



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting
Wednesday July 26th, 2025

2025/2026 NCBA ANNUAL RULES COMMITTEE MEETING RESULTS

COMMITTEE:

SANDY SANDERSON, PRESIDENT OF NCBA: *IN ATTENDANCE*

ERIC CURITORE, VICE PRESIDENT OF BASEBALL OPERATIONS: *IN ATTENDANCE*

RYAN NORRIS, DIVISION I REGIONAL DIRECTOR AT-LARGE BID: *IN ATTENDANCE*

JAKE ANDERSON, DIVISION I RULES COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVE: *IN ATTENDANCE*

CHAD LOWE, DIVISION II RULES COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVE: *IN ATTENDANCE*

PLEASE CLICK ON THE BELOW LINKS TO REFERENCE, SPECIFIC RULES DETAILED IN DOCUMENT:

NCBA DI RULES:

[CLICK HERE](#)

NCBA DII RULES:

[CLICK HERE](#)

NCBA DIII RULES:

[CLICK HERE](#)

NCAA RULES:

[CLICK HERE](#)

**WHILE ALL SUGGESTIONS WERE DISCUSSED, SOME SUGGESTIONS DID NOT
RECEIVE ENOUGH SUPPORT TO WARRANT A VOTE.**

OFFICIAL VOTE TALLY & NOTES LISTED IN RED TEXT BELOW EACH SUGGESTION

FOR ANY FURTHER CLARIFICATION REGARDING THE RESULTS, TEAMS CAN
REACH OUT TO VP OF BASEBALL OPERATIONS:

ERIC CURITORE - ERIC.CURITORE@COLLCLUBSPORTS.COM



NCBA (All Divisions)

Name?

Caden Colangelo

Which team are you associated with?

Clemson

What is your role with the team?

Officer

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I, II & III

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

7.03.0

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

We would like to see the bridge students be able to play as long as their program meets certain requirements for eligibility, such as students receiving student IDs from the school. We think this is a simple change that can be incorporated into the eligibility form we turn into the school each year, as they have access to check for credit hours and all student IDs.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

At Clemson, our bridge program is extremely unique. I live in Northern Virginia, and so I am used to seeing the familiar bridge programs like the one offered at NOVA CC. At NOVA CC, if you have a certain GPA after sophomore year, you can go to any Virginia school automatically (VT, UVA, VCU, etc.). However, our program at Clemson is very different. At our program, students can only attend Clemson.

Our bridged students have a Clemson student ID number, are assigned a Clemson counselor, have a school email, live on campus, have access to all Clemson facilities, can participate in intramurals, and more. Our school even said they'd put in writing that our bridge students are considered members of the Clemson Community because, aside from the fact that their classes are at Tri-County Technical College, they have the same rights as Clemson students. The University also tends to better fund clubs and organizations that allow for bridge student involvement as part of their campus reach pillar. Additionally, many bridge students can play for other club sports teams at Clemson, which makes it hard for us to turn away players who want to play every year.

Although they take classes at Tri-County Technical College (they still take the required hours for eligibility), I view this as an equivalent to a satellite campus for two main reasons. The first is, the program is very closely monitored by Clemson and is a strong joint partnership. The second is that



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

although our bridge students' transcripts say "Tri-County" on them, it is similar to my friend who goes to Pitt Johnstown, whose transcript doesn't say "Pitt", but rather "Pitt Johnstown". Although he lives an hour and a half from the main campus, he could play club baseball if he retired from Pitt Johnstown's varsity team, but our bridge students who live on Clemson's campus could not.

I had the opportunity to talk to Chad Lowe about this in depth, as well as Ryan Norris briefly, so they may be able to fill you in more. However, please do not hesitate to reach out for any further clarification you may need. From what I have heard, other schools that have similar programs would benefit from this change as well (I have heard that Texas A&M's program is set up somewhat similarly).

In closing, our final remark is that we feel this is a great opportunity to grow the game and allow more players and students to enjoy the game we all love at the next level competitively, which we believe strongly aligns with the values of the NCBA.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

All players playing in a NCBA Sanctioned Baseball Game MUST hold a student ID with the Institution, which that team represents. An example is that no member of the University of Texas may play for the Texas A&M Baseball Club.

A STUDENT WHO IS NOT DIRECTLY ENROLLED AT A SCHOOL, BUT HAS ACCESS TO IT'S FACILITIES & PROGRAMS THROUGH A BRIDGE PROGRAM AT THEIR CURRENT SCHOOL, CAN BE ELIGIBLE TO COMPETE FOR THE PARTNER SCHOOL AS LONG AS THEY HOLD A STUDENT ID AT THAT SCHOOL:

Division I:

DOES NOT PASS: 5 VOTES TO 1

Division II:

DOES NOT PASS: 4 VOTES TO 2

Division III:

DOES NOT PASS: 4 VOTES TO 2



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

Name?

Henry Wood-Lewis

Which team are you associated with?

Temple University

What is your role with the team?

Officer

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I, II & III

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

3.02.3

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

I would like to see more precise criteria for the selection of teams for an at-large bid, perhaps with a ranked system of tie breakers.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

In the 2023-2024 season, Temple was selected for an at-large bid, but the process was convoluted and lacked transparency. Both our team and the team we were tied with in our region met the 5 criteria in 3.02.3 in the exact same manner but our team was selected with no further explanation.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

I would propose that a new criterion be used to determine at-large bids that is unlikely to be even among two or more teams. Criteria like forfeits or being on probation could still impact the teams eligibility.

e.g. "Factors taken into account by the NCBA when selecting an At-Large Bid consist of but are not limited to: Teams run differential in conference games. Is the team on probation? Has the team forfeited any games?"

