

A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division II Championships Committee

Dempsey Building - Palmer Pierce B & C
Indianapolis, Indiana

May 30-31, 2012

1. Welcome.
2. Opening remarks and review of schedule. [Supplement No. 1]
3. Approval of February meeting and March and April teleconferences reports. [Supplement No. 2]
4. Committee roster. [Supplement No. 3]
5. Championships Committee liaison assignments. [Supplement No. 4]
6. NCAA staff assignments. [Supplement No. 5]
7. Candidacy/provisional/reclassifying chart. [Supplement No. 6]
8. Conflict of interest and recusal policy. [Supplement No. 7]
9. NCAA Championships and Alliances Guiding Principles. [Supplement No. 8]
10. Division II Strategic Positioning Platform. [Supplement No. 9] (Terri Steeb-Gronau)
11. 2012-15 Division II Strategic Plan. [Supplement No. 10] (Steeb-Gronau)
12. 2012 Division II Strategic Priorities. [Supplement No. 11] (Steeb-Gronau)

13. Report of April 2012 NCAA Division II Management Council and Presidents Council meetings. [Supplement No. 12] (Steeb-Gronau)
14. Benefits of NCAA Division II Membership Classification. [Supplement No. 13]
15. Playing Rules Oversight Panel Report (PROP). [Supplement No. 14] (Erin Lind)
16. Winter Championships Recap. [Supplement No. 15]
17. Nullification review. [Supplement No. 16]
18. Regional tournament and site selection – men’s basketball, women’s basketball and women’s volleyball. [Supplement No. 17]
19. Regionalization Update.
 - a. Great Midwest Athletic Conference (G-MAC) formation. [Supplement No. 18]
 - b. Updated regionalization maps and charts. [Supplement No. 19]
20. International membership hosts. [Supplement No. 17]
21. Non-divisional postseason hosts bid language. [Supplement P q020]
22. Championships and Alliances Update. (Mark Lewis)
23. Budget review. [Supplement No. 21] (Tamara Gingerich)
 - Go Ground and travel expense update. [Handout] (Juanita Sheely)
24. Selection criteria white paper and focus group materials. [Supplement P q022]

25. Timeline for sports committees recommendations. [Supplement No. 23]
26. Credentials types. [Supplement No. 24]
27. Future date formulas by sport. [Supplement No. 25]
28. NCAA Division II National Championships Festival. (Amy Reis)
 - a. 2012 Spring Festival - Louisville, Kentucky recap.
 - b. 2013 Winter Festival - Cleveland, Ohio update.
29. Review of regional advisory committee (RAC) processes.
 - a. RAC call schedules. [Supplement No. 26]
 - b. RAC balloting. [Supplement No. 27]
30. Championships Committee expansion. [Handout] (Steeb-Gronau)
31. Nominating Committee - Football Committee. [Supplement No. 28]
32. 2012-13 automatic qualifications. [Supplement No. 29]
33. Governing sports committee reports.
 - a. Men's basketball. [Supplement No. 30] (Donnie Wagner)
 - b. Women's basketball. [Supplement No. 31] (Roberta Page)
 - c. Football. [Supplement No. 32] (Wagner)
 - d. Women's lacrosse. [Supplement No. 33] (Michelle Forkner)
 - e. Men's soccer. [Supplement No. 34] (Russ Yurk)

f. Women's soccer. [Supplement No. 35] (Ashley Dunigan)

g. Softball. [Supplement No. 36] (Reis)

34. Other Business.

35. Future meetings schedule and teleconferences. [Supplement No. 37]

a. September 10-12; Indianapolis.

b. July 12, August 2, October 4, November 1 and December 6; teleconferences.

36. Adjournment.

MEETING SCHEDULE

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division II Championships Committee

Dempsey Building - Palmer Pierce B & C
Indianapolis, Indiana

May 29-31, 2012

Tuesday, May 29

Committee arrives.

Wednesday, May 30

8 a.m. to Noon	Meeting convenes.	Palmer Pierce B & C
Noon to 1 p.m.	Lunch served.	Palmer Pierce Atrium A & B
1 to 5 p.m.	Meeting reconvenes.	Palmer Pierce B & C
5 p.m.	Meeting recesses.	

Thursday, May 31

8 a.m. to Noon	Meeting convenes.	Palmer Pierce B & C
11:15 a.m.	Lunch served.	Palmer Pierce Atrium A & B
Noon	Meeting adjourns.	

**REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE
February 20-21, 2012 Meeting**

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- **Bylaw 31.2.1.7.1 (midseason eligibility verification form).**
 - (1) Recommendation. That the Management Council sponsor an administrative regulation to amend NCAA Division II Bylaw 31.2.1.7.1 to eliminate the requirement that an institution must submit a midseason eligibility verification form.
 - (2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.
 - (3) Rationale. This item was referred to the Championships Committee as a part of the Division II Ease of Burden Initiative (EOB). The initiative seeks to ease the monitoring burden, assist with time management and return efficiencies to the Division II membership. The committee agreed that by eliminating the mid-season verification form, efficiencies will be gained by the membership as it will be one less form that is required to be submitted.
 - (4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.
 - (5) Student-Athlete Impact. No direct impact will be felt by NCAA student-athletes other than the time made more available for institutional personnel to assist in other matters related to eligibility and code of conduct of NCAA student-athletes.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

a. Football—Teams' Arrival at the National Championship Game Site.

- (1) Recommendation. That, effective with the 2011 championship, both teams participating in the national championship game need to arrive at the finals site on Wednesday night prior to the championship game (which is conducted on a Saturday based on the championship date formula). As such, the teams would arrive at the national championship site three days prior to the game.
- (2) Effective Date. Immediate.
- (3) Rationale. The current policy is that the teams need to arrive on site for official activities, which begin at noon Central time on the Thursday prior to the national championship game. The teams have the option of either arriving on Wednesday night or Thursday morning. Based on the review of data from previous football championships, most teams already arrive on Wednesday night for the championship game, as travel on Thursday morning prior to the first required

activity has proven to be difficult. Such a change would allow the championship week itinerary to be slightly modified to allow the teams more flexibility and rest on the day prior to the national championship game. Please note that a mandatory Wednesday arrival would also ensure that the teams do not miss any of the mandatory functions on Thursday due to any possible travel delays.

- (4) Estimated Budget Impact. \$6,300. This would be the additional expense to the NCAA for an additional half-day per diem for each participating team in the national championship game. Each championship finalist is currently provided per diem for two days prior to competition, and such a policy change would require them to receive 2.5 days per diem. This is based on \$90 per day per diem in 2012 for 70 people in the official travel party for each team (\$45 extra per diem for 70 people for this half-day equates to \$3,150 per team). This would result in an additional NCAA expense of \$6,300 combined for both teams.

It is anticipated that it would cost an additional \$4,950 in maximum hotel expenses (room charges only; however, there would also be additional tax charges as well for each room) to each institution to implement this policy change. This is based on a maximum of 50 hotel rooms used in the primary team hotel at \$99 per night for each room using the 2011 team hotel room rate at one property. The institution would also have to incur meal costs for Wednesday evening, and it is hard to estimate this additional cost. If you equate the per person meal cost to \$20, this would total \$1,400 per team for one dinner meal. Finally, the participating teams would have to pay for local ground transportation expenses for one additional day. The average cost for ground transportation would be approximately \$900 for this extra day. As such, each team could conceivably have to also pay \$7,250 to arrive on Wednesday night, rather than on Thursday morning.

- (5) Student-Athlete Impact. Such a policy change would, hopefully, enhance the student-athlete experience. They would be guaranteed to have a championship experience for one additional evening. In addition, the schedule on the day prior to the national championship game would be modified to allow the student-athletes the ability to focus more on the actual game and also have some additional rest.

[NOTE: This budgetary item has been forwarded to the Division II Planning and Finance Committee for review and final approval.]

b. Men's Golf - Travel Party.

- (1) Recommendation. That the travel party be increased from six to seven effective with the 2013 NCAA Division II Men's Golf Championship.
- (2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.

- (3) Rationale. It is the committee's belief that more programs have added assistant coaches over the past few years. At both the regionals and finals sites, those assistant coaches are considered spectators as the men's golf committee has not adopted the United States Golf Association's (USGA) decision that allows a second coach to give advice. The committee has not previously adopted the decision as they believe it provides for an unfair competitive advantage for those programs that have the funds to send a second coach. However, the committee would allow the decision to provide for a second coach if the travel party were increased from six to seven to allow an assistant coach to travel with the team. The committee also believes that a travel party of six can be a safety issue as well. With fewer large passenger vans available, there have been instances in which institutions allow a student-athlete to drive a second vehicle.
- (4) Estimated Budget Impact. \$56,000 (See attachment A).
- (5) Student-Athlete Impact. Student-athletes would have greater access to coaches with a second coach permitted to give advice during the round. The recommendation could also alleviate concerns of student-athletes driving a vehicle to transport luggage and fellow players.

[NOTE: This budgetary item has been forwarded to the Division II Planning and Finance Committee for review and final approval.]

c. Women's Golf - Increase in Travel Party Size.

- (1) Recommendation. That the official travel party size be increased from six to seven, effective for the 2013 NCAA Division II Women's Golf Championships.
- (2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.
- (3) Rationale. In recommending an increase to the official travel party size for the sport of women's golf, the committee noted that it is common place during the regular season for both the head coach and assistant coach to travel with their team to tournaments. Furthermore, the committee noted that, with the rule change a year ago allowing two coaches to provide advice to players during competition, the current NCAA travel party size limits no longer include the full coaching staff (head coach and assistant coach) for reimbursement.
- (4) Estimated Budget Impact. Regional costs would be \$15,000 and final site costs would be \$16,000, resulting in a total budget impact of \$31,000.
- (5) Student-Athlete Impact. The committee felt that the student-athlete experience could be negatively impacted if, for financial reasons, an institution felt that they were not able to send their full coaching staff to the national championships.

