

**Boys' Tennis Post Season Meeting
June 19, 2025 @ 9:30am**

I. Welcome and introductions:

Sandy Mamary, NJSIAA (chair); Lisbeth Crouse, Glen Ridge (coach); Jeff Holman, Haddonfield (coach); Todd Green, Wayne Hills (coach); Harry Silverstein, Director of Officials; Courter Smith, Tournaments Director; Wesley Smith, Edison (coach)

II. Previous meeting correspondence and action if applicable

- New coaches workshop, and/or coaches association/listserve – recommended by girls, supported by boys – zoom meeting in August for new coaches; possible breakout session at January Coaches Clinic; Professional Meeting on February 27 at NJSIAA headquarters with agenda tbd
- UTR and WTN – discussed; UTR working well, will try to encourage teams to concurrently register with WTN
- Classifications – discussed; two-year cycles based on Northing numbers; done by season/sport, not by school...thus boys and girls from same school can face completely different paths to state titles (more below)
- Challenge match form online/clearinghouse with state and/or on njschoolsports.com – recommended by girls, supported by boys – investigation of how to collect easily for 2026-2027
- Challenge match form issues (stacking, late challenges, how many challenges) – discussed with no recommendation for change by either committee
- Carryover penalty for unsportsmanlike conduct – recommended by girls, supported by boys – (more below)
- In-match substitution – not recommended by girls, not supported by boys (more below)
- Multiple matches on school days – recommended by girls, supported by boys – (more below)
- Starting in 2025-26, sectional finals must be played at sites with five courts
- If a conference allows for regular-season matches to be contested on the courts proposed for a state match, then the NJSIAA will not change the match site, provided there are ample courts.
- Starting in 2025-26, to maintain consistency with other NJSIAA sports, a student competing on an interscholastic tennis team must participate as a member of his/her high school team in at least 50% of the school's total matches to be eligible for the NJSIAA Team State Tournament. Students who experience extraordinary circumstances, which are limited to injuries/medical reasons or return from academic ineligibility, must play in at least 50% of the school's matches, up to and including the cut-off date, less those matches in which the student was not able to compete due to extraordinary circumstances. Extraordinary circumstances shall be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the NJSIAA upon request by the school.
- Individual tournament – fill draw, waiting list, reduce size of draw??? – discussion of purpose of tournament – consensus was that it was to bring together the best players in the state in each season as opposed to just allowing entry to anyone having a "good" season; the tournament is not a revenue-generator so there is no push to fill the draws
- Minimum UTR for wildcard consideration – recommended by girls, supported by boys – will be in place for 2025-2026 season (more below)
- Team tournament seeding – discussed, no change recommended by either committee (more below)

III. Correspondence/Feedback regarding the 2025 season (regular- and post-season):

Proposal/correspondence; discussed at the meeting;

- Group/section classifications, may result in unbalanced numbers in some sections (particularly when a few sections are not filled). The committee felt that the two-year cycles are acceptable. The classifications are standardized, they are done in all sports and are intended to balance the number of schools participating – equity in terms of competitiveness is too difficult to change on a yearly basis, particularly in this sport when many top players make participation decisions well after classifications have been decided by the NJSIAA formula. Additionally, classifications can be different in each sport. It is possible that a Boys Tennis team will have a different Group/Section classification than the Girls Tennis team, both from the same school.