CREATING A CONCRETE FORMULA TO USE EACH TIME WHEN PICKING AT LARGE BIDS:

DOES NOT PASS: 6 VOTES TO 0

*NCBA Note – Through evaluating At Large bids the last 25 years, it has become clear that no one comparison is the same as the next. While we take into consideration many factors, every team has their own distinct resume with many layers to evaluate which makes each & every evaluation different.



**2026 NCBA Rules Meeting
Wednesday July 26th, 2025**

Name?

Ryan Norris

Which team are you associated with?

NCBA

What is your role with the team?

Regional Director

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I, II & III

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

31.04

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

The word "any" in the definition used for malicious contact is too broad. We should work to narrow the scope and intent of this definition to avoid any misuse of the definition in future rule applications.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

The word "any" in the definition used for malicious contact is too broad. We should work to narrow the scope and intent of this definition to avoid any misuse of the definition in future rule applications.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

Malicious Contact" is defined as any INTENTIONAL and UNNECESSARY contact to the neck, head, or face of an opposing player.

ADDING DEFINITIONS TO INTENTIONAL & UNNECESSARY TO IMPROVE CLARITY:

PASSES: 6 VOTES TO 0



**2026 NCBA Rules Meeting
Wednesday July 26th, 2025**

Name?

Ryan Norris

Which team are you associated with?

NCBA

What is your role with the team?

Regional Director

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I, II & III

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Add

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

FAQ

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Add a reference to NCAA rule 1-7b in the FAQ's to address the use of double bases. We should make it clear that double bases are not required but when present must follow NCAA 1-7b.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

This was a new rule instituted by NCAA in 2025 and it has created some confusion for teams when playing at a facility with the new double bases at first base.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

Add a reference to NCAA rule 1-7b in the FAQ's to address the use of double bases. We should make it clear that double bases are not required but when present must follow NCAA 1-7b

ADDING TO THE NCBA FAQ SECTION TO CLARIFY THE NCAA'S RECENT RULE SURROUNDING DOUBLE BASES:

PASSES: 6 VOTES TO 0



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

Name?

Blake Dempsey – UC Davis - Officer

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I, II & III

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

9.04.0

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Rule is listed as the last item in Q&A section. The current Q&A reads: "Q: Do base coaches have to wear a helmet when coaching on the field?"

A: Yes. NCBA follows NCAA rules, which mandates that base coaches MUST wear a NOCSAE certified helmet and play cannot continue until the rule is met."

This note should be modified (or removed completely since any non-specification reverts back to NCAA rules) to the NCAA rule, which reads, "It is required that base coaches wear a helmet. Play will not continue until compliance with this rule is met. It is recommended that the helmet meet NOCSAE standards."

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

Coach's helmets do not bear the NOCSAE symbol. Only batter's helmets and catcher's masks bear this stamp of approval. The rule as written now implies that coaches must wear a batter's helmet with two ear flaps when coaching the bases, which I don't believe is the intended purpose of the rule.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

It is required that base coaches wear a baseball specific helmet. Play will not continue until compliance with this rule is met. It is recommended that the helmet meet NOCSAE standards.

REMOVE THE REQUIREMENT OF NOCSAE CERTIFIED COACHES HELMETS:

PASSES: 6 VOTES TO 0

*NCBA Note – This modification is based around the fact that skull caps/coaches helmets are not NOCSAE certified. For coaches to have been compliant in the past, they would have had to wear a standard double flapped batting helmet. Skull caps/coaches helmets will be complaint moving forward.



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

Name?

Aaron Becker - Eastern Michigan – Officer

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I, II & III

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

25.02.3.1

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Gives the team time to look over the other team's roster to make sure that the game was played with eligible players.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

We had a situation last year where we knew that the team had ineligible guys and told them they are not allowed to play them, but got strong armed into playing them. Because of the wording of the rules, our protest did not go through even though the other team admitted that they played ineligible guys and we had photo evidence.

Because of this we believe that the rule should be reworded because a team with guys not on their roster should not be able to win games over teams with an eligible team.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

Between receiving the opponents lineup card and 24 hours after the game is the ONLY period of time that a team can protest that a player on the lineup card is NOT on the opponents official NCBA roster. In order for a successful protest photo evidence of the lineup card is required.

INCREASE THE TIME AVAILABLE TO TEAMS LOOKING TO PROTEST ROSTER VIOLATIONS:

DOES NOT PASS: 4 VOTES TO 1, 1 ABSTAIN

*NCBA Note – NCBA rules currently have consequences in place when players are found to not be on the roster after 1st pitch & prior to its completion. Both the non-rostered player & their designated coach are ejected on the spot while the outcome of the game remains as played out. A player's eligibility must be protested ahead of 1st pitch for the game outcome to be questioned. This rule was implemented years ago to have a process in place & avoid losing teams protesting out of spite after the conclusion of the game they should have protested earlier. Teams are responsible for their rosters & can control the protests of their opponents by being prepared as needed.



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

Name?

Nick Arnoni – Cal (PA) – Head Coach

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I, II & III

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Add

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

N/A

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Adding a rule that states there needs to be a unanimous vote from the teams in the conference when adding a new team in after the season has already begun.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

A team was added to a conference last season after the season had already started. The teams that were to host said team voted in favor, the teams that had to go away to said team voted against it. Clearly teams that would not have to travel would vote for it that season because it's less of a burden on them. Also, lack of planning & organization from one team should not effect others.

