2	29
Plymouth St.	43	2	45		JWU (Providence)	19	2	21
Rensselaer	54	5	59		Lake Forest	24	3	27
RIT	59	4	63		Meredith	19	4	23
Roanoke	49	6	55		Middlebury	34	3	37
Saint Joseph (CT)	40	7	47		MIT	24	3	27
Salisbury	59	6	65		Plymouth St.	21	3	24
Scranton	52	3	55		Pomona-Pitzer	29	3	32
St. John Fisher	49	8	67		Rhodes	24	1	25
St. Mary's (MD)	47	5	52		Roanoke	31	2	33
St. Lawrence	48	3	51		Salisbury	37	6	43
Stevens	57	5	62		Scranton	35	3	38
	67	10	77		Shenandoah	32	3	35
Stevenson SUNY Geneseo	44	6	50		Springfield	29	4	33
					St. John Fisher	_		
SUNY Poly	29	4	33			34	3	37
Swarthmore	47	3	50		St. Mary's (MD)	32	5	37
Transylvania	42	2	44		Stevens	31	4	35
Tufts	55	5	60		SUNY Canton	21	3	24
Union (NY)	47	4	51		SUNY Cortland	31	5	36
Wash. & Lee	54	6	60		TCNJ	21	5	26
Wesleyan (CT)	54	6	60		Transylvania	15	2	17
Averages	48.3	4.6	53.2		Trinity (CT)	30	4	34
					Tufts	37	4	41
	1			1	UChicago	28	3	31
	1			<u> </u>	Wash. & Lee	36	5	41
					Wesleyan (CT)	38	3	41
					Westfield State	28	3	31
					William Smith	35	3	38
					York (PA)	30	4	34
					Averages	27.7	3.3	31.1

	Men				Women		
<u>Institution</u>	Roster	<u>Coaches</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Roster</u>	<u>Coaches</u>	<u>Total</u>
Amherst	46	3	49	Aurora	25	3	28
Aurora	43	4	47	Babson	29	3	32
Babson	52	3	55	Bryn Athyn	15	2	17
Cabrini	55	6	61	Cabrini	23	7	30
Centre	50	4	54	Capital	16	2	18
Chris. Newport	54	6	60	Chris. Newport	27	4	31
Colorado College	55	3	58	Colby	36	3	39
Denison	51	3	54	SUNNY Cortland	28	3	31
Dickinson	46	3	49	Denison	35	3	38
Emmanuel (MA)	28	4	32	DePauw	16	2	18
Gettysburg	55	3	58	Franklin & Marshall	36	3	39
Grove City	37	6	43	George Fox	16	4	20
Норе	45	5	50	Gettysburg	37	4	41
Illinois Wesleyan	44	4	48	Норе	20	2	22
John Carroll	36	4	40	JWU (Providence)	20	3	23
Kenyon	47	3	50	Kenyon	27	2	29
Lake Forest	37	3	40	Lake Forest	21	2	23
Lynchburg	51	6	57	Merchant Marine	21	2	23
Maine Maritime	45	6	51	Meredith	18	1	19
Merchant Marine	40	3	43	Messiah	20	2	22
Middlebury	46	5	51	Middlebury	35	3	38
New England College	25	4	29	MIT	21	2	23
Pfeiffer	48	4	52	Mount Union	26	1	27
RIT	55	6	61	Plymouth St.	24	4	28
Salisbury	54	6	60	Pomona-Pitzer	30	3	33
Scranton	39	6	45	Rhodes	25	2	27
St. John Fisher	50	8	58	Roanoke	22	1	23
St. Mary's (MD)	41	4	45	Roger Williams	25	3	28
Stevens	53	4	57	Salisbury	34	6	40
SUNY Geneseo	47	6	53	Scranton	31	2	33
Swarthmore	50	4	54	St. John Fisher	28	3	31
Tufts	57	4	61	St. Mary's (MD)	20	3	23
Union (NY)	49	3	52	Stevens	28	3	31
Wash. & Lee	56	5	61	SUNY Canton	20	3	23
WestConn	53	8	61	SUNY Geneseo	26	3	29
Western New Engl.	53	4	57	TCNJ	26	5	31
Williams	41	4	45	Transylvania	18	1	19
York (PA)	45	5	50	Trinity (CT)	31	3	34
Averages	46.8	4.5	51.3	Tufts	32	3	35
			01.0	UChicago	25	3	28
				Wash. & Jeff.	18	3	21
				Wash. & Lee	30	5	35
				Wesleyan	36	4	40
				Westfield State	23	2	25
				William Smith	30	2	32
				York (PA)	28	4	32
							28.5
				Averages	25.6	2.9	28