[NOTE: This budgetary item has been forwarded to the Division II Planning and Finance Committee for review and final approval.]

- d. **Committee Reappointments.** Ratify the following sports committee extension, effective immediately. [Committee charts and nomination forms are included in Attachment B.]
- Men's Lacrosse. **Michael Cerino**, athletics director at Limestone College to extend service for a one-year appointment.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Opening Remarks and Review of Schedule.** Erin Lind, chair of the Championships Committee, introduced the new members joining the meeting: Ann Martin, director of athletics at Regis University and chair of the Division II Management Council; Lisa Sweany, director of athletics at Armstrong Atlantic State University; Frank Keenan, Division II SAAC representative; and Jarrett Newby, NCAA intern.
2. **Approval of September meetings and October through January Teleconferences reports.** The Division II Championships Committee approved the meeting minutes with minimal editorial comments.
3. **Championships Committee Roster.** The Championships Committee noted the new members (Ann Martin, Lisa Sweany and Frank Keenan) contact information provided in the updated roster.
4. **Championships Committee Liaison Assignments.** An updated NCAA Division II Championships Committee liaison assignment chart was shared, noting new committee appointments to specific sport committees.
5. **NCAA Staff Assignments.** As a standing agenda item, the Championships Committee reviewed the staff assignment listing and denoted the NCAA staff who are working with the new Championships Committee members.
6. **Report of October 2011 and January 2012 NCAA Division II Management Council and Presidents Council Meetings.** Director of Division II, Terri Steeb-Gronau, provided a brief summary of the meetings calling attention to: 1) membership statuses related to St. Andrews Presbyterian loss of accreditation and active status within Division II and the restricted membership status of Washington Adventist; 2) review of the "Ease of Burden" initiatives; 3) update on ongoing conversations related to accreditation of international members and whether different standards of accreditation can be accepted for international members; 4) the proposal was approved to increase from a two-year to five year wait for automatic qualification and pointed out that the moratorium on new conferences was lifted at the January 2012 NCAA Convention; and 5) that the Planning and Finance Committee at their April 2012 will review the

additional revenue dollars allocated to the division based on the recent agreements (e.g., royalties, ESPN) and will determine whether championships will receive a distribution of those monies for new initiatives.

7. Playing Rules Oversight Panel (PROP). Erin Lind, chair of the Division II Championships Committee and committee member of PROP, gave a brief report related to actions taken by PROP including, but not limited to, the following:

- The NCAA Women's Lacrosse Rules Committee's request for an experimental rule to have a designated head umpire for each intercollegiate women's lacrosse game for the 2012 season was approved.
- PROP agreed to ask that each rules committee review its rules related to game environment and sportsmanship in light of a significant effort to improve in this area by the men's basketball community.
- PROP asked NCAA staff to review all playing rules appeal/protest/forfeit procedures for future review and consistency.

PROP additionally discussed the following current topics, which Ms. Lind highlighted:

- Equipment and manufacture issues included updates on baseball and softball. Softball barrel compression testing will continue for the 2012 in-season tournaments and expand in the postseason.
- Arbiter Sports is the central hub for officiating in eight sports (baseball, men's and women's basketball, football, men's and women's ice hockey, men's and women's soccer, softball and volleyball).
- An update was given on current initiatives of the College Football Officiating, LLC and the Men's and Women's College Basketball Officiating, LLCs.

Lastly, in relation to the PROP report, there were sport committee rules reports and Ms. Lind noted a few:

- Field hockey eye protection recommendation is on hold and development of an American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) ball standard to be used in testing of the protection; and,
- Data collection of concussion/head trauma in sports other than football is being done.

PROP meets once per year in-person and has a monthly teleconference. Additionally, the Championships Committee asked Ms. Lind to keep them updated specifically as it relates to the game environment and sportsmanship during future Championships Committee meetings and the direction those discussions are heading.

8. Membership Fund Report. Rich Sanders is the appointed member to serve on the Membership Fund Selection Committee from the Division II Championships Committee. Mr. Sanders provided a report related to the background of the Membership Fund Committee and why it was

created, along with noting the requests that have been asked for from the Membership Fund Committee. The Membership Fund Committee only granted a certain number of the grants and noted that the \$100,000 overseen by the Membership Fund Committee does not have to be fully granted. Overall, more than \$68,000 was distributed at the last Membership Fund Selection Committee meeting.

9. **Division II Championships Committee Policies and Procedures Manual/Historical Project.** NCAA staff provided an update and noted that the Championships Committee policies and procedures manual is updated, but is always a fluid document due to changes in policies granted at in-person or during monthly teleconferences. A nother document NCAA staff has been working on is an historical document to outline all past actions by the Division II Championships Committee as a resource to have at future meetings. Again, the historical project will be a fluid working document due to changes approved and/or denied during Division II Championships Committee meetings and teleconferences.
10. **2012 Fall Championships Recap.** The Division II Championships Committee was updated on the 2012 fall championships and noted no issues were reported or questions asked by the reports provided by the NCAA Championships and Alliances point persons.
11. **Budget Review and Sport Budget Requests—Per Diem Update and Planning and Finance Committee Update.** The Championships Committee reviewed the 2011-12 fiscal report with year to date actual following the January close for the Division II championships budget. Tamara Gingerich, NCAA associate director of accounting, commented that, overall, budgets were being managed well by Division II Championships and Alliance point persons. However, Ms. Gingerich noted that expenses are up this year because of travel costs and particularly gas prices. Generally, in the past, Division II Championships have run healthy surpluses but due to the overall \$1 million dollar reduction to the championships budget as a part of the Long Range Projections Task Force recommendations, the championships budget is running on a much leaner budget overall.

Ms. Gingerich noted that at the April 2012 Planning and Finance Committee meeting, the Planning and Finance Committee is expected determine whether additional revenue dollars to the division will be allocated to championships. A key question that will be discussed at the April Planning and Finance Committee is how to use these additional revenue dollars and consider whether these additional revenue dollars should be placed in the reserve based on the current state of the economy. The next tri-annual budget cycle will be in 2015-16 for new sport budget money requests.

Juanita Sheely, NCAA associate director of travel and insurance, also shared commentary related to per diems, which will increase from \$90 per day in the 2012-13 academic year, and travel costs, which are currently running at a 30 percent increase in costs from FY 2011-12. The latter is of particular note for Division II, especially if the trend continues for the winter and spring championships, which it is expected to do by all travel forecasts, if not rise further. These travel increases are also being felt due to the limited number of regular airlines seats and thus, charter flights are being used more than historically has been done.

The Division II Championships Committee reviewed the budget requests for sport committees via their supplements shared at the meeting (Attachment C – Chart of Requests). The Championships Committee took deliberate actions and thorough analysis of the sport committee requests. Due to the overall requests, the Championships Committee again asked NCAA staff to provide a full analysis at the April 2012 teleconference to allow the Championships Committee to finalize and/or make any further budgetary edits related to recommendations moving forward to the Division II Management Council and Planning and Finance Committee.

Budget approvals by the Division II Championships Committee are noted within the actions sections while those tabled are listed below and will be considered at the Division II Championships Committee no later than the April 2012 teleconference for action:

a. Baseball—Bracket Expansion.

- The Division II Championships Committee denied that, effective with the 2013 championship, the baseball championship bracket be expanded to 64 teams. The bracket would be comprised of eight, eight-team regionals, which is an increase of two teams per region. The Championships Committee felt the cost far outweighed the current merits of the bracket expansion request.

b. Men's Golf—Rules Officials.

- The Division II Championships Committee denied that the number of rules officials at the regional sites be increased from five to seven, effective with the 2013 championships. At this time, the Championships Committee felt this was not a necessitated request that was essential to the championship.

c. Men's Lacrosse—Tournament Format.

- The Championships Committee denied that the semifinals be changed to coincide with the Division I quarterfinals at pre-determined sites, effective in the 2012-13 academic year. The Championships Committee commented that the men's lacrosse cross-divisional championships are important to Division II, yet even with a conservative cost presented; the Championships Committee could not approve the request.

d. Men's Soccer—Bracket Expansion.

- The Division II Championships Committee tabled discussion related to the recommendation that, effective with the 2012 championship, the men's soccer championship bracket be expanded to 48 teams.

The Division II Championships Committee sent the request back to the Division II Men's Soccer Committee asking them to examine bracket expansion options up to an eight-team bracket and provide financial information for the proposal (i.e., travel costs, bracket lay-outs, etc.) The request for further analysis is due to the

Championships Committee's responsibility to review overall ratio numbers and participant access to NCAA championships.

e. Wrestling—Increase in Championship Qualifiers.

- The Division II Championships Committee denied the recommendation for an additional 20 qualifiers to the Division II Wrestling Championships. Currently, 160 student-athletes qualify for the championships, with 40 student-athletes qualifying from each of the four wrestling regions. This proposal would bring the total number of student-athletes who qualify for the championships to 180, with 45 student-athletes qualifying from each region. The Championships Committee feels that at this time, there are an adequate number of qualifiers for the Division II Wrestling Championships.

12. Sport Committee Reports.

a. Baseball—Bracket Allocation.

- The Division II Championships Committee approved that, effective with the 2013 championship, six teams be selected for each of the eight regionals. Currently, six regions select six teams, the West region selects four teams and the South region selects eight teams. (Note: This recommendation was previously submitted at the September 2011 NCAA Division II Championships Committee meeting.)

With the growth in sponsorship and the revised regional alignment that will take place over the next year, the number of institutions per region has leveled and no longer supports the proportional postseason allocations that are currently followed.

b. Field Hockey—Date Formula Change and Predetermined Final Site.

- The Division II Championships Committee approved that the date formula be changed to mirror the Divisions I and III date formula to permit a joint championship effective September 1, 2013.

