

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 7-9, 2011

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

a. Administrative Regulation—Bylaw 31.3.4 (Automatic Qualification per Conference).

- (1) Recommendation. To adopt an administrative regulation to amend NCAA Bylaw 31.3.4 (automatic qualification) to specify each conference is permitted one automatic qualification (AQ) in each sport.
- (2) Effective. August 1, 2011.
- (3) Rationale. Current language in the NCAA Division II Manual does not place a limit on the number of AQs permitted to each conference. The recommendation codifies current practice and provides clarity and equity among all current eligible conferences.
- (4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.
- (5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

b. Noncontroversial Legislation—Playing Rules Oversight Committee Reporting.

- (1) Recommendation. To adopt noncontroversial legislation to amend Bylaw 21.8.5.2 (Championships Committee--Duties) to provide inclusion of the Playing Rules Oversight Panel (PROP) for reporting of rule changes that apply to Division II championships to be shared with the Division II Championships Committee.
- (2) Effective. Immediately.
- (3) Rationale. During the restructuring of the Division I governance structure, it was specified that the Playing Rules Oversight Panel would report to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet regarding issues related to Division I (see Bylaw 21.7.5.5.4) for sharing of information only. The change did not amend the legislation for PROP in Bylaw 21.1. The Division II legislation for the Championships Committee does not have similar language requiring PROP to report issues related to Division II and the language would provide consistency across divisions.
- (4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

- (5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

a. Conference Alignment and Regionalization.

- (1) Recommendation. To place the Great American Conference (GAC) in the South Central region for the 2011-12 academic year; and in 2012-13 the Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association (MIAA) and GAC will join the Central region and the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference (RMAC) will join the South Central region.
- (2) Effective Date. August 1, 2011.
- (3) Rationale. The creation of a new conference, the GAC, requires realignment within the Division II regionalization model for championships selections. The GAC will consist of six institutions from Arkansas—the University of Arkansas, Monticello; Arkansas Tech University; Harding University; Henderson State University; Ouachita Baptist University; and Southern Arkansas University—as well as three institutions from Oklahoma—East Central University; Southeastern Oklahoma State University; and Southwestern Oklahoma State University—for a total of nine Division II institutions. The Division II Championships Committee reviewed a number of scenarios related to conference alignment and the impact on regionalization. Specific factors were considered in forwarding this recommendation that the committee felt upheld the Division II platform, including maintaining no more than three AQ conferences in each region; consideration toward projected numbers of member institutions in each region to ensure appropriate access ratios; and a transition time for institutions to either adjust or begin scheduling institutions in their new region.

The committee recommends the placement of the GAC in the South Central region in 2011-12. With this placement, the GAC will be eligible for at-large selections in 2011-12 within the region that includes the Lone Star Conference, the Heartland Conference and the Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association. Effective 2012-13, the GAC and the MIAA will move to the Central Region and the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference will move to the South Central Region. Additionally, per Bylaw 31.3.4.5, the GAC must be a multi-sport voting member conference of the Association for two consecutive academic years before being eligible for automatic qualification.

Effective 2011-12

Central Region

Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference
Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference

South Central Region

Lone Star Conference
Heartland Conference
Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association
Great American Conference (eligible only for at-large selections)

Effective 2012-13

Central Region

Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference
Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association
Great American Conference (eligible only for at-large selections)

South Central Region

Lone Star Conference
Heartland Conference
Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference

Effective 2013-14

Central Region

Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference
Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association
Great American Conference

South Central Region

Lone Star Conference
Heartland Conference
Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference

[NOTE: Bob Boerigter, commissioner of the Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association; Erin Lind and Butch Raymond, assistant commissioner/SWA and commissioner of the Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference; David Sharp, director of athletics/head men's golf coach at Ouachita Baptist University; Patsy Smith, associate athletics director/SWA at Missouri Western State University; and, J.R. Smith, commissioner of the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference recused themselves from voting due to affiliations with conferences under consideration for realignment.]

- (4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

- (5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

b. Bracket Expansions and Conference Realignment.

- (1) Men's Lacrosse Bracket Expansion.

- (a) Recommendation. In men's lacrosse, approve a bracket expansion from the current four-team bracket to an eight-team bracket, beginning with the 2012-13 season.
- (b) Effective Date. August 1, 2012.
- (c) Rationale. The NCAA Division II Men's Lacrosse Championship is currently the largest Division II finals site by attendance, with more than 22,000 fans attending last year. Sport sponsorship is growing by two institutions per year, and the growth is expected to continue. Additionally, the current four-team bracket provides the lowest access ratio to the championship within Division II. Lastly, the Division II Men's Lacrosse Championship is an important element in the overall success of the Men's Lacrosse Championships weekend, netting the NCAA more than \$3.2 million from the finals site alone last year.
- (d) Estimated Budget Impact. The net additional funding request for bracket expansion is \$103,000.

