A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division III Membership Committee

Indianapolis, Indiana February 14-16, 2011

1. Welcome and announcements.

2. Review December 2010 teleconference minutes. [Supplement No. 1]

3. NCAA Division III Membership Committee roster. [Supplement No. 2]

4. Membership Committee SharePoint collaboration zone. [Supplement No. 3]

5. Academic and Membership Affairs (AMA) review of business practices and processes.

6. NCAA Division III governance and identity update. [Supplement Nos. 4 and 5]

   - Convention attendance. [Supplement No. 6]

7. White paper recommendations.

   - Division II as a destination.

     (1) White paper. [Supplement No. 7]

     (2) Joint meetings with NCAA Division II Membership Committee. [Supplement No. 8]

8. Provisional/reclassifying members.

   a. Current roster of provisional and exploratory members. [Supplement No. 9]

   b. Program and education timeline. [Supplement No. 10]

- Year-two videoconference evaluation form. [Supplement No. 11]

c. Committee mentor.

- New assignments.

d. Review year-three preliminary program assessments. [Supplement No. 12]

- Spalding University. [Supplement No. 13]

e. University of New Orleans. [Supplement No. 14]

f. Centenary College (Louisiana) – reclassifying session. [Supplement No. 15]

9. Active members.

a. Active member requirements/audits.

(1) Sports-sponsorship audit. [Supplement No. 16]

(2) Athletics program assessment.

(a) Maine Maritime Academy. [Supplement No. 17]

(b) New York City College of Technology. [Supplement No. 18]

(3) 2011 NCAA Convention attendance – attendance requirement.

(a) Staff decisions and authority. [Supplement No. 19]

i. Keystone College. [Supplement No. 20]

ii. University of Maine, Farmington. [Supplement No. 21]

iii. State University of New York at Oneonta. [Supplement No. 22]

iv. Rhode Island College. [Supplement No. 23]

v. U.S. Merchant Marine Academy. [Supplement No. 24]

vi. Waynesburg University. [Supplement No. 25]

(b) Waiver requests.

- Southern Vermont College. [Supplement No. 26]

(4) NCAA Division III Institutional Self-Study Guide audit. [Supplement No. 27]

- Wilmington College. [Supplement No. 28]

b. Active member education.

(1) 2011 NCAA Regional Rules Seminars topics. [Supplement No. 29]

(2) National Association of Division III Athletic Administrators.

(3) *Getting in the Game* educational product. [Supplement No. 30]

(4) Institutional Self-Study Guide and NCAA Division III Conference Self-Study Guide updates. [Supplement Nos. 31 and 32]

- Multi-division institutions.

(5) Multi-divisional institution education. [Supplement No. 33]

c. Review waiver report. [Supplement No. 34]

10. Conference membership.

a. NCAA Constitution 3.3 (member conference). [Supplement No. 35]

b. Single-sport conference update. [Supplement No. 36]

c. Men's volleyball conference applications.

11. Consortium agreement – Husson University. [Supplement No. 37]

12. New England compliance seminar and virtual focus group results. [Supplement Nos. 38 and 39]

13. Legislative referrals/consideration.

    a. NCAA Division II Proposal No. NC-2011-14. [Supplement No. 40]

    b. NCAA Division III Bylaw 20.11.3.8.4 (counting multiteam events in individual sports). [Supplement No. 41]

14. 2011 meeting schedule.

    a. In-person meeting.

        - June 22-24, 2011, Indianapolis, Indiana.

    b. Teleconferences: 1 - 3 p.m.

        (1) March 10;

        (2) April 14;

        (3) May 12;

        (4) June 9;

        (5) July 14;

        (6) August 11;

        (7) September 8;

        (8) October 13;

        (9) November 10; and

        (10) December 8.

c. Appeal teleconferences.

(1) April 7;

(2) July 14; and

(3) October 13.

15. 2012 in-person meeting dates selection. [Supplement No. 42]

a. February; and

b. June.

16. Other business.

17. Adjournment.

MINUTES OF THE

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

NCAA National Office
Indianapolis, Indiana

February 14-16, 2011

Participants:

Stefanie Baker-Watson, North Central College
Chris Graham, Midwest Conference
Charles Harris, Averett University
Dale Knobel, Denison University
Marybeth Lennox, Green Mountain College
Shana Levine, Washington and Lee University, Chair
Christopher Ragsdale, Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference
Charlyn Robert, Nichols College
Rubin Stevenson, Frostburg State University
Azure Davey, NCAA
Kristin Nesbitt, NCAA, recording secretary
Jean Orr, NCAA

Karen E. Tompson-Wolfe, Westminster College (Missouri) was unable to participate at the in-person meeting. Dan Dutcher, Amy Huchthausen, and Leah Kareti; NCAA, were in attendance for portions of the meeting.