The formula would read:

First Round: Saturday prior to finals.

Finals: Friday and Sunday prior to Thanksgiving.

In 2013, all three field hockey committees would like to have a field hockey joint championship similar to men's lacrosse, which would showcase all three national championships at one site. A date formula change is necessary to align all three divisions.

- The Championships Committee approved that the finals site for the field hockey championship be predetermined effective September 1, 2015.

Currently, the finals site is determined two weeks in advance of competition and is hosted by one of the competing final six teams. Selecting the finals host site in advance will help the host, NCAA staff and the Field Hockey Committee better plan and prepare for the championship, which will improve the championship and student-athlete's experience.

c. Men's Golf—Allocation of Championship Berths.

- The Division II Championships Committee approved that, effective with the 2013 championships, three teams from each regional will advance to the finals and the remaining eight berths will be allocated based on the regions represented in the prior year's match/medal portion of the championship. However, the maximum number of teams from each region will be capped at seven. If that were to occur, the next highest finisher not from that region will receive that spot for their region. Finally, allocations will return to five per region every four years with the reset aligning with the current schedule of the Spring Sports Festival every four years. It should be noted that any berth earned for a region based on an institution's finish the prior year will follow that institution should it be realigned into a new region.

After reviewing the championship structure over the past several years, it was the Men's Golf Committee's determination to propose an adjustment to regional allocations at the championship finals to a method similar to that of cross country. The proposal would continue to provide an equal level of guaranteed access to the finals per region with the majority of the bids, while providing incentive by allocating a minority of the bids to the regions that perform well at the finals. This change, it is believed, will significantly strengthen the championship field

d. Women's Lacrosse—Regional Realignment Modification and Selection Seeding Criteria.

- The Division II Championships Committee approved that the Division II women's lacrosse regional alignment expansion be changed in order to maintain a two-region model, effective immediately.

The Division II Championships Committee, at its February 2011 meeting, approved a regional expansion to four regions. When the Division II Women's Lacrosse Committee proposed the expansion, the sponsorship list was not an accurate representation of the projected growth. This was in part due to unexpected growth, as well as institutions not reporting sponsorship of the sport. The NCAA staff noted they had been in touch with commissioners from each conference sponsoring the sport, and the realignment to two-region model was supported.

- The Division II Championships Committee approved that seeding criteria for the Division II women's lacrosse be changed to reflect the bracket expansion. The seeding criteria should state that each region will seed four teams from each instead of three teams.

e. Men's and Women's Tennis—Championship Field Size.

- The Division II Championships Committee approved that the championship field for the Men's and Women's Tennis Championship remain at 48 teams per gender, with regional travel paid by the NCAA. The Championship Committee noted that this item no longer needs to be requested on an annual basis as the Championships Committee will institute this action on a permanent basis, effective immediately.

f. Wrestling—Regional Alignment. The committee approved the Division II Wrestling Committee's proposal to realign the regions for the Division II Wrestling Super Regional tournaments, noting the Division II Wrestling Committee send information to the membership related to the alignments. The current regional alignment does not fully take into account conference affiliations among the wrestling membership, nor does it most adequately address institutional travel expenses and associated travel time related to the Super Regional round of the championships. Attachment D is the current regional alignment; the proposed regional alignment beginning in the 2012-13 academic year; and provides a breakdown of the institutions affected by the proposed realignment.

The focus of this proposal, effective September 1, 2012, is to address the inconsistencies between the Division II wrestling regional alignment and that of the Division II membership, specific to conference affiliation. The current regional alignment reflects some conference affiliations that are no longer active or will become inactive at the beginning of the 2012-13 academic year. The Division II Wrestling Committee feels that the alignment of the wrestling regions, though not identical to the traditional Division II regional alignment, should allow conference members to compete in the same Super Regional tournaments, in order to qualify for the finals. Without this proposed realignment, some conference members will continue to compete in regions separate from the majority of their conference partners during future years.

In addition, the proposal aims to address concerns voiced by portions of the wrestling membership that travel expenses and travel time associated with the Super Regional round could be improved with a more logical regional alignment

This proposed alignment would group the six wrestling-sponsoring institutions in the southeast (seven with the addition of Shorter University (GA) beginning in 2014-15) into the same region. Currently, institutions representing the Peach Belt Conference (PBC) and South Atlantic Conference (SAC) compete in the same region as the Northeast-10 (NE-10), Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference (PSAC), and West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (WVIAC). Institutions representing Conference Carolinas (CC) compete in the same region as the Great American Conference (GAC), Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (GLIAC), and Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association (MIAA).

The proposed realignment would align the GLIAC with the NE-10, PSAC, and WVIAC. It would also align the CC, PBC, and SAC to compete in the same region with the GAC and MIAA.

While the makeup of the Division II wrestling membership does not allow for a simple geographic solution to fit into the construct of the four-region wrestling alignment, the wrestling committee strongly believes that this proposed realignment is the best option currently available to the wrestling membership as a whole. It aims to better satisfy the desires of the Division II philosophy by eliminating as much travel time as possible, thereby reducing the opportunity for missed class time. It also aims to reduce travel expenses by more appropriately grouping institutions by both geographic location and conference affiliation. Lastly, it aims to provide as much balance within each of the four regions as possible, taking into account all of the aforementioned considerations, as well as the institutions currently in the Division II membership process, through the conclusion of the 2014-15 academic year.

Due to the fact that regular season schedules and results have no bearing on the regional alignment or championship qualification, the recommended implementation date is August 1, 2012.

Institutions incur all expense related to regional tournaments. While no direct savings will be seen within the Division II Wrestling budget, it is expected that the membership will realize cost savings as a result of the regional realignment.

The student-athlete impact is expected to be positive with the realignment, both for the fact that student-athletes will now be able to compete with their conference partners at the Super Regional tournaments across the entire division, and due to the reduction of as much travel time as possible. The latter is also expected to result in a reduction of missed class time in some instances, which will positively affect student-athletes as it pertains to their academics.

13. Championships and Alliances Update. Greg Shaheen, interim executive vice president for Championships and Alliances, provided a brief update on the status of work and restructuring going on in the Championships and Alliances department including, but not limited to, the following:

- Strategic analysis of expenditures related to the Championships and Alliances approach as a whole is being reviewed (i.e. cost to conduct a championship per student-athlete). The goal is to understand the financial backgrounds in a more comprehensive way and work with the administrative services department in a more cohesive manner.
- Work is being done on a historic budget structure with the goal being to simplify or clarify the budget process internally and externally to membership. All 89 championships will have a release of financials related to their event.

- The interim executive vice president job search is underway and being overseen by Parker Executive Search. The announcement of a full-time executive vice president for Championships and Alliances is expected no later than by the end of the first quarter.

14. **Site Representative Taskforce.** Katie Holmes from Championships and Alliances shared the work being done by an internal site representative taskforce. The taskforce has implemented an availability form for site representatives interested in working an NCAA championship (preliminary or finals site), and it allows individuals to select based on their interest by sport or location. The next step is to inventory the database to assist in tracking who has served as a site representative and use that resource for future events.

Also, evaluations have been asked to be completed. There are two variations of evaluations. The first is an evaluation to be completed by the host for the evaluation of the site representative, and the second is one for the site representative to complete as an evaluation of the site and the process as a site representative. The evaluations have been developed with the assistance of NCAA research.

Further information will be shared related to a site representative manual and education that is expected to be implemented by Fall 2012.

15. **Great America Conference (GAC) Automatic Qualification (AQ) Waiver Review.** The Division II Championships Committee denied the GAC's request for an automatic waiver during the 2012-13 academic year. The Championships Committee understood the desire to escalate the timeframe to garner access to NCAA championships; however, it noted the legislation outlines a two-year wait for automatic qualification, which the Championships Committee felt was important to uphold in this request.
16. **South Dakota School of Mines Exception Waiver Review.** The Championships Committee asked Erin Lind, chair of the Championships Committee, and NCAA staff to provide a response to South Dakota School of Mines informing them that, due to a membership change occurring in South Dakota with the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference (RMAC), that South Dakota School of Mines would be considered in-region to the South Central region. The 2012-13 regionalization map will be updated upon receipt of official membership notification by the RMAC, and the new regionalization map will be shared via the NCAA Championships and Alliances newsletter when updated for all membership to be made aware of the update.
17. **Legislative Committee Referrals—Code of Conduct.** Jennifer Fraser, associate director of academic and membership affairs and liaison to the Division II Legislative Committee, provided a referral from the Legislative Committee asking for consideration to be made to provide the Division II Code of Conduct online in an editable format to ease the burden on institutional personnel. The Division II Championships Committee approved the recommendations,

18. **Division II and the 75th Anniversary of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship.** NCAA staff joined the Championships Committee meeting to provide an update on internal work to determine the feasibility of combining the Division I, II and III Men's Basketball Championships in Atlanta, Georgia in 2013, as a part of the 75th anniversary of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship.

The Division II Championships Committee moved to support the initiative as the NCAA studies the idea further and requested that staff ensure a Division II women's basketball plan is developed and announced at the same time as any formal men's basketball announcement.

NCAA staff will continue to share the information with the Championships Committee as more details are finalized in the coming months, with expectations to announce the venture at the 2012 Men's Final Four in New Orleans.

19. **ESPN and CBS Coverage of Division II.** Greg Weitekamp, Championships and Alliances – Media Services, gave an overall update on the relationships of the NCAA with ESPN and CBS/Turner from a media perspective. The new ESPN agreement is for 13-years. One of the adverse effects of the agreement was the loss of the Division II Women's Basketball Championship now being shown on CBS College Sports, rather than ESPN. The agreement was seen as a way to enhance coverage of the 89 championships available through the discussions. The platform of CBS College Sports affords the NCAA to provide regular season coverage that will translate in to championship coverage that keeps viewers on the same channels as they are accustomed throughout the year.