- Exchange completed challenge match forms in the rule's modifications, include verbiage about the necessity to **exchange** completed challenge match forms prior to every match. The committee felt that the exchange of completed, accurate challenge match forms was a necessary part of every match, but noted that it may not be possible to provide such a form during the first two weeks of the season, since competition is allowed to start so soon after tryouts begin; thus, the committee has placed dates on the challenge match form by which the challenge match form must be exchanged, this will be brought to the attention of the leagues/conferences committee meetings.
- Request to publish the challenge match form online and have results entered at njschoolsports.com. This will be discussed further within the NJSIAA. Both girls' and boys' post season committees are in favor of this online posting.
- Clarification on doubles lineups, particularly about rotation of doubles pairings from one match to the next. Among the other requests was a proposal to prohibit a 1st doubles player, when partner is not playing, from dropping to 2nd doubles, since that strong player in a lower position can be considered stacking. If there is a listed challenge match result, which a coach/AD has signed off on, movement in doubles is acceptable. Doubles pairs are not always formed in the order of the singles ladder, some programs have balanced doubles teams, so the absence of a player from 1st doubles might actually make the 2nd doubles team better than the makeshift team, regardless of how good one of those players may be. Some programs rotate from match to match because they have a number of comparable players; ongoing challenge matches, and/or multiple combinations, and/or rotating among various pairs can provide additional playing opportunities, and also help programs prepare for possible lineup adjustments should they be necessary at some point in the season (sickness, vacations, school trips, for the boys – AP testing and senior class trips). The committee felt that rotating doubles pairs was acceptable, if the challenge- match form supports the placement of the pairs on a given day. The absence of a member of 1st doubles should not require the 2nd doubles team to split, and while the strong player might be the strongest on the 2nd doubles court, his partner is presumably the weakest doubles player among the four participants – since doubles is a pair, moving that non-lineup player into 1st doubles may make the 2nd doubles pair stronger and therefore the lineup may be stacked at that point. Recommendation of the committee was to maintain current wording and explanation, and to remind coaches that ALL doubles challenges and combinations need to be included on the challenge match form. There is a section on the back for additional challenge matches, and it should include all doubles challenge matches.
- Challenge matches between doubles teams only be one set. Since there are some programs with a large pool of possible doubles combinations, playing all best of three matches is not feasible given court constraints and the need to develop relationships among partners. The committee noted that the only doubles match requiring a best of three sets result was the contest between the normal #1 and #2 doubles pairings. On days when coaches need to adjust, and it is for a short period of time, the one set result is sufficient. The committee hopes that coaches use integrity when deciding to present their doubles lineups, and that one set provides an accurate result for a short-term lineup adjustment. ALL doubles challenge matches should be included on the challenge match form
- Sportsmanship: The carryover penalty for bad sportsmanship at the end of a match seems to have no consequence. A proposal to suspend a player for the next match if there is a code-able behavior at the conclusion of, or after, a match. The committee supports initiatives to promote sportsmanship, teach accountability, and include an individual consequence for poor behavior and/or sportsmanship. There is an unsportsmanlike behavior form for the officials to complete on the NJSIAA website under the officials tab. Recommendation of both the girls' and boys' committees were to adopt this proposal for state tournament matches, and any match officiated during the regular season or county/conference tournament; the court officials and tournament directors (county, conference, and/or state) will be able to issue suspensions for observed behavior at their respective tournaments. During the state tournament, the assigned official will issue the code and inform the tournament director and player's coach if a suspension will be issued. A player's coach may implement this consequence at any time on a member of that coach's program, as the

committee wants to empower and encourage coaches to always promote good sportsmanship. A formal proposal has been presented by the Director of Officials to the NJSIAA for inclusion in tennis rules for 2025-2026.