	Men				Women		
<u>Institution</u>	Roster	<u>Coaches</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Roster</u>	<u>Coaches</u>	<u>Total</u>
Albion	38	2	40	Aurora	27	3	30
Amherst	38	2	40	Bryn Athyn	14	3	17
Benedictine (IL)	26	3	29	Cabrini	25	7	32
Bowdoin	46	5	51	Capital	18	2	20
Cabrini	53	5	58	Catholic	34	3	37
Catholic	54	5	59	Claremont-M-S	26	2	28
Chris. Newport	57	4	61	Colby	36	3	39
Colorado Col.	55	5	60	Denison	32	3	35
Denison	51	4	55	Framingham St.	19	2	21
Dickinson	47	3	50	Franklin & Marshall	35	2	37
Dubuque	42	3	45	George Fox	16	2	18
Gettysburg	58	5	63	Gettysburg	38	3	41
Grove City	36	4	40	Hamline	21	6	27
John Carroll	35	4	39	Haverford	27	3	30
Lynchburg	54	5	59	Ithaca	31	3	34
Marine Maritime	37	4	41	Kenyon	25	2	27
MIT	35	7	42	Merchant Marine	21	2	23
North Central (IL)	38	4	42	Meredith	24	1	25
Norwich	44	5	49	Messiah	25	2	27
Rensselaer	50	6	56	Middlebury	37	3	40
RIT	57	6	63	Pomona-Pitzer	30	3	33
Roanoke	47	6	53	Rhodes	29	2	31
Salisbury	51	6	57	Roanoke	29	2	31
Sewanee	44	3	47	Roger Williams	28	3	31
Southern Va.	36	3	39	Salisbury	38	4	42
St. John Fisher	54	6	60	Springfield	34	5	39
St. Lawrence	50	3	53	St. John Fisher	27	3	30
Stevens	53	4	57	St. Joseph's (ME)	26	2	28
Stockton	45	3	48	St. Lawrence	33	3	36
SUNY Cortland	55	1	56	St. Mary's (IN)	18	4	22
SUNY Maritime	39	3	42	St. Mary's (MD)	24	3	27
Tufts	56	4	60	Stevens	27	3	30
UMass Boston	38	4	42	Stevenson	30	5	35
Union (NY)	54	3	57	SUNY Canton	26	4	30
Wash. & Lee	57	5	62	SUNY Cortland	29	3	32
Wesleyan (CT)	55	8	63	SUNY Geneseo	33	1	34
Western New Eng.	57	2	59	TCNJ	28	6	34
York (PA)	49	4	53	Transylvania	22	2	24
Averages	47.1	4.2	51.3	Tufts	36	4	40
Therages	7/.1	7.4	31.3	UChicago	31	2	33
				Wash. & Jeff.	21	3	24
				Wash. & Lee	34	5	39
				Wasii. & Lee Wesleyan (CT)	35	3	38
				Western Conn. St.	<del> </del>		29
				William Smith	23	6	
				York (PA)	23	5	28
					27	3	30
				Averages	27.7	3.2	30.8

Men				Women				
<u>Institution</u>	Roster	<u>Coaches</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>In</u>	<u>stitution</u>	Roster	<u>Coaches</u>	<u>Total</u>
Babson	49	3	52	Aurora		26	3	29
Benedictine (IL)	29	3	32	Babson		23	2	25
Cabrini	57	6	63	Becker		21	1	22
Catholic	54	7	61	Cabrini		20	6	26
Centre	42	3	45	Carroll (	(WI)	25	4	29
Chris. Newport	55	3	58	Catholic	:	35	3	38
Colorado Col.	58	6	64	Cazenov	ria	17	1	18
Denison	46	2	48	Chicago		29	2	31
Endicott	48	8	56	Denison		30	3	33
Franklin & Marshall	41	4	45	Farming	dale St.	15	3	18
Grove City	26	3	29	FDU-Flo	rham	18	3	21
Норе	42	4	46	Franklin	& Marshall	36	4	40
Illinois Wesleyan	48	4	52	George l	Fox	18	3	21
John Carroll	40	4	44	Hamline	2	21	4	25
Kean	49	7	56	Illinois V	Wesleyan	20	2	22
Lasell	30	5	35	Ithaca		26	2	28
Lynchburg	55	6	61	John Ca	rroll	25	5	30
Northwestern-St. Paul	29	3	32	JWU (Pi	rovidence)	17	2	19
Pfeiffer	35	2	37	Meredit	h	23	1	24
RIT	62	4	66	Messiah		25	2	27
Salisbury	60	6	66	Morrisvi	lle St.	15	3	18
St. John Fisher	52	8	60	Notre Da	ame (MD)	13	2	15
Stevens	51	3	54	Rhodes		28	1	29
Stevenson	67	3	70	Roger W	/illiams	26	3	29
SUNY Cortland	51	3	54	Salisbur	у	34	4	38
SUNY Maritime	50	3	53	St. John	Fisher	25	3	28
SUNY Poly	26	2	28	St. Mary	r's (IN)	18	4	22
Transylvania	39	4	43	SUNY C	ortland	25	3	28
Tufts	50	4	54	TCNJ		24	6	30
UMass Boston	37	4	41	Transylv	vania vania	21	3	24
York (PA)	45	3	48	Tufts		29	4	33
Averages	45.9	4.2	50.1	UW-Rive	er Falls	22	1	23
				Wash. &	Jeff.	22	2	24
				Wash. &	Lee	29	5	34
				Western	Conn. St.	24	4	28
				Westfiel	d St.	24	2	26
				William	Smith	30	2	32
				Average	es	23.8	2.9	26.7