There is the fact that some exposure was lost from a commercial television standpoint for Division II, yet the NCAA now has additional platforms to make available to consumers (i.e., ncaa.com for online streaming, multimedia device videos, etc.) The substantial improvements in multimedia coverage from quality of videos and announcers are a priority for the NCAA and, currently, all championships will be produced in high-definition and available via the NCAA app (iphones and Android version is in development). Overall, as a whole for the NCAA, the exposure and availability of the championships will far exceed where we have been in the past.

20. **Selection Criteria White Paper and Focus Group Materials.** The Championships Committee acknowledged the large volume of information and feedback received from the Division II membership related to selection criteria and began undertaking the task of work to determine the issues, initial recommendations and provide an updated white paper to share with NCAA membership (i.e., institutions and conferences).

Please refer to Attachment E with the full recap of discussion and initial recommendations that the Championships Committee is discussing and will continue to do so through their 2012 September meeting.

21. **Selection, Seeding, Bracketing Taskforce Update.** The Championships Committee received an update on the internal NCAA staff working group related to selection, seeding and bracketing. Donnie Wagner, Championships and Alliances—Tournament Operations, provided the update

noting that the initial steps the taskforce are undertaking include the ability to have a written and documented selection process by sport and division. Over the summer, additional meetings for the taskforce are scheduled and further updates will be provided by NCAA staff.

22. **Ranking of Teams in the Membership Process.** The Division II Championships Committee approved the policy that institutions in the Division II membership process will not be published in NCAA rankings. The Championships Committee reiterated the value of the membership process and did not want any confusion related to championship rankings.
23. **Regionalization Update—Great Midwest Athletic Conference (G-MAC) Formation.** The Championships Committee reviewed the formation and timeline (Attachment F) related to the G-MAC for regionalization and championship implications. The Championships Committee will continue to monitor the formation of the new conference and ensure at the appropriate time that any regionalization updates and championship form are completed. More information will be brought forward from NCAA staff related to the G-MAC as they complete their membership application process with the Membership Committee.
24. **Regionalization Consultant and RFP review.** The Championships Committee reviewed the request for proposal sent by NCAA staff for a potential regionalization consultant. It was noted that the funding would come from reserve and be a one-time use that would need approval by the Planning and Finance Committee. Upon final proposals received by NCAA staff, a formal recommendation will be forwarded at the Championships Committee March or April teleconference for review and action.
25. **International Membership Hosts.** Discussion was held related to the growth of Division II and issues that arise with international membership hosts. The Championships Committee discussed a number of issues that would need to be considered before granting an international host (i.e., passports, criminal background checks and etc.) for championship participants traveling to that site. Rich Sanders, Championships Committee member, commented that the West conferences are looking to have conversations around the topic, especially as it relates to regular season play versus Simon Fraser University. Mr. Sanders will report back to the Championships Committee on the conference discussions during a summer 2012 meeting or teleconference with additional feedback.
26. **Non-Divisional Postseason Hosts.** The Championships Committee approved for NCAA staff to draft language to include in bid documents that, for example, “the Division II Championships Committee has the authority to determine a location and host for NCAA Championships.” The Championships Committee feels it’s important for a Division II member institution or conference to be affiliated with hosting Division II championships.

In relation and in response to a letter from Northern Alabama, Division II Football Championship host, the Championships Committee referred the topic back to the Football Committee to develop a joint response.

27. **Automatic Qualification (AQ) Form Update.** The Championships Committee received an update related to the new process of conference offices submitting their automatic qualification information electronically to the NCAA by February 1 of each year. Any feedback related to the system is welcome and, overall, there will continue to be upgrades to make the input process easier for conference personnel.
28. **Priorities for Championships Committee.** The Championships Committee began an initial analysis of prioritizing expenditures within championships in September 2012 and if the need were ever to arise where the full operating budgets were to be reduced. The focus of the committee was on reduction of championship expenditures in no specific order, except for bracket reduction, which was the last option. The Championships Committee asked NCAA national office staff to provide examples in the final policy listing and add this to the standing agenda items. The Division II Championships Committee approved the priorities below:
- Reduction of per diem;
 - Adjustment of regional sites;
 - Enhancement monies;
 - Bracket reduction.
29. **Timeline for Sports Committee Recommendations.** The Championships Committee recognizes the ability for more thorough analysis of recommendations when provided at one time by all governing sports committees, where applicable (i.e., automatic qualifications). The Championships Committee has deferred the recommendation to Championships and Alliances – Tournament Operations staff to develop a timeline based on the following items: budget requests, bracket expansion, automatic qualification, selection criteria, site selection, travel party and size adjustments, date formulas, field size adjustments, and etc. The Championships Committee will finalize the timeline during their May 2012 in-person meeting.
30. **On-Site Administrator.** The Championships Committee discussed the 2012-13 team on-site administrators policy approved in September 2011 and held discussions on the individual team sports. The Championships Committee feels that the ability to require a school to supply a team contact form with personnel information and require those individuals to participate in a conference call prior to departing for the Championship, if applicable, would be sufficient. The Championships Committee will have a formal recommendation presented at the May 2012 Championships Committee meeting to finalize the recommendation language and take action on the policy.
31. **NCAA Division II National Championships Festival – 2012 Festival Update and 2014-24 Festival Dates.** Amy Reis, Championships and Alliances – Tournament Operations, provided an update on the current planning for the 2012 Festival in Louisville, Kentucky, related to community events and new initiatives taking place at the event.

The Championships Committee also approved the dates for the 2014 - 2024 NCAA Division II National Championships Festival as follows:

2014 – 15	Fall Festival	December 2 - 6, 2014
2015 – 16	Spring Festival	May 16 - 21, 2016
2016 – 17	Winter Festival	March 5 - 11, 2017
2018 – 19	Fall Festival	Nov. 27 – Dec. 1, 2018
2019 – 20	Spring Festival	May 11 - 16, 2020
2020 – 21	Winter Festival	March 7 - 13, 2021
2022 – 23	Fall Festival	Nov. 29 – Dec. 3, 2022
2023 – 24	Spring Festival	May 13 - 18, 2024

As part of the Division's long-range planning efforts, the Division II Planning & Finance Committee has allocated the necessary budgetary resources for the Division II National Championships Festival to operate through 2024. The ability to provide membership and governing sports committees the future dates will assist in scheduling and allow for the appropriate date formula changes to be approved by the Division II Championships Committee, as predicated by the above dates.

During the May 2012 in-person Championships Committee, NCAA staff will present the sports formulas based on the approved dates above.

32. **2013 NCAA Convention.** The Championships Committee was asked for feedback on the 2012 NCAA Convention and if they have any preferred topics for education sessions, to supply any comments to the NCAA staff prior to June 1 to be considered as part of the programming for the 2013 NCAA Convention.
33. **D2 ADA Football Sub-Committee Taskforce Recommendation.** The Division II Championships Committee received communication from the Division II Athletics Directors Association (D2 ADA) about the issues related to football scheduling. The Championships Committee noted receipt of the letter and discussion of the topic in-depth. The Championships Committee is sensitive to the needs and concerns outlined, yet the Championships Committee does not have a precedence to mandate scheduling. The topic was referred to the Division II Football Committee for specific feedback as related to the sport.
34. **Other Business.**
 - **Men's Soccer.** The Championships Committee received correspondence from the RMAC and Lone Star Conferences independently about the ratio access for men's soccer. The Championships Committee referred the topic to the Division II Men's Soccer Committee, as it is the Championships Committee's understanding that discussions are occurring in the

Men's Soccer Committee around this topic already. The Championships Committee would request a timely follow-up no later than April 2012 Championships Committee teleconference.

- **Conference Commissioners Association (CCA).** The Championships Committee was updated regarding the ongoing conversations within CCA to change the make-up of the Championships Committee to have one representative from each active conference. The expected legislation is on target to be presented at the 2013 NCAA Convention.
- **Nullification.** The Championships Committee addressed concerns about the process related to nullification and the timing of the penalty. The specification that the penalty be administered at the time of selections is legislated; thus, the Championships Committee requested additional information from staff at the 2012 May meeting.

35. Future Meetings. The Division II Championships Committee reviewed their upcoming meeting schedule noting teleconferences in March, April and May. Due to schedules, the March teleconference was moved to Wednesday, March 7th. The next in-person meeting is scheduled for May 30 and 31 to be held in Indianapolis.

