	PAGE 1
1	IN RE:
2	; ;
3	NEW JERSEY STATE INTERSCHOLASTIC ATHLETIC: ASSOCIATION - ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING :
4	: :
5	:
6	
7	Monday, May 5, 2025 Edison, New Jersey
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	APPEARANCES:
13	
14	PARKER McCAY, P.A. BY: STEVEN P. GOODELL, ESQ.
15	3840 Quakerbridge Road, Suite 200, Hamilton, New Jersey 08619 609-896-4222
16	Attorneys for New Jersey State Interscholastic Athletic Association.
17	interscholastic Athretic Association.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	AUEDN COUDT DEDODTING INC
23	AHERN COURT REPORTING, INC. Certified Court Reporters 732-662-8062
24	karenahern16@comcast.net
25	

Τ	MS. MAGUIRE: It is twelve o'one P.M. we
2	have a quorum of right now 285 schools in
3	attendance. I would like to introduce those on
4	the dais. First we have Steve Goodell, NJSIAA
5	General Counsel, also today's Parliamentarian we
6	have Dave Frazier. Our Advisory Committee Chair
7	Dave, if you don't know Dave, he's the Athletic
8	Director of Rutherford High School. Jen Fleury
9	is also here. She's our Advisory Committee
10	Secretary. If you don't know Jen, she's the
11	Athletic Director at Villa Walsh Academy.
12	All right. Since attendance today is
13	based on the delegate cards that were submitted
14	at registration, I have a motion from Tom
15	Mullahey of Clifton High School and a second
16	from Jason Corley, Long Branch High School to
17	omit a roll call. Is anyone opposed?
18	(No response.)
19	MS. MAGUIRE: Does anyone abstain? Just
20	show of hands.
21	(No response.)
22	MS. MAGUIRE: Great. Thank you. We all
23	do want to get out of here today.
24	For your information the 2024 Annual

Meeting transcript is available on the NJSIAA

25

website under Inside NJSIAA Constitution and
Legislation. We will notify all schools via an
alert email when today's transcript is posted to
this same location on our website. We will also
post a final voting summary by school via an
alert email by the end of this week. NJSIAA
Assistant Directors, Al Stumpf, Derryk Sellers
and Sandy Mamary are in the back. They will be
collecting all the ballots. Paul Popadiuk,
Chief Compliance Officer; Tony Maselli, Chief
Operating Officer will be counting the ballots
in a separate room.

Lastly, please take your time and ensure the ballot is complete. If a ballot is not complete, it is not a legitimate ballot and it does not count as a ballot count. Complete names for school name. Make sure you actually check yes, no or abstain and actually sign the ballot. So, please just take that time cause every year we have ballots that don't count.

So now I will turn this meeting over to our Parliamentarian, Steve Goodell. Thank you.

MR. GOODELL: All right. Good afternoon, everybody. I'm here to give you the ground rules for today's meeting and the voting.

You're going to have two different proposals before you today. One is a proposal to amend the bylaws. The other is a proposal to adopt a new policy. In general you may think of this as being one big proposal, talk about it compared to balance formula, but it really -- there are two different issues before you.

The first is should there be a competitive balance element to the classification system.

That would be a change to the bylaws, and that's going to be the question you're asked first.

So, the issue before you will be should the bylaws be changed to allow for a competitive balance formula. Since it's a bylaw amendment under the Constitution, you need a majority vote of the ballots cast at this meeting for it to pass.

The second issue would be the specific competitive balance formula that has been proposed and circulated and discussed at all the sectional meetings. That would be a policy which would be part of the policies and procedures. Same vote, a majority vote of the ballots cast here. However, in the future, that policy would be subject to change by the

Executive Committee, but this is the general membership's opportunity to vote on the initial competitive balance formula.

Since these two are both similar, we're going to -- we're going to take the discussion one at a time, but we're not going to have votes one at a time. You have two separate ballots, but the votes will be the same. That way you don't have to wait to count the votes for the first one to see what happens and then do the second one. It's more time efficient.