[Note: These minutes contain only actions taken (formal votes or stated "sense of the meeting") in accordance with NCAA policy regarding minutes of all Association entities. While certain items on the committee's agenda were acted on at various times throughout the meeting, all final actions within a given topic are combined in these minutes for convenience of reference.]

The NCAA Division III Membership Committee meeting was called to order at 8:11 a.m. Eastern time by the chair. All members were present as noted above.

1. Welcome and Announcements. The Membership Committee and all attendees introduced themselves. The committee took the opportunity to welcome the two new committee members to the group.

2. Review December 2010 Teleconference Minutes. The committee reviewed the minutes from the December 10, 2010, teleconference.

   It was VOTED

   "That the minutes of the December 10, 2010, teleconference be approved as written."

3. Membership Committee Roster and Committee Zone. The committee reviewed the roster and it was noted that staff should be contacted if information needs to be changed. Staff provided the committee with an overview of the collaboration zone and provided instructions on how to navigate the site to conduct committee business.

4. Academic and Membership Affairs Review of Business Practices and Processes. Amy Huchthausen provided the committee with information regarding a department-wide review of business practices and processes in the academic and membership affairs department at the NCAA national office. The staff discussed the primary goals of the review as they concern committee business.

5. NCAA Division III Governance and Identity Update. The committee reviewed the strategic positioning platform. Dan Dutcher provided the committee with an update on the Division III identity initiative and goals for the upcoming year for the Division III governance structure. The committee received information from the staff regarding the membership's desire for customizable identity videos that enable them to personalize the identity message. Additional ideas the staff informed the committee about included the concept of holding a "Division III Week" that would feature academic, athletics, and community service-based activities centered on the themes of the Division III platform. Committee members noted the need to reach out to the high school community with the Division III message. Staff agreed with this suggestion and discussed strategies for reaching this group, due to its leadership being more fragmented than that of the organization of the NCAA. Committee members raised the idea of engaging sports information directors through a dedicated individual. The staff noted that Division II has outsourced that responsibility to an external group. .

6. White Paper Recommendations. The NCAA staff provided the committee with an overview of the Division III White Paper focusing on Division II as a membership destination. The committee reviewed the agenda for the Division II and Division III Membership Committee joint meeting, at which the two committees would get to know

the structure of each division's membership processes and better educate themselves to improve both groups' ability to advise prospective NCAA institutions as to which division may be the best fit. The committee also discussed addressing the potential impact on Division III of membership policies that have recently been enacted in Division I and Division II.

7. Current Provisional/Reclassifying Member Program.

a. Current Roster of Provisional and Exploratory Members. The committee reviewed the provisional/reclassifying roster and verified the information was correct.

b. Program and Education Timelines. The committee reviewed the provisional/reclassifying process timeline and the programming that is provided. The committee made suggestions regarding the year-two videoconferences in two areas: providing optional opportunity for mentor participation and administration of the exit survey in an electronic format to enable to data comparisons from various points in the process. Staff noted the videoconferences that were conducted this year were received favorably by the participating institutions, and posited that participation in the two-year videoconference compliance session would likely create a positive trend in terms of institutions learning the legislation.

c. Committee Mentor Program – New Mentor Assignments. NCAA staff reminded the committee that with the departure of two of the previous members of the committee, there are two vacancies for institutions on the mentorship program that need to be filled. Chris Ragsdale was assigned as mentor to Franciscan University of Steubenville and Charlyn Robert was assigned to Spalding University to fill the vacancies left by the departure of Diana Schwartz and Mark Majeski. Staff noted role of a mentor and also reminded and encouraged the committee that if questions arise that are outside the scope or comfort level to use them as a resource.

d. Review Year Three Preliminary Program Assessment – Spalding University. The committee reviewed the year three preliminary program assessment for Spalding University and provided feedback to the institution. The committee noted that throughout the assessment, the institution referred incorrectly to the senior woman administrator. The institution also included a job description for a senior woman administrator, which is illegal and needs to be removed. The committee noted the institution has been involved in the process for four years and seems to be fairly

well developed. Under the subject area of sports medicine, the institution notes its reflections on hiring additional training staff. The committee requested staff verify the institution is certifying its coaching staff for CPR.

e. Other Provisional and Exploratory Member Business. The committee reviewed additional issues pertaining to the following provisional/reclassifying institutions:

(1) University of New Orleans. The committee provided the NCAA staff with feedback as to what should be communicated to the institution. The committee noted its intent to review the institution in June; however, a preliminary review of the institution's compliance with Division III membership requirements indicates that the institution is in a precarious position. Specifically, certain elements of the membership process have not been met and are now at a point at which they cannot be rectified. The committee noted that although the institution's intent is to pursue the Division II process, the institution will still be reviewed with the same standards that are applied to any institution that would go through the Division III membership process. The committee further noted the institution currently is not in good standing due to behavior that is atypical of an institution that wishes to become a member of Division III.