Committee Chair: Erin Lind, Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference (NSIC)
Staff Liaisons: Roberta Page, Championships and Alliances
Amy Reis, Championships and Alliances

February 20 - 21, 2012

<u>ATTENDEES</u>	<u>ABSENTEES</u>
Bob Boerigter, Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association	Dr. Michael Scales, Nyack College and Alliance Theological Seminary (<i>PC liaison</i>)
Bob Dranoff, East Coast Conference	
Kris Dunbar, Lake Superior State University	
Frank Keenan, NCAA DII SAAC Representative	
Erin Lind, Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference (<i>chair</i>)	
Claudia Mackey, Elizabeth City State University	
Ann Martin, Regis University (<i>MC chair</i>) – participated via teleconference	

Francis Reidy, Saint Leo University	
Richard Sanders, Northwest Nazarene University	
David Sharp, Ouachita Baptist University	
J.R. Smith, Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	
Patsy Smith, Missouri Western State University	
Bren Stevens, University of Charleston (<i>MC vice chair</i>)	
Lisa Sweany, Armstrong Atlantic State University	

OTHER PARTICIPANTS:

John Baldwin, Amanda Conklin, Lee Dicklitch, Ashley Dunigan, Ron English, Terri Steeb-Gronau, Jennifer Fraser, Michelle Forkner, Tamara Gingerich, Katie Holmes, Jeff Jarnecke, Rachel Kay, Jarrett Newby, Roberta Page, Laura Peterson, Carol Reep, Amy Reis, Greg Shaheen, Juanita Sheely, Sharon Tufano, Donnie Wagner, Greg Weitekamp, and Russ Yurk (*NCAA staff*)

Sport: Division II Men's Golf

Transportation	Student-Athletes	Non-Athletes	Total Travelers	Total Transportation (Note 1)	Avg. per total travelers (Note 1)	Projected total transportation	
2009-10 Actual amount (from TES)				\$ -			
Add 2% for 2010-11				\$ -			
Add 2% for 2011-12				\$ -			
Add 2% for 2012-13				\$ -			
Total actual travel plus inflation	432	110	542	\$ -	\$ -		
Projected total- add 1 non-athlete teams only	432	190	622		\$ -	\$ -	
Projected increase in Transportation						\$ -	
Per Diem	Student-Athletes	Non-Athletes	Total Travelers	Per Diem Days	Avg. days per total travelers (Note 1)	Per Diem (Note 2)	Total Per Diem Amount
2009-10 Actual Amounts (from TES)	432	110	542	2,489	4.59	\$ 85	\$ 211,565
Projected total- add 1 non-athlete teams only	432	190	622	2,856	4.59	\$ 85	\$ 242,792
Projected increase in Per Diem							\$ 31,227
Total projected increase in per diem and transportation							\$ 31,200
Game Expenses	Student-Athletes	Non-Athletes	Total Participants	Game Expense per participant			Total Amount for Game Expense
2009-10 Actual Amounts (from Oracle)	432	110	542	\$ 23			\$ 12,418
Projected total- add 1 non-athlete teams only	432	190	622	\$ 23			\$ 14,251
Total projected increase in Game Expense							\$ 1,833
Total projected increase							\$ 33,000

Note 1: Transportation and per diem information based on 2009-10 championships information from TES.

Note 2: Projected cost is based on per diem rate expected to be in place when this proposal becomes effective in 2012-13. Additional costs can be expected if the per diem rate increases.

Note: This analysis provides an estimate for adding 1 non-athlete to the travel party for the teams that qualify for the regionals round only.

Sport: Division II Men's Golf

Transportation	Student-Athletes	Non-Athletes	Total Travelers	Total Transportation (Note 1)	Avg. per total travelers (Note 1)	Projected total transportation	
2009-10 Actual amount (from TES)				\$ 73,519			
Add 2% for 2010-11				\$ 1,470			
Add 2% for 2011-12				\$ 1,500			
Add 2% for 2012-13				\$ 1,530			
Total actual travel plus inflation	108	28	136	\$ 78,019	\$ 573.67		
Projected total- add 1 non-athlete teams only	108	48	156		\$ 573.67	\$ 89,492	
Projected increase in Transportation						<u>\$ 11,473</u>	
Per Diem	Student-Athletes	Non-Athletes	Total Travelers	Per Diem Days	Avg. days per total travelers (Note 1)	Per Diem (Note 2)	Total Per Diem Amount
2009-10 Actual Amounts (from TES)	108	28	136	768	5.65	\$ 85	\$ 65,280
Projected total- add 1 non-athlete teams only	108	48	156	881	5.65	\$ 85	\$ 74,880
Projected increase in Per Diem							<u>\$ 9,600</u>
Total projected increase in per diem and transportation							\$ 21,100
Game Expenses	Student-Athletes	Non-Athletes	Total Participants	Game Expense per participant			Total Amount for Game Expense
2009-10 Actual Amounts (from Oracle)	108	28	136	\$ 91			\$ 12,418
Projected total- add 1 non-athlete teams only	108	48	156	\$ 91			\$ 14,244
Total projected increase in Game Expense							\$ 1,826
Total projected increase							<u>\$ 23,000</u>

Note 1: Transportation and per diem information based on 2009-10 championships information from TES.

Note 2: Projected cost is based on per diem rate expected to be in place when this proposal becomes effective in 2012-13. Additional costs can be expected if the per diem rate increases.

Note: This analysis provides an estimate for adding 1 non-athlete to the travel party for the teams that qualify for the finals round only.

2011-12 DIVISION II MEN'S LACROSSE COMMITTEE

(Division II Championships Administration Only)

Composition: Three members. One representative from the North (East-N: Northeast-10), one representative from the Central (East-S: East Coast; Midwest and Atlantic) and one representative from the South (Southeast and South). Quota of 50 percent administrators: **2. The committee composition will change in 2012-13 to four members – two from the North region (Northeast-10, RMAC, East Coast and independents); and two from the South region (Conference Carolinas and independents).**

Vacancies: **Two September 2012 vacancies. Both must be from the South region. One must be an administrator.**

Staff Liaison: Will Hopkins

Chair:

LC DIST/ REG	POS	EM/ GEN	NAME AND INSTITUTION	CONFERENCE	9/11-9/12	9/12-9/13	9/13-9/14	9/14-9/15
South	AD	N/M	Michael Cerino Limestone College	Conference Carolinas	Cerino*			
North	AD	N/M	Glenn Hofmann Merrimack College	Northeast-10	Hofmann	Hofmann*		
Central (North 2012-13)	C	N/M	Timothy Boyle Dowling College	East Coast	Boyle	Boyle	Boyle	Boyle*
(South 2012-13)								

*Not eligible for reappointment

10/25/11

Division II Sport Budget Requests

<i>Division</i>	<i>Sport</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Cost</i>	
II	Baseball	Add 1 team to each regional (8 total)	\$ 197,000	
II	Baseball	Add 2 teams to each regional (16 total)		\$ 573,000
II	Football	Extra day per diem for early arrival	\$ 6,300	\$ 6,300
II	M Golf	Increase travel party for finals round by 1 non-athlete	\$ 23,000	\$ 23,000
II	M Golf	Increase travel party for regionals round by 1 non-athlete	\$ 33,000	\$ 33,000
II	M Golf	Added rules official	\$ 12,600	\$ 12,600
II	W Golf	Increase travel party for finals round by 1 non-athlete	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000
II	W Golf	Increase travel party for regionals round by 1 non-athlete	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
II	Lacrosse	Tournament format change - four teams at semifinals	\$ 37,000	\$ 37,000
II	Rowing	Add 1 non-athlete for individual qualifying boats	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000
II	M Soccer	Additional official	\$ 1,550	\$ 1,550
II	M Soccer	Increase bracket to 48 teams	\$ 545,000	\$ 545,000
II	W Soccer	Additional official	\$ 1,550	\$ 1,550
II	Wrestling	Increase in championship qualifiers by 20 Sas	\$ 28,775	\$ 28,775
Total cost			\$ 919,775	\$ 1,295,775

<i>Division</i>	<i>Sport</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Cost</i>	
II	Football	Added evaluators to review officials	\$ 4,600	\$ 4,600
II	M Swimming	Increase field by 15 SAs and 4 non-athletes	\$ 31,000	\$ 31,000
II	M/W Tennis	Additional official	\$ 1,400	\$ 1,400
II	M/W Tennis	Host allowance	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,200
Total cost			\$ 38,200	\$ 38,200

	Indicates action/vote needed on request
--	---

Current Division II Wrestling Regional Alignment

Division II Wrestling Championships
Current Regional Realignment

15	<u>Region 1</u> (<i>NE-10, PBC, PSAC, SAC, WVIAC</i>)	<u>City</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Conference Affiliation</u>	<u>Notes</u>
	American International College	Springfield	MA	Northeast-10 Conference	
	Anderson University (South Carolina)	Anderson	SC	South Atlantic Conference	
	East Stroudsburg University	East Stroudsburg	PA	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	
	Gannon University	Erie	PA	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	
	Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	Kutztown	PA	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	
	Mercyhurst College	Erie	PA	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	
	Millersville University	Millersville	PA	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	*Scheduled to become active by 2013 championships
	Newberry College	Newberry	SC	South Atlantic Conference	
	University of North Carolina at Pembroke	Pembroke	NC	Peach Belt Conference	
	Ohio Valley University	Vienna	WV	West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	
	University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown	Johnstown	PA	West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	
	Seton Hill University	Greensburg	PA	West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	
	Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	Shippensburg	PA	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	
	Shorter University (GA)	Rome	GA	Independent	* Scheduled to become active by 2015 championships
	West Liberty University	West Liberty	WV	West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	
13	<u>Region 2</u> (<i>CC, GAC, GLIAC, MIAA</i>)	<u>City</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Conference Affiliation</u>	<u>Notes</u>
	Ashland University	Ashland	OH	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	
	Belmont Abbey College	Belmont	NC	Conference Carolinas	
	University of Central Missouri	Warrensburg	MO	Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association	
	University of Central Oklahoma	Edmond	OK	Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association	
	University of Findlay	Findlay	OH	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	
	King College	Bristol	TN	Conference Carolinas	
	Lake Erie College	Painesville	OH	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	
	Limestone College	Gaffney	SC	Conference Carolinas	
	Lindenwood University	St. Charles	MO	Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association	* Scheduled to become active by 2014 championships
	Notre Dame College (OH)	Euclid	OH	Independent	* Scheduled to become active by 2013 championships
	Ouachita Baptist University	Arkadelphia	AR	Great American Conference	
	Tiffin University	Tiffin	OH	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	
	Truman State University	Kirksville	MO	Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association	

