

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION III ANALYSIS WORKING GROUP
OCTOBER 6, 2026, MEETING

ACTION ITEMS.

1. **Legislative items.**
 - **None.**
2. **Nonlegislative items.**
 - **None.**

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Welcome.** Marc Camille, chair of the working group, provided a welcome, reviewed the working group's charge and commenced the meeting at 8:02 a.m. Eastern.
2. **Report of the September 17 meeting.** The working group approved the report of its September 17 meeting as presented.
3. **Eligibility case study and proposal.** The working group reported that the initial feedback received regarding the eligibility case study has been positive. Members expressed that the case study has generated discussions regarding the 2027 age-based legislative proposal and individuals appreciate the broader potential considerations identified in the case study. The working group discussed approaches to keep the case study a focus of discussion for the membership as the 2027 NCAA Convention approaches. Staff noted outreach efforts already scheduled (e.g., webinars for select constituent groups such as athletic direct reports and presidents/chancellors, a presentation at the Faculty Athletics Representative Association Fall Forum, monthly compliance webinars, and governance committee meetings), and the working group supported seeking additional opportunities (e.g., another National Association of Division III Athletics Administrators Power Hour) for interactions with the membership on this issue.

The working group shifted to a discussion regarding the merits of the age-based eligibility proposal and whether this group should provide a position to the Management and Presidents Councils. The working group agreed that the time is not ripe to provide a position as issues continue to be raised regarding the proposal. The working group wants to allow time for evaluation of these issues before taking a position. Additionally, the working group believes the case study is a valuable tool to evaluate the proposal and there is concern that if the working group, as drafters of the study, take a position it could undermine the usage of that resource. At this time the working group wants to focus on the case study's data and fostering discussion as opposed to advocating for a position.

4. **Prioritized working group options.** After its September 17 videoconference, the working group members prioritized the options within the working group's purview via an electronic poll. The responses created the following priority list for this meeting.

- a. **Playing seasons and resources; comprehensive review of traditional and non-traditional segments.** The working group identified this option as its highest priority item. It received a summary of previous playing seasons reviews and membership data that was part of those reviews. Since 2004, the membership has conducted a review of its playing and practice seasons five times with a legislative change being adopted at the 2023 Convention. The working group determined that this review continues to be a priority. The feedback from a membership survey distributed in late April 2026 indicated that most institutions are using the maximum days and competitions but budgets, staffing, and facilities are not keeping pace, which is creating financial tensions. The working group will focus on developing questions to be included in the 2027 Division III membership survey to better understand membership concerns in this area and allow the working group and governance structure to properly develop potential action steps to mitigate existing tensions.
- b. **Economic tension: legislative cost scoring.** The working group identified challenges with this option while noting the potential benefits of implementing a mechanism that requires all Division III legislative proposals to provide the financial impact for institutions and conferences. The group agreed to keep this as a priority item and directed staff to explore approaches to review with the working group at a future meeting. The group acknowledged that if the option is feasible, it would preferably be implemented next fall with the 2028 legislative proposals.
- c. **Economic tension: financial peer benchmarking.** The working group reviewed the plug and play cost model, athletics return on investment, and impact analysis. It recognized value in developing an NCAA platform that provides financial benchmarking data to support institutional decisions (e.g., staffing, addition of teams, etc.) that have revenue impacts. The working group generally supported the concept but was concerned that to have accurate and useful data, it would require an associated burden for institutions to submit it. Ultimately, the working group believed the value did not outweigh the associated collection and reporting burden. Generally, the group thought this concept could be more valuable at the conference level. It also directed staff to develop and share best practices with the membership.
- d. **Economic tension: NCAA technology centralization.** The working group agreed that this option should be reviewed with a broader perspective. The working group described challenges in this space (i.e., limited staff and the need to use technology to streamline processes). The concept is to build an NCAA-owned open API layer, starting with the NCAA ID, that connects major athletics management platforms (Teamworks, Front Rush, etc.) to NCAA systems for single-source eligibility, roster, and compliance data. The working group acknowledged that this concept would need more time to implement, and a resolution solely at the national level may not be sufficient. The group directed staff to engage the NCAA IT department to better understand the capability and time needed to develop this concept. The working group will continue to evaluate approaches for this concept.

