

TULSA NATIONAL LITTLE LEAGUE TEAM OKLAHOMA (2026) INVESTIGATIVE REPORT

Communications, GameChanger Records, Eligibility Discussions, and Documentary Evidence

Prepared by

Kenneth R. Crawford

Doctoral Research Initiative

Integrity of the Game vs. Economic Impact (Politics): The Oklahoma Business Plan

Executive Summary

This report consolidates communications, screenshots, and documentary evidence concerning the 2026 Tulsa National Little League Team Oklahoma baseball program and related events preceding the Little League Southwest Regional Tournament.

The materials reviewed include:

- Text message conversations between Kenneth Crawford and an anonymous individual connected to the Tulsa National Little League baseball program.
- Text message communications from Kenneth Crawford to the Little League Southwest Regional Director.
- Screenshots documenting the state of the GameChanger platform at multiple points in time, including team rosters, player listings, staff assignments, archived games, notifications, scorekeeper attribution, schedules, and team permissions.
- Discussions regarding player eligibility, residency questions, sibling eligibility, GameChanger activity, roster visibility, and community concerns.

The report's purpose is to organize these materials into a coherent, chronological record. It is **not** intended to establish wrongdoing by any individual solely from these communications. Where the messages contain allegations, opinions, or reported information, those are identified as such and distinguished from documented observations visible in the screenshots.

Scope of Review

The report analyzes:

- Communications involving the Team Oklahoma baseball program.
- Messages exchanged with the Southwest Regional Director.
- Messages exchanged with an anonymous coach associated with Tulsa National Little League.
- GameChanger screenshots documenting application displays.
- Discussions regarding residency, sibling eligibility, roster composition, and GameChanger records.

The report is limited to the materials provided and does not independently verify every factual assertion made in the conversations.

Methodology

The evidence was organized using four principles:

1. **Chronology** – arranging communications and screenshots by date and time.
 2. **Topic** – grouping discussions into themes such as eligibility, GameChanger, and communications.
 3. **Evidence Classification** – identifying whether each item is:
 - Documented by screenshot,
 - An apparent firsthand observation,
 - Reported information,
 - Opinion or interpretation,
 - Requiring corroboration.
 4. **Cross-referencing** – linking screenshots to the related communications.
-

Chronological Timeline (Summary)

July 21

- Message sent to the Southwest Regional Director acknowledging the softball ruling and expressing optimism for moving forward.

July 22

- Kenneth Crawford sends a message to the Southwest Regional Director relaying a report that GameChanger records had been modified, including allegations of player additions, game deletions, and changes to the official league GameChanger.

- Discussions begin with the anonymous coach regarding GameChanger, player eligibility, and roster questions.

July 22–24

- The anonymous coach discusses:
 - sibling eligibility,
 - player participation,
 - coaching decisions,
 - requests for historical scorebooks,
 - GameChanger lineups,
 - archived records,
 - and obtaining PDF exports.

July 24–25

- Discussions continue regarding:
 - the number of games reportedly changed,
 - obtaining additional scorebooks,
 - preserving documentary evidence,
 - and possible witness statements.

July 25

- Screenshots document:
 - archived games,
 - scorekeeper attribution,
 - game notifications,
 - replay availability,
 - and player listings.

July 27

- Discussions continue regarding:
 - residency,
 - sibling eligibility,
 - internal concerns,
 - reported coach questionnaires,
 - and community reactions.

Thematic Analysis

1. GameChanger Records

The screenshots document the GameChanger interface at several points in time, including:

- team rosters,
- player pages,
- staff pages,
- permissions,
- archived games,
- notifications,
- replay pages,
- scorekeeper attribution,
- and video clips.

The screenshots demonstrate what the application displayed at those times. They do not, by themselves, establish why any changes occurred.

2. Eligibility and Residency

Recurring topics include:

- league boundaries,
- sibling eligibility,
- family addresses,
- registration timing,
- and residency.

These discussions reflect questions and reported information. Independent verification would be necessary to determine any player's eligibility under Little League rules.

3. Communications with the Southwest Regional Director

Messages sent by Kenneth Crawford include:

- notification regarding reported GameChanger modifications,
- notification regarding deleted games,
- follow-up communications after receiving additional reports.

The screenshots provided primarily show outgoing messages; any responses would need to be documented separately if available.

4. Anonymous Coach Communications

The conversations include:

- apparent firsthand observations about GameChanger displays,

- reported information from others,
 - personal opinions about league operations,
 - concerns about retaliation,
 - and discussions about protecting anonymity.
-

Documentary Evidence

The screenshots document:

- Team roster displays.
- Staff listings.
- Player lists.
- Archived games.
- Notifications.
- Replay pages.
- Team permissions.
- Scorekeeper attribution.
- Communications with the Southwest Regional Director.
- Communications with the anonymous coach.

Each screenshot should be assigned an exhibit number (e.g., Exhibit A-1, A-2, etc.) and referenced in the report.

Evidence Assessment

Each significant statement should be categorized as:

- **Documented by screenshot** – directly visible in a screenshot.
 - **Apparent firsthand observation** – described by someone who states they personally observed it.
 - **Reported information** – attributed to another person.
 - **Opinion or interpretation** – a conclusion or belief.
 - **Requires corroboration** – not independently established by the materials reviewed.
-

Preliminary Findings

Based on the materials reviewed:

1. Communications regarding Team Oklahoma and GameChanger were ongoing before the Southwest Regional Tournament.
2. Multiple screenshots document the state of the GameChanger application at specific points in time.
3. The conversations combine firsthand observations, reported information, and opinions, which should be evaluated separately.
4. The current materials are sufficient to support a detailed chronology and identify areas for further factual investigation but are not, by themselves, conclusive proof of any rule violation or misconduct.

CHAPTER 1

Background and Context

Introduction

This investigative report consolidates documentary evidence, electronic communications, GameChanger screenshots, and contemporaneous observations concerning the selection and administration of the 2026 Tulsa National Little League Team Oklahoma baseball team leading to the Little League Southwest Regional Tournament.

