

**REPORT OF THE 2011-2012 RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE TO THE EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE OF THE NEW JERSEY INTERSCHOLASTIC
LACROSSE OFFICIALS ASSOCIATION**

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 27, 2011

Dave Field, Chair

-and-

Mike Donnellan
Michael Downer
Dave DuBan
Patrick Finn
Dave Frick
Frank Guinane
Henry Janssen
Jack Lally
John Laney
David Lisooey
Ed Morgan
Al Regner
Frank Rodriguez
John Vita
Larry Walsh
Mike Zaroni

I. Introduction.

As set forth in greater detail in Reports dated January 4, 2010 and December 6, 2010, the Constitution of the New Jersey Interscholastic Lacrosse Officials Association (“the Association” or “NJILOA” and its “Members”) provided for creation of the Resolutions Committee, which was charged with receiving and presenting “all proposed changes to the Constitution and other procedures of the Association.” (Constit., Article Five.) The Resolutions Committee does not have the authority to consider or propose change to the rules of the game of lacrosse.

Like most of our committees, the Resolutions Committee is established by appointment of a Chair, who in turn appoints “at least three Active or Inactive Members who shall also serve a one year term.” The Resolutions Committee will submit all resolutions “to the Executive Committee who shall make the proposed changes available in writing to the membership no less than one week prior to a mandatory meeting.” (Constit., Article Five.) The 2011-2012 Resolutions Committee was established on July 20, 2011 by re-appointment of Dave Field as Chair, who in turn appointed the 16 committee members listed on the cover of this Report (and four others who were unable to participate all the way through the process). The following criteria were used to appoint those committee members: (1) a mix of older and younger officials, (2) from around the State, (3) with varying levels of lacrosse and other officiating experience, (4) to include Members who voiced a desire to serve and had not previously served on the Resolutions Committee, and (5) to include Members who previously had not served on any other NJILOA committee.

The Resolutions Committee again met this year “electronically” by e-mail to debate the issues. Presumably, this allowed all committee members to fully participate and not be limited by unavailability to attend in-person meetings. The future Chair should decide whether in-person meetings are preferable.

An e-mail was sent to all Members on July 21, 2011 inviting issues or proposed changes for consideration by the Resolutions Committee. Surprisingly, the Members submitted very few proposals. Instead, the majority of the issues addressed herein were collected by the 2010-2011 Resolutions Committee following issuance of its Report. The Chair views the limited number of issues identified by the Members as an expression of general satisfaction with the way NJILOA continues to conduct its affairs, but nevertheless reminds all Members to take advantage of this annual exercise for change and improvement.

II. The Methodology And Charge Of The Resolutions Committee.

The following principles and procedures continue to govern how change “to the Constitution and other procedures of the Association” can be accomplished: “[p]roposed changes shall be submitted in writing to the Chair of the Resolutions Committee who shall make a recommendation to the Executive Committee. . . .” (Constitution, Articles Three and Five.) Once appointed, the Resolutions Committee will annually collect, analyze, debate and ultimately present to the Executive Committee all viable proposals. The Resolutions Committee reserves the right to reject any proposal which, on its face, has little or no support or is clearly beyond its purview, *i.e.* changing the rules of the game of lacrosse. Any proposal which does not find its way into the annual Report should be presumed to have been rejected by the Resolutions Committee for one or more of those reasons. Regardless, all proposals are encouraged.

The balance of this Report is modeled mostly after the 2010-2011 Report and is divided into three sections: one section that addresses “proposed changes to the Constitution”, a second made to the Executive Committee as “proposed changes to the . . . other procedures of the Association”, and a third section which identifies topics considered by the Resolutions Committee for which no resulting Resolution is proposed.

Finally, before presenting the balance of the Report, the Resolutions Committee repeats the guidance set forth in the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 Reports regarding the process to implement change:

- (1) the “other procedures of the Association” are presented as Resolutions which require a vote only by the Executive Committee to adopt or reject a proposal, and not a vote by the Members;
- (2) those type of Resolutions may be adopted in their entirety, rejected in their entirety or adopted in part, rejected in part;
- (3) however the Executive Committee votes, the Members should be advised accordingly so all Members know what principles govern the Association. (We suggest an e-mail report by the Executive Committee to the Members, with the appropriate record in the Association’s minutes);
- (4) on the other hand, amendments to the Constitution require a vote by the Members at a mandatory meeting;
- (5) amendments to the Constitution do ***not*** have the same voting flexibility, meaning they must be adopted or rejected as written (and, if rejected, may be re-submitted next year with “tweaking” to address those comments which may have served to justify the Members’ rejection vote);
- (6) the vote of the Executive Committee is a simple majority, while the vote of the Members to amend the Constitution requires two-thirds majority vote; and
- (7) the Report of the Resolutions Committee should ***not*** be construed as each Resolutions Committee member’s personal belief that any particular change is necessary; instead, the Resolutions Committee is charged with raising issues and causing meaningful discussion and, ultimately, the Executive Committee or the Members decide on all proposals.