[NOTE: The Division II Planning and Finance Committee will review the funding request at its April meeting.]

- (e) Student-Athlete Impact. The opportunity for growth and access to the NCAA championship will further enhance the excitement and the number of experiences of student-athletes participating in an NCAA event. Additionally, with increased access to the championship, sport sponsorship could potentially increase because of the additional exposure of the game, as well as the opportunity for success.

- (2) Women's Lacrosse Bracket Expansion.

- (a) Recommendation. In women's lacrosse, approve a bracket expansion from the current six-team bracket to an eight-team bracket, beginning with the 2012-13 season.
- (b) Effective Date. August 1, 2012.

- (c) Rationale. The NCAA Division II Women's Lacrosse Committee rationalized that even though the Division II bracketing ratio of 1:8 will only increase the field from six teams to seven, the additional institution will create imbalance in the selection process. The established seeding criterion states that each region will seed the top three teams from each region; subsequently, a seven-team bracket would not allow for an equal selection of teams from each region.

Conversely, expanding the bracket to eight teams would remove any conflict of deciding which team and which region should receive a bye, since an eight-team bracket would have no bye games. Additionally, an equal number of teams will be selected from each region, which will create an equal bracket. Lastly, Division II women's lacrosse is projected to increase in sponsorship numbers, and the added two first-round games of an eight- team bracket will create more exposure for the sport.

- (d) Estimated Budget Impact. There will be no impact, as there is a surplus in the budget that would fund the expansion to eight teams. The budget increased in 2008-09 from \$56,000 to \$113,000. This was due to the expansion from four to six teams. This unintended surplus will cover the increase in travel and per diem. Thus, this increase will subsidize the expansion from six to eight teams.

Eight-Team Bracket	
Per Diem Increase Per Day (Travel Party Size of 30)	\$5,400
Addition of Two first-round games	
2008-09 Average doubled	\$4,491.98
2009-10 Average doubled	\$2,339.76
<i>Note: Per diem used is based on projected 2013 per diem of \$90 per day.</i>	

- (e) Student-Athlete Impact. A more competitive tournament will be created by expanding the bracket to eight teams, which will stimulate the regional base and promote better attendance. Student-athletes will benefit by the creation of more opportunities for institutions to participate in the championship tournament.

(3) Women's Lacrosse Regional Realignment.

- (a) Recommendation. In women's lacrosse, to expand from two to four regions. The four regions would include Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, West and South regions.
- (b) Effective Date. August 1, 2012.
- (c) Rationale. The committee believes the increase in sport sponsorship, in conjunction with the growth of schools outside the established regions, will create a more competitive and balanced bracket. In addition, the proposed bracket expansion would allow for four regional first-round games instead of two.
- (d) Estimated Budget Impact. The realignment will have a positive budget impact because more first-round games will be played in closer proximity to participating institutions instead of teams traveling further distances; therefore, travel costs will have the potential of decreasing. (For example, currently, if Tiffin University was to play Saint Anselm College—both institutions are aligned in the North region—one institution will incur a flight because they are approximately 770 miles apart, an estimated cost of \$38,115. However, with the proposed realignment, Saint Anselm would not be able to play Tiffin until the semifinals, as they would be in different geographical regions.)
- (e) Student-Athlete Impact. Student-athletes will benefit because the realignment will create a more diverse bracket. Institutions would have the potential to play non-conference games in the first round. Also, institutions will not have to travel as far to a first-round game, which will save them time on the road.

(4) Men's and Women's Indoor Track and Field Bracket Expansion.

- (a) Recommendation. That the number of student-athletes selected to the indoor track and field championships be increased from 200 to 270 student-athletes per gender.
- (b) Effective Date. August 1, 2012.
- (c) Rationale. Currently, the access ratio for the indoor track and field championships is 1:20 for men and 1:19 for women, which is higher than other access ratios for Division II individual-team championships. The proposed increase in participant numbers

would result in a ratio of approximately 1:15 for men and 1:14 for women, bringing the numbers more in line with ratios of other Division II championships. The increased numbers will still provide for a competitive atmosphere at the championships, while providing more qualified student-athletes the opportunity to compete at the national championships. The committee is certain that, logistically, the meet could still be run over a two-day period, even with the addition of the 3,000-meter run. The sport committee also feels that the changes would not limit or restrict the current pool of hosts.