(2) Centenary College (Louisiana). The committee reviewed a communication from Centenary College (Louisiana) that representatives from the institution were not in attendance at the NCAA Division III provisional/reclassifying session held at the 2011 NCAA Convention. The committee noted that should other incidents occur the totality of such incidents would be considered in future decision making. The committee noted, however, that the purpose of the requirement is so that institutions participate in educational activity that provides additional information about the division and noted that during Convention, institutional representatives did attend Division III educational sessions that were presented at the event. The committee noted it would review the information on the school's program assessment in June.

8. Active Member Requirements/Audits.

a. Sports-Sponsorship Audit. Staff noted this is the first year the committee has conducted an audit that has not resulted in the need for a waiver. Staff provided the committee with an overview of the random auditing process and how those audits are done within the membership pool. The "for cause" institutions are

institutions that are known to have dropped a sport and were in danger of falling below the minimum number of sports sponsored. At the point at which the full pool is exhausted, the staff would request the committee revisit the size of the pool and how institutions are considered within the pool. The committee suggested that the audits continue to be held for the duration of the size. Noted that institutions that drop and add sports midyear are currently harder to detect, but are still reviewed through the sports-sponsorship reporting process. The staff noted that institutions that drop sports but which are not in danger of falling below the minimum sports-sponsorship requirements are not included within the pool. The next in-person meeting will feature a presentation from NCAA research staff to highlight the results of this auditing process over the past several years.

b. Athletics Program Assessment. Staff reminded the committee of the purpose of the athletics program assessment in relation to the reasons for each institution's submission of the assessment, and noted that reviews should be conducted accordingly. As a separate concern, the committee discussed whether the program assessment is itself an appropriate vehicle for truly evaluating whether an institution is compliant in sports sponsorship. The staff discussed revision of this document to better reach that concern. The committee suggested inclusion of sports demographic form as a standard attachment for the program assessment.

(1) Maine Maritime Academy. The committee noted the institution stated heavily in the beginning that their registrar and other individuals who conduct compliance duties. However, further into the document when job descriptions are discussed, institution may wish to include compliance duties within the job description of the three individuals who are specifically mentioned at the beginning of the document. The committee noted the institution has not completely shown that they have processes in place for monitoring requirements for sports sponsorship; documentation seems only to delegate the responsibility to the coaches, without providing additional clarification.

(2) New York City College of Technology. The committee noted that in light of sports sponsorship being the reason that the institution is on probation, the institution has not taken to heart the committee's suggestions as to how better to demonstrate compliance with the standards for sports sponsorship. The institution failed to include the required documentation for the completion of this assessment and the committee requests the institution resubmit by May the assessment and any documentation that has not yet been submitted. The committee also requested the review and certification of the assessment by the institution's president. The

committee was concerned with the fact that the institution's completion of the assessment is not a realistic view of their current circumstances. The committee cannot tell which sports are being sponsored given the information provided on the assessment. The committee also noted the lack of processes and procedures outlining how the institution monitors its compliance with the sports-sponsorship requirement, as well as inconsistency among the individuals who are charged with the responsibility for monitoring sports sponsorship. The committee strongly suggests that this institution enter into a mentoring relationship with a similar institution and spend time with that school to see how compliance processes are conducted. The committee noted that despite the level of effort the institution makes the institution's efforts still fall short of the standards expected for the division, and requested that a member of the committee who is a president speak one-on-one with the president of this institution.

c. NCAA Division III Institutional Self-Study Guide Audit – Wilmington College. The committee reviewed the NCAA Division III Institutional Self-Study Guide submitted by Wilmington College and provided feedback to the institution. The committee noted the institution's EADA and sports medicine sections had inconsistent responses regarding whether various administrators listed had seen those documents. The committee noted the institution's submission was otherwise adequate.

It was VOTED

"To approve the submission of Wilmington's Institutional Self-Study Guide."