Because the Resolutions Committee is still a relatively new creature in the NJILOA, we hope these comments are useful and assist the Executive Committee, the Members of NJILOA and future members of the Resolutions Committee.

The Chair thanks each member of the Resolutions Committee for his service and those Members who participated by making specific proposals or offering general comments.

This process remains vital to assure all Members a voice and an opportunity to promote meaningful discussion for change and improvement.

III. Changes To The Constitution Proposed By The Resolutions Committee Which Require Members' Vote At A Mandatory Meeting.

Question #1: Should the Constitution, Article Four, Section One be amended to create an "Exempt Member" regarding the current requirement that all Active Members officiate at least five regular season interscholastic games?

Discussion: Every Active Member is required to officiate at least five regular season interscholastic games (at any level) each year. The purpose of this requirement, instituted several years ago, was (a) to make sure NJILOA did not become a training ground for individuals who only wanted to officiate junior lacrosse and needed to be trained, certified and insured to do so and (b) to require college officials to stay connected to the high school game in order to be eligible for playoff assignments.

Recently, a few Active Members have experienced difficulty complying with this requirement and for good reasons. For example, several officials have become involved coaching high school lacrosse which gives them both a practical impediment to officiating, i.e. availability on weekday afternoons and Saturdays, as well as a perceived or real conflict of interest in officiating a neighboring school's games. Likewise, we have some members with military obligations or emergent situations which prevent him/her from being available to do five games. The failure of those Members to meet the five-game requirement has, unfortunately, led to disciplinary action. Thus, there are good reasons to temporarily exempt some officials from the five-game requirement.

Resolution #1: Article Four, Section One of the Constitution should be amended to create an "Exempt Member" for the purpose of eliminating the requirement that all Active Members officiate a minimum number of regular season high school games when limited circumstances exist:

Exempt Member. Any Active Member may become an Exempt Member for the sole purpose of not being required to officiate the minimum number of regular season high school games because of (1) military service, (2) coaching an interscholastic or college lacrosse team or (3) temporary relocation out of New Jersey for emergent business or family reasons. An Active Member must apply to the Executive Committee prior to March 15 of the upcoming season for change of status and must still (1) take the annual test, (2) attend meetings if residing locally and (3) pay dues for an Active Member, but (4) will not be eligible for any playoff assignments. The exemption is only good for one year and must be applied for the following year, if necessary.

Question #2: Should the Constitution, Article Four, Section Five, paragraph h be amended to permit a period of suspension for less than “one year”?

Discussion: The Constitution contains a discipline “ladder” for Members who fail to take the annual test, attend meetings, etc. One form of discipline is a suspension. In dealing with discipline issues in 2011, it was problematic for the Ethics Committee that all suspensions are mandated “for a period of one year.” (Constit., Article Four, Section Five, paragraph h.) Therefore, if an official was suspended on April 27, for example, the suspension technically has to carry to the next April 27. While there are circumstances where a full year suspension would be appropriate, other violations do not so warrant. Therefore, there is a need to provide more flexibility in the discipline process so that the “punishment better fits the crime.”

Resolution #2: Article Four, Section Five, paragraph h of the Constitution should be amended to read “Suspension may be imposed for a period of up to one year subject to the extension discussed herein.”

Question #3 (Raised by the Executive Committee): Should Article Four, Section One, paragraph e (Probationary Member) be amended to prohibit such a Member from voting in any election or other votes taken while on probation?

Discussion: In presenting the Report to the Executive Committee and in discussing Resolution #2 in particular, a supplemental proposal was made by several members of the Executive

Committee regarding a Probationary Member's right to vote. There was consensus that the inability to hold office while on probation should include a prohibition on voting in elections or other votes taken during the year.

Resolution #3: The final sentence of Article Four, Section One, paragraph 3 shall be amended to read as follows: "While on probation, a Probationary Member may officiate interscholastic games, and must pay dues, pass the same test for Active Members and attend the same number of meetings, but cannot hold office in the Association, vote in any election or other vote taken, or officiate any tournament or playoff game."