Additionally, the number of student-athletes participating in both men's and women's indoor track and field has increased significantly over the past five years, resulting in a higher access ratio each year. If the trend continues, the access ratio will continue to increase for both genders.

A proposal to increase participant numbers for the indoor track and field championships was discussed at the USTFCCCA convention in December. The proposal that was approved (109 in favor and nine opposed) at the convention and submitted to the track and field committee for review is an increase to 292 participants per gender. The track and field committee reviewed the numbers and determined that 270 participants per gender would improve the access ratio, while maintaining the current format for the meet, with the capability to add the 3,000-meter run.

- (d) Budget Impact. The projected expense increase is \$150,000 for the men's championships and \$148,000 for the women's championships. Over the past two fiscal years (2008-09 and 2009-10 championship seasons) there has been an average budget surplus of \$34,649 for the men's championships and \$21,706 for the women's championships. When adding 10 percent to expenses incurred over the past two years to account for unexpected increases in future years, the expected expense is \$152,101 for the men's championships and \$164,188 for the women's championships. Please note that this does not account for an increase in the budget for the championships.

[NOTE: The Division II Planning and Finance Committee will review the funding request at its April meeting.]

- (e) Student-Athlete Impact. The additional numbers will provide more opportunities for qualified student-athletes to compete nationally at the championship finals.

(5) Men's and Women's Indoor Track and Field 3,000-meter run event.

- (a) Recommendation. That the 3,000-meter run be added as an event for the NCAA Division II Men's Indoor Track and Field Championships and the NCAA Division II Women's Indoor Track and Field Championships, pending an approval of the recommendation for an increase in participant numbers for the indoor track and field championships.
- (b) Effective Date. August 1, 2012.
- (c) Rationale. The 3,000-meter run is an event that is typically conducted at collegiate indoor track and field meets throughout the regular season. It is also conducted as an international event and is currently run at the NCAA Division I Indoor Track and Field Championships. Adding the 3,000-meter run would provide an opportunity for the shorter distance student-athletes to compete nationally at the championships.

The committee is certain that, logistically, the meet could still be run over a two-day period with the addition of the 3,000-meter run. The committee also feels that the changes would not limit or restrict the current pool of hosts.

This proposal was discussed at the U.S. Track and Field and Cross Country Coaches Association (USTFCCCA) convention in December and moved forward with strong support by the coaches (84 percent in favor).

- (d) Budget Impact. The budget impact for adding the 3,000-meter run is reflected in the estimated budget impact for increasing the participant numbers for the championships. If the proposal to increase the participant numbers for the indoor track and field championships is not approved, the NCAA Division II Men's and Women's Track and Field Committee would ask the Championships Committee to review a proposal to add an appropriate number of student-athletes per gender to accommodate the 3,000-meter run.
- (e) Student-Athlete Impact. Student-athletes would have the opportunity to compete at the national championship level in an event in which they compete throughout the indoor track and field season.

(6) Men's and Women's Outdoor Track and Field Bracket Expansion.

- (a) Recommendation. That the number of student-athletes selected to the NCAA Division II Men's and Women's Outdoor Track and Field Championships be increased from 310 to 377 student-athletes per gender.
- (b) Effective Date. August 1, 2012.
- (c) Rationale. Currently, the access ratio for the outdoor track and field championships is 1:17 for men and 1:16 for women, which is higher than other access ratios for Division II individual-team championships. The proposed increase in participant numbers would result in a ratio of approximately 1:14 for men and 1:13 for women, bringing the numbers more in line with ratios of other Division II championships. The increased numbers will still provide for a competitive atmosphere at the championships, while providing more qualified student-athletes the opportunity to compete at the national championships. The committee is certain that, logistically, the meet could still be run over a three-day period with the additional numbers. The committee also feels that the changes would not limit or restrict the current pool of hosts.

Additionally, the number of student-athletes participating in both men's and women's outdoor track and field has increased significantly over the past five years, resulting in a higher access ratio each year. If the trend continues, the access ratio will continue to increase for both genders.

A proposal to increase participant numbers to 377 per gender for the outdoor track and field championships was discussed at the U.S. Track and Field and Cross Country Coaches Association (USTFCCCA) convention in December, and was voted through with 109 in favor and nine opposed.