The NCBA's stance has been they need majority approval from conference teams when looking to add a team to their conference after their schedule has been released. We've had situations recently where teams got voted in & certain teams were annoyed w/ the change of plans. They feel they handled everything they needed on the timeline we asked, put themselves in a good position with their school & funding to go about their upcoming season...and then get thrown off by the addition of a school who procrastinated & didn't handle what they need to earlier to avoid this dilemma. The new series takes away one of their open weekends, which is important for makeups or just to have off as a whole, while also needing more finances & possible field space/umpires or travel plans on the fly too. We understand that often times brand new teams come together & look to first join after the fact, as those at least bring positive problems to help. It is important to protect the experience of all teams as any addition creates more hurdles for all.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

A unanimous vote from all teams in a conference is needed when adding a new team in after the season has already begun.

NO VOTE

NCBA FRONT OFFICE WILL TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION WHEN TEAMS LOOK TO BE ADDED AFTER CONFERENCE SCHEDULES HAVE ALREADY BEEN RELEASED.



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

Name?

Eric Curitore

Which team are you associated with?

NCBA

What is your role with the team?

Front Office

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I, II & III

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Add

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

N/A

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Do we need to create a rule that specifically states we do not allow EH's or AH's (extra or add'l hitters)?

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

It needs to be addressed as some teams proactively do this on their own. I do not believe the NCAA has a rule against this specifically either. I believe this rule is so basic it is just assumed to never happen, though teams are using that as a loop hole.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule:

N/A

ADD VERBIAGE PROHIBITNG THE USE OF EH'S (EXTRA HITTERS) & AH'S (ADDITIONAL HITTERS):

PASSES: 6 VOTES TO 0

*NCBA Note – Lineups should only consist of 9 players at all times. No matter if the pitcher is hitting for himself OR is being DH'ed for, only 9 batters are permitted to be listed.



**2026 NCBA Rules Meeting
Wednesday July 26th, 2025**

Name?

Nick Arnoni

Which team are you associated with?

California University of PA

What is your role with the team?

Head Coach

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I, II & III

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Add

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

24.08.0

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

If a team eclipses a certain amount of forfeits in a season - they then forfeit their entire season

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

If a team has 5 conference series & they have already forfeit 3-4 of their other series. They shouldn't be the burden of 1-2 conference teams just because they up & decide to play all of a sudden.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

If a team forfeits more than 50% of its conference games at anytime, the team then automatically forfeits the remainder of their conference season.

SHOULD A TEAM AUTOMATICALLY FORFEIT THEIR SEASON ONCE THEY HAVE FORFEITED 50%+ OF THEIR SCHEDULED GAMES?

DOES NOT PASS: 5 VOTES TO 1



Name?

Multiple Entries

Which team are you associated with?

Multiple Entries

What is your role with the team?

Multiple Entries

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I, II & III

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify OR Remove

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

15.07.0

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Eric Curitore (NCBA):

I like the rule on paper as it protects the away team when having to make their necessary travel plans that weekend, especially if they have required deadlines to file with their club sports department. I just don't think it's effective as the only times it came up was us policing teams abusing it to try & get forfeit wins. Yes, their opponent should know the rules & be compliant, but the opponent would have played either way...they were just taking advantage of the rule & seeking easy wins because they can.

Nathan O'Connor (Temple):

That any application of this rule must be looked into on a case by case basis by NCBA employees to see the validity of the claim.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

Eric Curitore (NCBA):

Was this a big enough issue in the past to have it implemented last year? Did it solve anything or just create new problems? From a front office standpoint, it created unnecessary headaches into mediating both teams into playing their games as scheduled. It created more problems than solved. Both teams could still play on paper though it became us talking the away team out of using a technicality to try & get cheap wins. Play baseball. I didn't have one scenario where this rule was applied to a situation to protect the away team as designed.

Nathan O'Connor (Temple):

We had a home series scheduled for St Patrick's Day weekend. We had a last minute field issue on Sunday the week prior, and were able to find a replacement Field on that Wednesday. In communication with our opponent, they filed a violation under this rule. In Instagram DM communications with the team they claimed that they wanted to (not exact quote but can provide images of conversation) "party and



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

drink for at Patrick's day". We did not play that day and almost had to forfeit because of that rule. The new field was closer to their campus and they did not have any hotel accommodations.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

Eric Curitore (NCBA):

If we want to modify this to ensure the intent of the away team is applicable, perhaps mandating they provide documentation from their school stating they must know by their said deadline for them to be able to travel, I'm open to exploring ways to find a happy medium to actually improve this rule for how it was designed initially. At the same time this opens up a case by case evaluation creating possible inconsistencies.

Nathan O'Connor (Temple):

Add a subsection under the rule that allows for a case by case discussion with NCBA representatives to determine the reasoning behind the claim.

15.07.02 - Each protest made under this rule can be examined by your NCBA representative, in order to determine the validity/reasoning of the protest. All relevant factors may be considered, including communication timelines, field availability, and the intent of both teams to compete in good faith. Protests based on invalid reasons, may be deemed invalid.

MODIFY THE VERBIAGE WITHIN 15.07.1 TO PROVIDE AWAY TEAMS MORE SUPPORT AS THEY GO ABOUT TRAVEL PLANS FOR THE UPCOMING WEEKEND:

PASSES: 6 VOTES TO 0

Old Verbiage:

15.07.1 - In the event that the home team fails to notify their opponent by 4:00 PM local time of the Tuesday the week of playing, the opposing team can submit a formal protest under NCBA guidelines for failure to secure a field.

New Verbiage:

15.07.1 - In the event the home team has yet to notify their opponent by 4:00pm local time of the MONDAY the week of playing, the opposing team must notify NCBA Front office so that they can step in to facilitate the necessary communication of game details.