- Review the dates of the boys' individual tournaments. The boys' tournament conflicts with a few graduations, creeps up on exams, and seems very long after the season. The NJSIAA understands there are some schools facing conflicts with graduation, some schools facing issues with exams, etc. Moving the dates is not as simple as it seems due to securing the facilities, the calendar in general (Memorial Day weekend is not an option), and trying to consider that there is no standard school calendar among the member-schools. The adopted tournament dates were intended to have the tournament finish earlier to avoid academic conflicts and missed class days by student-athletes and coaches.
- Request for more officials, and more consistent enforcement of rules by officials. Several coaches mentioned concerns with the lack of consistency among officials, and with the availability of officials in general. There were multiple requests from coaches for outside training to be provided to officials by the USTA, as opposed to internal training sessions. The committee agreed that all had seen officiating issues during the season and suggested that recruitment take place. The director of officiating noted that all officials receive yearly training sessions, and that a major problem with retaining/recruiting officials is a lack of work – there is a cost involved, and many do not see the economic benefit of officiating when income barely meets the cost of dues and fees. The director of officiating noted that many schools in the southern portion of the state try to hire officials for at least three regular season matches – as a result, there is plenty of work and thus officials are more willing to work. In the northern and central portions of the state, very few officials are requested for regular season matches and that leads to fewer officials working. Recommendation of this committee was to encourage the recruitment of officials and to encourage each school to request an official for a few regular season matches, thereby guaranteeing work opportunities
- Request to make the state individual tournaments into regional tournaments, with top finishers in each region advancing to Mercer County Park for the latter rounds. The committee felt that it would be very difficult to implement this system since certain parts of the state have many more high-level players than others. The availability of suitable facilities, the administrative requirements, and the logistics of running multiple concurrent events outdoors would be very difficult. The committee declined to further this request and will keep the state-wide individual tournaments.
- Request to make it mandatory to have coaches/officials on court during all 3rd set match tiebreaks. High pressure moments can be difficult for players and coaches, a single call or shot has significant weight. Several instances were described in which the moment may have overtaken good judgement and/or the ability to keep score accurately. Concern about a coach's ability to devote too much time to one court, at the expense of four others; concern about multiple matches reaching match tiebreaks simultaneously. What if neither coach nor only one coach feels comfortable on the court? **Recommendation of this committee was to adjust the wording in the modifications to allow coaches to stand at the net posts during 3rd set match tiebreaks to facilitate accurate, sporting play. Coaching would be allowed on changeovers, but not during play; and coaches would only be watching their own team's side. The committee will solicit more input from coaches for continued discussion next year.**
- Request to eliminate the 2-speaking coach's rule. While noted that there are challenges to reaching all players at sites with courts separated into pods, the rule levels the playing field so that schools with fewer resources are not further behind since some programs have seemingly unlimited resources. There is no problem with having multiple coaches present, but only two per team match can speak to the players. **Recommendation of the committee was to continue with this rule.**
- Request to eliminate the inclusion of match results vs. non-NJSIAA teams from power point calculations and team records. The NJSIAA, across all sports, maintains the same stance that schools may choose their opponents; to qualify for state team tournaments, 60% of a team's total contests must be against NJSIAA member-schools. If a school chooses to play out-of-state competition, there is a formula used in all sports for power point calculations. If a program doesn't want to have results against an out of state opponent

factor in its power points, then teams shouldn't play outside of the state. Teams hosting events should consider the consequence of including out-of-state competition, and participating teams should be aware of potential consequences when entering/agreeing to play. **Any action along this line is beyond the scope of this committee.**

- Request that the seeding for the team tournament should not include power points. The regulations are clear that the power points are used for entry and determining the 16 teams in any bracket. The seeding committee then can consider UTR, strength of schedule, record, head-to-head, etc. to seed the bracket. There were multiple cries of "foul" when teams with fewer wins/matches were elevated in brackets. It gets difficult to give a standard response to how different brackets are seeded, when some of the sections have teams with no head-to-head results and almost no common opponents; alternately, some brackets have triangles (team A beat team B; team B beat team C; team C beat team A). In the boys' brackets, out of 18 sections, 12 finals featured 1v2; 4 featured 1v3; 1 featured 2v4; and 1 featured 3v4. The committee seeded the tournament accurately. **The recommendation of both the girls' and boys' committees were to continue with the power point index being used for initial entry, and for the seeding committee to utilize its variety of factors to seed teams within the brackets.**
- Request to revisit and discuss the decision a few years ago to go from full 3rd sets to the 3rd set match tiebreak. The committee noted that the overwhelming majority of coaches found that the 3rd set match tiebreak was a positive as it saved players from a more grueling full 3rd set (particularly in matches in which the team result was decided), moved things along so that players had more time to devote to their academics as opposed to possibly sitting at a tennis match for an extra hour, meant that fewer matches had to be moved to earlier starting times, provided more consistent match times for transportation and scheduling; and season-long 3rd set match tiebreaks were consistent with rules for state tournament and USTA play. The argument that top-level players benefit from a full 3rd set seemed offset by the prevalence of cramping in latter rounds of the state individual tournaments (*weather and number of matches in a condensed period of time acknowledged*); the high-level players are not accustomed to playing outside in the elements and/or for a full three sets – they all train indoors and USTA uses the match tiebreak. **The committee felt that continuing with the 3rd set match tiebreak was in the best interest of players and programs.**

IV. Review of the regular and post-seasons

Unfavorable weather for nearly the entire season; the maximum number of matches was barely approached – there were roughly 40 schools that played 20+ matches (including state team matches and their county/conference tournament), and two Group champions played 25 matches, which included their conference tournament, and 6 state team matches. The lag time between most schools' last regular conference play and the start of the state tournament was problematic for many – players lost interest, and in many cases, stuck around for just one match. Is there a way to shorten the time between conference and state play, since unlike other sports, there are very few days of play and/or a need for rest days, like most other NJSIAA sports require? **The adopted team tournament dates were moved earlier for 2026, but there will still be a slight lag as the committee recognizes that the sport has a very high number of motivated student-athletes, many of whom are taking multiple AP Exams, and administrative schedules are beyond the control of players and programs. Lessening the tennis match scheduled during the two-week window reduces stress on the players and minimizes the likelihood of multiple lineup changes, but there is concern that moving the team tournament into that window will impact significantly team match results.**