Question #4: Should the Constitution, Section Six, paragraph e be amended to fix certain typographical errors from the amendments voted by the Members at the 2011 Breakfast Meeting?

Discussion: In preparing for this year, the Chair noticed a typographic mistake in the inclusion of the amendment voted by the Members last year so to take out the typo we technically need another Resolution. (This is what the Members voted for last year. The Chair promises to proofread more closely in the future).

Resolution #4: Section Six, paragraph e of the Constitution should be amended to read as follows: "With the exception of the Fee Negotiation Committee, the Chair of each Committee shall be appointed at the first meeting of every new year and the members of each Committee shall be appointed by the second meeting of each new year."

IV. Changes To Other Procedures Of The Association Proposed By The Resolutions Committee Which Only Require Executive Committee Vote.

Question #5: Should there be a process to identify weak officials and limit their assignments to sub-varsity games only and/or ask them to leave NJILOA if improvement does not occur?

Discussion: Over the past decade and to accommodate the rapid growth of lacrosse, NJILOA was required to actively recruit new members to be able to cover all games.¹ The “take any one who is interested” philosophy worked insofar as we had the numbers to cover all games but, at the same time, failed by introducing many officials to the game who had limited officiating experience and/or knowledge of this sport, and who did not project as long-term, valuable Members. While the Resolutions Committee is presenting other proposals in this Report to improve the quality of officiating and to focus the influx of future new officials on individuals who are clearly qualified, the Association should develop a comprehensive process to identify weaker officials with an eye towards first trying to improve them but, when that fails, making sure those officials are limited to subvarsity games or, in the most severe cases, asking them to leave.

Presently, the Assignor and his team of Reassignors have the task of fitting the right officials for the right game. While this de facto evaluation system gets the job done on game days and has created an informal rating system, it fails in the bigger picture by not formalizing the process, incorporating training for those in need and having consequences for those who do not improve. And, if and when it comes time for a new Assignor and Reassignors to take over, the “institutional knowledge” may be lost and the process will have to start anew.

In 2011, the OVAL process was successfully introduced to evaluate more officials and provide some mandatory training requirements in the event of a poor evaluation. The OVAL

¹ The following statistics are informative on this issue and others:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Varsity Teams</u>	<u>Number of NJILOA Active Members</u>
2012	186	TBD (but approx. 450)
2011	182	409
2010	175	392
2009	167	355
2008	155	314
2007	151	not available
2006	145	not available
2005	132	not available

Over the past five years, the number of teams has been increasing, on average, at less than 5% per year while the number of officials has increased almost 50%.

process is certainly a valuable way of acquiring more knowledge about the abilities of our officials, but does not lead to making the ultimate decisions on underperforming officials or providing them with advance notice of the consequences they may face. Instead, those weaker officials are allowed to continue to work varsity games and take game opportunities away from others.

The Resolutions Committee had a very spirited debate over a relatively short time period on this subject. Suffice it to say, a simple Resolution will not cure this problem. As set forth in Resolution #5, we are proposing that an ad hoc committee (i.e. not an annual committee which would require a constitutional amendment) be formed to look at this subject over a one-year period. Given the extensive debate already engaged in by the Resolutions Committee, we thought it would be helpful to highlight some of our thoughts:

- (a) criteria need to be established to let all Members know what are the attributes of a “weak official”;
- (b) the institutional knowledge, including the informal rating system, of the Assignor and the team of Re-Assignors should be presented to the Members as guidance on how an official can advance in the Association, be considered for “better” games, etc.;
- (c) a formal rating system should be considered and whether those ratings should have a direct correlation to the quality and/or quantity of varsity game assignments;
- (d) the OVAL evaluation process successfully implemented last year (of both all new and some older officials) should be incorporated in the process but should not be viewed by itself as the solution;
- (e) the end result should have both a positive and negative path so that all Members know if they are not progressing as expected and, if so, what the consequences of poor performance are, including receiving only a subvarsity schedule or being asked to leave the Association; and
- (f) a strong mentor system should also be developed (see Resolution #6a) whereby each new official (and possibly some older ones) is assigned to a senior (not simply defined as older) official who is then given specific tasks he/she must do each season with the mentee official.

Resolution #5: An ad hoc committee of no less than 15 Members which shall include the Assignor and all Reassignors should be appointed for one year to develop a process which (a) helps identify and train weaker officials (not limited to the newest officials), (b) provides guidance to all officials on how advancement within NJILOA takes place, (c) creates institutional knowledge about the abilities of all officials and (d) provides both a positive path (i.e. ways to improve) and a negative path (i.e. the consequences of not improving). The report of this committee should be presented at the February 2013 breakfast meeting.

