

THSLL/TSLA Meeting minutes

Date: October 4, 2025

The THSLL Board Meeting was called to order by Troy at 9:04 am.

In Attendance: Andris Dikmanis, Will Doby, Elizabeth Dupont, Tony Martin, Sean Ray, Troy Walker, GL Van Dyne. Non-Voting: Nancy Powers, Chris Shaffer. Not attending: Dave Edwards, Monica Joy,

Welcome and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order. Attendees were directed to complete the roll call electronically via a link in the chat.

Troy thanked the board for their work, and acknowledged:

- North Coordinator: Tony Martin
- Vice Commissioner & North Coordinator: Will Doby
- Central Coordinator: Troy Walker
- South: G.L. Van Dyne, Andris Dikmanis, and Sean Ray
- San Antonio: Monica Joy
- West: Elizabeth DuPont
- Webmaster: Chris Shaffer
- League Administrator: Nancy Powers

Voting Procedures and Member Conduct

The required voting percentages is based on those present and voting and submitted proxies. One vote is counted per program. 8 programs submitted proxy votes. 51% of Voting Member Programs are required to pass league play proposals. 67% of Voting Member Programs required to pass league structure proposals.

Troy addressed member programs' communication with the THSLL board. Personal attacks against board members and other member programs should be avoided. Members were urged to focus on attacking the policy or reasons for improvement.

Voting Items and Discussion

Troy discussed the Class D proposal, and that it was submitted too late for team review. The board will continue developing the proposal and will send for member program review. The vote for the restructuring of Class D was tabled.

Voting Item 1: Budget

Nancy presented the budget, noting that increased referees fees and the cost of the State Championship led to higher expenses.

The budget includes a raise for the State Administrator and the Webmaster.

The LOA (referee assigning) contract is under review; no increase in assigning fees is anticipated, but a request for higher travel fees due to gas costs is possible.

Hopefully the sixes official's fee will be standardized across districts to a set fee between \$60 and \$75.

Dues Increase: The following dues increases were proposed:

Varsity: from \$880 to \$930

JV: from \$680 to \$730

Sixes: from \$400 to \$450

Vote Result: The budget passed with 95% Yes and 5% No.

Voting Item #2: Appendix B Timetable

Dates were highlighted:

District playoffs to be set in December. Start of season January 30, End of Season April 25th.

Super Regionals May 2,3rd. State Championships May 9,10th.

Vote Result: The timetable passed with 100% Yes.

Voting Item #3: NCAA Rule Waiver (80/60 Shot Clock Reset)

Appendix A contains waivers to NCAA rules.

The current league rule is to reset the shot clock to 80 seconds.

Vote Instruction: Voting No keeps the current rule (reset to 80 seconds). Voting Yes changes the rule to reset to 60 seconds.

The consensus of the league over time has been to keep the 80-second reset.

Vote Result: The NCAA Shot Clock Rule did not pass with 74% No.

Voting Item #4: Dual Division Teams Required to Field JV Team

Discussion

Vote Result: The requirement for Dual Division teams to field a JV team did not pass with 39% No.

Voting Item #5: Dual Division Teams Required to Field JV Team

Discussion

Vote Result: The requirement for Dual Division teams to field a JV team did not pass with 39% No.

Voting Item #6: Class 6's League Structure

The vote is for mandatory six games for Sixes teams. If this item is voted down, the rule will revert to the current status.

Vote Result: The requirement for revision of Class 6's League Structure to field a JV team did not pass with 39% No.

Voting Item #7: Independent Class District Proposal

A discussion was held regarding the current structure of Class A and the lack of incentive for promotion.

Concerns were raised that the lower-seeded Class A teams are "punished" by facing top teams (1 and 2 seeds) in the playoffs, often resulting in lopsided scores.

A proposal for realignment was presented as a 100% opt-in plan to address this imbalance.

A call was made for stronger language, a formal two-year evaluation process, and a coach committee to better define and enforce promotion and relegation.

The meeting concluded with the recommendation to vote No on the current realignment proposal and discuss it again later, as it was suggested to be ill-defined.

Vote Result: The Independent Class District Proposal did not pass with 76% No.