The post-season went well, considering the weather. The teams and players with the highest UTRs were the teams/players, lasting the longest. Thanks to the folks at Mercer County and Veterans Parks for their hospitality and flexibility with hosting the tournaments, particularly with the weather encountered. Efforts to condense the post-season a bit to minimize potential conflicts with graduations and exams and reduce missed class time would be appreciated. The draws have gotten bigger in singles/doubles, as the wildcards have been granted a bit more liberally

– the original intent was to reward outstanding players/pairs, who didn't qualify because they were playing behind seeded players and likely would have been seeded themselves, had they not been playing on such a strong team or in such a strong conference – there were multiple 3rd singles players put into the draw this year, almost all with losses and only two playing behind multiple seeded players – perhaps, the seeding/selection committee should revert to strict adherence to the wording of the wildcard provision. The tournament seems to be rewarding players who are good at their position, as opposed to outstanding players who have legitimate chances to advance deep into the singles draw. *Of the 13 1st singles players granted wildcards, 3 (these players are wildcards because of injuries early in season) advanced to the round of 16 and beyond, while 3 lost in the 1st round; of the 23 2nd singles players granted wildcards, 12 lost in the 1st round; of the 10 3rd singles players granted wildcards, 5 lost in 1st round (2 of the 3 who advanced to the 3rd round entered undefeated and playing behind two potential, or actual seeds).* Removing the wildcards who lost in the 1st round would essentially mean that seeds get a 1st round bye. It was noted that the doubles wildcards have stayed consistent with the verbiage and intent. *All 9 2nd doubles teams granted wildcards won at least one match in the tournament.* **The Tournaments Director and the seeding committee will pay more attention to the verbiage for singles wildcards next year, and the inclusion of a minimum UTR for consideration may help a bit. There has been a clamoring for a smaller draw, particularly given the huge disparity in level of play between the top and bottom players – reducing the number of wildcards might allow for the top players to receive a 1st round bye, and thus make the remaining 1st round matches more competitive.**

V. Boys' Calendar for Spring 2026

Start Date: practices/tryouts may start on March 9, 2026

Competition Starts: March 16, 2026

Cut-off: May 13 (with download on May 14 at noon)

Seeding Meeting: May 15, 2026

Team Tournament Dates: May 19, 21, 26, 28; June 2 (Groups)

Individual Tournament Info:

Tournament Dates: May 30 and 31; June 6 and 7, 2026

VI. Review of current regulations and any proposed changes:

Proposals for rule modifications:

- *Proposals to allow in-match substitution – “During team matches, a coach can substitute one (1) player into a set any point at 1st or 2nd doubles **ONLY**. This substitution can be due to the inability to play due to injury or lack of performance at the position. Once a player is **replaced**, they cannot return. The replacement player must be on the singles ladder of the challenge match form and must not have been announced into the varsity lineup (i.e. no singles players or moving a 1st singles player to 2nd doubles). Replacement player must assume the serving position and return position of the replaced player. If a warning and/or point penalty has been assessed for violations of CONDUCT to any of the four doubles players, a replacement player may not be used in that match. The player that started the match is the player of record. The CAL, Olympic, and Tri-County conferences have introduced this measure into regular-season matches with success. Committee concerns related to permanent removal of a player for the match – in other sports, you can reinsert a player removed for poor play, etc., but this proposal does not allow for that. If the committee revised the proposal to allow for re-insertion, would it be fair to have a serving specialist (for example) just on court when serving, and would that be like a form of stacking? The committee felt that proposal, while potentially providing an*

avenue to avoid injury defaults/retirements and perhaps allowing an additional player to participate in certain matches, provides a very easy path to stacking in the doubles, and potentially denies a struggling student-athlete (play-wise, not injured) the opportunity to persist through a difficult stretch of play. More consideration is possible if limited to being used in cases where an injury occurs during the match but concerns about stacking as well as faking injuries. **Recommendation from both the girls' and boys' committees were to not adopt this proposal.**