So, the first thing you're going to be asked for is to discuss the bylaw amendment, the bylaw change. As always, if there are any questions, you can ask those to Colleen Maguire. She's the one who will be presenting them. She can clear up any questions you may have about the particular issue.

Then those who wish to speak in favor will be asked to come to the mike. Please limit your comments to three minutes. Once everybody has had a chance to speak in favor, we'll take those who wish to speak against. Please make your comments to three minutes. Again, once both ballots have been fully discussed, you'll be

asked to vote and then they'll be counted and
the results will be given to you at this
meeting. Those are the ground rules.

2.2

Now, Dave Frazer is up. He's the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and he will be running the meeting from here on.

MR. FRAZIER: All right. Good afternoon, ladies and gentleman. Welcome to our Annual Business Meeting. The NJSIAA Advisory -- Advisory Committee, we met December 11th in 2024 to review the proposals that are laid before you. It was voted in favor to move those proposals to the Executive Committee, and the NJSIAA Executive Committee voted to accept the proposals at their January 15th, 2025 meeting.

Following the acceptance by the Executive Committee, member schools had the opportunity to provide feedback, input and ask questions on the proposals. In March of 2025, NJSIAA staff hosted two sectional meetings, one of which was at our DAANJ and the others were virtual through NJSIAA to reach out for any questions or any feedback regarding the final proposals, and the final products are here before you today.

Today we will follow our annual voting

procedures, and as Mr. Goodell stated, both 1 proposals today require a majority of the ballots cast at this meeting. 3

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ballot number 1, proposal to incorporate a competitive balance formula for classification of public schools. That is your gray ballot. That's sponsored by the NJSIAA. NJSIAA staff has proposed to amend the bylaws to allow a public school's classification to be changed based on a competitive balance formula as approved by the Executive Committee and set forth in the policies and procedures. Advisory Committee and Executive Committee have endorsed the proposal.

Before we move forward, I will ask for a motion to move the proposed legislation forward for adoption. I see John Fraraccio, Memorial High School, and I'll call for a second. I see Ryan Miller of Scotch Plains-Fanwood High School.

At this time, I'll call Ms. Maguire back to the podium. She will give you the nuts and bolts of the proposal. When she is completed, if you have any questions on the proposal only, not a back and forth, just questions on what

she's proposing, that will be the time for it.

Without further ado I will call Colleen back up

3 to the podium.

MS. MAGUIRE: Thank you, Dave.

This is a very brief first ballot. As previously stated this ballot is solely to update the bylaws. Currently our bylaws require a public school's classification to be based solely on enrollment. Therefore, this bylaw represents a change to this principle and will now allow a public schools classification to differ from its enrollment. The details of the competitive balance formula will be discussed and presented in the second ballot. Thank you.

MR. FRAZIER: Okay. Does anyone have any questions on what Colleen stated?

(No response.)

MR. FRAZIER: All right. If anyone wishes to speak against the motion, please step up to either of the microphones, state your name, your school and your position, and once again please try to keep your time to approximately three minutes.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Dave. Jamy Thomas, Pennsville Memorial High School.

1 We are a Group I school in south Jersey.

I am the Athletic Director there. I am speaking in opposition to this today. My two primary reasons on ballot number 1, the first one is in terms of communication. I know that it was stated that this was presented twice, once at the DAANJ and once online. I will say I was in attendance at both of those. At neither meeting were comments or questions accepted at either one of those meetings.

Previously -- I've been Athletic Director at Pennsville since 2005. We had sectional meetings that took place in October. They were in various areas of the state. We had an opportunity to hear proposals, and we had an opportunity to comment and discuss proposals. There are a lot of people in this room with a lot of experience and a lot of knowledge about athletics, and taking those people's comments and concerns out of this process is very detrimental to how we move forward as an organization.