The report has three primary objectives:

1. Preserve the available evidence in chronological order.
2. Distinguish documented evidence from participant statements and opinions.
3. Identify issues that warrant additional review or corroboration.

The report does not presume misconduct. Rather, it organizes the available materials into a structured factual record while identifying where additional evidence would be needed to reach definitive conclusions.

Purpose

The communications reviewed indicate that multiple individuals expressed concerns regarding:

- Team Oklahoma player eligibility.
- Residency and league boundary requirements.
- Sibling eligibility.
- Historical GameChanger records.
- Apparent GameChanger modifications.
- Deleted GameChanger schedules.
- Archived scorebooks.
- Communications with Little League leadership.
- Community confidence in league administration.

These concerns developed over several weeks preceding the Southwest Regional Tournament and resulted in communications with Little League Southwest Regional leadership.

Background

Tulsa National Little League serves as one of Oklahoma's chartered Little League programs.

During the summer of 2026, Tulsa National assembled Team Oklahoma to represent Oklahoma in the Little League Southwest Regional Tournament.

At approximately the same time, controversy involving the Tulsa National softball program resulted in extensive public discussion concerning eligibility and tournament participation. Several conversations contained in this report reflect concern that similar scrutiny might also be directed toward the baseball program.

Because of those events, participants discussed preserving documentary evidence before records might change or become unavailable.

Sources Reviewed

This report incorporates several categories of evidence.

Category A

Text Communications

Messages between Kenneth Crawford and:

- Anonymous coach connected to Tulsa National
 - Southwest Regional Director
-

Category B

Documentary Screenshots

Including:

- Team rosters
 - Staff listings
 - Player listings
 - Archived schedules
 - Archived games
 - Notifications
 - Team permissions
 - Video clips
 - Scorekeeper pages
-

Category C GameChanger Screenshots

Documenting:

- historical games
 - replay pages
 - archived videos
 - player pages
 - deleted schedules
 - team structure
-

Category D

Supporting Research

Cross-referenced with existing research already developed concerning:

- Little League regulations
 - Congressional Oversight research
 - Oklahoma youth sports reform
 - previous communications with Little League officials
-

Standard of Review

Throughout this report every statement is classified according to evidentiary value.

Tier 1

Documented Evidence

Evidence directly visible.

Examples include:

- screenshots
- timestamps
- notifications
- player lists
- scorekeeper listings

These require no witness interpretation.

Tier 2

Apparent Firsthand Observation

Statements made by participants describing events they indicate they personally observed.

Examples include observations about:

- GameChanger behavior
- archived schedules
- roster displays

These remain participant observations unless independently verified.

Tier 3

Reported Information

Information attributed to another individual.

Examples include:

"Someone told me..."

"I heard..."

"Parents are saying..."

These statements document what was reported, not necessarily that the underlying information is true.

Tier 4

Opinion

Personal conclusions.

Examples include:

- motive
- intent
- responsibility

These are clearly separated from documented facts.

CHAPTER 2 Principal Investigative Questions

The communications repeatedly revolve around several central questions.

Question 1

Were Team Oklahoma players properly eligible under applicable Little League rules?

Subtopics include:

- residency
 - league boundaries
 - sibling eligibility
 - registration
 - family addresses
-

Question 2

Did historical GameChanger information change?

The communications repeatedly reference:

- edited lineups
 - modified scorebooks
 - archived games
 - deleted schedules
 - replay information
-

Question 3

If GameChanger information changed,

what was changed?

Possible categories include:

- player listings
- lineup entries
- scorebooks
- schedules
- archived games

The screenshots document the state of the application at different moments but do not independently establish why changes occurred.

Question 4

Were other coaches aware of any historical GameChanger changes?

The anonymous coach discusses:

- obtaining PDFs
- contacting coaches
- locating historical scorebooks
- identifying additional witnesses

These discussions reflect investigative planning rather than evidence that such records exist.

Question 5

Did Southwest Regional officials receive notice?

The screenshots document messages sent by Kenneth Crawford notifying the Southwest Regional Director of reported concerns before tournament play.

The materials provided primarily show outgoing communications.

CHAPTER 3 Investigative Themes

Several themes emerge repeatedly throughout the communications.

Theme One

Preservation of Evidence

A recurring objective is preserving records before they become unavailable.

Examples include requests for:

- PDFs
 - archived scorebooks
 - screenshots
 - GameChanger pages
 - historical schedules
-

Theme Two

Protecting Sources

The anonymous coach repeatedly expresses concern about:

- retaliation
- business relationships
- family relationships
- anonymity

The conversations emphasize protecting the individual's identity while discussing what they report observing.

Theme Three

Community Confidence

Participants express concern that controversy could affect:

- league credibility
- community trust
- families
- youth participation

These concerns are presented as personal opinions and community perceptions rather than verified facts.

Theme Four

Youth Sports Reform

Your messages consistently broaden the discussion beyond a single team or tournament, explaining that your long-term objective is statewide youth sports reform focused on transparency, accountability, and protecting opportunities for young athletes. That theme provides context for why documentary evidence, communications, and records are being collected.

CHAPTER 4 Detailed Chronological Reconstruction

Purpose

This chapter reconstructs the communications into a continuous timeline and correlates text messages with the accompanying GameChanger screenshots. The objective is to preserve the sequence of events, identify the evolution of the discussions, and distinguish documented observations from participant reports.

Phase I

Initial Communications and Context

July 21, 2026

Communication with Southwest Regional Director

Kenneth Crawford sent a message acknowledging the recent softball ruling and expressed support for the decision.

The message communicates two themes:

- Recognition that the decision, while difficult, was viewed by the sender as appropriate.
- Hope that the outcome could serve as a positive step for Little League in Oklahoma.

At this stage, the communication is supportive rather than accusatory.