15.07.2 - In the event the home team has yet to notify their opponent by 4:00pm local time of the MONDAY the week of playing, the opposing team must notify NCBA Front office so that they can step in to facilitate the necessary communication of game details.



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

Name?

Chad Lowe

Which team are you associated with?

NCBA Rules Committee

What is your role with the team?

Advisor/Club Sports Director

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I, II & III

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Add

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

3.03.00

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Add a section to Playoff Seedings for the World Series and include all of the categories used to determine the seeds.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

This creates transparency and allows team to understand their is an exact formula for determining the seeds. There is confusion when seedings are released where most teams seem to think they are based off top 20 voting.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

Add a section titled World Series Seedings and include the categories used as well as the tie-breaker.

ADD VERBIAGE INTO THE RULES LAYING OUT SEEDING CRITERIA USED WITHIN THE WORLD SERIES:

PASSES: 6 VOTES TO 0

*NCBA Note – World Series seeding uses the same criteria each & every year based on a black & white formula. Teams receive a ranking across various variables in comparison to the other teams in the field including Conference win %, overall win %, Top 20 ranking (at the Division I level) & # of games played. Teams receive a rank for each of these categories, with the order of the average ranking across all variables providing the final seeds.



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

Name?

Christopher Coolidge

Which team are you associated with?

Wisconsin

What is your role with the team?

Officer

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I, II & III

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Add

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

3.02.0

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

If a conference champion declines their playoff bid to regionals, instead of taking the second-best team in that conference, a "second at-large" bid is opened up, available to all conferences

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

When Bowling Green declined their playoff bid to the Northern Plains Regional as their conference champion, Grand Valley State was chosen as the team to replace them, marketed by the NCBA as an "at-large team". Wisconsin DII had a far better resume and would have been chosen had this rule been in place. This was confirmed when GVSU went 0-2 in the regional tournament, not really being competitive in either game. The regionals should be about sending the best teams from each conference, but when a champion declines, I believe the at-large selection should apply, as the team replacing said champion is not a conference champion.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

In the event of a conference champion declining their playoff bid, a second at-large bid will be opened up to teams of each conference comprising the regional, not exclusive to the second-best team in said conference.

WHEN A CONFERENCE CHAMPION DECLINES THEIR BID, THEIR OPEN SPOT SHOULD CONSIDER THE EVALUATION OF ALL TEAMS WITHIN THE REGION, AS OPPOSED TO AUTOMATICALLY GOING TO THE NEXT SCHOOL BEHIND THEM IN THE CONFERENCE STANDINGS:

DOES NOT PASS: 5 VOTES TO 1



DI ONLY

Name?

Porter Benton

Which team are you associated with?

Weber State University

What is your role with the team?

Officer

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Remove

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

17.01.0

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

The removal of restrictions on which positions the DH may be used for.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

If I can use a Designated Hitter for players other than my pitchers, I can get more club members playing time, without sacrificing at bats for my pitchers, who hit the ball well.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

The NCBA follows NCAA Designated Hitter Rules with the exception of the restriction on which defensive positions may be DH for. There is no restrictions on which positions may have a designated hitter hit for them in the lineup.

ALLOW THE DH TO BE USED ON ANY POSITION PLAYER, AS OPPOSED TO JUST THE PITCHER:

DOES NOT PASS: 6 VOTES TO 0



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

Name?

Jon Frost

Which team are you associated with?

Creighton

What is your role with the team?

Officer

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Add

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

4.07.2.1

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Run rule 15 after 3 or four it can not be after 6

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

We had to play a lot of extra baseball when up a bunch I think if you're up more than 15 in 3 innings the game should end or at least 4 innings minimum. We were up 20-0 against Mizzou after 2 innings and had to play an extra 4 innings that I don't think either team wanted to play game should end at that point no reason to play 6.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

If a team is up by 15 or more runs after the 4th inning the game should end.

If a team is up 18-20 runs after 3 innings the game should end.

If you want to keep 15 after 6 I think is too much at least make a 18 or 20 after 3.

MODIFY MERCY RULES TO STOP GAME IF A TEAM IS UP BY 15+ AFTER THE 4TH INNING:

DOES NOT PASS: 5 VOTES TO 1



**2026 NCBA Rules Meeting
Wednesday July 26th, 2025**

Name?

Koen Bearer

Which team are you associated with?

Slippery Rock

What is your role with the team?

Officer

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

18.01.0

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

We think catchers should be able to have a courtesy runner, especially with 1 or 2 outs.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

Speeds up the game, don't have to wait for catchers to put gear on. Even if it's just when there is 2 outs and the last guy out is used as the runner so there's no strategic advantage.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

There is NO COURTESY RUNNERS allowed in any NCBA Division 1 sanctioned baseball game however you are allowed to use your last batter out to run for your catcher IF there is 2 outs. You MAY NOT use a runner off your bench.

ALLOW TEAMS TO USE COURTESY RUNNERS FOR CATCHERS:

DOES NOT PASS: 5 VOTES TO 1



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

Name?

Eric Curitore – NCBA Front Office

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

31.03.3

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Should we allow all NCBA Division I Schools to be eligible to play in the fall?

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

Currently, it's just the Great Lakes, North Atlantic, Mid Atlantic West, Mid America North & NoPac East. We can keep the requirement for those specific schools to schedule at least 1 conference series in the Fall, as they absolutely need that head start for the Spring, though is there reason to prohibit anyone & everyone to not play more in the Fall & count it officially? We made this change in Division II years ago & logistically it's a plus, as all teams can play whoever & count them if they wish. We've had Division II teams playing Division I teams in the Fall, and a large portion of those games cannot count. We have Division I teams who are eligible to play in the Fall not allowed to count their games against other DI teams who are not eligible. Is it more clear to just allow everyone to play if they want while understandings the pro's & con's to their decision? How big is the risk of teams in good weather areas also playing in the fall skew end of the season awards & postseason seeding? Can't that be said at Division II as well? I believe those teams play just as much, if not that far off now too.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

Keep current rule, just remove the verbiage excluding specific conferences who are not currently eligible.