9. Convention Attendance. The committee discussed several issues related to the membership requirement to attend NCAA Convention.

a. Staff Authority. The staff provided the committee with information regarding the logistical difficulties that several institutions encountered in attempting to attend Convention. In light of the extreme inclement weather surrounding Convention, the committee discussed whether to delegate authority to staff to make decisions regarding guidance for institutions in similar circumstances. The committee also reviewed the concept of "reasonable standards" for good-faith efforts to meet the attendance requirement. The committee noted the need for flexibility for institutions that are faced with such circumstances in the future, but were wary of the possibility of creating a looser standard for Convention attendance. The

committee noted the extremely low number of institutions that were not in attendance at Convention due to this circumstance. Staff noted that past incidents have created a small amount of precedent regarding circumstances surrounding personal matters (i.e., death, family emergency). The committee noted that it does not want to set specific limits, but thought that cost considerations are important factors for reviewing whether a good-faith effort was made. The committee agreed that a waiver should not be advertised, but if circumstances were to arise, would be available. The committee discussed giving staff guidance to apply a "rule of reason" in extraordinary circumstances. Staff noted the frustration of institutions that find themselves in the circumstance of needing a waiver due to their experience on the front end of the process.

It was VOTED

"To provide staff the authority to waive the requirement based on clear precedent previously granted by the committee, if the institution involved has made the appropriate arrangements to transfer its voting rights."

b. Attendance Requirement. The committee reviewed the legislation tied to Convention voting and noted the current legislation does not specifically link the membership requirement to in-person attendance at Convention. Under the current operation of the rules, the institutions that did not physically attend Convention technically have satisfied the requirement as legislated, as a delegate for their institution (the conference commissioner) did cast a vote for them at Convention.

It was VOTED

"To recommend a modification of wording to the legislation to specify "an institutional voting delegate."

c. Waiver Requests. The committee reviewed waiver requests from institutions which registered a vote, but were not in attendance at the business session.

It was VOTED

"To approve a waiver of the Convention attendance requirement per NCAA Constitution 3.2.4.15 for the University of Maine, Farmington."

It was VOTED

"To approve a waiver of the Convention attendance requirement per Constitution 3.2.4.15 for Rhode Island College."

It was VOTED

"To approve a waiver of the Convention attendance requirement per Constitution 3.2.4.15 for U.S. Merchant Marine Academy."

In coming to its decision for each institution, the committee noted inclement weather, extraordinary circumstances, the institution transferred its vote to its conference representative, and good-faith efforts by the institution to be in attendance at Convention. The staff noted that additional waiver requests arising from failure to attend Convention will be reviewed by staff under its new authority, with the outcomes of staff decision provided to the committee.

d. Voting Quorum. Staff noted that the current legislation requires a minimum of 40 individuals to constitute a divisional quorum, and a minimum of 100 individuals to constitute an association-wide quorum. Staff will review the numbers for quorum to conduct business and return to the committee with an update.

10. Active Member Education.

a. 201a NCAA Regional Rules Seminars Topics and Attendance. Staff provided the committee with an update on the topics that will be presented by the staff at the 2011 NCAA Regional Rules Seminars in May and June. Staff solicited feedback and suggestions from the committee for future years. Committee discussed the membership's desire to hear about various methods to address drug education that were more systematic and comprehensive than simply having a speaker.

b. National Association of Division III Athletic Administrators. It was noted that the National Association of Division III Athletic Administrators (NADIIIAA) Convention will run in conjunction with the Regional Rules Seminar in Dallas this year. Staff provided an overview of the topics and structure of the NADIIIAA sessions that will be conducted.

c. *Getting in the Game* Educational Product. The committee reviewed the format and offerings of the *Getting in the Game* website. The committee stressed the importance of having a video education format for the *Getting in the Game* website due to continuity of the message presented, ease of presentation to multiple groups, and the ability to create an individual opportunity for student-

athletes to be able to get the information when they are not in a group setting. The committee particularly noted the significant amount of time that is saved on each campus by the membership in not having to create the presentations that are made to their students. The staff asked whether there are additional elements that could be added to the site, given the data regarding the audience that is returning to the site. The committee discussed drug testing and sports wagering issues as examples of educational material that could be presented in this forum. The committee also liked the concept of "one-stop shop" where institutions can go to one place and be provided with a wealth of resources at their disposal.

d. Institutional Self-Study Guide and NCAA Division III Conference Self-Study Guide. Staff provided the committee an update on the Institutional Self-Study Guide (ISSG) and the NCAA Division III Conference Self-Study Guide (CSSG) regarding changes that have been made to the obligations of multidivisional institutions to Division I. The committee discussed the reasons for giving multidivisional classifications and agreed to provide three areas of educational efforts to assist multidivisional institutions in tracking their Division I responsibilities. The committee agreed to enhance the ISSG and CSSG to include a section specific to multidivisional institutions (e.g., adding a question that asks the date of an institution's last Division I rules compliance evaluation). The committee also agreed that staff should highlight the Division I compliance review requirement via the NCAA Division III Monthly Update, and emphasize NCAA Division I Regional Rules Seminars programming to Division III multidivisional institutions.

The committee also discussed whether activation of the identity initiative should be added to the CSSG. Staff noted that the next submission of the CSSG would be coming within a short period (within the next two years). In light of the timing of this requirement, the committee decided to table the issue for review at its next February meeting.