Evidence Classification

- Documented communication.
 - No allegations contained.
-

Phase II

Initial Reports Regarding GameChanger

July 22

The communications transition from general discussion to specific concerns regarding GameChanger.

A message is sent to the Southwest Regional Director reporting information received from another individual concerning:

- alleged GameChanger updates,
- reported addition of player information,
- reported deletion of games,
- and reported removal of portions of the league GameChanger.

Importantly, the message attributes this information to another source rather than presenting it as the sender's firsthand observation.

Evidence Classification

- Documented outgoing message.
 - Underlying claims are reported information requiring corroboration.
-

Phase III

Anonymous Coach Communications Begin

The conversation with the anonymous coach develops into one of the central sources of information reviewed in this report.

Early discussions focus on:

- player eligibility,
- younger siblings,
- boundary eligibility,
- roster composition,
- and knowledge of player families.

The coach identifies several players by surname while responding to questions regarding sibling participation.

The exchange demonstrates that the discussion is exploratory, with the coach occasionally expressing uncertainty (e.g., "not sure about..."), indicating that not all responses are presented as definitive knowledge.

Evidence Classification

- Combination of apparent firsthand knowledge and uncertainty.
 - Statements concerning player eligibility require independent verification.
-

Phase IV

Discussion of Team Selection

Subsequent messages shift toward discussion of:

- player ability,
- coaching decisions,
- parent reactions,
- roster selections,
- and competitive considerations.

The coach offers opinions regarding player performance and coaching choices.

Examples include:

- evaluations of defensive ability,
- observations regarding player health,
- references to parental dissatisfaction,
- comments about decisions affecting roster selection.

These statements are subjective evaluations and should be interpreted as opinions rather than factual findings.

Evidence Classification

- Opinion.
 - Personal evaluation.
-

Phase V

Documentary Preservation

A significant change occurs when the discussion moves from player eligibility to preserving documentary evidence.

Topics include requests for:

- scorebook PDFs,
- timestamped GameChanger records,
- archived games,
- historical lineups,
- and player appearances in GameChanger.

This phase indicates an effort to preserve records before they might become unavailable or change.

Evidence Classification

- Documented requests.
 - Investigative planning.
-

Phase VI

Expansion of Investigation

Kenneth Crawford asks whether:

- additional coaches experienced similar GameChanger changes,
- additional scorebooks exist,
- additional witnesses may exist,
- and whether statements could be obtained from affected coaches.

The anonymous coach responds that only two games involving his team were known to him and expresses doubt that other coaches would participate because of perceived social pressures within the community.

This exchange documents the perceived difficulty of obtaining corroborating testimony.

Evidence Classification

- Documented communication.
 - Coach's explanation is opinion regarding others' willingness to participate.
-

Phase VII

GameChanger Observations

The discussion turns toward GameChanger behavior itself.

The anonymous coach reports observing GameChanger activity and describes watching a game status appear to change before becoming final.

Screenshots accompanying the conversation document:

- GameChanger notifications,
- finalized games,
- replay availability,
- and historical notifications.

These screenshots document what appeared on the device at specific moments.

Evidence Classification

- Screenshots are documented evidence of application displays.
 - Interpretations regarding why displays changed require corroboration.
-

Phase VIII

League Structure Discussion

The conversation broadens to league organization.

Topics include:

- Tulsa National facilities,
- financial incentives,
- league expansion,
- family participation,
- registration timing,
- and sibling eligibility.

The anonymous coach references community discussions about:

- family-member addresses,
- sibling participation,
- and delayed registration.

These are reported community discussions rather than independently verified facts.

Phase IX

GameChanger Documentary Screenshots

A substantial portion of the evidence consists of screenshots documenting GameChanger.

These include:

Team Pages

- Team overview.
 - Player lists.
 - Staff pages.
 - Permissions.
-

Archived Games

Historical games displaying:

- final scores,
 - scorekeepers,
 - replay availability,
 - player RSVP information,
 - staff RSVP information.
-

Notifications

Screenshots documenting:

- replay notifications,
 - finalized games,
 - video availability.
-

Team Administration

Screenshots documenting:

- staff assignments,
 - team permissions,
 - videographer permissions,
 - scorekeeper permissions.
-

Team Listings

Player pages documenting:

- jersey numbers,
- player initials,
- roster composition.

These screenshots provide documentary evidence of what the application displayed at the time they were captured.

Phase X

Growing Community Concern

Later communications reflect broader concern within the baseball community.

Themes include:

- internal discussions,
- uncertainty among families,
- concern regarding eligibility,
- concern regarding community reaction,
- and questions reportedly presented to coaches.

The anonymous coach reports that coaches were asked a series of questions regarding players on the team, though no copy of those questions is included in the evidence reviewed.

Evidence Classification

- Reported information.
 - Additional documentation would be necessary to verify the existence or content of any questionnaire.
-

Phase XI

Communications with Southwest Regional Director Continue

Additional messages are sent informing the Southwest Regional Director of continuing reports and expressing concern over the disappearance of GameChanger information.

The messages document:

- continued communication,
- preservation of concerns,
- and notification to regional leadership.

The screenshots do not show substantive responses from the recipient.

Investigative Observations

The chronology demonstrates an evolution from:

1. general discussion,
2. to player eligibility,

3. to documentary preservation,
4. to GameChanger records,
5. to broader community concerns.

One notable feature is the consistent effort to preserve records and obtain contemporaneous documentation rather than relying solely on recollections.

At the same time, many assertions within the conversations are reported by participants and are not independently verified by the screenshots alone. Maintaining this distinction throughout the report is important to ensure the findings remain objective and evidence-based.

CHAPTER 5 Reconstructed Communications Transcript

Introduction

This chapter reconstructs the communications into a continuous narrative while preserving their overall sequence. Rather than reproducing every text message verbatim, the transcript organizes the exchanges by topic and chronology and identifies where screenshots provide documentary support. Where participants express opinions, relay information from others, or describe events they say they observed, those distinctions are noted explicitly.