- (d) Budget Impact. The projected expense increase is \$133,000 for the men's championships and \$141,000 for the women's championships. Over the past two fiscal years (2008-09 and 2009-10 championship seasons), there has been an average budget surplus of \$84,668 for the men's championships and \$87,388 for the women's championships. When adding 10 percent to expenses incurred over the past two years to account for unexpected increases in future years, the expected expense is \$99,980 for the men's championships and \$107,223 for the women's

championships. Please note that this does not account for an increase in the budget for the championships.

[NOTE: The Division II Planning and Finance Committee will review the funding request at its April meeting.]

- (e) Student-Athlete Impact. The additional numbers will provide more opportunities for qualified student-athletes to compete nationally at the championship finals.
- (7) Men's and Women's Cross Country Bracket Expansion.
- (a) Recommendation. That the number of teams and individuals selected to the NCAA Division II Men's Cross Country Championships and the NCAA Division II Women's Cross Country Championships increase from 24 to 32 per gender for teams and from 16 to 24 automatic qualifiers per gender for individuals. The top three teams from each regional meet would automatically qualify for the championships. Regions will be allotted one additional berth for each team finishing in the top eight in the previous year's national championships. This is consistent with the current procedures for selecting teams to the cross country championships, with one additional automatic qualifier for each region. The top three individuals from each regional meet who are not part of a selected team will automatically qualify for the championships. In addition, any other individuals who finish in the top five at their regional meet and are not part of a qualifying team are selected to the championships. This is consistent with the current procedures for selecting individuals to the championships, with one additional automatic qualifier for each region. The total number of competitors for each gender would increase from 184 to 248.
 - (b) Effective Date. August 1, 2012.
 - (c) Rationale. Currently, the access ratio for the cross country championships is 1:16 for men and 1:17 for women for overall individuals participating in the championships. For the team portion only, the access ratio is 1:10 for men and 1:11 for women. These numbers are higher compared to other Division II team and individual championships. The proposed increase would result in a ratio of approximately 1:13 for men and 1:14 for women for the overall individuals. The team access ratio would change to 1:7.5 for men and 1:8 for women, which brings the ratios more in line with other Division II championships. The number of student-

athletes participating in both men's and women's cross country has increased steadily over the past five years, resulting in a higher access ratio each year. If the trend continues, the access ratio will continue to increase for both genders.

The increased numbers will still provide for a competitive atmosphere at the championships. The allocation of one additional automatic qualifying team and one additional automatic qualifying individual from each region is in line with the current Division II regionalization philosophy. This proposal was discussed at the U.S. Track and Field and Cross Country Coaches Association (USTFCCCA) convention in December, and the vote was unanimously in favor of this proposal, with two abstentions.

- (d) Budget Impact. The projected increase in transportation, per diem and game expenses is \$95,000 for the men's championships and \$96,000 for the women's championships. Over the past two fiscal years (2008-09 and 2009-10 championship seasons), there has been an average budget surplus of \$113,393 for the men's championships and \$122,944 for the women's championships. When adding 10 percent to expenses incurred over the past two years to account for unexpected increases in future years, the expected expense is \$10,533 for the men's championships and \$2,827 for the women's championships. Please note that this does not account for an increase in the budget for the championships.

[NOTE: The Division II Planning and Finance Committee will review the funding request at its April meeting.]

- (e) Student-Athlete Impact. The additional team and individual berths from each region would create a more competitive atmosphere at the regional meets, and more teams and individuals will have an opportunity to represent their region nationally at the championship finals.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Championships Committee Duties and Sport Committee Liaison Assignments.** The committee recommended that the Division II Championships Committee liaisons be included on all sport committee teleconferences, participate as active members of the sport committees while reviewing and providing expertise for sport committee proposals forwarded to the Division II Championships Committee.

2. **Report of October 2010 and January 2011 NCAA Division II Management Council and Presidents Council meetings.** A brief summary of the October meeting was provided, calling attention to a report received by the Management Council from the Committee on Women Athletics (CWA) regarding its objection to the decision to permit GoDaddy.com to serve as a title sponsor for a football bowl game. It was noted that the Management Council unanimously voted to support the CWA's position regarding GoDaddy.com as a bowl title sponsor and to request that the concerns expressed by the committee be addressed in order to determine how best to ensure that future bowl sponsors are aligned with the image, values and integrity of the Association.

The Championships Committee was also updated on issues surrounding transgender student-athletes and the need for resources to protect student-athlete well-being, as well as address competitive equity issues.

The overview of the January 2011 Management Council meeting included a brief highlight of the moratorium on the creation of new Division II conferences. The Management Council agreed to establish a two-year moratorium on the acceptance of petitions for membership from new Division II conferences, beginning with the adjournment of the 2011 NCAA Convention through the adjournment of the 2013 Convention.