	Men				Women			
<u>Institution</u>	<u>Roster</u>	<u>Coaches</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Institution</u> <u>Roster</u> <u>Coaches</u>		<u>Coaches</u>	<u>Total</u>
Amherst	40	4	44		Albion	19	2	21
Cabrini	53	6	59		Amherst	30	3	33
Concordia Wisconsin	36	2	38		Bowdoin	28	4	32
Denison	44	5	49		Brockport	27	1	28
DeSales	40	4	44		Catholic	32	3	35
Elizabethtown	42	3	45		Claremont-M-S	30	2	32
Franklin & Marshall	55	5	60		Colby	35	3	38
Gettysburg	50	4	54		Colorado Col.	32	2	34
Grove City	23	4	27		Denison	31	3	34
Норе	35	5	40		Endicott	35	3	38
Illinois Wesleyan	53	3	56		Franklin & Marshall	31	3	34
John Carroll	33	3	36		George Fox	16	2	18
Keene St.	43	2	45		Gettysburg	30	4	34
Lynchburg	51	7	58		Hamline	22	4	26
Morrisville St.	30	3	33		Illinois Wesleyan	18	2	20
New England Col.	39	4	43		Ithaca	31	2	33
Norwich	40	5	45		JWU (Providence)	22	2	24
Piedmont	31	3	34		Lebanon Valley	22	4	26
Rhodes	49	3	52		Mary Washington	37	2	39
RIT	52	4	56		Merchant Marine	24	2	26
Salisbury	49	6	55		Meredith	19	1	20
Springfield	44	6	50		Middlebury	31	3	34
St. John Fisher	44	6	50		Misericordia	28	2	30
Stevenson	67	9	76		Morrisville St.	19	2	21
Stockton	45	3	48		Mount Union	23	3	26
SUNY Cortland	45	3	48		New England Col.	23	2	25
SUNY Maritime	41	4	45		Notre Dame (MD)	18	3	21
Transylvania	40	2	42		Plymouth St.	23	4	27
Tufts	55	5	60		Rhodes	24	2	26
Union (NY)	44	3	47		Salisbury	31	4	35
Ursinus	42	3	45		Springfield	31	5	36
Washington & Lee	53	3	56		St. John Fisher	31	3	34
Wesleyan (CT)	53	7	60		SUNY Canton	22	3	25
Western New England	40	6	46		TCNJ	25	4	29
Williams	45	3	48		Transylvania	22	3	25
York (PA)	43	5	48		Tufts	29	5	34
Averages	44.1	4.3	48.4		Washington & Lee	33	2	35
					Wesleyan	34	4	38
					Westfield St.	25	2	27
					Westminster	24	2	26
					William Smith	26	4	30
					York (PA)	28	3	31
					Averages	26.7	2.8	29.5



J.B Clarke IMLCA Executive Director Direct (813) 373-2349

Sean Woods IMLCA Vice-President for Division III Direct (401) 305-8770

January 25, 2024

Will Hopkins NCAA Associate Director, Championships and Alliances P.O. Box 6222 Indianapolis, IN 46206-6222

## Request for Removal of the Exclusion of Division III Student-Athletes from Championship Sidelines

Dear Will,

The Intercollegiate Men's Lacrosse Coaches Association ("IMLCA") continues to seek the removal of the rule that, every year, excludes Division III student-athletes from participating with their team on the sidelines of championship competitions.

Please accept this letter and the accompanying materials as evidence submitted by the IMLCA and its member coaches in support of lifting the exclusion of student-athletes from their championship competitions.

The modification we seek is noncontroversial for all of the reasons articulated in the 2023 "bench proposal" set out in the January 27, 2023, Report of the NCAA Division III Men's Lacrosse Committee.

In addition, the IMLCA conducted a survey of the Division III coaches in January of this year. The results offer compelling evidence that the exclusion of student-athletes from championship competitions should cease.

First the IMLCA asked Division III coaches if they were in

favor of removing the restriction on the number of studentathletes allowed to participate with their teams on the sidelines in championship competitions.