Current Division II Wrestling Regional Alignment

14 Region 3 (<i>GLVC, HC, NSIC</i>)	City	State	Conference Affiliation	Notes
Augustana College (South Dakota)	Sioux Falls	SD	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
University of Indianapolis	Indianapolis	IN	Great Lakes Valley Conference	
University of Mary	Bismarck	ND	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
Maryville University of Saint Louis	St. Louis	MO	Great Lakes Valley Conference	
McKendree University	Lebanon	IL	Great Lakes Valley Conference	* Scheduled to become active by 2014 championships
Minnesota State University, Mankato	Mankato	MN	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
Minnesota State University, Moorhead	Moorhead	MN	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
Minot State University	Minot	ND	Independent	* Scheduled to become active by 2013 championships
Newman University	Wichita	KS	Heartland Conference	
Northern State University	Aberdeen	SD	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
Southwest Minnesota State University	Marshall	MN	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
St. Cloud State University	St. Cloud	MN	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
Upper Iowa University	Fayette	IA	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
University of Wisconsin, Parkside	Kenosha	WI	Great Lakes Valley Conference	
13 Region 4 (<i>CCAA, GNAC, MIAA, PWC, RMAC</i>)	City	State	Conference Affiliation	Notes
Adams State College	Alamosa	CO	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	
California Baptist University	Riverside	CA	Pacific West Conference	* Scheduled to become active by 2014 championships
Chadron State College	Chadron	NE	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	
Colorado Mesa University	Grand Junction	CO	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	
Colorado School of Mines	Golden	CO	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	
Colorado State University, Pueblo	Pueblo	CO	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	
Fort Hays State University	Hays	KS	Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association	
Grand Canyon University	Phoenix	AZ	Pacific West Conference	
University of Nebraska, Kearney	Kearney	NE	Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association	
New Mexico Highlands University	Las Vegas	NM	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	
San Francisco State University	San Francisco	CA	California Collegiate Athletic Association	
Simon Fraser University	Vancouver	Canada	Great Northwest Athletic Conference	* Scheduled to become active by 2013 championships
Western State College of Colorado	Gunnison	CO	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	

Proposed Division II Wrestling Regional Alignment

Division II Wrestling Championships Proposed Regional Realignment

15 <u>Region 1</u> (<i>GLVC, NE-10, PSAC, WVIAC</i>)	<u>City</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Conference Affiliation</u>	<u>Notes</u>
American International College	Springfield	MA	Northeast-10 Conference	
Ashland University	Ashland	OH	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	
East Stroudsburg University	East Stroudsburg	PA	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	
University of Findlay	Findlay	OH	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	
Gannon University	Erie	PA	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	Kutztown	PA	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	
Lake Erie College	Painesville	OH	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	
Mercyhurst College	Erie	PA	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	
Millersville University	Millersville	PA	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	*Scheduled to become active by 2013 championships
Ohio Valley University	Vienna	WV	West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	
University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown	Johnstown	PA	West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	
Seton Hill University	Greensburg	PA	West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	Shippensburg	PA	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	
Tiffin University	Tiffin	OH	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	
West Liberty University	West Liberty	WV	West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	
14 <u>Region 2</u> (<i>CC, GAC, MIAA, PBC, SAC</i>)	<u>City</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Conference Affiliation</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Anderson University (South Carolina)	Anderson	SC	South Atlantic Conference	
Belmont Abbey College	Belmont	NC	Conference Carolinas	
University of Central Missouri	Warrensburg	MO	Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association	
University of Central Oklahoma	Edmond	OK	Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association	
Fort Hays State University	Hays	KS	Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association	
King College	Bristol	TN	Conference Carolinas	
Limestone College	Gaffney	SC	Conference Carolinas	
Lindenwood University	St. Charles	MO	Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association	* Scheduled to become active by 2014 championships
University of Nebraska, Kearney	Kearney	NE	Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association	
Newberry College	Newberry	SC	South Atlantic Conference	
University of North Carolina at Pembroke	Pembroke	NC	Peach Belt Conference	
Ouachita Baptist University	Arkadelphia	AR	Great American Conference	
Shorter University (GA)	Rome	GA	Independent	* Scheduled to become active by 2015 championships
Truman State University	Kirksville	MO	Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association	

Proposed Division II Wrestling Regional Alignment

14 Region 3 (<i>GLVC, NSIC</i>)	City	State	Conference Affiliation	Notes
Augustana College (South Dakota)	Sioux Falls	SD	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
University of Indianapolis	Indianapolis	IN	Great Lakes Valley Conference	
University of Mary	Bismarck	ND	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
Maryville University of Saint Louis	St. Louis	MO	Great Lakes Valley Conference	
McKendree University	Lebanon	IL	Great Lakes Valley Conference	* Scheduled to become active by 2014 championships
Minnesota State University, Mankato	Mankato	MN	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
Minnesota State University, Moorhead	Moorhead	MN	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
Minot State University	Minot	ND	Independent	* Scheduled to become active by 2013 championships
Northern State University	Aberdeen	SD	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
Notre Dame College (OH)	Euclid	OH	Independent	* Scheduled to become active by 2013 championships
Southwest Minnesota State University	Marshall	MN	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
St. Cloud State University	St. Cloud	MN	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
Upper Iowa University	Fayette	IA	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
University of Wisconsin, Parkside	Kenosha	WI	Great Lakes Valley Conference	
12 Region 4 (<i>CCAA, GNAC, HC, PWC, RMAC</i>)	City	State	Conference Affiliation	Notes
Adams State College	Alamosa	CO	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	
California Baptist University	Riverside	CA	Pacific West Conference	* Scheduled to become active by 2014 championships
Chadron State College	Chadron	NE	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	
Colorado Mesa University	Grand Junction	CO	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	
Colorado School of Mines	Golden	CO	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	
Colorado State University, Pueblo	Pueblo	CO	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	
Grand Canyon University	Phoenix	AZ	Pacific West Conference	
New Mexico Highlands University	Las Vegas	NM	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	
Newman University	Wichita	KS	Heartland Conference	
San Francisco State University	San Francisco	CA	California Collegiate Athletic Association	
Simon Fraser University	Vancouver	Canada	Great Northwest Athletic Conference	* Scheduled to become active by 2013 championships
Western State College of Colorado	Gunnison	CO	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	

Institutions Affected by Proposed Realignment

Division II Wrestling Championships

Institutions Affected by Proposed Regional Realignment

<u>Affected Institution</u>	<u>Current Region</u>	<u>Proposed Region</u>
Ashland University	Region 2	Region 1
Anderson University (South Carolina)	Region 1	Region 2
University of Findlay	Region 2	Region 1
Fort Hays State University	Region 4	Region 2
Lake Erie College	Region 2	Region 1
University of Nebraska, Kearney	Region 4	Region 2
Newberry College	Region 1	Region 2
Newman University	Region 3	Region 4
University of North Carolina at Pembroke	Region 1	Region 2
Shorter University (GA)	Region 1	Region 2
Tiffin University	Region 2	Region 1

DIVISION II SELECTION CRITERIA WHITE PAPER
CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE & FOCUS GROUP RECAP

The Division II Championships Committee reviewed the membership feedback, conference scheduling statistics and the recap supplement provided from the Division II Selection Criteria Focus Group during their February 20 and 21, 2012 meeting.


The Championships Committee provided additional parameters and feedback to include in the recap provided which the Championships Committee noted was beneficial to their discussion at their February meeting. The Championships Committee provided the following key points reiterating the work done by the focus group along with a few new items for consideration including:

- The Championships Committee supported the focus groups opinion that the selection criteria are not a broken system but education of the key constituents would be a beneficial step in the process.
- Education of coaches, conference offices, regional advisory committees (RACs) and national committee members is a key point that needs addressed in moving forward related to selection criteria. Additionally, the opportunity to provide conference offices with training materials would be key to the process and maintain the expectations for all serving on committees for consistency purposes.
- A consideration to include both incoming and out-going national committee members during annual meetings would be beneficial as well.
- Transparency related to the selection criteria process should be a primary focus to allow membership and the public better understanding of the selection criteria process.
- An evaluation of the contingent states policy should be undertaken during the May 2012 Championships Committee meeting as part of the selection criteria discussion.
- The short-term focus was determined to be education with a discussion for a long-term evaluation related to providing regions the autonomy of determining their qualifying teams. A much further analysis of the latter needs to take place to see if the idea is feasible, develop the processes that could be implemented and get further membership feedback related to the topic.
- The Championships Committee noted that much further discussion and review of requested information from NCAA staff will continue per the timeline provided in the Selection Criteria White Paper shared with NCAA membership. The Championships Committee will continue formulating ideas and formulate recommendations at the May 2012 meeting.

The Division II Selection Criteria Focus Group met in Indianapolis for a half-day on February 8th and 9th to discuss the membership feedback from the Division II Selection Criteria White Paper and additional NCAA staff provided resources (i.e., Supplement 30).

The focus group discussions were thoughtful and wide-ranging including the following questions, concepts and discussion points for the Division II Championships Committee to consider as part of their conversation at their 2012 February meeting:

- Where does Division II fall on the below continuum line today at selections and is that fair? Where should Division II fall on the continuum at selections?



- Are teams that have goals of making it into the NCAA Championships playing in-region/non-conference schedules or is the issue with those teams that have no plans to participate in NCAA Division II Championships?
- What are Division II's priorities during selections? Should criteria across sports be similar or is each sport different from a selection criteria perspective?
- The focus group recognizes that the selection criteria must be solid and sport specific, yet more weight should be added behind criteria that matches Division II's priorities and then make selections under those expectations.
- Selection criteria should have a length of time set to evaluate changes made to a sport's criteria and the impact. A suggested time line would be every three – four years to allow for scheduling implications by members schools.
- Should Division II consider Division I, III or NAIA contests in postseason selections? The focus group suggested that to be selected for Division II Championship, teams should be only selected based on Division II opponents. Yet, the focus group noted that the NCAA should not be in the habit of mandating when or who a team plays. Rather, if provided by the NCAA the selection criteria based on Division II priorities then teams must meet that criteria to be considered. If a team wants to participate in a Division II Championship then they must play a Division II schedule.
- Can you begin to prioritize Division II selection criteria principles under the following elements (in no particular order):
 - Overall Division II Schedule / Strength of schedules
 - Head-to-Head competition

- In-Region Division II games
 - In-region/non-conference competition
- Could sport committees consider earned access to address the issues of in-region, non-conference competition (i.e., soccer)? The focus group reiterated that no mandate should be put in place yet thought that earned access may address the issue related to in-region, non-conference competition for the sports experiencing the most difficulties in evaluation at selections.
 - Should reseeding occur at NCAA Championships if in-region/non-conference competition is encouraged during the regular season? Should committees be given autonomy to make decision on seeding?
 - Overall, is selection criteria the issue? The focus group indicated that they felt that wasn't the core issue. Rather, they identified the following key items to better address the topic:
 - Develop Division II priorities on selection criteria.
 - Consistent criteria
(minimize the number of changes to the criteria and how often it is allowed by sport committees to change)
 - Educate NCAA membership on selection criteria of each sport.
 - Provide training and education of committees
(RACs and National Committees)
 - The focus group also encouraged each group that reviews the topic to keep the evaluation at a global perspective to ensure it's as fair to all Division II members as possible and in the best interest of Division II as a whole.