Also as a part of the January 2011 Management Council and Presidents Council Report, It was noted that the Management Council recommends that the President Council charge the Division II Legislation Committee to review the winter break legislation to study the feasibility of creating a 10-year rolling calendar that would continue to provide a seven-day winter break consistent for all Division II schools and would take into account the years in which December 20 would fall on a Friday, Saturday or Sunday. The Management Council discussed Convention Proposal No. 2011-9 and believes a consistent seven-day period for all schools provides for the fewest number of scheduling conflicts. This is still a legislative change so it will require a vote at the 2012 NCAA Convention.

3. **Budget Review.** Tamara Gingerich, NCAA associate director of administrative services, reviewed the current standing of the Division II championships budget and shared with the Championships Committee that Division II championship managers continue to monitor and oversee their budgets in a fiscally sound manner. A continued surplus is expected to be shown at the end of the year, barring any unforeseen circumstances (i.e., travel expenditures).
4. **Policies and Procedures Manual—Conflict of Interest Statement.** The Championships Committee approved the recusal conditions, effective immediately, to reflect consistency in policies and procedures throughout the Division II governance

structure. This language will be applied to the Division II Championships Committee policies and procedures manual.

RECUSAL CONDITIONS:

A committee member shall recuse himself or herself from discussion and deliberation if the committee member meets any of the following conditions:

- Is employed at the institution or conference office;
- Is employed at an institution in the same primary athletics conference as the participating institution or conference office;
- Is employed at an institution or conference office in the state in which the participating institution is located;
- Is a candidate for employment, or has been a candidate within the past two years, at the participating institution or conference office;
- Is an alumnus and alumna of the participating institution;
- Has previously visited the institution as a peer-review team member or as part of a regional or professional accreditation team that either put the institution on probation or terminated its accreditation;
- Is, or has been, an employee at a conference office in which the participating institution is a member within the past two years; or
- If the subcommittee member feels he or she must recuse himself or herself for any other potential conflict of interest, either real or perceived, that may exist.

5. 2011 NCAA Convention Follow-up.

- a. Legislation Adopted. Stephanie Quigg, NCAA director of academic and membership affairs, provided an update on the legislation that was adopted at the 2011 NCAA Convention. The “Life in the Balance” proposals, skill instruction legislation, and Division II wrestling proposal regarding practices and competition start dates were adopted and will become effective August 1, 2011.

- (1) Life in the Balance and Skill Instruction Legislative Proposals.

- (a) Proposal No. 2011-5 specifies that for basketball, swimming and diving, indoor and outdoor track and field, and wrestling, an

institution shall not commence preseason practice or the first date of competition before September 7 or the institution's fourth day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.

- (b) Proposal No. 2011-6 specifies that for baseball, golf, lacrosse, rowing, softball and tennis, an institution shall not commence weight training, conditioning, skill instruction or practice and competition before September 7 or the institution's fourth day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.
 - (c) Proposal No. 2011-7 amends Bylaw 17.1.6.2 so that winter and spring sport coaches would have the ability to prepare for in-season competition with team activities, including practice, from the beginning of the institution's academic year in the fall term through the day before the first permissible practice date. The same opportunity would be available for fall championship sports from the first day of classes in the winter or spring term through February 15. Skill instruction would be maintained for the development of individual student-athletes after the Division II championship until the week before the institution's final examination period.
- (2) Wrestling Proposal—Specifies that a student-athlete shall not participate in outside competition (on a team or as an individual) between the beginning of the institution's academic year and November 1; further, to specify that an institution shall not commence practice sessions prior to October 10 and shall not engage in its first date of completion with outside competition prior to November 1.
- b. Division II Strategic Priorities. It was noted that the Division II Strategic Priorities for 2011 would focus on three overarching strategies:
 - (1) Continue to emphasize the Division II "Life in the Balance" strategic positioning platform in all student-athlete well-being, regulatory, financial and membership decisions;
 - (2) Promote the institutional benefit and value of Division II membership; and
 - (3) Plan for our future success as a division, as we grow strategically and allocate our limited resources.
- c. Championships Educational Session. Championships Committee representatives Bill Fusco, Erin Lind and Butch Raymond were panelists in a session titled, "Update on Current Division II National Championships Initiatives and Prioritizing Enhancements for the Future." The session provided an update on

Division II RPI implementation and regionalization, discussion on areas of continued analysis by the Division II Championships Committee on bracket expansion, and the budget impacts along with championship long-range planning priorities. The attendees of the session executed the same priority assessment as a number of stakeholders in Division II have completed in the last year to provide further direction from all constituents in Division II.