My second point is just I have some concerns with the ability to manage the data and the information that is going to be needed to do

this accurately every two years. I know that, 1 2 you know, you will all know that there have been struggles with power points, how power points 3 are calculated. There have been changes at the 4 5 last minute to several of our sectional playoffs that make impact on our lives in the moment. 6 7 This is something that with all that information, how are these changes going to be 8 known that they are accurate and that they are 9 10 consistent throughout every two years. There 11 are I think a lot of questions that need to be answered. There's a lot of data that needs to 12 13 be looked at prior to this being approved. Thank you. 14 15 MR. FRAZIER: Thank you.

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

If there are no others to speak against the motion, then I'll ask does anyone wish to speak for the motion?

(No response.)

MR. FRAZIER: Seeing that there is none, we will move on to ballot number 2. That is your green ballot. Ballot number 2, the proposal to add a new policy entitled competitive balance formula for classifications of public schools. Again, the sponsor for this piece of proposed legislation is the NJSIAA

staff. NJSIAA staff has proposed adoption of a

competitive balance formula, and the Advisory

Committee and the Executive Committee have

endorsed the proposal.

I will ask for a motion to approve -- to move the proposed legislation for adoption.

Laura Palmerezzi, Verona High School. I'll call for a second. I see Joshua Aronowitz of Matawan High School.

Once again I'll call Colleen back up to describe the proposed policy change. When she is completed, if you have any questions regarding the policy, then please raise your hand, step up to the mike and ask any questions. Colleen.

MS. MAGUIRE: Thank you. Thank you, Dave.

This one's a little longer, ballot number

2. Ballot number 2 will adopt a competitive

balance formula that is outlined in the ballot.

First I'm going to discuss the background and then highlight the details of the new formula.

So in recent years, my staff has received increasing criticism that public school enrollment policies can lead to a competitive

advantage, specifically schools that are 1 2 non-boundary or non-traditional. As a result, last May I convened a committee to review 3 options to address these increasing criticisms. 4 5 I consulted other State Associations for best practices and quickly learned that several 6 7 states have already adopted policies that made changes to a school's classification and no 8 longer rely solely on enrollment. Across all 9 10 these states no matter what factors are 11 considered schools will move up a classification. 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I also surveyed member schools, and 73 percent of schools responded that NJSIAA should consider a competitive balance formula that is based on school district enrollment policies.

Lastly, we solicited feedback at monthly

League and Conference Officer meetings since

August. I would like to thank Paul Popadiuk for

his support as well. As between the two of us,

we were invited to attend seven different League

and Conference meetings to discuss the proposals

and solicit feedback. So when asked, we did go

to meetings and solicit feedback.

The proposal itself, all right, so the

final proposal before you today is a hybrid of some of the formulas currently in use by other State Associations. The competitive balance formula to be adopted will identify non-traditional schools and determine if they should move up to the next highest classification group based on state tournament success. For purposes of our proposal, we define a non-traditional school as one that can enroll either nonresident students or students from a geographic area that encompasses multiple schools or multiple school districts. These types of non-traditional schools are actually listed in ballot number 2.

2.2

It is important to note that the competitive balance formula or proposal is not applicable to traditional schools regardless of your state tournament success. A traditional school is one whose students attend based solely on geographic residence and do not enroll students by any other criteria. The proposal initially is specific to football, boys basketball and girls basketball. The formula may be adopted by other sports in future classification cycles.

The formula will first identify teams that
needed a success factor during the state
tournament. Once identified, then the school
will be categorized as either a traditional or
non-traditional school. The success factor

2.2

points are also detailed in ballot number 2.

The type of non-traditional school will depend on if the team automatically moves up to the next classification group or if the roster needs to be reviewed to determine if non-resident students are participating on the varsity team. School districts with open enrollment policies such as county based magnet schools, county based vo-tech schools, charter schools or multi school district, these all enroll students from large geographic areas and will automatically move up to the next highest classification group.