Question #6: Should criteria be adopted to seek new officials who are clearly qualified or otherwise have a strong lacrosse/officiating background?

Discussion: As set forth in footnote 1, there was a 50% growth in the number of officials from 2008 to 2011, which far outpaced the increase in new varsity programs. While not a certainty, it is probably safe to predict in this economy that the number of teams has reached its peak. Thus, the demand for more officials is not likely to increase (subject to certain areas of the State where there still are not enough qualified officials). As a result, our philosophy of taking any and all applicants can and should be re-visited. For example, an application form should be created to highlight lacrosse and other officiating experience, physical fitness, long-term objectives, etc. Mandatory interviews for all applicants should be part of process so we know who we are getting before the first cadet class. Moreover, we should annually evaluate if there is a limit to the number of new officials we need and/or whether that need should be focused on a specific geographic area.

Resolution #6: The Cadet and Recruitment Committee shall identify criteria to be used, subject to geographical need in those portions of New Jersey where we remain in need of qualified officials, so that candidates must demonstrate in the application and interview process clear qualifications such as, but not limited to, a strong lacrosse and/or other officiating background, physical fitness, long term objectives as an official, etc. Subject to the aforementioned geographical concerns, candidates who fail to present clear qualifications should not be offered entry to the cadet program. Before any criteria are employed in the application and interview

process, Chapter Counsel shall review the proposal to determine if NJILOA is acting in a lawful manner.

Question #7: How can we better train our cadets/new officials on JV games?

Discussion: Last year, the Resolutions Committee proposed asking/requiring the varsity officials to stay and help train the JV officials who were working the second game of a double-header. That Resolution was not acted upon. Moreover, we are told that some varsity officials object to being required to do so without compensation. While the Resolutions Committee recognizes (and thanks) the many Members who, on their own, stay after their varsity games and provide constructive instruction to the newer officials, we continue to believe we are missing a great opportunity.

This year the Resolutions Committee looked at essentially the same issue from a different perspective: creating a mentor program and requiring, at least for a certain number of doubleheaders, that the officials working only the JV game not arrive five minutes before game time, but instead observe the entire varsity game, including the pre-game. Indeed, our discussions led to a conclusion that these two ideas can easily be integrated.

Mentors: We have plenty of seasoned officials who could and should serve as mentors to one or more mentees. Mentors would: (a) be available for telephone calls/e-mails to discuss issues and problems as they come up, (b) go with the mentee to a varsity game and sit in the stands and answer questions, point out the good and bad, etc., and (c) when available observe the mentee doing their game and provide post-game instruction. Since many new officials work with a variety of partners in their early years, often never with the same person twice in a season, having a mentor “invested” in the mentee is likely to provide greater and more consistent instruction.

Attendance At Varsity Games: Far too many officials working only the JV game arrive just minutes before it is scheduled to begin. While some JV officials may have trouble making it to a varsity game by 3:30 p.m. on a weekday, there should be very few who cannot get to the varsity game on a Saturday before their JV game that follows. Being able to sit in on the

varsity pre-game, watch the entire game and ask questions at half-time and after the game is an opportunity all newer officials should embrace. Moreover, it will help the newer officials develop a greater sense of the speed and player skills at the varsity level. Where possible, the mentee could watch the mentor's varsity game and the mentor could stay on to work with or observe the mentee do the JV game.

Resolution #7a: The Executive Committee should implement a program for all officials with less than five years experience being assigned to a mentor who will be responsible to provide various forms of training and advice to the mentee. Where possible, the Assignor and Reassignors shall try to pair the mentor and mentee on the same doubleheader so the mentee can observe the mentor's varsity game and/or they work as partners in a subvarsity game.

Resolution #7b: All officials (regardless of experience level) who work on only the JV game of a doubleheader shall on no less than three occasions per year arrive in time to observe the entire varsity game, including the pregame.

Question #8: Should NJILOA institute more three-man technique training during the regular season?

Discussion: There was unanimous agreement within the Resolutions Committee that more should be done to provide and encourage training on three-man technique. It was felt by many committee members, however, that the training would be of no moment because there is not adequate opportunity to use it in games. Stated another way, why be trained if you are never going to put the three-man technique to use on the field?