- 6. Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) Process and Appointments.** The committee approved implementation of a fine to conferences that do not complete the RAC process and appointments by the assigned deadlines, effectively immediately.

On April 1 of the academic year, the NCAA will send a request for all RAC appointments to be submitted no later than August 1. Conferences must appoint individuals to a RAC to assist in the evaluation of teams during the selection of championship participants. The conference office must submit all RAC appointments by August 1 or a \$500 fine will be assessed. If the conference office does not complete the form correctly, a fine of \$300 will be assessed. Advisory committees do not have the authority to select teams and/or individuals; they strictly act in an advisory capacity. The final authority for selections rests with the governing sports committee. Members of the governing sports committees shall serve as chairs of the regional advisory committees.

7. Governing Sport Committee Reports.

a. Men's Golf.

- (1) Approved that Hershey, Pennsylvania, be designated as the site for the 2011 Atlantic/East super regional, with Millersville University of Pennsylvania serving as the host for the competition to be conducted at the Hershey Links Golf Club.
- (2) Approved that Conover, North Carolina, be designated as the site for the 2012 South/Southeast super regional, with Lenoir-Rhyne University serving as host for the competition to be conducted at Rock Barn Golf and Spa.
- (3) Approved that Jefferson City, Missouri, be designated as the site for the 2012 Midwest/South Central super regional, with Lincoln University (Missouri) serving as the host for the competition to be conducted at the Jefferson City Country Club.
- (4) Approved that Hershey, Pennsylvania, be designated as the site for the 2013 NCAA Division II Men's Golf Championships, with Millersville

University serving as host for the competition to be conducted at Hershey Country Club.

- (5) Approved that Kenosha, Wisconsin, be designated as the site for the 2013 Midwest/South Central super regional, with the University of Wisconsin-Parkside serving as the host for the competition to be conducted at Strawberry Creek Golf Course.

b. Men's Tennis.

- The committee approved the revised automatic qualifications made in the September 2010 report. The following 15 conferences will receive automatic qualification for the 2011 NCAA Division II Men's Tennis Championship: Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference; Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association; Conference Carolinas; Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Great Lakes Valley Conference; Gulf South Conference; Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association; Northeast-10 Conference; Peach Belt Conference; Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference; Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference; South Atlantic Conference; Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Sunshine State Conference and the West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

c. Women's Tennis.

- The committee approved the revised automatic qualification changes made in the September 2010 report. The following 19 conferences will receive automatic qualification for the 2011 NCAA Division II Women's Tennis Championship: Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference; Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association; Conference Carolinas; East Coast Conference; Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Great Lakes Valley Conference; Gulf South Conference; Lone Star Conference; Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association; Northeast-10 Conference; Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference; Pacific West Conference, Peach Belt Conference; Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference; Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference; South Atlantic Conference; Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Sunshine State Conference and the West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

| d. Men's and Women are Cross Country.

- The NCAA Division II Men's and Women's Cross Country Committee issued a misconduct penalty to Western State College of Colorado for actions taken by a cross country student-athlete at the 2010 NCAA Division II Men's and Women's Cross Country Championships. The

penalty for the misconduct was to recover per diem in the amount of \$480 that was issued to Western State for the respective student-athlete.

8. Division II Membership Process. Leslie Schuemann, NCAA assistant director of academic and membership affairs, provided an overview of the Division II membership process, information about which schools are in the process and provided information about concepts discussed at the 2011 Convention.

- a. The NCAA Division II Manual outlines the process for becoming a Division II member. The process can be found in a flowchart on page 282, Fig. 20.2, Legislation Bylaw 20.3.

The cost to enter the Division II membership process is \$28,000, which covers the first two years, and \$14,000 a year to remain in the process. Once the institution(s) reach the provisional years, they also must pay \$900 for Division II membership dues.

- b. There are currently 21 institutions in the Division II membership process.

Candidacy One (9 total): Ohio (3), South Dakota (2), California (1), Tennessee (1), Missouri (1) and Illinois (1).

Candidacy Two (7 total): Ohio (2), North Dakota (1), California (1), South Dakota (1), Missouri (1) and Vancouver, British Columbia (1).

Provisional year (5 total): California (2), Ohio (1), Missouri (1) and Arkansas (1).

Totals by state: Ohio (6), California (4), South Dakota (3), North Dakota (1), Missouri (3), Illinois (1), Tennessee (1), Arkansas (1) and Vancouver, British Columbia (1).