The working group members reviewed and started an initial discussion regarding next steps with each option. Specifically, the working group answered these questions:

- What is the rationale for making the option a high priority? What membership tension is the option mitigating?
 - What impact does each option have on the Division III philosophy statement, specifically the athletic and collegiate experience of student-athletes, and institutional impact (e.g., financial, legal, staff and facilities implications)?
 - What is the needed data, research, and membership engagement?
 - What is the anticipated timeline to complete the review?
5. **NCAA Convention – Issues Forum presentation.** The working group discussed format and topics for discussion during the Issues Forum at the NCAA Convention. The group confirmed that the opportunity to engage colleagues in roundtable discussions is important and discussed several potential topics, including eligibility (both broadly and specific to the age-based proposal), playing and practice seasons, financial resources, and developing a vision to address budget constraints with rising athletics costs. The working group will continue to discuss the format, including roundtable topics and questions, and identify presenters at its next meeting.
 6. **Fundamental change concept case studies.** The working group discussed if and when to engage in a review of a membership segmentation case study developed by the outside consultant in response to membership discussions around the concept. The group acknowledged the complexity of the topic and agreed that the group would revisit the case study after the NCAA Convention.
 7. **Working group’s term length.** The working group agreed that the development of options to mitigate identified tensions and case studies necessitates the working group to continue its work past the 2027 NCAA Convention and through June 2027. It also agreed that due to historical knowledge and past meeting participation, the working group should proceed with existing members, and it will not add any new members
 8. **Next steps.** At its upcoming meetings before Convention, the working group will receive updates from committees that received option hand-offs; engage in focused discussion regarding roundtable topics for the Issues Forum; engage in further discussions regarding priority option items; and continue its discussion regarding potential membership amendments to the age-based eligibility proposal.
 9. **Additional business.** There was no additional business.

- 10. Future videoconferences and meetings.** The working group reviewed its upcoming meeting schedule that includes videoconferences on November 2 and December 15. Staff will send a doodle to schedule videoconferences and an in-person meeting to occur in 2027 between February and June.
- 11. Adjournment.** The meeting ended at 1:50 p.m. Eastern.

Working Group chair: Marc Camille, Albertus Magnus.

*Staff Liaisons: Louise McCleary, Division III Governance and Member Services
 Jeff Myers, Division III Governance and Member Services
 Bill Regan, Division III Governance and Member Services*

NCAA Division III Analysis Working Group October 6, 2026, Videoconference	
Attendees:	
Jonathan Accardi, Keuka College.	
Eric Bitterbaum, State University of New York at Cortland.	
Meg Nowak Borrego, Framingham State University.	
Marc Camille, Albertus Magnus College	
Jessica Chapin, Brandeis University.	
Brad Duckworth, University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point.	
G. Anthony Grant, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.	
Portia Hoeg, Centennial Conference.	
Erica Perkins Jasper, Claremont Mudd Scripps.	
Heidi Jaynes, Carleton College.	
Paige Klubba, Piedmont University.	
Alfred Lamptey, University of Mount Saint Vincent.	
Rob Larson, Luther College.	
Frank Merckx, Drew University.	
Joe Onderko, Presidents' Athletic Conference.	
Adam Puckett, George Fox University	
Wayne Webster, Albion College.	
Lori White, DePauw University.	
Absentee:	
Andrea Talentino, Augustana College (Illinois).	
NCAA Staff Support in Attendance:	
Louise McCleary and Jeff Myers	
Additional Staff Members in Attendance:	
Corey Berg, Grace Colburn, Lisa Rogers.	
Guests.	
None.	