Section I

Communications Between Kenneth Crawford and the Anonymous Coach

Initial Contact

The discussion begins with Kenneth Crawford explaining that he has been contacted regarding Team Oklahoma and asking questions related to player eligibility, residency, and the composition of the tournament roster.

The anonymous coach agrees to discuss the issues but requests that their identity remain confidential. Throughout the conversation, the coach repeatedly expresses concern about professional relationships, community dynamics, and potential retaliation if identified.

Classification

- Documented communication.
 - Source requests anonymity.
-

Discussion of Sibling Eligibility

Kenneth Crawford asks questions concerning whether particular players have younger siblings participating within the league and whether those relationships could affect eligibility.

The anonymous coach responds based on personal familiarity with several families. In some cases, the coach expresses confidence in the information; in others, the coach indicates uncertainty.

The discussion covers:

- younger siblings,
- family relationships,
- approximate ages,
- and participation in league programs.

These responses appear to be based on the coach's personal knowledge but are not independently verified within the materials reviewed.

Classification

- Apparent firsthand observations.
 - Would require corroboration if used to evaluate formal eligibility.
-

Discussion of Player Ability and Team Selection

The conversation expands into opinions regarding player selection.

The anonymous coach comments on:

- defensive ability,
- pitching,
- player development,
- injuries,
- and coaching decisions.

The coach also references dissatisfaction expressed by some parents whose children were not selected.

These portions of the discussion reflect personal evaluations and reported community sentiment rather than objective findings.

Classification

- Opinion.
 - Reported information.
-

Discussion of GameChanger Records

A significant portion of the conversation focuses on GameChanger.

Kenneth Crawford asks whether historical scorebooks and archived records might still exist.

The anonymous coach discusses:

- archived scorebooks,
- exported PDF reports,
- lineups,
- historical games,
- and GameChanger displays.

The coach explains that retrieving older information may require locating coaches who originally maintained the records.

This discussion reflects an effort to identify documentary evidence rather than to draw conclusions from memory alone.

Classification

- Investigative planning.
 - Documentary preservation.
-

Preservation of Evidence

The conversation repeatedly returns to preserving records before they become unavailable.

Topics include:

- screenshots,
- scorebooks,
- archived games,
- replay files,
- and obtaining copies from coaches.

The coach also discusses contacting others who may possess historical records.

Classification

- Documented investigative activity.
-

Community Reaction

Later messages reflect broader concern regarding:

- community confidence,
- family reactions,
- coaching relationships,
- league politics,
- and the impact of ongoing controversy.

The anonymous coach repeatedly distinguishes between what they personally know and what they have heard from others.

Classification

- Combination of firsthand observations and reported information.
-

Concerns Regarding Anonymity

The coach emphasizes that remaining anonymous is important because disclosure could affect relationships within the local baseball community.

This concern is expressed multiple times throughout the conversation.

The discussion reflects the coach's perception of possible social or professional consequences rather than evidence that retaliation would occur.

Classification

- Personal concern.
 - Opinion regarding potential consequences.
-

Section II

Communications Between Kenneth Crawford and the Southwest Regional Director

July 21

Kenneth Crawford sends a message acknowledging the recent softball eligibility decision and expresses appreciation for the difficult decision made by regional leadership.

The tone is respectful and supportive.

No allegations are made.

Classification

- Documented communication.
-

July 22

Kenneth Crawford notifies the Southwest Regional Director that he has received reports alleging changes to GameChanger.

The message references:

- player information,
- deleted games,
- modifications,
- and concerns that documentary records may have changed.

The message attributes these concerns to another source rather than asserting firsthand knowledge.

Classification

- Documented outgoing communication.
 - Underlying allegations are reported information.
-

Follow-up Communication

Subsequent messages advise the Southwest Regional Director that additional information has reportedly been received and that GameChanger records appear different from earlier observations.

The messages express concern that historical records may no longer be visible.

The screenshots supplied primarily document outgoing messages; substantive responses from the Southwest Regional Director are not visible in the materials reviewed.

Classification

- Documented outgoing communication.
-

Section III

Communications Regarding Documentary Evidence

The conversations repeatedly emphasize locating objective documentation rather than relying solely on recollections.

Examples include requests for:

- GameChanger screenshots,
- archived schedules,
- scorekeeper pages,
- PDF scorebooks,
- replay information,
- archived notifications,
- and historical game records.

This investigative approach reflects an effort to preserve contemporaneous records that could later be compared against official documentation.

Section IV

Evolution of the Discussion

The communications progress through several distinct phases.

Phase One

General discussion concerning Team Oklahoma.

Phase Two

Questions concerning player eligibility.

Phase Three

Questions regarding residency and sibling eligibility.

Phase Four

Discussion of historical GameChanger records.

Phase Five

Efforts to preserve documentary evidence.

Phase Six

Discussion of community reactions and concerns.

Phase Seven

Notification of Southwest Regional leadership.

Communication Themes

Across all conversations, several recurring themes emerge.

Transparency

Participants repeatedly emphasize the importance of documenting events and preserving records.

Accuracy

There is a consistent effort to distinguish between information personally observed and information reported by others.

Protection of Sources

The anonymous coach requests confidentiality throughout the exchanges.

Youth Sports Governance

Kenneth Crawford repeatedly frames the discussions within the broader objective of improving accountability and transparency in youth sports administration.

Investigative Assessment of the Communications

The communications demonstrate a methodical attempt to gather and preserve information before tournament play and while questions were being raised within the local baseball community. They also illustrate the importance of treating participant statements according to their evidentiary status.

The conversations alone do not establish the truth of every allegation discussed. Instead, they provide a roadmap for identifying documentary records and potential witnesses that could corroborate or refute specific claims.

CHAPTER 6 Documentary Evidence Analysis

GameChanger Records, Communications, and Electronic Evidence

Introduction

This chapter examines the documentary evidence independently of the text conversations. The objective is to identify what each exhibit objectively depicts and to distinguish documented observations from interpretations or conclusions.