It was noted that some institutions in candidacy one and candidacy two are still looking for some sort of conference affiliation but many have a conference affiliation during the provisional year.

9. Score Reporting Demonstration. Amber Feldman, NCAA assistant coordinator of championships, provided a PowerPoint tutorial of how to use the NCAA score reporting system. The tutorial is not sport-specific and can be used by regional advisory and national committees. The timeline on when the tutorial will be released [has not yet been determined](#).

10. **Pilot Charter Bus Initiative.** Juanita Sheely, NCAA associate director for travel and insurance, provided overall feedback on the NCAA fall bus initiative pilot program. The pilot bus program's initial purposes are to increase efficiency. Rather than having each team be responsible for its own transportation arrangements, Short's Travel will have one point of contact operating under pre-negotiated, discounted rates that will service all participating teams. In addition, all payments will be handled by the NCAA-provider, eliminating the need for teams to pay in advance and seek reimbursement. Secondly, the pilot program will look to reduce costs, as Go Ground Transportation feels that, at a minimum, the NCAA can realize a 10 to 15 percent savings on the ground transportation costs that are currently reimbursed. The pilot bus initiative aims to improve safety as the NCAA program will develop the "gold" standard safety certification for charter bus transportation. The results of the fall program proved to be financially better than originally thought. There was a 53 percent savings overall (\$400,000) and 38 percent savings per trip (\$2,500). The pilot program will continue for team sports in winter and spring 2011.

11. **2010 NCAA Division II National Championships Festival Recap.** Amy Reis, NCAA assistant director of championships, presented a recap of the Division II Festival that crowned national champions in men's and women's cross country, field hockey, men's and women's soccer, and volleyball. The festival received exceptional service and support from the hosts, Bellarmine University, the University of Louisville and the Louisville Sports Commission. Ms. Reis gave an overall assessment of opening ceremonies at the Muhammad Ali Center, the closing ceremony at Churchill Downs, community engagement with the Louisville school district and the use of the student-athlete lounges at the hotels. Committee members who attended the festival gave positive comments on their experiences at the festival, the environment and hotel properties.

Upcoming bids are currently available for the 2012 and 2013 NCAA National Championship Festivals, with a deadline of April 15, 2011.

12. **Required On-Site Game Administrator.** The Championships Committee discussed whether Division II should have more consistency in requiring administrators to attend pre-championships meetings and be on site at the NCAA championships. The committee members did not think it was necessary for an administrator to be at all championships or practices, but felt an administrator should be required at championships for team sports. The committee will review legislative language at its June 2011 meeting.
13. **Playing Rules Oversight Panel (PROP) Report.** Bill Fusco, Division II Championships Committee liaison to PROP, indicated there were no Division II specific rule changes during PROP's last meeting. Mr. Fusco will continue to provide updates at

future Division II Championships Committee meetings when rule changes are made that affect Division II championships.

14. **RPI.** Jim Wright, NCAA director of statistics, provided historical background of how the RPI began implementation at the NCAA, stating that the statistical data's use started as a Division I program nearly 30 years ago. The three elements used in calculating the RPI are: winning percentage, opponent's winning percentage and opponents' opponents' winning percentage.

RPI takes these three elements already being used by committees, weighs them and comes up with a single team RPI. Division I usually uses RPI as a starting point for ranking. Once the sport committees see the full scope of the RPI information, the committees evaluate the individual factors to get a full assessment of the teams being considered for rankings.

Currently, Division II sports are not under any obligation to use the RPI. The use of the RPI is being evaluated at annual sports committee meetings for recommendation for implementation; and, if approved, the RPI would be implemented for team sports during the 2011-12 academic year.

The Championships Committee was reminded of a previous committee decision that determined if a sport committee decided to use the RPI, it could not add a fourth element (i.e., bonuses) for another two years after initial implementation.

15. **Code of Conduct.** This updated policy had already been approved by the committee and was presented to the committee solely so it could see the language updated in printed format. It was suggested that NCAA championships managers remind coaches of the code of conduct at the coaches meeting prior to the championships.
16. **In-Region, Non-Conference Incentive Plan.** The Championships Committee discussed the NCAA Membership Committee's recommendation for funding to serve as an incentive to encourage more in-region, non-conference competition. The Championships Committee agreed to endorse the continued study of the concept for financial incentives, which would drive more in-region, non-conference competition to assist sports committees in rankings and selections. The committee will continue discussions at its June 2011 meeting.
17. **Regional Travel Contingency Plan.** The committee approved the current implemented travel contingency plan to continue for the 2011-12 academic year. The approved contingency plan is for any regional championship site where all seven participating school teams must fly by charter or commercial means in order to reach the host site.