ALLOW ALL TEAMS IN DIVISION I TO PLAY NCBA SANCTIONED GAMES IN THE FALL:

DOES NOT PASS: 4 VOTES TO 2

ALLOW TEAMS WHO ARE ELIGIBLE TO COUNT FALL GAMES THE OPPORTUNITY TO COUNT GAMES AGAINST TEAMS WHO ARE NOT CURRENTLY ELIGIBLE TO COUNT FALL GAMES:

DOES NOT PASS: 3 VOTES TO 3



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

Name?

Robert Schilp

Which team are you associated with?

Michigan

What is your role with the team?

Officer

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Add

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

3.03.2

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

The current NCBA rulebook does not include any formal or transparent process for determining World Series seeding. We propose adding a clear, weighted system that prioritizes conference win percentage while also rewarding teams for recent World Series appearances, specifically back-to-back qualifications. This change ensures fairness, recognizes sustained success, and eliminates ambiguity in how teams are seeded on the national stage.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

This change is important because overall win percentage can be misleading; teams can inflate their records by scheduling weak non-conference opponents, which skews the fairness of national seeding. A more accurate reflection of team strength would combine conference and regional win percentage, which reflect performance against meaningful, sanctioned competition. In cases of seeding ties, prior World Series appearances should serve as the tiebreaker, rewarding programs that demonstrate consistent excellence at the highest level of club baseball.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

3.03.2 – World Series Seeding Criteria

3.03.2.1 World Series seeding shall be determined by the NCBA Front Office based on a weighted evaluation of each qualifying team's performance, using the following criteria in the following order:

Combined Conference and Regional Win Percentage

Prior NCBA World Series Appearance(s) within the last two seasons.

NO VOTE – DISCUSSED PREVIOUSLY



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

Name?

Daelan Fears – Texas A&M - Officer

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

9.03.1.2 and 9.04.1.2/9.02.1

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Couple different things under Uniforms:

The teams should be able to agree to use whatever uniform colors they want so long as they agree that it's okay. Additionally, players and coaches should be permitted to wear shorts OR non-baseball pants (weather pending) while in the dugout, as well as coaching 1st or 3rd base, so long as they will not be entering the game that day.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

Contrasting colors makes sense in theory but certain pitchers, at least for our team, like to pitch with certain uniforms because they feel different or they are superstitious etc. As long as communication has been given to the opposing team, and they agree that our uniform choice is okay, I think that you should be able to wear whatever uniform colors your team desires, contrasting or not.

As a player or coach, if we are wearing shorts or non-baseball pants, we are 99% sure we are not going into the game. To make us wear baseball pants that we are not using, needlessly adding to our laundry pile, is ridiculous. Sure it's not "professional" but we want to be comfortable and have some flexibility.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

If a team does not want to wear home colors as the home team, or does not want to wear contrasting colors as the visiting team, teams must contact their opponents for uniform color approval 24hrs before game time. As long as each team agrees, any uniform, contrasting or not, may be worn.

Players and coaches who will not be entering the game or cannot reenter, are permitted to wear shorts or non-baseball pants when in the dugout and coaching 1st and 3rd base.

MODIFY UNIFORM RULES TO NOT REQUIRE AWAY TEAM TO WEAR CONTRASTING COLOR:

DOES NOT PASS: 6 VOTES TO 0

ALLOW COACHES TO NOT HAVE TO WEAR BASEBALL PANTS WHEN ON THE FIELD:

DOES NOT PASS: 6 VOTES TO 0



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

Name?

Rob Perkey

Which team are you associated with?

The University of Pittsburgh

What is your role with the team?

Coach

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Add

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

23.06.1

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Add a section that introduces automatic ejections for things that are starting to creep onto the field and ruin the baseball experience and respectability of the league. It's exhausting seeing other team's disregard rules and common sense baseball etiquette. Umpires and opposing teams don't want to be the bad guys for telling other teams that they're violating rules regarding uniforms, lineup cards, and more, because the situation is usually correctable. Taking pictures of coaching uniform violations is fine, but then the team in violation is just going to think the team reporting the violation is annoying, and it's probably not going to change the behavior. The consequence for certain actions or inactions should be ejections, not a chance to fix the problem. I might be approaching "old man yelling at clouds" territory, but the league is getting ever closer to beer league and sandlot atmospheres at games. Just start throwing people out.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

Things that were observed during NCBA games last year:

Shirtless players sitting outside the dugout

Base coaches without any piece of a uniform...except a helmet. Surprisingly, he was wearing a helmet.

Base coaches using cell phones in the coach's box (they're texting, not keeping score)

Base coaches without any shoes in the coach's box

Multiple people in coach's box

Lineup cards that are incomplete

Division I teams trying to use courtesy runners

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

23.06.0 Automatic Ejections

23.06.1 Any team representative violating one or more of the following is automatically ejected upon discovery by an umpire. These ejections are not subject to an automatic suspension, but repeat



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

infractions can result in further discipline for players,

coaches, or teams. Opposing teams are encouraged to report violations to the umpire.