Choice schools, tuition schools and schools that act as a host for satellite campuses for county based academy programs, all enroll non-resident students. For these schools varsity rosters will be reviewed to determine if non-resident students are participating.

The formula will allow schools to move

back to the previous classification group if the school does not sustain success in the new classification group. This process is also detailed in ballot number 2. The formula will be applied in the next classification cycle which is the 2026-2027 school year, and moving forward changes to the formula will be approved by the Executive Committee.

In summary the concept of trying to competitively align classifications is a growing conversation in many State Associations. There is no fool proof way to ensure competitive balance in every classification in every sport. However, identifying teams that have sustained success and then reviewing the team further to see if their school's enrollment policy plays a role in that success will lead to a more level playing field for traditional schools especially for our small group size traditional schools.

Some schools may view this as a -- as punitive while others view this as long overdue. As previously shared, last May, 73 percent of you felt that school enrollment policies were leading to a competitive advantage. I commend our committee for tackling a very complex issue

in a fair and reasonable manner.

2.2

The formula will have minimal impact on a very small number of schools that continue to have success in our state tournament. More importantly it may also result in some school districts reconsidering their enrollment policies while others may realize that things are better served in a different classification group, both of which will have a positive impact on competitive balance.

As I wrap up my remarks, I remind everyone that it is my role to just tackle an issue and make recommendations. It is the member schools' role to make those decisions. So, thank you.

MR. FRAZIER: Okay. Does anyone have any questions for clarification on the proposal? If you have a question for clarification -- of clarification of the proposal step up to the microphone.

MR. WAGNER: Dave, I have one.

MR. FRAZIER: Or speak very loud.

MR. WAGNER: It's not a clarification.

It's a simple question, and again it may not be a clarification. How does the -- the rule affect the largest group schools that fall into

1	those categories?
2	MR. FRAZIER: Yep. Sorry. My mistake.
3	Please state your name. State your name and
4	MR. WAGNER: Bob Wagner, Atlantic County
5	Institure of Technology.
6	So, that was that was the question.
7	How does the rule affect the schools in Group
8	IV, Group V if you have success?
9	MS. MAGUIRE: Thank you.
10	As we discussed when I came down to your
11	conferences meeting, thanks for having me down,
12	that it does not. Once you get to the top of
13	the Group V in football, Group IV in basketball,
14	it does not impact them because there is no
15	further place for them to go.
16	MR. WAGNER: Thank you.
17	MR. FRAZIER: Any other questions for
18	clarification?
19	MS. WILSON: My name is Michelle Wilson,
20	University High School.
21	I would like to have clarified once again
22	why the only sports being basketball and
23	football?
24	MS. MAGUIRE: Right now the committee felt
25	this is a huge fundamental change to how we

approach our classifications. The criticism 1 2 that Paul Popadiuk and I continue to get, a majority if not all pertain group -- around 3 these three sports, and we wanted to get it in 4 5 place and everyone understands it before we let it go out to other sports -- other sports. 6 7 every sport may be interested in the formula, but once it's known and once it's in place and 8 we have the process and everyone is comfortable 9 10 with it, then the Sports Committee can come 11 through the Executive Committee and request 12 whether or not it should be adopted for their 13 sport.

> So, to answer your question, the criticism we were hearing was really centered on these sports, and the committee felt it's in the best interest of everybody to start slow and let it -- and then let it get understood, put the changes in place and then let's see if it needs to be extended to other sports.

> > MS. WILSON: Thank you.

Thank you, Michelle. MR. FRAZIER:

Any other questions for clarification?

MR. BRUNNER: Pat Brunner, Morris Knolls.