11. Review Membership Waiver Report. The committee reviewed an updated chart of membership waivers adopted since the February 2010 in-person meeting.

12. Conference Membership.

a. NCAA Constitution 3.3. The staff wishes to carry the language between both the championships legislation and the language in Constitution 3.3 for consistency purposes. Staff requested the committee discuss whether they do or do not

embrace the championship-related concept of what "core" means for membership purposes. The committee agreed that institutions should only count as core in one multisport conference. The committee discussed various benefits of being a core member of a conference, including: grant funds, voting rights, the number of Student-Athlete Advisory Committees that are sponsored, and a reduction in the number of CSSGs that are completed.

The committee discussed the nature of single-sport conferences and whether there should be an exception to the core requirement for those conferences. The committee noted the ability to get championships access drives participation in single-sport conferences because that access has effects on other aspects of the college such as retention and enrollment. The committee noted that for other groups, it is the philosophical similarity between conference institutions that drives conference membership. The committee suggested that staff review why conferences were formed prior to the adoption of automatic qualification, and investigate whether the philosophy of the institution and how that philosophy relates to that of the other institutions in the conference was a factor. If many institutions have automatic qualification as a primary motivation and that is an important aspect to institutions, the committee noted that perhaps the true issue is more to police the trend to protect against abuse.

The committee noted that although the fiscal aspects of an umbrella conference could be attractive, permitting the umbrella model degrades the philosophical aspects of conference affiliation and leads institutions to make decisions based less on affinity and more on the ability to procure automatic qualification. Staff noted that the NCAA Division III Championships Committee was opposed to the prospect of the umbrella model of conference membership because of the possibility of endangering the small conference, and the committee agreed with this view. The staff noted that future discussions would occur to explore the nonchampionships benefits of an umbrella model.

b. Single-Sport Conference Update. Staff provided the committee with an update on the outcome of the interpretation regarding conferences that have two genders participating in a single-sport conference. Staff requested feedback from the committee regarding timelines and communications to the conference. The committee suggested copying the director of athletics at the affected schools and that communication is issued within the next two weeks notifying the two-gender conference that it needs to split because it is neither a single-sport conference nor a multisport conference.

c. Men's Volleyball Conference Applications. Staff provided the committee with an update on the status of men's volleyball conference applications. Staff noted that due to timing and affiliation considerations, the staff may see more applications in the next cycle than in the current cycle.

13. Consortium Agreement – Husson University. The committee deliberated the consortium agreement between Husson University and the New England School of Communications. The staff noted that the second institution would be merged into the Division III institution. The committee noted that although student-athletes at both institutions are currently required only to be full-time students at either institution that the two institutions are integrated and from a national perspective, the consortium has met the minimum requirements for a consortium agreement under the legislation.

It was VOTED

"To approve the consortium agreement between Husson and the New England School of Communications contingent on approval of the consortium by the institution's conference. The committee noted that future approvals of the consortium agreement would be contingent on a review of the circumstances of the original approval and would not be guaranteed if changes to such circumstances were to occur. Finally, the committee noted the approval would be for the four-year period beginning 2010-11."

14. New England Compliance Seminar and Virtual Focus Group Results. The committee discussed a request from eight conferences in the New England region to conduct a compliance seminar at one of their member institutions on a biennial basis, beginning in 2012. The request also seeks for these institutions to be able to count the compliance seminar toward their once-in-three-years requirement to attend the Regional Rules Seminars. The committee noted various considerations that should be addressed, including administrative concerns such as the decreased ability for staff to do their work because of the technical limitations of an on-campus format, and the ability to schedule the event with the NADIIIAA forum. Because of the loss of the benefits of a larger-scale national event, the committee agreed should the request be granted, there should be a minimum required number of confirmed attendees for the pilot event, and that multiple attendees from each institution should be expected to be in attendance.

The committee discussed re-routing grant funding toward institutions that still have to travel for compliance seminars. The committee viewed networking as more of a perk associated with the seminars than a full consideration. The committee discussed the use of technology as a supplemental method to provide more utility to the membership in

educational endeavors, especially when cost concerns are taken into consideration; however, the committee strongly prefers the in-person format. The committee discussed extending the pilot for a second year to develop a technology-based model for year-two attendance, but committee members expressed concern with technology-based education taking the place of in-person education in satisfaction of the once-in-three-years requirement. In voicing that concern, the committee noted the importance of the connection between institutions and that in-person fellowship. The committee also noted that permitting the technological option to count for the membership requirement would lead to institutions simply fulfilling the requirement in that way each cycle, with the communal aspect of the compliance seminars being lost.