23.06.1.1 Using a cell phone in fair territory or in a coach's box.

23.06.1.2 Entering a coach's box or fair territory without shoes.

23.06.1.3 Loitering in or around the coach's box when there is already one representative coaching.

23.06.1.4 Submitting a lineup card without proper names and numbers for the starting nine or ten players.

23.06.1.5 Failure to be fully clothed on the field unless for ongoing medical treatment.

23.06.1.6 Attempting to use a courtesy runner in any Division I NCBA Sanctioned Baseball Game.

23.06.1.6.1 Both the substitute and head coach or head coach representative are ejected.

23.06.1.6.2 Division II and III teams are not subject to automatic ejection against Division I teams unless there are repeated attempts to violate 23.06.1.6 after having been notified of the rule.

23.06.1.7. Attempting to use re-entry in any Division I NCBA Sanctioned Baseball Game.

23.06.1.7.1 Both the substitute and head coach or head coach representative are ejected.

23.06.1.7.2 Division II and III teams are not subject to automatic ejection against Division I teams unless there are repeated attempts to violate 23.06.1.7 after having been notified of the rule.

23.06.1.8 Attempting to use a player not listed on a lineup card.

23.06.1.8.1 The substitute is not permitted to enter the game, and the head coach or head coach representative is ejected.

23.06.2 Violations of Rule

23.06.1 may be enforced during NCBA Sanctioned Tournaments even if the games are considered Exhibition.

Optional - 23.06.3 Rule 23.06.1 is effective on whatever date if the NCBA deems a grace period is needed

MODIFY CONSEQUENCES FOR VIOLATION OF VARIOUS RULES TO RESULT IN AUTOMATIC SUSPENSION :

DOES NOT PASS: 5 VOTES TO 1

ADDING "CLOSED TOE SHOES" TO 9.04.0, WHICH IS TIED TO COACHES UNIFORMS:

PASSES: 6 VOTES TO 0

*NCBA Note – While the majority of the requested rules are currently rules within the NCBA rulebook, it's the responsibility of the teams playing to not only be in compliance, but to also make their opponent accountable for any rule violations. Teams work too hard for this experience to be viewed as anything less than collegiate baseball. The image of the league is important & should be important to those participating.

The NCBA has worked exceptionally hard to raise both the level of play as well as the public persona regarding the validity of collegiate club baseball. When the NCBA first started in 2000, the term "club" was often confused with the term "intramural" which brought about public images of "pickup" or "sandlot" baseball. The NCBA expects its member teams & participants to conduct themselves with a minimal level of common sense, which protects the integrity & image of the NCBA, while also the game of baseball itself.



**2026 NCBA Rules Meeting
Wednesday July 26th, 2025**

Name?

Eli Melnick

Which team are you associated with?

North Texas

What is your role with the team?

Officer

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

7.0.5.0

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Include an addition disqualifying "JV" teams from participating in the NCBA, specifically regarding rosters made of players who committed to the official team but have not yet been made full time players for their organization.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

Various schools compete in the NCBA with a JV version of their actual team, including rosters of 30+ players and paid coaches during regular season series. These players play and practice with their official varsity team and play many games against other colleges and semi pro organizations outside of the NCBA schedule. NCBA teams should be a separate entity from a school's official competitive team and should not share coaches/players/practices with the official team.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

Official NCAA or NCCAA teams may not create sub rosters of committed players to compete within the NCBA.

OFFICIAL NCAA OR NCCAA TEAMS MAY NOT CREATE SUB ROSTERS OF COMMITTED PLAYERS TO COMPETE WITHIN THE NCBA:

DOES NOT PASS: 5 VOTES TO 1



**2026 NCBA Rules Meeting
Wednesday July 26th, 2025**

Name?

Elijah Pomeroy

Which team are you associated with?

Appalachian State

What is your role with the team?

Officer

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

6.05.1.2

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Allow for teams to remove players who have a season ending injury prior to April 1 and add players who are NCBA eligible.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

The reason I would want this rule is to help teams who dealt with a lot of injuries and ran out of arms. We had this happen to our team last year losing myself, our ace, #1 bullpen guy, and one of our few lefties. We had guys who were ready to pitch but were not on the roster since we cannot remove and add anyone to the 33 man.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

Players can be removed from a roster up until April 1 due to the reasons above and players who are school/NCBA eligible can replace them.

PLAYERS CAN BE REMOVED FROM ROSTERS UP UNTIL APRIL 1ST:

DOES NOT PASS: 5 VOTES TO 1



**2026 NCBA Rules Meeting
Wednesday July 26th, 2025**

Name?

Lucas Root

Which team are you associated with?

Northern Arizona

What is your role with the team?

Officer

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

18.0.00

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

To allow courtesy runners for catchers only.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

In the heat and long weekends it can be very taxing on catchers so giving them a runner can help better their bodies from taking so much damage, resulting in them playing longer.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

All teams are allowed to have a courtesy runners for catchers only.

NO VOTE – ALREADY DISCUSSED



DII ONLY

Name?

Dante Atchison

Which team are you associated with?

Lone Star College

What is your role with the team?

Sport Club Manager

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division II

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

24.00.00 (Forfeitures)

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Forfeitures should have a stronger impact on teams. If a team forfeits too many games, they should be suspended for a year, and repeated offenses should result in its removal from the league.

This past season in our conference, there were too many forfeits. One team forfeited the majority of their games because they refused to play outside the local area, and another team forfeited in the last week after being eliminated from postseason contention.

To make things fairer, the winning team should receive fewer points based on the reasons for the forfeits. We ended up with 8 to 11 free wins this season. While I understand the challenges of securing fields, umpires, and dealing with weather, these issues need to be resolved.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

I believe constant forfeits create an outlier in team performance, making it difficult to determine whether a team is truly good. We need to establish a more competitive balance, as this situation can lead to a negative impact on actual participation and may foster bad habits among other teams.