Because digital platforms such as GameChanger may change over time, screenshots serve as contemporaneous records of what a user observed at the moment each image was captured. However, a screenshot reflects only the information displayed at that specific time and does not, by itself, establish why any information appeared or changed.

To facilitate future reference, each image should be assigned an exhibit number.

Exhibit Series A

Communications with the Southwest Regional Director

Exhibit A-1

Initial Communication

Description

A text message from Kenneth Crawford to the Southwest Regional Director acknowledging the recent softball eligibility decision.

Objective Observations

- Message transmitted prior to baseball regional play.
- Tone is respectful and professional.
- Expresses appreciation for a difficult decision.

Investigative Value

Demonstrates that communication with regional leadership existed before additional concerns were raised.

Exhibit A-2

Report of GameChanger Concerns

Description

Message notifying the Southwest Regional Director that reports had been received concerning apparent GameChanger changes.

Topics referenced include:

- player additions,
- deleted games,
- GameChanger modifications.

Objective Observations

The screenshot confirms that the message was sent.

It does not independently verify the underlying allegations.

Investigative Value

Documents that regional leadership was notified of reported concerns before tournament play.

Exhibit A-3

Follow-up Communication

Additional message informing the Southwest Regional Director that more information had reportedly been received.

Objective Observations

- Continued communication.
 - Continuing concern regarding historical GameChanger records.
-

Exhibit Series B

Anonymous Coach Communications

The anonymous coach communications represent one of the largest portions of the documentary record.

Exhibit B-1

Discussion regarding:

- younger siblings
- player relationships
- family participation

Observations

Coach answers based upon personal familiarity with several families.

Some responses are definitive.

Others are qualified by uncertainty.

Classification

Apparent firsthand observations.

Exhibit B-2

Discussion regarding:

- defensive ability
- player development
- roster decisions

Observations

Coach provides personal evaluations.

These statements are opinions rather than documentary evidence.

Exhibit B-3

Discussion regarding:

- parents
- dissatisfaction
- roster selection

Observations

Coach reports concerns expressed by others.

These statements constitute reported information.

Exhibit B-4

Discussion regarding:

GameChanger

Coach explains:

- archived scorebooks
- PDF reports
- historical records
- lineups
- coach access

Investigative Value

Documents efforts to locate independent documentary evidence.

Exhibit B-5

Discussion regarding:

obtaining records from other coaches.

Coach expresses doubt regarding willingness of others to participate.

Classification

Opinion regarding anticipated cooperation.

Exhibit Series C

GameChanger Screenshots

Exhibit C-1

Team Home Page

Documents:

- team identity
 - navigation
 - season information
-

Exhibit C-2

Player Listing

Documents:

- player names
- jersey numbers
- roster order

Important

The screenshot documents who appeared on the roster when the screenshot was captured.

It does not establish when players were added.

Exhibit C-3

Staff Listing

Documents:

- coaches
- scorekeepers
- videographers

Investigative Value

Shows administrative structure displayed within GameChanger.

Exhibit C-4

Permissions

Documents:

staff permissions.

This information may assist in determining who possessed administrative access.

Exhibit C-5

Archived Schedule

Documents:

historical schedule.

Later screenshots depict little or no schedule information remaining.

The screenshots establish what was visible at different times but do not establish why any differences occurred.

Exhibit C-6

Archived Games

Documents:

historical game listings.

Visible information includes:

- opponents
 - dates
 - scores
 - game status
-

Exhibit C-7

Replay Notifications

Documents:

notifications generated by GameChanger.

Includes:

- finalized games
 - replay availability
 - uploaded videos
-

Exhibit C-8

Scorekeeper Attribution

Multiple screenshots identify scorekeepers displayed for specific games.

Examples include:

- Mindy Abbott
- Paige Romine

Important Observation

The screenshots document names displayed by the application.

They do not independently establish who entered data or whether any subsequent modifications occurred.

Exhibit Series D

Archived Video

Screenshots document:

- archived clips
- replay pages
- historical video listings

These images demonstrate that videos existed within the GameChanger platform at the time captured.

Exhibit Series E

Deleted Schedule Discussion

Several screenshots depict a team page displaying no scheduled events.

Objective Observation

The page appeared empty when captured.

Limitations

The screenshots alone cannot determine whether:

- games were deleted,
- archived,
- hidden,
- moved,
- or otherwise changed.

Additional platform records would be required.

Cross-Correlation Analysis

The documentary evidence and conversations frequently intersect.

For example:

Coach discusses archived scorebooks.

↓

GameChanger screenshots document archived games.

↓

Kenneth notifies Southwest Regional.

↓

Additional screenshots document changing application displays.

This progression demonstrates why contemporaneous screenshots are valuable.

Documentary Reliability Assessment

The evidence reviewed consists of four distinct categories.

Category One

Native Screenshots

Highest documentary value.

Examples:

- notifications
- roster pages

- archived games

These depict the application directly.

Category Two

Text Messages

Reliable documentation of communication.

However,

they document:

what people communicated,

not necessarily

whether every statement communicated was accurate.

Category Three

Participant Observations

Important because they may direct investigators toward documentary evidence.

Require corroboration.

Category Four

Opinions

Lowest evidentiary value.

Useful for understanding participant perspectives.

Not proof of factual events.

Preliminary Documentary Findings

The documentary record establishes that:

- ✓ Communications occurred before regional play.
- ✓ Regional leadership received notice of reported concerns.
- ✓ GameChanger displayed historical roster, schedule, staff, and archived game information at various times.
- ✓ Participants actively attempted to preserve documentary evidence.
- ✓ The communications consistently sought independent documentation rather than relying solely on recollection.

At the same time, the current record does **not**, by itself, establish that GameChanger records were improperly altered or that any player was ineligible. Those conclusions would require additional corroborating evidence such as official eligibility documents, platform audit records, or other independent sources.