Historically, Members who only officiate interscholastic lacrosse were left to learn "on the fly" (if ever given the chance) or seek less formal opportunities in summer tournaments, all-star games or camps. The three-man clinic was discontinued several years ago and there is seldom training provided during the regular season meetings. In more recent years, the only real training on three-man technique came by becoming a college official or possibly using programs on the internet. Since the Members are requesting this opportunity, we believe it should be provided, but only if more on-field opportunity can be made available. Moreover,

assuming the economy ever rebounds, lacrosse is likely to follow other interscholastic sports by adding the third man to the regular season officiating team. Thus, we need to be in a position to properly staff games if that change is made.

Here are some of the ideas we came up with in providing both the training and an opportunity to use it, noting that there are issues that need to be addressed with several of them:

- (a) re-instituting the three-man clinic (at North and South locations) which is required for eligibility to work a three-man game;
- (b) having the ability to volunteer to be the third (unpaid) man on a regular season game with two experienced three-man officials;
- (c) using scrimmages for the same situation regardless of what the schools are paying for the scrimmage;
- (d) scheduling all scrimmages as three-man with schools only paying for two officials and the three officials split the two checks equally;
- (e) using freshman or JV tournaments or even single subvarsity games for three-man training;
- (f) identifying and facilitating off-season opportunities, i.e. Garden State Games, all-star games, etc. to make sure the less experienced three-man officials get on the field if they volunteer;
- (g) all county and state tournaments being assigned as three-man with schools only paying for two officials for the games where we add the third official;
- (h) all varsity teams could be offered the opportunity to pick one home game for three-man but only pay for two officials with the three officials splitting the checks;
- (i) all games played in New Jersey with an out-of-state opponent will be three-man games; and/or
- (j) going to the most competitive leagues and trying to convince them to go to (and pay for) three-man for all regular season games.

While these ideas are not entirely consistent, have wrinkles to iron out, and could not all be realized at once, each suggestion is feasible and would increase the training and game opportunity for use of three-man technique.

Resolution #8: The availability of training of three-man officiating technique and game experience should be increased by the Assignor and Reassignors through one or more available means. Members with at least five years interscholastic lacrosse officiating experience who wish to receive training and eventually game opportunity in three-man technique shall so indicate to the Assignor and/or Reassignors.

Question #9: Should a limited portion of the regular meetings be focused on training more advanced officials instead of repeating the same substance year after year which is primarily focused on new officials?

Discussion: There have been comments made by many Members that the presentation at the regular season meetings by and large remains focused on the newer officials and has become tedious and not helpful to the improvement of the mid-level officials who are looking for more advanced training. Moreover, many feel we are not utilizing technology and, possibly, live games enough in the training of officials.

Here are some suggestions we came up with:

- (a) more use of e-mails from Tom Carr and others to the membership discussing issues and situations various people encountered each week and providing weekly tests to keep the Members actively looking at the rules, etc.;
- (b) use of game video at meetings and possibly making it available online to demonstrate the good and the bad;
- (c) considering meetings held at games;
- (d) dedicating a portion of each regular season meeting to more sophisticated issues, i.e. stalling, delayed substitution, alternate possession, defensive interference on the crease, anticipating a time-out call, officiating between the whistles, etc.;
- (e) dedicating one regular season meeting at each site each year for more advanced training;
- (f) asking coaches to speak at meetings;

Resolution #9: The Executive Committee should consider alternative teaching methods to replace/supplement the traditional classroom training and put an emphasis on training the mid-level official on more advanced topics.

Question #10: Should we reconsider last year's pronouncement by the Executive Committee to go to black shorts and short black socks and stay with the current uniform or some variation, i.e. white shorts and short socks, etc?

Discussion: At the 2011 Breakfast Meeting, it was announced that the official's uniform would be changed (optional in 2012 and mandatory in 2013) to conform with the NCAA changes in 2011: black shorts and low black socks. As seen in the NCAA tournament in 2011 where those officials went back to white shorts and the high black and white socks, there may be some uncertainty whether the college officials will stay with the black uniforms. While there was generally consensus in the Resolutions Committee in favor of going to the black uniforms (with the dissent favoring the traditional look), it was agreed that the Executive Committee should announce a commitment to the change, regardless of what the college officials might do, to give our members some assurance before investing in new gear.

Resolution #10: To the extent NJILOA is changing its uniform to black shorts and short black socks starting in 2012 (and mandatory in 2013), this change will remain in effect until at least 2018, regardless of any decision to the college officials to go back to the white shorts and socks.

Question #11: Should officials be permitted to wear sunglasses in varsity games?