I think this can impact my school

21

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24 25

district. So, I do have a question. If we did 1 2 meet the competitive balance formula and move up, what is the criteria for moving down or do 3 you just stay in that new group? 4 5 MS. MAGUIRE: Pat, because the first year review paragraph on ballot 2, look below, you'll 6 see football and basketball. It outlines if you 7 continue to move up, if you stay in the 8 9 classification group or if you're eligible to 10 move back down to your previous classification 11 group. It's important to know though no school 12 will ever move down to a classification group 13 that it's lower than its natural enrollment. 14 Does that -- Pat, does that answer your 15 question? So, in football, you know, in that first year review, you could move up, stay or 16 you could move back. The points are listed 17 18 there. Does that help? 19 MR. BRUNNER: Yes. 20 MS. MAGUIRE: Okay. Thank you. 21 MR. FRAZIER: Any further questions? 22 (No response.) 23 MR. FRAZIER: Okay. Seeing that there's 24 none, does anyone wish to speak against the 25 motion? If so, please move forward towards one

of the microphones. Once again identify your name, position and your school. You'll have a three-minute period. Repetitive speeches are discouraged. Thanks.

MR. THOMAS: Jamy Thomas again.

I'm trying to do this in the appropriate things. I did have three points. So, two of them felt like they -- they hit on ballot number 1. I feel like this -- this point hits on ballot number 2.

I do have concerns with the equity of the proposal. I'm a Group I school. The only group I feel that is positively impacted by this is Group I, and I'm still speaking against this. For those groups that are above, we are just kicking the can up the group sizes to give you those teams that we don't want in our group it sounds like which is sort of where this came out of.

I know with the basketball program that there was a charter school that kind of came onto the scene. That team would have beat any team in the state, probably would have beat most of the colleges in New Jersey. There's not much we can do about that. You know, this proposal

again with the lack of communication and the
inability for this to be discussed as a group, I
feel is just not prepared and not ready and does
not provide equity across the board for all five
groups or four groups in certain sports. Thank
you.

MR. FRAZIER: Thank you.

If there's no one else, does anyone wish to speak for the motion? If so, please pick either microphone. Once again please identify yourself with your name, school and position.

MR. VIVINO: Dan Vivino, Westwood High School.

Just a couple of points. First thing is the Group IV comments, Group V comments have been going around since this was proposed. I look at who -- who's more equipped. So, I'm a Group II. We're going to get some good Group I's that come up to us potentially in this proposal. Are we more equipped to compete with a Group I that has some extra resources and advantages or as a Group I? When you look at the Group IV and V in the football, is the school with 2,000 enrollment better equipped to face a team of a thousand and maybe five tuition

kids then a school with just a thousand. So, while I understand there's some feeling and sentiments of the large schools, they have more resources just in numbers. They're going to be more equipped to handle those types of teams.

To the non-publics in the rooms, thank you for coming. Obviously, this is a public vote for those of you that came. I would just say for as long as I can remember, you are classified based on how you have resources. So, just think about that when you're voting. We're just looking to have that consistency with publics that may have some extra resources, but maybe they need to be classified a bit differently.

You know, the conversation about how we're going to police this, it's like anything else.

We have our checks and balances, but I think this one will be even easier. Someone doesn't have integrity, isn't reporting correctly.

Between social media and coaches talk now, they know everything in five minuteas at least from an outside school and what's going on, and I would imagine that they'll be some greater sanctions or issues for schools that don't

properly report it as opposed to being up front, and if there is a mistake that's not to say on October 5th somebody can't be moved if something like that was caught.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We have this obvious problem. I don't think anyone disagrees with that. What we have now is nothing. These things can always be revisited, tweaked. I'm sure that will happen down the road if this is to go through, and as Miss Maguire said you have a limited amount of schools impacted. If you're a school that, you know, you happen to get a few tuition kids for random reasons and you win in basketball, that's not commonly what you do. You're probably going to get moved back in one year. It's not the end of the world. If you look at the schools that year after year are winning in multiple sports or certain sports, if this were to expand, it's not a secret. Ninety percent of them have an extra -- an edge. They have an extra resource. They have a bigger pool they're pulling from. They have tuition kids. They have things going on.