- *Proposal to adopt no-ad scoring in all games/all matches.* This scoring system is frequently used in large county/conference tournaments during the early rounds to speed up play and move the tournament along; it is used in other states for high school tennis; college tennis uses this scoring system. While those points are valid, there were no reports of problems during the season with the length of matches, particularly with the implementation of the 3rd set match tiebreak. If county/conference tournaments choose to utilize this format in early rounds, the committee has no problem with it. **Recommendation from both the girls' and boys' committees were to not adopt this proposal.**
- *Proposal to eliminate let cords on service points.* In college play, there are no lets; in play, there is no re-do for a ball hitting the net and rolling over, so why have it on the serve? Some concern about inconsistent playing conditions around the state – not every court has nets with the same tautness, there are not officials at every match to measure and gauge the nets, and there haven't been many complaints about service lets as a problem. **Recommendation of the committee was to not adopt this proposal.**
- *Proposal to allow programs to play multiple matches on school days, if both teams agree. A related proposal for teams to be able to play two matches at the same time, as long as no players are in both matches, thereby allowing more players to compete and not putting any players' health at risk.* Conferences that have teams play twice might be able to reduce make-ups and/or save on transportation costs. The committee discussed how this would impact team lineups, UTR, and qualification for states. Since all matches would count, the 24-match limit is not impacted, and more players potentially can participate, there was a general feeling that lineup integrity would be maintained, scheduling might be easier, and transportation costs could potentially be lowered. Given the weather issues this past season, it would make rainouts potentially far less problematic. Playing the same team twice on one day would require a program to give up the home court match, but if both teams agree, then two matches could be played one after the other. In this case, regulation scoring has to be used, and players may participate in both matches. If a program is going to play a split-squad match (two matches simultaneously), then no player may participate in both matches (which would be possible, if there are differing numbers of courts at each site, and/or if staggered start times were used to allow for a player to be in both matches). This scenario is less likely than the previous part of the proposal as an interested program would need a lot of depth and would have had to play a lot of challenge matches to support lineups in this case since all positions would have to be in proper verified order. **Recommendation of both the girls' and boys' committees were to adopt the proposal for programs to play multiple matches on school days, if both teams agree. Players may participate in consecutive matches, but not in simultaneous matches. A formal proposal will be submitted to the NJSIAA for approval and has been adopted to state: A school may schedule more than one match (2 match max) at the end of a regular school day. All schools must mutually agree on both start times. The NJSIAA does not support early dismissal to accommodate consecutive matches on a regular school day; however, if all schools agree the NJSIAA will not interfere. All matches will count towards the 24-match limit.**
- *Proposal to reduce the injury timeout from 10 minutes to 6 minutes.* Changing the time allowed for injury/medical timeouts will require Sports Medicine Advisory Committee action. The request noted that often times when a trainer is not nearby (regular matches), the delay can last 15-20 minutes; the proposal indicated that the 6-minute clock would begin when the trainer arrives. A proposal will be submitted for review, for inclusion in the 2026-2027 rules. **Recommendation of the committee was to have that proposal drafted and presented to the Sports Medicine Advisory Committee. This rule will not be changed.**

- *A proposal to allow a team to forfeit a position in the lineup, as opposed to moving players up when an identified athlete is unable to compete on a given day.* Coaches are obligated to present the best player available on a given day at 1st singles, the 2nd best player at 2nd singles, and possibly place an alternate or JV player at 3rd singles to maintain existing doubles pairings, provided the absent player is only out for a short-term. What happens if your team's opponent has a tremendous 1st singles player, do you just tell a likely to lose player to rest for the day? Is that fair to an opponent who is prepared to play? What impact would these forfeits then have on individual tournament qualification? Aren't we supposed to be teaching players to compete; win some, lose some; learn from your experiences; be part of the team and sometimes must sacrifice for the team? **While acknowledging that an absence of a 1st or 2nd singles player can significantly influence a team result, the recommendation of the committee was to keep the current rules regarding lineups.**
- *A proposal to allow a team to forfeit 3rd singles, if there are only 6 players on a team.* Players in other individual/team sports (wrestling, swimming, track) can move weight classes and/or events, so why can't tennis players? In cases where a team only has six players, why must one sit out when a position could be left open – the team still starts out losing 1-0? Since the rules about stacking require that a team places its best three players at the three singles spots, allowing a player to move down in the lineup would violate the stacking rule. **While the committee is sympathetic to the programs with a very small number of participants, the recommendation of the committee was to maintain the current rules regarding lineups.**
- A proposal regarding the carryover rule for sportsmanship **will be adopted** as follows: If a player commits a code violation at the end of their match in either an individual or team match during any NJSIAA tournament, the penalty shall be assessed to the highest remaining singles player still on the court at the start of the next game or immediately in a tiebreak. If there is no singles player remaining on court, then the penalty shall be assessed to the highest remaining doubles pair still on the court at the start of the next game or immediately in a tiebreak.
If the team match has been completed, the carryover penalty shall be assessed at the start of that player's next match. If that player is not playing in the next match, the penalty shall be assessed to the No. 1 singles player in that next match.
If a player commits a code violation at the end of their match in any NJSIAA individual tournament, then the penalty will be assessed at the start of their next match, either individual or team. If the season is completed, this code violation will be assessed during the next season. If the player is a senior, we encourage the school to take appropriate action.