Committee members noted that the information that is presented to the membership in person at the compliance seminars is usually not fully expressed in the PowerPoint presentations that go along with those sessions. The concept of the coaches' test was brought up, and the staff noted that continuing education may be a more proper avenue for teaching the membership about the rules, as opposed to conducting an annual open-book test. The committee asked the staff to develop models to explore the use of technology to drive compliance education, keeping the concerns that had been discussed in mind. Various models were discussed including: videoconferencing where presentations are given live by the staff to a smaller group; the provision of "heavy information" PowerPoint presentations that provide actual educational content (as opposed to outlines); and comprehensive educational videos (longer format, not digital "shorts") filmed by staff with the added component of a live individual from the staff (either in person, or via videoconference) to address questions raised by coaches and administrators.

It was VOTED

"To approve a pilot compliance seminar for the purpose of gathering additional information to determine whether the idea is feasible on a permanent basis; further, to approve the staff's exploration of additional compliance-based educational models."

Staff asked the committee for feedback as to how the membership could be incentivized to use whatever product would then be provided. The committee discussed linking participation to some measure to ensure use of the educational product. Committee members noted that various institutions have on-campus requirements to certify that rules education has occurred with their coaching staff, and that concept could be expanded to a requirement from the division. Committee instructed the staff to provide the NADIIIAA president with formal notification of the pilot program, given the possible impact on that group's attendance rates. Staff noted that similar tracking will be done at the Regional Rules Seminars so as to compare with the pilot seminar.

15. Legislative Referrals/Consideration. The committee reviewed legislation related to restricted membership status and examined the impact on institutions and student-athletes if the catastrophic-injury insurance was lost during the restricted membership category.

    a. Men's NCAA Division II Proposal No. NC-2011-14. The committee reviewed noncontroversial legislation that was adopted in Division II.

       It was VOTED

       "To recommend noncontroversial legislation to amend NCAA Division III Bylaw 20.2 (establishment of and compliance with division criteria) to clarify that the Membership Committee has the jurisdiction to impose any penalties for membership requirements that are discovered during the enforcement process and will notify the NCAA enforcement staff and the NCAA Division III Committee on Infractions of any action taken by the Membership Committee."

    b. Division III Bylaw 20.11.3.8.4. The committee discussed the application of the multiteam contest legislation and took no action. The committee was loath to change the legislation in light of the potential for abuse. The student-athlete experience is not enhanced by counting a contest twice. The committee also noted that the option already exists for institutions that are able to set up their scoring correctly, and the sentiment was the majority of institutions were able to do so within the operation of the legislation.

16. Franciscan University of Steubenville. The committee reviewed a waiver request from Franciscan University of Steubenville to use a nonchampionship sport to meet the sports-sponsorship requirements.

    It was VOTED

    "To approve a waiver of the sports-sponsorship legislation contingent on the institution returning to the Membership Committee in December with an update on whether there have been any substantial changes to their circumstances."

17. Future Meeting Dates.

    a. In-Person Meeting Dates.

       (1) June 22-24; Indianapolis, Indiana.

(2) February 15-17, 2012; Indianapolis, Indiana.

b. Teleconferences. The committee allotted two hours for each teleconference. The teleconferences will begin at 1 p.m. Eastern time and take place on the second Thursday of each month as follows:

(1) March 10;

(2) April 14;

(3) May 12;

(4) June 9;

(5) July 14;

(6) August 11;

(7) September 8;

(8) October 13;

(9) November 10; and

(10) December 8.

c. Appeal teleconferences.

(1) April 7;

(2) July 14; and

(3) October 13.

18. Other Business. None.

19. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 9:33 a.m. Eastern time.

# # # # #

MINUTES OF THE

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

DIVISION II AND DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE JOINT MEETING

NCAA Hall of Champions
Indianapolis, Indiana

February 15, 2011

Participants:

NCAA Division II Membership Committee Members: Barry Blizzard, West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, David R. Brunk, Peach Belt Conference, Rick Cole Jr., Dowling College, President Philip Gerbino, University of the Sciences, Dan Mara, Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference, Sandra Michael, chair, Holy Family University, Monique Morgan, Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association, Erin O'Connell, Seattle Pacific University, Kim Pate, vice chair, Brevard College, Steven Rackley, University of Findlay, Karen L. Stromme, University of Minnesota, Duluth, Brian Swanson, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona and Sue Willey, University of Indianapolis.
NCAA Division III Membership Committee Members: Stefanie Baker-Watson, North Central College, Chris Graham, Midwest Conference, Charles Harris, Averett University, Dale Knobel, Denison University, Marybeth Lennox, Green Mountain College, Shana Levine, Washington and Lee University, Chair, Christopher Ragsdale, Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference, Charlyn Robert, Nichols College and Rubin Stevenson, Frostburg State University.
Dan Calandro, NCAA
Azure Davey, NCAA
Dan Dutcher, NCAA
Bernard Franklin, NCAA,
Leah Kareti, NCAA
Kristin Nesbitt, NCAA, recording secretary
Delise O'Meally, NCAA
Jean Orr, NCAA
Mike Racy, NCAA
Jess Rigler, NCAA
Leslie Schuemann, NCAA
Terri Steeb, NCAA
Stephanie Smith, NCAA