Great Midwest Athletic Conference (GMAC) Formation & Timeline

In fall 2011, presidents of six institutions announced the formation of a new conference, to be named the Great Midwest Athletic Conference (GMAC).

The six member institutions include: Cedarville University (Cedarville, Ohio); Central State University (Wilberforce, Ohio); Kentucky Wesleyan College (Owensboro, Kentucky); Trevacca Nazarene (Nashville, Tennessee); Urbana University (Urbana, Ohio); and Ursuline College (Pepper Pike, Ohio).

The new conference will begin competition in the fall of 2013, pending approval by the Division II Membership Committee.

Currently, Kentucky Wesleyan holds membership in the Great Lakes Valley Conference and Central State and Urbana are independent member institutions. The other three schools are in the Division II membership process.

Until the conference is an active conference meeting NCAA requirements, the institutions in the conferences are considered independents for championship purposes and eligible for at-large berths based on their active status and the region that their state resides.

GMAC Conference Formation Timeline and Eligibility for Conference Benefits:

Note: The following timeline is based on the conference's active status as of September 1, 2013. If the conference is not an active conference as of September 1, 2013, the timeline will be amended, as necessary.

2013-14

February 2013	Division II Championships Committee recommends placement of conference in the regionalization map contingent on Division II Membership Committee approval in July 2013.
July 2013	Division II Membership Committee approves/denies conference's active status.
September 1, 2013	Representation on the Division II Management Council and Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (elections shall occur during the July 2013 meetings).
September 1, 2013	Eligible to receive Conference Grant Funds (application submitted by June 30, 2013. deadline).
September 1, 2013	Conference appointments to Regional Advisory Committees.
January 2014	Eligible to vote at the NCAA Convention.

2014-15

May 2015 Eligible for conference portion of enhancement fund distribution
(based on 2013-14 sport sponsorship numbers).

2015-16

September 1, 2015 Automatic qualification for championships is granted to conference.
*(Note: For 2013-14 and 2014-15, the active institutions in the
conference are eligible for at-large berths.)*

If not approved as an active conference for 2013-14, the above timeline shall be amended,
including:

February 2014 Division II Championship Committee recommends placement of
conference in the regionalization map contingent on Division II
Membership Committee approval in July 2014.
*(Note: It is necessary for the Championships Committee to reevaluate
the placement of the conference in light of possible new institutions
joining the conference.)*

July 2014 Division II Membership Committee approves/denies conference's
active status.

September 1, 2016 Automatic qualification for championships is granted to conference.
*(Note: For 2015-16, the active institutions in the conference are
eligible for at-large berths.)*

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE
March 7, 2012, Teleconference

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- a. Committee Appointments.** Ratify the following sports committee appointment, effective immediately. [The committee chart and nomination forms are included in Attachment A.]
- Men's and Women's Track and Field. **William Bright**, assistant athletics director for compliance and communication at Stillman College, to replace Jamie Moreno, former head coach at Florida Southern College.
- b. Committee Appointments.** Ratify the following sports committee and sports rules committee appointments, effective September 1, 2012 . [Committee charts and nomination forms are included in Attachment A.]
- (1) Baseball. **Douglas Jones**, head baseball coach at Tusculum College, to replace Christian Stryker, sports information director at Coker College, due to the expiration of committee term.
 - (2) Men's Basketball. **Stan Wagnon**, commissioner of the Lone Star Conference, to replace Jim Johnson, athletics director at Pittsburg State University, due to the expiration of committee term.
 - (3) Men's Basketball. **Wendall Staton**, director of athletics at Georgia College and State University, to replace Mark Peeler, men's basketball coach and athletics director at Erskine College, due to the expiration of committee term.
 - (4) Men's Basketball Rules. **Mark Peeler**, men's basketball coach and athletics director at Erskine College, to replace Scott Eaton, athletics director at Northern Kentucky University, due to the expiration of committee term.
 - (5) Women's Basketball. **Shantey Hill**, senior associate athletics director at C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University, to replace Joan Lehoullier, senior associate athletics director at the University of Massachusetts at Lowell, due to the expiration of committee term.

- (6) Women's Basketball. **Lynne Andrew**, assistant director of athletics at Fort Lewis College, to replace Sandee Mott, associate athletics director at Metropolitan State University, due to the expiration of committee term.
- (7) Field Hockey. **Shelly Morris**, head field hockey coach at Stonehill College, to replace Kelley Frassinelli, women's field hockey coach at Southern Connecticut University, due to the expiration of committee term.
- (8) Women's Golf. **Chad Markuson**, associate athletics director at Minnesota State University Moorhead, to replace Matthew Higgins, women's golf coach at Concordia University, St. Paul, due to the expiration of committee term.
- (9) Women's Ice Hockey. **Jeffrey Giesen**, head women's hockey coach at St. Cloud University, to replace Shannon Miller, women's ice hockey coach at the University of Minnesota Duluth, due to the expiration of committee term.
- (10) Men's Lacrosse. **Brad Jorgensen**, assistant athletics director and head men's lacrosse coach at Saint Leo University, to replace Michael Cerino, director of athletics for Limestone College, due to the expiration of committee term.
- (11) Men's and Women's Skiing. **Mark (Sparky) Anderson**, head skiing coach (alpine and nordic), to replace Scott Jerome, Nordic skiing coach at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, due to the expiration of committee term.
- (12) Men's and Women's Soccer Rules Committee. **Peter Campbell**, senior associate director of athletics at Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania, to replace Jack Hyde, head coach soccer coach at San Francisco State University, due to the expiration of committee term.
- (13) Softball. **Yvonne Burbank**, associate senior woman administrator at Sonoma State University, to replace Pam Knox, head softball coach at Western Oregon University due to the expiration of committee term.
- (14) Men's and Women's Track and Field. **Matthew van Lierop**, head men's and women's cross country / track and field coach at Mount Olive College, to replace Mike Mead, head coach and athletics administrator at Clayton State University due to the expiration of committee term.
- (15) Playing Rules Oversight Panel. **Dr. Douglas Blais**, faculty athletics representative at Southern New Hampshire University, to replace Alan Patterson, commissioner of Conference Carolinas due to the expiration of committee term.

- c. **Committee Reappointments.** Ratify the following sports committee and sports rules committee reappointments, effective September 1, 2012. [Committee charts and nomination forms are included in Attachment A.]

- (1) Baseball. **Kenny Leonesio**, head baseball coach at California State University, Stanislaus.
- (2) Men's Basketball. **Joseph Clinton**, basketball coach and administrator at Dominican College (New York).
- (3) Women's Golf. **Rebecca Mailloux**, head women's golf coach at Grand Valley State University.

[Note that the Division II Championships Committee deferred action on appointments for the football and men's golf committees and referred back to the Nominating Committee for further discussion. These appointments will be considered at the July Management Council meeting.]

d. Men's Soccer - Amendment to the Regional Bid Allocations and Championship Bracket.

- (1) Recommendation. Approve that, effective with the 2012 championship, the number of regional bids be amended as outlined below resulting in the attached bracket. (Attachment B)

Proposed Regional Alignment

Region	Sponsorship	Bids/Region	Regional Access Ratio
Atlantic	24	4	6.00
Central	9	2	4.50
East	37	5	7.40
Midwest	30	5	6.00
South	18	3	6.00
South Central	18	3	6.00
Southeast	33	5	6.60
West	33	5	6.60

Average access ratio – 6.14

National access ratio – 6.31

Lowest access ratio – 4.50

Highest access ratio – 7.40

Current Allocations with 2012 Regional Alignment

Region	Sponsorship	Bids/Region	Regional Access Ratio
Atlantic	24	4	6.00
Central	9	2	4.50
East	37	6	6.17
Midwest	30	4	7.50
South	18	4	4.50

South Central	18	2	9.00
Southeast	33	6	5.50
West	33	4	8.25

Average access ratio – 6.43

National access ratio – 6.31

Lowest access ratio – 4.50

Highest access ratio – 9.00

- (2) Rationale. With the growth in sponsorship and the changes in regional alignment set to take effect in fall of 2012, the post season bracket access ratios across all regions have become inequitable.
- (3) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.
- (4) Estimated Budget Impact. \$43,000.

The pairings outlined in Attachment D reflect the least expensive option to accommodate the bid reallocation. Additionally, no new dollars are required to support the amendment to the regional bid allocations and may be supported by the current soccer budget.

- (5) Student-Athlete Impact. The proposed realignment will create more equitable access to post season play across all regions.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Men's Basketball—2013 Championship Venue.** The committee approved that the 2013 Division II Men's Basketball Championship take place at Philips Arena in Atlanta, Georgia, as part of the 75th anniversary of the Division I Men's Final Four. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee believes that this would be a tremendous opportunity for Division II basketball and would provide an outstanding student-athlete experience for the two teams that advance to Atlanta, as well as an opportunity for greater exposure at the Men's Final Four. While understanding that there are still some issues to be resolved (how to get down to two teams, fan costs), the Men's Basketball Committee is supportive of the concept and appreciates the opportunity to take part in the 75th anniversary of the Division I Men's Final Four. Staff has talked with the Division II representatives of the National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC) and the leadership is fully supportive of the concept [Attachment C].