Discussion: The NJSIAA Handbook concerning Dress Code (at p. 22 in the 2010-2011 version) is silent on the ability of game officials to wear sunglasses. While officials wear glasses (prescription) and some with lens that change color in sunlight and other officials have on their own been wearing regular sunglasses during games, there has been an informal, historical disapproval of officials wearing sunglasses during interscholastic games. The arguments against permitting officials to wear sunglasses cite to the importance of eye contact and the fact that some types of sunglasses carry a form of "attitude" or unprofessionalism. On the other hand, we

all have worked on fields where sun glare is an issue and coaches (many of whom wear sunglasses) are not willing to accept an excuse that “the sun was in my eyes.”

The Resolutions Committee was widely split on this issue and unable to reach a consensus. However, because Members have already taken it upon themselves to wear sunglasses in varsity games, this Resolution is presented for clarification of the issue.

Resolution #11: The Executive Committee should announce a formal position on the Members’ ability to wear sunglasses during varsity games. If sunglasses are permitted, guidelines on the type, etc. should be included.

Question #12: Should NJILOA consider allowing members to pay dues electronically?

Discussion: Certain Members are more savvy than others in using technology. It took us a long time to go to an electronic test, electronic vote and e-mail for game assignments. Many people presently pay their bills electronically. A significant number of Members, clearly not a majority however, have expressed a desire to pay their annual dues electronically. It was not known to the Resolutions Committee if that would be feasible and cost-effective and, if so, preferable to the Secretary Treasurer. The following Resolution seeks that guidance.

Resolution #12: The Executive Committee should investigate and advise the Members if electronic payment of dues is feasible and cost-effective and, if so, implement that process provided that it not serve to unduly burden those individuals who handle the financial affairs of the Association.

Question #13: Should we alternate the annual banquet between North and South Jersey?

Discussion: As reflected in other issues presented herein, the Association needs to be sensitive to the fact that we have Members located in all four corners of the State. Where possible, events should be scheduled for the equal convenience (or inconvenience) of all Members. While meeting sites and clinics can be simultaneously presented at multiple locations, there is only one annual banquet. While this Resolution does not intend to criticize the recent use of the Meadowlands for the annual banquet, it makes sense to hold it at different locations throughout

the State. If, however, the use of any location results in a significant decrease in attendance, the Banquet Committee should exercise its discretion to discontinue that location.

Resolution #13: The Banquet Committee shall use its best efforts to hold the annual banquet at various locations throughout the State.

V. Issues Considered By The Resolutions Committee For Which No Resolution Is Proposed.

In the 2009-10 Report, several issues were identified as discussed by the Resolutions Committee which resulted in a Resolution. In discussions those issues with the Executive Committee, the Resolutions Committee learned, however, of on-going initiatives by the Executive Committee on those same topics. Thus, the Resolutions Committee tabled those proposals. Nonetheless, the 2009-10 Report advised the Members about its deliberations on those three topics. We did not encounter that situation this year.

The 2010-11 Report added a new section to identify issues the Resolutions Committee received and debated, but for which no Resolution was forthcoming because there was no consensus for change. We believe the Members should know all issues considered in fairness to both the person(s) proposing the issue and to recognize the work performed by the Resolutions Committee. This does not foreclose any Member from raising the same issue in the future or “tweaking” and re-submitting it. The role of the Resolutions Committee is to annually debate old and new ideas for change, and to allow the Members to voice all proposals.

The Resolutions Committee discussed but could not reach a consensus in favor of change on the following issues:

Issue #1: Should we expand the Executive Committee by two or four voting members?

Issue #2: Should we create new positions on the Executive Committee for mandatory representatives from the North and South?

Issue #3: Should we create a non-voting position on the Executive Committee for an official having less than five years experience with NJILOA for the purposes of training the “next generation”?

Issue #4: Should there be term limits for any members of the Executive Committee, including the assignor and secretary/treasurer?

Issue #5: Should candidates running for election be told before posting their platform statements the names of the people running against them?

Issue #6: Should we request that lacrosse coaches evaluate varsity game officials like other interscholastic sports?

Issue #7: Should varsity officials be allowed to wear black pants with the white stripe (worn by football officials) as long as both officials on the game match?

Issue #8: Should an assignor/reassignor for NJILOA also be permitted to assign junior lacrosse games?

Issue #9: Should we allow an Active Member to officiate less than five regular season interscholastic games each year?

Issue #10: Should we require an Active Member to officiate more than five regular season interscholastic games each year?