[Note: These minutes contain only actions taken (formal votes or stated "sense of the meeting") in accordance with NCAA policy regarding minutes of all Association entities. While certain items on the committee's agenda were acted on at various times throughout the meeting, all final actions within a given topic are combined in these minutes for convenience of reference.]

The NCAA Division III Membership Committee joint meeting was called to order at 1:02 p.m. Eastern time by Ms. Davey. All members were present as noted above.

1. Welcome and Announcements. The joint committee and all attendees introduced themselves. The chairs of both NCAA Division II and Division III Membership Committees took the opportunity to welcome participants to discussion.

2. Background and Purpose of Annual Joint Meeting. The NCAA staff presented the joint committee with its goals for meeting. The joint committee was convened to provide both divisions with a better understanding of each division's membership process, educational timelines and processes, and core concepts and initiatives. Mr. Dutcher provided the participants with background information as to where the concept of a joint meeting began in Division III. Mr. Dutcher discussed the Division III white paper in which Division III governance noted concern among Division III membership that external NCAA applicants viewed conditions of Division III membership as merely making the promise not to award athletics financial aid, or came to their interest in Division III by the mistaken assumption that Division III was the easiest of the three divisions to join based on cost effectiveness.

   Ms. Schuemann noted that Division II's Membership Committee was charged with shaping its policies and procedures for membership affiliation to be conducted in line with the Division II strategic platform. To that end, Division II conducted research into its institutions and their funding models and developed a cost analysis tool. Division II also studied past institutions and their transition into the division and developed a feasibility study to address the issue of institutions not conducting a thorough assessment of their institution prior to joining the division. The ultimate result of these changes is that the Division II membership process is a selective, rigorous process that accepts only those institutions that truly conform to the Division II model. As part of the Division II membership exploration process, the Division II Membership Committee strongly suggests that institutions wishing to join Division II undergo additional education about the processes in both Division I and Division III, to ensure that Division II is the best fit.

3. NCAA Executive Committee Working Group on Membership. Staff noted the working group was convened at the Association-wide level to address the issue of membership growth as a whole. The current charge of the working group was sparked by discussions with the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) about programmatic alliances. The NCAA Executive Committee was provided information from those discussions and ultimately decided that membership growth for the entire Association

should be reviewed by first taking in mind whether the Association, as a private organization, has a legal obligation to grow its membership.

The staff provided the joint committee with additional information on the discussion of growth potential and the source of new additions to the NCAA. The working group reviewed both four-year and two-year associations and determined that the primary driver for growth, would NCAA growth continue, would likely be based in NAIA institutions. Other factors that would come into play could be explored via scenario forecasting under various conditions. Staff also noted the potential impact of membership moratoriums on various constituencies, given the federated structure of the Association. The liaisons to the Executive Committee requested feedback from the participants regarding these issues.

Staff noted that some institutions may not be viable members of any of the three NCAA divisions. Staff noted the narrowing of opportunities for an institution to become a member of Division I, as well as internal struggles at some current Division I institutions to meet the requirements of that division.

4. New Member Educational Processes – Divisional Overviews.

a. Division II. The Division II Membership Committee chair provided the group an overview of the Division II membership process. The Division II Membership Committee noted the $14,000 annual fee for the membership application process goes toward vendors that conduct several reviews of applicant institutions throughout the process to assist the committee with compliance assessment. The initial review of an applicant institution is a snapshot of the institution at exactly where they are at the start of the application process, to determine not only whether the institution is meeting the minimum requirements for Division II membership, but also to ascertain philosophically, how close that school is to the model Division II institution.

A Division II applicant institution is given the latitude to choose three Division II institutions that they believe most accurately represent the sort of institution they wish to be. Those choices become a short list from which the Division II Membership Committee selects one to be visited by the applicant institution. The Division II Membership Committee noted its philosophy that when the official application for membership is made, that the institution has already reviewed the necessary information through the feasibility study and has committed to joining Division II. The Division II membership liaisons noted that there is no one common reason as the cause of an institution to be held back in the Division II membership process.

b. Division III. The Division III Membership Committee chair provided the group with an overview of the Division III membership process. The Division III Membership Committee noted that a key difference from the requirements of the Division II Membership Committee lies in the timeline for which an applicant institution must be in full compliance with the Division III legislation. The Division III membership process involves a one-time fee of $20,000 for participation in the process. The Division III membership process has an additional component to provide for a consolidation of the third and fourth years of the membership process, reserved for those extraordinary institutions that have demonstrated a level of excellence that the committee believes demonstrates that it is appropriate to accelerate.