The travel contingency plan is outlined in execution below:

- This contingency plan shall include a two host site format in which the No. 1 seed and the No. 2 seed will host a four-team tournament. The winner of each host site will compete for the regional championship.
- The regional championship game will occur at the site of the highest remaining seed.
- The contingency plan (i.e., two-site format) shall be implemented by the governing sports committee if it is determined that a cost savings (includes travel and administrative costs) of at least **\$20,000** will occur and the plan does not result in an undue hardship, as determined by the governing sports committee, to the participating schools (e.g., the No. 1 and No. 2 hosts sites must meet regional tournament host guidelines and specifications).

- 18. Committee Nomination Process.** Sharon Tufano, NCAA committee coordinator, attended the meeting to answer questions from the committee regarding the RAC nomination and election process. At the Nominating Committee's meeting in January, the committee had five areas of focus: conference rotation, held positions (coach/administrator), regional alignment, gender/diversity and RAC experience. The Nominating Committee did not prioritize the five areas, noting that priorities are dependent on the makeup of the sport committee. Ms. Tufano will remind the Nominating Committee to forward a second candidate to the Championships Committee.

The Championships Committee made the following recommendations regarding the committee nomination process:

- a. Request to provide more thorough nomination forms to the Championships Committee (i.e., rationale).
- b. Send thank you letters to RAC members when their terms expire and indicate available national committee opportunities as a recruitment tool.
- c. Request for the Nominating Committee to check references.

- 19. Fall Championships Recap.** The 2010 NCAA Division II Football Championship marked the 25th consecutive year the championship game has been played in Florence, Alabama. This is the second longest tenured NCAA championship at any one site, only behind the Division I Men's College World Series in Omaha, Nebraska. University of Minnesota Duluth captured the championship over Delta State University by a 20-17 score, with a field goal on the final play of the game. This marked the 10th consecutive

year that the championship game has been decided by seven points or fewer. AT&T activated around the championship with an in-game text promotion, a halftime promotion and fan giveaways (e.g., fleece headband). The attendance at the championship game was lower than anticipated. The additional fall championships were summarized in the 2010 NCAA National Championships Festival recap.

20. Proposal Championships Model for Division II. A proposed championships model drafted by the commissioner of the West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference commissioner and a few other commissioners was sent to Greg Shaheen, NCAA interim executive vice president of championships and alliances. The proposal was forwarded to the Championships Committee for review and feedback.

- a. The Championships Committee appreciated Mr. Blizzard's follow-through in providing Mr. Shaheen with new ideas and concepts.
- b. The Championships Committee noted that the proposal was not endorsed by the Conference Commissioners Association. The intent was to put more emphasis on the conference tournament to enhance student-athletes championship experience financially by saving dollars at NCAA regional tournaments by putting those dollars into the conference tournaments. Yet, this model would take away from regionalization and regionalization is a core philosophy for the division. With the adoption of this model, regionalization would become obsolete.
- c. The model proposed appears similar to the old NAIA model with districts. This proposal has some fundamental flaws that would need to be worked out, and the committee did not feel Division II wants to change the Elite Eight numbers, which emphasize the Division II regional model. The Division II strategic platform and strategic plan are unique to Division II, and Division II members have done a lot to set Division II apart from the other divisions—one example being the regionalization model. The NCAA's current format reflects that with support of the eight regions in the division and is the format the Championships Committee supports.
- d. Another concern of the committee was the elimination of the regional rounds. This would limit championship opportunities, which are a staple of the Division II philosophy. It was recognized by the committee that this proposal also provided a viewpoint that if you enhance conference championships, a larger number of student-athletes will have the opportunity to compete and be provided a greater conference championship experience.
- e. The committee recommended that this type of dialogue continue within the NCAA membership to further examine possible options. These types of recommendations should initiate dialogue for further examination of the Division II championships model.

25. **Championships and Alliances.** Mr. Shaheen spoke with the Division II Championships Committee regarding the new structure of ranking and selection calls.
26. **Future Meetings.** The Championships Committee reviewed future meeting dates, noting that the committee will travel May 31, meet Wednesday, June 1, and Thursday June 2, and depart Thursday afternoon, for the summer meeting.
27. **Adjournment.** The Division II Championship Committee adjourned at 2:04 p.m., Tuesday, February 8.

Committee Chair: Bill Fusco, Sonoma State University
Staff Liaisons: Roberta Page, Championships
Amy Reis, Championships