CHAPTER 7 Eligibility Analysis

Residency, League Boundaries, Sibling Participation, and Tournament Eligibility

Introduction

One of the primary themes throughout the communications is player eligibility. Rather than making direct accusations, the participants repeatedly ask questions about residency, league boundaries, sibling participation, registration timing, and supporting documentation. These topics are discussed in the context of Team Oklahoma's roster selection for the 2026 Little League Southwest Regional Tournament.

This chapter analyzes those discussions and distinguishes between documented evidence, participant statements, and matters that would require additional verification.

Applicable Eligibility Framework

Little League eligibility generally involves several categories of documentation and requirements. Depending on the circumstances, these may include:

- Residency or school attendance eligibility.
- League boundary requirements.
- Tournament affidavit documentation.
- Tournament player verification.
- Any approved waivers or exceptions recognized under applicable Little League policies.

This report does not evaluate whether any specific player met or failed to meet these requirements because the supporting eligibility documents were not part of the materials reviewed.

Theme 1: Residency

The communications contain repeated references to player residency.

Discussion topics include:

- where families live,
- which league boundaries they may fall within,
- grandparents' residences,
- parents' residences,
- and questions regarding player addresses.

The anonymous coach answers some questions from personal familiarity with families while expressing uncertainty about others.

Investigative Assessment

The conversations document that residency questions were being discussed.

They do **not** independently establish whether any residency requirement was or was not satisfied.

Determining residency eligibility would require:

- official residency documents,
 - tournament affidavits,
 - league verification records,
 - or school attendance documentation.
-

Theme 2: Sibling Eligibility

The communications devote considerable attention to younger siblings.

The discussions include:

- whether certain players have younger siblings,
- whether siblings were participating,
- approximate ages,
- and which divisions they may have played in.

Kenneth Crawford asks questions designed to understand family relationships rather than to reach immediate conclusions.

The anonymous coach responds based upon personal familiarity with several families.

Investigative Assessment

The discussions establish that sibling relationships were being explored as part of understanding roster eligibility.

The conversations alone do not establish that any sibling relationship affected eligibility.

Theme 3: Registration Timing

Several communications reference registration timing.

Topics include:

- when players entered the league,
- participation during the regular season,

- and whether timing may have affected eligibility.

These discussions appear exploratory.

No official registration records accompany the communications.

Investigative Assessment

Registration timing could be relevant under applicable Little League rules, but the screenshots and messages alone are insufficient to determine compliance.

Theme 4: League Boundaries

Participants discuss league boundaries and family locations.

Examples include:

- neighborhood references,
- community locations,
- and questions concerning which league a family may belong to.

The discussions demonstrate awareness that league boundaries may affect tournament eligibility.

Investigative Assessment

Boundary questions are recurring discussion topics, but no official boundary maps or eligibility determinations are included in the evidence reviewed.

Theme 5: Community Knowledge

The anonymous coach frequently responds from familiarity with families participating within Tulsa National.

Examples include:

- knowledge of siblings,
- player development,
- coaching histories,
- and participation over several seasons.

This familiarity provides context for the coach's observations but does not replace official documentation.

Theme 6: Parent Concerns

The communications include references to concerns reportedly expressed by parents.

Topics include:

- roster selection,
- player opportunities,
- coaching decisions,
- and tournament participation.

These statements reflect reported community sentiment rather than independently verified facts.

Eligibility Evidence Matrix

Topic	Evidence Reviewed	Classification	Additional Evidence Needed
Residency	Text discussions	Reported information / apparent firsthand knowledge	Residency verification, school attendance records, tournament affidavit
Sibling participation	Text discussions	Apparent firsthand knowledge	Official roster and registration records
League boundaries	Text discussions	Reported information	Official Little League boundary maps and league records
Registration timing	Text discussions	Reported information	Registration database, league participation records
Tournament eligibility	Questions raised	Unresolved	Official tournament eligibility documents

Relationship to GameChanger

An important theme emerging from the report is that eligibility discussions became intertwined with GameChanger documentation.

The progression generally follows this pattern:

1. Questions arise regarding player eligibility.
2. Participants begin examining historical GameChanger records.
3. Screenshots are preserved.
4. Archived scorebooks and schedules are discussed.
5. Regional leadership is notified of reported concerns.

This sequence helps explain why GameChanger records became a focus of the investigation.

Limitations

The evidence reviewed does not include:

- Tournament affidavits.
- Official eligibility packets.
- Residency documentation.
- School attendance verification.
- Approved waivers.
- Internal Little League eligibility determinations.

Accordingly, this report cannot determine whether any specific player was eligible or ineligible. It can only document that questions were raised and describe the nature of those questions.

Preliminary Eligibility Findings

The communications show that:

- Multiple participants discussed residency, sibling participation, and league boundaries.
- Questions were raised before tournament play.
- Participants sought documentary evidence to evaluate those questions.
- The available evidence is insufficient to make definitive findings regarding any individual player's eligibility.

CHAPTER 9 Comprehensive Evidence Matrix

Introduction

This chapter organizes the documentary evidence, communications, and participant statements into an evidence matrix. The purpose is to identify what each exhibit documents, how it relates to the investigative questions, and where additional corroboration would be necessary. The matrix is intended to help readers distinguish between objective records and participant-reported information.

Evidence Classification System

Each item is assigned one of five classifications:

Classification	Definition
A – Documentary Evidence	Directly visible in screenshots or messages.
B – Apparent Firsthand Observation	Participant describes something they indicate they personally observed.
C – Reported Information	Participant relays information attributed to another person.
D – Opinion/Interpretation	Personal belief, evaluation, or conclusion.
E – Requires Corroboration	Issue identified but not independently established by the available materials.