So, I just would say we can always revisit this, but I think it's at least a step. Maybe

it's not perfect, but those -- those are things
we can tweak. It's a step in the right
direction to look at the schools that really
have different resources that are an advantage.
Thank you.

MR. FRAZIER: Thank you.

MR. PELLETIER: Good afternoon. Roger Pelletier from Mahwah High School.

I'm here to speak on behalf of this proposal. I feel like in a time when our boundaries of our public schools are getting blurred every year, this proposal begins to address and starts to level the playing field of some of those concerns.

I believe starting with a limited slate of sports also allows us to assess and evaluate the program as we go through this, and hopefully moving forward, you know, that data helps us make decisions on where we go from here, and the last thing I have is the same reason I voted to endorse this as an Advisory Committee member, it's an improvement over what's in place and addresses some of the concerns in place right now. Thank you.

MR. FRAZIER: Thank you.

1 Any others?

MR. BROWN: Chris Brown, Park Ridge High School.

Also just talking to Jamy's point, as a small Group I, probably one of the smaller ones in the state, I don't necessarily know if this is the perfect solution, but it is a step in the right direction. We see everything that happens at the next level and it trickles down. It's just -- and it's getting worse and worse whether it's NILs, transfers, whatever the case may be. We need to put a grip on some of this stuff. It's just getting worse and worse by the day, and I think this is a step in the right direction. Thank you.

MR. FRAZIER: Thank you. Are there any other?

(No response.)

MR. FRAZIER: Okay. Listen closely. I'm going to go out of order here. First, do not fold your ballots. Okay. Keep them unfolded.

Now, I will call the question for both proposals. The first proposal is on your gray ballot and that is to amend the bylaws. The second is on the green ballot, to amend the

classification rules. Note that both of these proposals require a majority vote of the membership based on the total number of ballots cast. I'll remind you, A, do not fold your ballots, B, make sure your ballots are completely filled out, name, school, address, print, sign. Unless your vote is properly filled out, it will not be counted. 

With that being said, I will ask that the NJSIAA staff members begin to make their way around the room. If we have a table captain to kind of round them all up, separate the greens and the whites, make somebody's job easier.

Once again please make sure that the ballot is properly filled out. We will announce the results as soon as they are available.

(Whereupon the ballots are being counted.)

MR. FRAZIER: I have the results. Ballot number 1 a total of 286 votes were cast, 194 yes, 90 no, two abstentions. For ballot number 2, green ballot, 285 have votes counted, 189 yes, 94 no, two abstentions. Both proposals pass with an overwhelming majority.

At this time before we conclude, I'm going

1	to ask for a motion to adjourn. Thank you.
2	Sjocquelyn Winstead from South Orange-Maplewood
3	and I'll use Jennifer Fleury as our second from
4	Villa Walsh Academy. Thank you very much for
5	participating in this process. Have a great
6	spring, great summer.
7	(Whereupon the meeting was
8	concluded.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	IN RE:
2	· :
3	NEW JERSEY STATE INTERSCHOLASTIC ATHLETIC: CERTIFICATE ASSOCIATION - ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING :
4	
5	I, KAREN M. AHERN, the officer before whom the
6	foregoing deposition was taken, do hereby certify that
7	the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing
8	deposition was duly sworn by me, and that said
9	deposition is a true record of the testimony given by
10	said witness; that I am neither attorney nor counsel
11	for nor related to or employed by any of the parties to
12	the action in which the deposition was taken; and
13	further that I am not a relative or employee of any
14	attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto or
15	financially interested in the action.
16	
17	Karen M. Ahern
18	Maren W. Mern
19	CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER & NOTARY PUBLIC
20	LICENSE NO. XIO1061
21	
22	DATED: May 9, 2025 NOTARY I.D. NO. 2084523
23	
24	NOTE: THE CERTIFICATE APPENDED TO THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS,
25	UNLESS UNDER THE DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR DIRECTION OF THE CERTIFYING COURT REPORTER.?