104 Division III men's lacrosse coaches responded and 100% of them are in favor of the measure.

Second, the IMLCA asked each Division III coach if they were certain that their institution would permit their entire eligible roster to attend the championships if the rule were lifted. All but 8 of the 104 responding coaches answered Yes.

This result is evidence of two things. First, there is institutional support for removing the measure. Second, perhaps more importantly, all 8 of the Division III coaches who were not sure their school would send their entire roster still supported lifting the restriction.

Thank you, Will, for your assistance with this request and your invaluable support of our sport. Always, should you have any questions or if we can provide any additional supporting material, please do not hesitate to contact either of us at the telephone numbers above.

Sincerely,

J.B. Clarke

IMLCA Executive Director Division III Vice-President

Sean Woods



### REPORT OF THE

### NCAA DIVISION III MEN'S LACROSSE COMMITTEE

### JANUARY 27, EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE

### ACTION ITEMS.

- 1. Legislative items.
  - None.
- 2. Nonlegislative items.
  - a. Regional rankings.
    - (1) <u>Recommendation</u>. The committee reviewed all team sport ranking percentages across all regions and notice that men's lacrosse has three regions below 15% while several other sports have no regions below 15% with the exception of one region in men's soccer, women's soccer, football and softball and an exception of two regions in women's lacrosse. The committee would like to request an increase of regions I, III and IV to the 15% threshold for this spring 2023. The committee will also support other sports to increase to 15% in any other regions below the 15% threshold.
    - (2) Effective date. February 1, 2023.
    - (3) <u>Rationale</u>. The men's lacrosse committee understands the championship committee's recommendation of having all team sports rank 7 across each region to ensure consistency and provide support for the feedback provided that all team sports are regionally ranking too many teams. However, some sports based on their sponsorship, are impacted more than other sports. Please refer to <u>supplement A</u> to see a breakdown of each team sport and the percentages of ranked teams per region. By allowing each committee to rank at least 15%, would give each region the same minimum ratio.
    - (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
    - (5) Student-athlete impact. None.
  - b. Bench personnel.
    - (1) <u>Recommendation</u>. The committee would like to revisit feedback presented to the championship committee back in April and September 2022. Per those discussions and feedback, the men's lacrosse committee would like to seek approval to allow each participating institution to bring as many student-athletes as they have on their current roster to the championships and be permitted in the bench area.
    - (2) Effective date. February 1, 2023.

### (3) Rationale.

- a) These student-athletes are a part of the team all season, but when they make the NCAA championship selected student-athletes are regulated to sit in the stands away from their teammates. This is a situation that no coach, administrator or athlete looks forward too. For those teams that make it to the NCAA championship tournament, it immediately turns into one of the lowest moments of the year for the coaching staff, administrators and of course the selected student athletes and parents. They should all be celebrating and preparing for their next opponent, when the focus then turns to 'how am I going to tell these kids they are sitting in the stands'?
- b) Coaches are charged by their presidents and directors of athletics to maintain higher roster sizes than in the past due to the high education financial climate. The ability to ensure a full championship experience will only contribute the overall experience of the student athletes. This will in turn provide a higher rate of retention of those student-athletes
- The men's lacrosse committee agreed with allowing the women's lacrosse institutions to match the bench limit of 50 to match the men's lacrosse bench limit as it provided the women's programs full access for their athletes. This is something we are all striving for. However, the committee feels that decision does not accurately and equitably reflect the current roster landscape of the men's lacrosse teams. Per the data provided in attachment B, every women's lacrosse roster would be allowed in the bench area while the majority of men's rosters will have student-athletes that will need to sit in the stands rather than be with their team in the bench area. Attachment B also illustrates participating men's and women's lacrosse institutions in the 2019, 2021 and 2022 championships. The game of lacrosse has many disparities between the men's and women's games that cause the difference in roster sizes. The substitution patterns, positions, equipment, field dimensions, and the playing rules are all completely different, unlike soccer, basketball, hockey, tennis and volleyball that lacrosse is possibly being grouped in with.
- (4) Estimated budget impact. None.
- (5) <u>Student-athlete impact</u>. This would provide a positive experience for all competing student-athletes.

### **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

### 3. None.

Will Hopkins,

Committee Chair: Scott McVean, Rochester Institute of Technology, Liberty League.

Staff Liaison(s): Will Hopkins, Championships and Alliances

NCAA Division III Men's Lacrosse Committee
January 27, Email Correspondence
Attendees:
Dave Carty, Moravian University.
Celine Cunningham, Bates College.
Scott McVean, Rochester Institute of Technology.
Pete Rosaschi, Franciscan University of Steubenville.
Dave Zazzaro, Rhodes College.
Guests in Attendance:
None.
NCAA Staff Liaison (or Staff Support if subcommittee) in Attendance

Other NCAA Staff Members in Attendance:	
None.	

NCAA/01\_27\_2023/WHH