Investigative Issue Matrix

Issue	Supporting Evidence	Classification	Status
Communications with Southwest Regional Director	Text message screenshots	A	Documented
Anonymous coach discussions	Text message screenshots	A	Documented
Questions regarding player residency	Coach communications	B/C	Requires corroboration
Questions regarding sibling eligibility	Coach communications	B/C	Requires corroboration
Team roster displayed in GameChanger	GameChanger screenshots	A	Documented
Staff assignments displayed	GameChanger screenshots	A	Documented

Archived games visible	GameChanger screenshots	A	Documented
Replay notifications	GameChanger screenshots	A	Documented
Scorekeeper names displayed	GameChanger screenshots	A	Documented
Discussions regarding historical GameChanger changes	Communications	B/C	Requires corroboration
Discussions regarding deleted schedules	Screenshots and communications	A + C	Requires platform records
Community concerns	Communications	C/D	Reported information
Parent dissatisfaction	Communications	C	Reported information
Coaching evaluations	Communications	D	Opinion

Evidence Strength Assessment

Strong Documentary Evidence

The following categories are directly documented:

- Text messages exchanged.
- Screenshots of GameChanger pages.
- Team roster displays.
- Staff pages.
- Player lists.
- Archived game listings.
- Replay notifications.
- Scorekeeper attribution.
- Administrative permission pages.

These items establish what was visible at the time the screenshots were captured.

Moderate Evidentiary Support

The following categories are supported by participant statements but would benefit from additional documentation:

- Descriptions of historical GameChanger activity.

- Discussions of archived scorebooks.
- Statements about player participation.
- Descriptions of internal league discussions.

These statements may identify valuable investigative leads but should not be treated as independently verified facts.

Limited Evidentiary Support

The following categories consist primarily of opinions or reported information:

- Evaluations of player ability.
- Speculation regarding motives.
- Predictions regarding community reactions.
- Opinions concerning coaching decisions.

These statements are useful for understanding context but have limited evidentiary weight.

Investigative Questions Matrix

Question 1

Were eligibility questions discussed?

Answer

Yes.

The communications repeatedly discuss:

- residency,
- sibling participation,
- league boundaries,
- and registration timing.

Evidence

Documented text messages.

Question 2

Were GameChanger records examined?

Answer

Yes.

The screenshots document:

- archived games,
 - roster pages,
 - staff pages,
 - notifications,
 - permissions,
 - and player listings.
-

Question 3

Were concerns communicated to regional leadership?

Answer

Yes.

Messages to the Southwest Regional Director document that concerns were communicated before tournament play.

Question 4

Does the evidence establish that GameChanger records were improperly modified?

Answer

Not from the materials reviewed alone.

The report documents:

- discussions about possible changes,
- screenshots showing GameChanger at different times,
- and reports from participants.

Determining whether records were modified, and if so why, would require additional evidence such as platform audit logs or administrative records.

Question 5

Does the evidence establish that any player was ineligible?

Answer

No.

The communications raise questions and identify issues for review, but they do not include the official eligibility documentation necessary to reach definitive conclusions.

Investigative Gaps

The following evidence was not available for review:

- Official tournament affidavits.
 - Residency verification documents.
 - School attendance records.
 - Little League waiver approvals.
 - GameChanger administrative audit logs.
 - Official scorebook exports.
 - Regional eligibility review documents.
 - Written witness statements beyond the text messages.
-

Recommended Additional Evidence

To strengthen the evidentiary record, the following materials would be valuable if available through lawful means:

1. Official Team Oklahoma tournament affidavit.
2. Little League eligibility verification documents.
3. GameChanger administrative activity logs.
4. Archived scorebook exports.
5. Registration records.
6. Publicly available tournament records.
- 7.

CHAPTER 10 Conclusions and Recommendations

Overall Assessment

The communications and documentary evidence reviewed provide a detailed contemporaneous record of concerns raised before the 2026 Little League Southwest Regional Tournament. The materials demonstrate a sustained effort to preserve information, compare records, and notify regional leadership of reported concerns.

The report also illustrates the importance of distinguishing between:

- documented screenshots and messages,
- participant observations,
- reported information,
- and personal opinions.

Maintaining these distinctions is essential to ensuring that the report remains objective and useful to readers.

Key Findings

Based on the materials reviewed:

1. Communications occurred over multiple days leading up to the tournament.
 2. Regional leadership received documented notifications regarding reported concerns.
 3. Participants actively sought to preserve documentary evidence, including screenshots and GameChanger records.
 4. Questions regarding eligibility and GameChanger activity were discussed extensively.
 5. The available materials identify issues for further review but do not, by themselves, establish rule violations or misconduct.
-

Recommendations

1. Preserve all original screenshots and message exports with metadata where possible.
 2. Maintain the anonymity of individuals who requested confidentiality unless they choose to identify themselves or are otherwise lawfully disclosed.
 3. When presenting this report publicly or to officials, clearly distinguish documented facts from reported information and opinions.
 4. If further review is warranted, seek official records (eligibility documents, GameChanger records, or other contemporaneous documentation) through appropriate channels.
 5. Update this report if additional evidence becomes available, documenting any new findings separately from the existing record.
-

Final Remarks

This report is best understood as an **investigative chronology and evidence organization tool**. It preserves communications and documentary records in a structured format, highlights recurring themes, and identifies areas where additional factual development would be necessary. By separating documented evidence from participant reports and interpretations, it provides a transparent foundation for any future review while avoiding conclusions that are not supported by the current record.

APPENDIX A

Comprehensive Investigative Findings

Executive Investigative Findings

After reviewing the complete collection of communications and documentary exhibits, several consistent investigative themes emerge. These findings are limited to what is supported by the materials reviewed and should not be interpreted as definitive findings of rule violations absent additional corroborating evidence.

Finding 1

Preservation of Evidence Was a Primary Objective

One of the strongest themes throughout the communications is the repeated effort to preserve contemporaneous records rather than rely on memory.

Examples include requests for:

- GameChanger screenshots.
- Archived scorebooks.
- PDF exports.
- Historical schedules.
- Replay notifications.
- Player rosters.
- Staff listings.
- Administrative pages.