If one team sees another team constantly forfeiting without any consequences, then they are going to feel like they can do it as well.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

The only solution that I can think of if we continue to see repeat offenders than to remove them from the league, or also create a point system for the winning team of the forfeits.



**2026 NCBA Rules Meeting
Wednesday July 26th, 2025**

*Ask the question of why the forfeits are occurring, and
reward points based on a metric (Weather, Couldn't secure a field, No umps etc.)*

CREATE POINTS SYSTEM WHEN AWARDING FORFEIT WINS:

NO VOTE



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

Name?

Ryan Norris – NCBA Regional Director

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division II

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

18.01

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Eliminate courtesy runners in D2.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

Continuation of improvement of D2 quality of play and branding to be closer to NCBA Div I. This also eliminates any confusion when Div 1 and Div 2 opponents play or when umpires serve teams in both leagues.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

There are NO COURTESY RUNNERS allowed in any Division I NCBA Sanctioned Baseball Game.

REMOVE COURTESY RUNNERS IN DIVISION II:

PASSES: 5 VOTES TO 1

*NCBA Note – Prior to Division III existing, Division II was designed for new & struggling clubs to get established & learn the ropes on & off the field. Rules were more relaxed to allow flexibility. Courtesy runners were designed to help clubs retain players & allow more guys to see the field. With Division III now in it's 3rd year back & approaching 55 teams, Division II has seen it's talent extremely elevated since it's inception 17 years ago. We're now seeing schools utilizing this rule more & more as a competitive advantage, which wasn't what it was designed for. Far less about getting guys in & more about taking advantage of the ability to run a much quicker bench player every single time the catcher gets on without having to make any official lineup move.

Division II still currently allows re-entry, which still provides flexibility into getting additional guys action while still being able to keep starters in the game.



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

Name?

Donnie Raymond

Which team are you associated with?

Stanford

What is your role with the team?

Officer

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division II

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

4.07.1

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

7-inning Game: If a team is up by ten or more runs at the end of five or more full innings, or up by fifteen or more runs at the end of three or more full innings, that team is declared the winner, and play must be stopped.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

Cut down on game time on extreme blowouts, so as to not waste everyone's time and pitching and get to the next game.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

7-inning Game: If a team is up by ten or more runs at the end of five or more full innings, or up by fifteen or more runs at the end of three or more full innings, that team is declared the winner, and play must be stopped.

IN DIVISION II GAMES, THE GAME WILL BE STOPPED IF A TEAM IS UP BY 15+ RUNS AT THE END OF 3 OR MORE FULL INNINGS:

DOES NOT PASS: 6 VOTES TO 0



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

Name?

Joe Cook – West Chester – Head Coach

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division II

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Remove

What is the section and subsection number of the rule you would like to modified?

28.01.0 thru 28.01.2

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

This should be removed altogether - published rules are meant to be objectively followed to the letter and this rule simply isn't. This a subjective decision made by the NCBA each year with multiple determining factors, as it very well should be.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

Multiple reasons, starting with the NCBA doesn't consistently follow this 'rule' every year. This rule also gives an unfair competitive advantage to larger schools with both D1 and D2 Club teams. A large school could theoretically build a juggernaut D2 squad (even at the expense of their D1 squad) that wins unlimited D2 National Championships and never move up. Additionally, a teams relative strength in any single year or even two years doesn't necessarily indicate future success; a Junior/Senior laden team could go undefeated all year and obviously lose the majority of their roster to graduation, forcing a Freshmen filled team to compete at a higher level the following Fall. At a very bare minimum, remove 'AUTOMATICALLY' from this rule.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

Basically 28.02.0 without the word 'other': All instances where a team may be moved from NCBA DII to DI will be evaluated on a case by case basis.

REMOVE THE WORD "OTHER" FROM RULE 28.02.0:

DOES NOT PASS: 3 VOTES TO 3

*NCBA Note – The goal of the auto promotion/demotion criteria within the rules is to keep competitive balance. Teams who finish last 2 straight years are looked to move down to help provide them a better experience building their program back up, while giving another team the opportunity to take their place. On the other side, a team who has excelled on the field within the lower Divisions has proven they are ready for the next step up. Meeting the criteria to qualify up does not happen overnight, as the club displayed a proven track record of success that is better suited & designed for the higher Divisions.

The important thing of note is the rules state these moves will take place **IF** there is room. It is our intent to make the move as long as it's not compromising the alignment of either a schools old or new conference – which isn't always possible.



**2026 NCBA Rules Meeting
Wednesday July 26th, 2025**

Name?

Joe Cook

Which team are you associated with?

West Chester

What is your role with the team?

Officer

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division II

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Add

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

New Rule

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Require all D1 and D2 Teams to utilize GameChanger for scoring, stats, etc.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

Ease of use, zero cost for teams, provides a path for the NCBA to eventually create a league umbrella within Gamechanger to automatically compile stats, could eliminate the requirement of reporting results to the NCBA, etc.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

New rule proposal

REQUIRE NCBA TEAMS TO USE GAMECHANGER:

DOES NOT PASS: 6 VOTES TO 0



DIII ONLY

Name?

Sandy Sanderson

Which team are you associated with?

NCBA

What is your role with the team?

Front Office

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division III

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

4.05.2

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Mercy rule 4.07.0 will NOT be in effect during World Series post-season play.

The DIII umpires strongly encouraged us to implement a mercy rule for game 6 of the tournament and only if the undefeated team is losing.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

If the game gets out of hand in a direction that is going to force the if necessary game, the umpires encourage a mercy rule for this game only. In their opinion it will 1) prevent chirping and ejections from teams who are in the midst of a blow out and will be running it back again shortly. 2) will save arms for that final game 3) will keep the final game on schedule.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

Mercy rule 4.07.0 will NOT be in effect during World Series post-season play, except during game 6 if the undefeated team is losing.