Proposals for tournament amendments:

- *A proposal for raising the singles automatic qualifying standard to 70%, same as doubles.* There is a chance that some weaker players will be relegated to wildcard status, and their low UTRs (along with failing to meet the 70% standard) will reduce the size of the singles draw. There does not seem to be a need to create space in the draw by increasing the qualifying standard, as 60% ensures that players performing at a high level at 1st singles have an avenue to entry in the singles tournament, regardless of UTR, strength of schedule, etc. **Recommendation of both the girls' and boys' committees were to keep singles automatic qualifying standard at 60%.**
- *A proposal for a minimum UTR for wildcard consideration.* Players in other individual/team sports (golf, swimming, track) must meet much stricter time/score standards than in tennis. Players with low UTRs are not outstanding players, and coaches should not be encouraged to submit paperwork that will be denied. Perhaps, consider using the standard required for players who attend schools that do not sponsor a tennis team **(7.43 for boys' 2026 tournament)**. Each year, the committee examines dozens of unsuccessful entries for players who are not automatic qualifiers, play behind non-qualifiers and/or barely qualified 1st singles players, and/or who have multiple losses, often to players who did not qualify. The individual tournament should be for the best players in the state, not anyone who wants to participate. Doubles pairs below a

combined 10 UTR should not be considered for wildcards. This seems mainly geared towards the 2nd doubles teams, but there have been some 1st doubles wildcard entries for teams with low UTRs, winning percentages under 50%, and/or multiple losses to non-qualifiers. **Recommendation of both the girls' and boys' committees were to adopt this proposal, and to institute a minimum UTR for wildcards in both singles and doubles. The tournament director will review data from the past three years to determine that number for each event, and it will be published in individual regulations each year.**

VII. New Business

Most team section brackets are not completely filled. There have been times in the past when the NJSIAA has merged sections; in other sports, there are fewer brackets which are larger. Going forward (2026-27 and beyond), we are going to have either 12-team brackets in the same group/section configuration we currently use or will use 24-team brackets that would still be configured by group but would feature a North I/II section and a Central/South section, with the winners advancing to Mercer County Park.

The committee unanimously favored the 12-team brackets and thought maintaining the four sections was of paramount importance. Some concern about limiting opportunities to participate in the state tournament – others noted that no one is denying an opportunity to compete all year, but that the end of season tournament is supposed to be a reward, and not simply a guarantee for any program submitting a form and payment. Clean benefit of reducing all the draws to 12 teams is that the top four teams in each bracket with a bye, reducing the usually non-competitive matches of the 1st round. Teams still will qualify by power points – coaches and Athletic Directors will need to schedule appropriately to provide the best likelihood for inclusion in the draw.

There was no support for 24-team super-brackets. The Public Group Semifinals were revised a few years ago to seed the four section champs so that the best two teams presumably do not see each other in the semifinals – placing two sections together would very likely place the best two teams together, and that would likely make the final at Mercer County Park less exciting and meaningful. Additionally, making it to Mercer County Park is seen as a culmination of a program's hard work throughout the season – while the super-brackets may mean fewer players missing a day of school, they will also be missing perhaps the best day of team tennis they will ever experience. The committee members will discuss with colleagues the merits of both options for further discussion next year, but there was no interest in going to the 24-team option.

VIII. Good of the Order

Meeting adjourned at 12:18pm