Rather than immediately drawing conclusions, the communications consistently sought documentation that could later be compared against official records.

Investigative Significance

This approach strengthens the credibility of the record because it emphasizes preservation of contemporaneous evidence over retrospective recollection.

Finding 2

Regional Leadership Received Notice

The screenshots document multiple communications sent to the Little League Southwest Regional Director before tournament competition.

The messages:

- identify reported concerns,
- request review,
- document that notification occurred.

The evidence establishes that communication occurred.

The screenshots reviewed do **not** establish how those communications were evaluated internally or what actions, if any, were taken in response.

Finding 3

Eligibility Questions Were Raised Before Tournament Play

The conversations repeatedly discuss:

- residency,
- league boundaries,
- sibling eligibility,
- registration timing,
- player participation.

The communications demonstrate that questions existed.

The report cannot determine whether those questions ultimately had merit because official eligibility documentation was not reviewed.

Finding 4

GameChanger Became an Investigative Resource

Initially the discussions focused upon eligibility.

Over time the investigation shifted toward documentary preservation using GameChanger.

The communications reference:

- archived games,
- scorebooks,
- replay pages,
- notifications,
- staff pages,
- permissions,
- player pages.

The screenshots preserve those application displays at specific moments in time.

Finding 5

Anonymous Source Demonstrated Caution

Throughout the communications the anonymous coach repeatedly requested anonymity.

Reasons included concerns about:

- relationships,
- baseball community dynamics,
- possible repercussions.

The report documents those concerns without attempting to determine whether retaliation would actually occur.

Finding 6

Opinions Were Frequently Distinguished From Facts

The anonymous coach routinely differentiated between:

"I know..."

"I think..."

"I'm not sure..."

"I heard..."

This distinction is important.

It demonstrates that the participant did not present every statement as certain fact.

Instead, varying levels of confidence were expressed throughout the conversations.

Finding 7

Community Confidence Was A Reoccurring Theme

The communications extend beyond a single baseball team.

Participants express concern regarding:

- transparency,
- accountability,
- fairness,
- confidence in youth sports administration.

Those broader concerns help explain why documentary preservation became a priority.

APPENDIX B

Potential Corroborating Sources

If an independent review were conducted, the following categories of records could help confirm or refute specific questions raised in the communications:

Little League Documentation

- Tournament Affidavit.
 - Tournament Verification Packet.
 - Residency documentation.
 - School enrollment verification.
 - Approved waivers (if applicable).
 - Boundary determination records.
-

GameChanger Records

If retained by the platform or account administrators:

- Administrative audit history.
 - User permission history.
 - Lineup revision history.
 - Schedule revision history.
 - Archived scorebooks.
 - Export logs.
 - Team administration records.
-

League Records

- Registration dates.
 - Season participation records.
 - Team assignments.
 - Draft records (if applicable).
 - Tournament certification documents.
-

Witnesses

Potential firsthand witnesses could include:

- scorekeepers,

- coaches,
- league administrators,
- tournament officials,
- individuals responsible for GameChanger administration.

Any statements should be evaluated independently and compared with documentary records.

APPENDIX C

Suggested Exhibit Organization

To make the report easier to reference, assign sequential exhibit numbers.

Communications

Exhibit A-1

Communication to Southwest Regional Director acknowledging softball decision.

Exhibit A-2

Communication reporting GameChanger concerns.

Exhibit A-3

Follow-up communication to Southwest Regional Director.

Anonymous Coach

Exhibit B-1 through B-20

Chronological communications regarding:

- siblings,
- residency,
- GameChanger,
- scorebooks,
- community concerns,
- documentary preservation.

GameChanger

Exhibit C-1

Roster page.

Exhibit C-2

Player listing.

Exhibit C-3

Staff page.

Exhibit C-4

Permissions.

Exhibit C-5

Archived games.

Exhibit C-6

Replay page.

Exhibit C-7

Notifications.

Exhibit C-8

Scorekeeper attribution.

Exhibit C-9

Video clips.

APPENDIX D

Investigative Limitations

This report has several important limitations.

1. It relies on the screenshots and communications provided.
2. It does not include official Little League eligibility files or internal administrative records.
3. It does not independently verify all participant statements.
4. Screenshots capture what was visible at a particular moment but do not, by themselves, explain why information appeared or changed.

Recognizing these limitations helps ensure that the report remains balanced and evidence-based.

APPENDIX E

Future Research Opportunities

Based on the materials reviewed, future research could include broader questions about youth sports governance, such as:

- How volunteer organizations maintain transparency in eligibility decisions.
- Best practices for preserving electronic records used in tournament administration.
- Governance and accountability mechanisms for nonprofit youth sports organizations.
- The role of digital platforms like GameChanger in documenting tournament participation.

These topics align with broader discussions about governance and transparency and do not depend on the outcome of any particular eligibility question.

Closing Statement

The communications and screenshots compiled in this report provide a substantial contemporaneous record of discussions surrounding the 2026 Team Oklahoma baseball program. Their principal value lies in documenting what participants communicated, what the GameChanger application displayed at specific times, and the steps taken to preserve information and notify league leadership.

Where the record contains allegations, reported information, or opinions, those have been identified as such. Where the record contains screenshots or direct communications, those have been treated as documentary evidence of what was displayed or communicated at the time. This distinction allows the report to serve as an organized investigative resource while remaining appropriately cautious about conclusions that cannot be established from the available materials alone.

At this stage, the report is well suited to be converted into a professionally formatted publication with a cover page, table of contents, exhibit tabs, timelines, and appendices. I also recommend adding a one-page "**Standards of Objectivity and Evidentiary Use**" section at the front of the report to explain that it distinguishes documented evidence from reported information and opinions and should not be interpreted as making findings beyond what the evidence supports. This addition will strengthen the

report's credibility for a wide range of readers, including journalists, attorneys, policymakers, and sports administrators.