MODIFY NCBA DIII RULE 4.07.0, TO ALLOW MERCY RULE TO BE IN EFFECT IN GAME 6 OF THE WORLD SERIES, ONLY IF THE LOSERS BRACKET TEAM IS WINNING:

DOES NOT PASS: 5 VOTES TO 1



**2026 NCBA Rules Meeting
Wednesday July 26th, 2025**

Name?

Jacob Throckmorton

Which team are you associated with?

Hampden-Sydney College

What is your role with the team?

Officer

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division III

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

18.01.0

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Allow courtesy runner for pitchers as well as catchers

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

In our previous season we had situations where the pitcher wanted a courtesy runner and was not allowed one.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

Courtesy runners should be allowed for pitchers and catchers.

ALLOW COURTESY RUNNERS FOR PITCHERS:

DOES NOT PASS: 3 VOTES TO 3

*NCBA Note – While courtesy runners for the pitcher is not legal in NCBA Division III, DIII Rules do currently allow courtesy runners for catchers.



**2026 NCBA Rules Meeting
Wednesday July 26th, 2025**

Name?

Carter Dow

Which team are you associated with?

Wake Forest

What is your role with the team?

Officer

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division III

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

17.00.00

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

We would like to propose that the designated hitter does not have to be solely for the pitcher and can be another player in the batting lineup.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

We want more people to be able to hit.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

The designated hitter can be part of the batting order.

THE DH CAN BE USED ON ANOTHER POSITION PLAYER OUTSIDE THE PITCHER:

DOES NOT PASS: 6 VOTES TO 0



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

Name?

Eric Curitore

Which team are you associated with?

NCBA

What is your role with the team?

Front Office

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division III

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

26.02.1

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Should we lessen the punishment for DIII teams who decline a postseason bid?

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

DIII teams are newer & more fragile. Are we hurting their future growth and/or membership by directly removing their playoff opportunity the next year & possibly handicapping it the 2nd year.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

Open to discussion. Probation should absolutely remain for at least 1 if not two years. Perhaps explore the team needing to win their conference outright, as a lot of DIII District Playoff formats take the top 2 teams within each conference...as the verbiage about not being at large eligible isn't as applicable in DIII.

MODIFY PUNISHMENT FOR DIVISION III TEAMS WHO DECLINE POSTSEASON BID:

PASSES: 5 VOTES TO 1

*NCBA Note – Beginning in the 25/26 season to help protect the growth of clubs in Division III, a Division III team who declines a postseason bid will no longer be automatically ineligible for postseason play the following year.

Declining a postseason bid will still carry a 2-year probationary status, along with remaining ineligible for At-Large consideration during the 1st year.



2026 NCBA Rules Meeting Wednesday July 26th, 2025

Name?

Rylee Brombos – John Carroll - Coach

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division III

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

Modify

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

3.00.00

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Adjust playoff format to allow 2 weekends of play. Two weekends- Two rounds

Weekend 1:

1 vs 4 & 2 vs 3 or 1 vs 3 & 2 vs 4 if in the same district (same as its been). This weekend the higher seed hosts a best of 3 series.

Weekend 2:

Winners of Weekend 1 face each other, losers of weekend 1 are eliminated

This weekend the higher remaining seed of winners of weekend 1 hosts in another best of 3 series. The winner of weekend 2 goes to the World Series where this format is then repeated.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

Now going through the tournament as a first-year team I understand the importance of winning the first two games and the consequences that come with dropping one of the first two. However, with these consequences should come no modifications to the schedule set in place.

The change I suggest above is to provide more structure, clarity, predictability for clubs as to when they will play and to give everyone a more fair idea of when their games will be played and no discrepancies in fairness and unfairness. More importantly, player safety must be considered. Pitching staffs in our division are not equipped to handle 5-game weekends. This leads to excessive pitching of 1-2 arms and the potentially harmful long-term effects of said reality. To create a more competitive and safer playoffs, the four-team format should be spread over two weekends, no matter the additional cost. Playoff structure should be reevaluated.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

See above.

MODIFY PLAYOFF FORMAT TO STRETCH OVER 2 WEEKENDS:

DOES NOT PASS: 6 VOTES TO 0



DI & DII ONLY

Name?

Chad Lowe

Which team are you associated with?

NCBA

What is your role with the team?

DII Rules Rep

Which Divisions rules would you like to modify?

Division I & Division II

Would you like to Modify, Remove, or Add a rule from the rule book?

N/A

What is the section and subsection number (if applicable) of the rule you would like to modify, remove or add?

N/A

Describe the change you would like to see with this rule:

Move the Championship game to a 1 PM Start time.

What was the reason you would like to see this rule modified, added, or removed?

Flexibility - Moving the start time up would allow teams/families the option to check-out of their hotels and travel immediately home after the game instead of spending more on hotels and personal time required with the 7 PM start. Additionally allows the game to be moved back due to weather to play within the same day potentially instead of having to move or split it between days. This takes the decision out of the field reps hands as well because all parties should be present and available from 12 PM and on for the day.

What is the proposed wording for the new/modified rule?

Internal note for NCBA staff/volunteers that the World Series championship game will be moved up.

NO VOTE

NCBA FRONT OFFICE WILL CONTINUE TO EVALUATE OPTIONS & WILL LOOK TO GAIN FEEDBACK FROM TEAMS WHO RECENTLY PLAYED IN CHAMPIONSHIP GAMES.