The Division III Membership Committee noted that sports sponsorship is the main reason for which an applicant institution would be held back in the Division III membership process. Division III has a best practices document that is provided to institutions that are on probation, but there is not a document laying out what a model Division III institution looks like because of the diverse nature of Division III institutions. The Division III liaisons noted the number of independent institutions in Division III has dropped significantly from what was nearly a quarter of the division in the past. Applicant institutions typically attempt to find a conference affiliation at the outset of the Division III process due to the weight that conference affiliation plays in determining the entering class for the first year of provisional membership.

5. NCAA Educational Efforts Prior to Divisional Application. The committee reviewed a divisional comparison document created by the NCAA research staff, highlighting the strategic plans, facts and figures of both divisions.

a. Division II Values Study – Executive Summary. The Division II Membership Committee provided an explanation of its partial scholarship model and that model's impact on campuses. The model bolstered enrollment in new student populations and in female population, and has increased the diversity of Division II campuses. The Division II committee noted the financial simulation model has provided Division II institutions with the ability to make data-driven decisions, such as the establishment of programs in particular sports, whether to increase funding for particular scholarships, and the like.

b. Strategic Focus and Analysis. The joint committee reviewed the NCAA Executive Committee Membership Working Group's recommendation to require

a mandatory, broad-based preliminary education for institutions interested in entering the provisional or reclassifying membership process in any division. The committee discussed a potential model involving an interactive web experience in which institutions could view videos that provide the broad, initial education regarding the differences between the three divisions. Committee members proposed various elements that should be included, such as the philosophical explanations of each division and what they stand for; the nuts-and-bolts information about the minimum requirements and the strategic positioning platform; how an "average" institution in each division typically looks regarding sports sponsorship; and a map that populates and specifically details other institutions, their athletics affiliations, and the sports those institutions offer.

The site should also include a tool in which visitors to the site can input information about their institution and athletics profile and compare to active NCAA institutions. Such a tool could also compare the athletics offerings to divisional requirements (e.g., sports-sponsorship requirements). The comparative tool could also highlight areas of difference between the divisions and help institutions strategically plan and determine which division is the best choice. In the meantime, the two groups agreed to compile a list of the information that both groups consider essential to the education of potential members, and the staff will put this information together. Mr. Dutcher noted that the Executive Committee next meets in April.

Committee members noted the preference for a process that requires more thought than a simple calculator, but less effort than the comprehensive process that is done at the level of the feasibility study. The joint committee recommended that certification that education has been completed by a broader-based group of senior-level individuals beyond merely the CEO and the athletics staff of the institution should be a required part of any process that is established.

The joint committee suggested that the staff conduct a survey of institutions that have gone through the process to provide feedback as to what could have been done to better prepare them prior to their going through the membership process. The committee suggested that such a survey be comprehensive and involve individuals from all departments on campus that were impacted by the process (e.g., the registrar, financial aid, athletics).

The joint committee discussed a neutral, non-divisionally-directed review where the potential institution is provided with information on the Association as a

whole and all three divisions individually, followed by to a particular division. Staff noted that the typical response when first contacted by an institution about coming to their particular division, is an attempt to also provide information as a "concierge" of sorts. The committee also suggested a non-division specific contact or office at the NCAA that could serve as a resource for initial NCAA inquiries. This suggestion was raised when the committee considered that institutions seeking information may potentially speak to both Division II and III staff and receive a different educational process.

6. Member Conference – Legislative and Governance Concepts. The Division III Membership Committee updated the Division II Membership Committee on the addition of Athletics Direct Reports to the Management Council, and Division III's reclassification of the type of information that is reviewed by the President's Council to items that are less organizational in nature. Division III also noted that financial dashboards are likely to be piloted at the conference level in the fall.

   The Division II Membership Committee provided an overview of possible strategic growth management recommendations that Division II is exploring as alternatives to imposing a cap on the number of institutions that are permitted to be members of Division II. The list of options included increasing the minimum number of core institutions in newly-formed conferences, limiting the number of Division II conferences eligible to receive membership privileges at 24 conferences, delaying the availability of full access to conference grants and automatic qualification for NCAA championships, and denying an institution admittance into Division II unless the institution has been invited to become a member of a conference. Additional strategies have also been discussed by Division II, such as continuing to increase the application fee for the membership process and continuing to reduce the maximum number of institutions invited to enter the process each year.

7. Other Business. None.

8. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m. Eastern time.

# # # # #