The estimated budget impact for Division II would be approximately \$185,000. These figures were based on increasing the per diem for the participating teams from the current per diem of \$85 to the Division I per diem of \$225 for each day. This would allow for the teams to pay for the higher lodging costs that are associated with the Men's Final Four. Also included are expenses for the officials (4) and committee member (8) to attend and any local transportation costs that may be encountered [Attachment D].

The student-athletes who advance to the championship game will be able to participate in a number of different activities around the Men's Final Four, including the Salute Presentation, a community outreach initiative, an introduction during the semifinals of the Men's Final Four and the winning team being introduced during the championship game of the Men's Final Four as the Division II national champion. These experiences for the student-athletes will be lifelong and provide a very positive and memorable student-athlete experience. The student-athletes who advance to the championship would at most miss two additional days of class time from a normal Elite Eight experience.

[Please see Supplement No. 3—Administrative Committee summary from the March 7 teleconference for information concerning approval by that body.]

2. **Men's Lacrosse—Regional alignment.** The committee approved the moving of Adams State College, Dominican University of California, Colorado Mesa University, Lindenwood University and Notre Dame da Namur University from the North evaluation region to the South evaluation region, effective September 1, 2012. This change results in both men's and women's lacrosse accounting for these five institutions into the same evaluation region.
3. **Women's Volleyball—Officials' Requirements.** The committee approved the following requirements be met to serve as an official for regional and/or national competition for the Division II women's volleyball championship:
 - a. Registration through Arbiter by September 15 (already a requirement).
 - b. Attend an in-person clinic.
 - c. Complete an online exam and pass with a score of 90 percent or better, by September 15.
 - d. Officiate at least ten NCAA matches during the academic year prior to the championship for which they are selected.

These requirements would be effective immediately, except for the requirement of ten NCAA matches. That requirement would be effective for the 2013 championship.

Currently, officials are required to register through Arbiter in order to serve as an official for Division II postseason volleyball. The additional requirements noted above have previously been approved for Division I postseason volleyball assignments. There are 28 clinic opportunities for officials during the summer, and the majority of the Division II officials are currently attending the clinics. Division I had 100 percent clinic participation by the 2011 championship officials. The online written exam is open book, and only five of the nominated officials for the 2011 Division I championship did not pass the online written exam by the deadline. Implementing the requirements will create consistency across all divisions and will ensure that the officials assigned to the Division II volleyball championship are educated and experienced.

4. **Women's Volleyball—Committee Chair Appointment.** The committee approved that Jill Stephens, head women's volleyball coach at Florida Southern College, be elected as the committee chair for the 2012-13 and 2013-14 academic years.
5. **Women's Volleyball - Selection of host for 2012 final site.** The committee approved that Pensacola, Florida, be designated as the site for the 2012 Division II Women's Volleyball Championship. The University of West Florida and the Pensacola Sports Association will serve as co-hosts for the championship, to be conducted at the West Florida Field House.

The Women's Volleyball Committee received two other bids, from the University of North Alabama and Concordia University, St. Paul. As noted in the attachment, the estimated travel expenses for North Alabama were significantly higher than the other two bids. Additionally the committee had concerns about the quality of the facilities at North Alabama, most importantly the locker rooms.

Concordia-St. Paul hosted the women's volleyball championship in 2008 and 2009 and the committee felt a rotation in sites would enhance the student-athlete experience. West Florida submitted an extensive marketing plan and has experience in hosting many successful NCAA Division II championship rounds, including men's and women's soccer finals, women's golf regionals, baseball regionals, and the 2006 Fall Festival. The Women's Volleyball Committee felt West Florida's hosting experience and marketing plan will provide a great foundation for enhancing and promoting the championship.

Finally, the high quality of West Florida's facilities, as well as the hotels, banquet facility, and local attractions in Pensacola, will greatly enhance the experience for the participating teams.

The estimated ticket sales and operational expenses for the recommended sites are as follows:

Concordia-St. Paul	Estimated Expenses/Ticket Sales: \$14,880/\$22,200
North Alabama	Estimated Expenses/Ticket Sales: \$15,830/\$16,750
West Florida/Pensacola	Estimated Expenses/Ticket Sales: \$28,880/\$25,200

The NCAA administrative services group has provided estimated transportation and per diem expenses for the site and this information can be found in Attachment E.

6. **Men's Lacrosse—Orientation.** The Men's Lacrosse Committee participated in a joint orientation meeting with Division I and Division III to begin the 2012 championship planning.
7. **Women's Volleyball.**
 - **Seeding Teams at the Final Site.** The Division II Championships Committee denied that the Women's Volleyball Committee be allowed to seed the eight teams that advance to the finals site using the information provided in the score-reporting system. Further process related information would need provided by the Volleyball Committee before

further review of this type of implementation would be considered by the Championships Committee.

- **Coordinator of Officials at Final Site.** The Division II Championships Committee tabled the discussion related to having a coordinator of officials be assigned to the final site to make evaluations and assignments for further review of budgetary impact. The Championships Committee will plan to take action on this item at their April teleconference.
- **Ranking and Selection Criteria.** The Division II Championships Committee tabled that the following changes be made to the criteria for ranking and selecting teams throughout the season and for the championship:

Primary Criteria

- Head-to-head results;
- ~~In-region results (includes, not in priority order, in-region won-loss record, results versus regionally ranked teams in their region, teams in the region above and equal to .500 and teams in the region below .500);~~
- Results versus common opponents; ~~and~~
- **Results versus ranked teams in any region (once-ranked-always-ranked).**
- i. **In-region significant wins and losses (results versus teams 1.000-.750; .749-.500; .499-.250; .249 and below); and**
- j. **In-region RPI.**
- k. ~~In-region strength of schedule/record and Division II strength of schedule/record (includes average opponents' winning percentage and average opponents' opponents' winning percentage).~~

Tie-Breaking Procedures

If the evaluation of the primary criteria does not result in a decision, the committee will select teams based on the following criteria, (listed in rank priority order):

- Head-to-head results;
- ~~In-region results;~~
- **In-region significant wins and losses;**
- Results versus in-region common opponents;
- **In-region RPI;**
- **Results versus ranked teams in any region (once-ranked-always-ranked);**
- ~~In-region strength of schedule;~~
- Results versus out-of-region common opponents;
- **In-region win-loss percentage; and**
- **Division II win-loss percentage.**
- ~~Division II strength of schedule;~~
- ~~In-region record; and~~
- ~~Overall Division II record.~~

The Division II Championships Committee felt that due to the overall review currently being analyzed related to selection criteria white paper in Division II as a whole, that any updates to selection criteria are on hold.

- **Competing at the Division I Site.** The Volleyball Committee discussed the possibility of conducting the Division II championship at the same site and on the same weekend as the Division I Women's Volleyball Championship. Discussions are to begin with the proposal with internal groups and the Volleyball Committee will work with the American Volleyball Coaches Association (AVCA) coaches committee to discuss logistics, format, etc., regarding the pending forthcoming proposal.
8. **University of West Georgia Correspondence.** The Division II Championships Committee reviewed a written letter received from the University of West Georgia President, Dr. Beheruz N. Sethna, related to regionalization concerns. The Championships Committee forwarded the information to the Football Committee for recommendations. Additionally, the Championships Committee will plan to revisit the recommendations from the Football Committee at the May 2012 meeting.
 9. **Other Business.** The Championships Committee was updated on a future in-region waiver for Grand Valley State University that is expected to be forthcoming at the April teleconference related to women's lacrosse that will be up for discussion.
 10. **Future Meetings.** The Division II Championships Committee reviewed its upcoming meeting schedule and noted that the next in-person meeting is scheduled for May 30 and 31. Monthly teleconferences are planned for April 5 and May 3.

Committee Chair: Erin Lind, Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference (NSIC)
Staff Liaisons: Roberta Page, Championships and Alliances
Amy Reis, Championships and Alliances

TELECONFERENCE Wednesday, March 7, 2012	
<u>ATTENDEES</u>	<u>ABSENTEES</u>
Bob Boerigter, Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association	Kris Dunbar, Lake Superior State University
Bob Dranoff, East Coast Conference	Frank Keenan, NCAA DII SAAC Representative
Erin Lind, Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference (<i>chair</i>)	Ann Martin, Regis University (<i>MC chair</i>)
Claudie Mackey, Elizabeth City State University	Patsy Smith, Missouri Western State University
Francis Reidy, Saint Leo University	Bren Stevens, University of Charleston (<i>MC vice chair</i>)
Richard Sanders, Northwest Nazarene University	
Dr. Michael Scales, Nyack College and Alliance Theological Seminary (<i>PC liaison</i>)	
David Sharp, Ouachita Baptist University	
J.R. Smith, Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	
Lisa Sweany, Armstrong Atlantic State University	

OTHER PARTICIPANTS:

Terri Steeb-Gronau, Sharon Tufano, Roberta Page, Amy Reis, Russ Yurk, Donnie Wagner, Jarrett Newby and Tamara Gingerich (*NCAA staff*)

2010-11 DIVISION II MEN'S AND WOMEN'S TRACK AND FIELD COMMI

Composition: Eight members, including four representing men's track and four representing women's track. Two positions are allocated for men, Two for women. Quota of 50 percent administrators: 4
 One from each region: West, Central, South Central, Midwest, South, Southeast, Atlantic, East.

Vacancies: **One immediate vacancy. Jamie Moreno has resigned. South region; coach or administrator. Two September 2012 vacancies. One men's interests; one women's interests; Southeast and Central regions; coaches or administrators.**

Committee preference: **Administrator with strong track background; coach with significant track and meet management experience.**

Staff Liaison: Katie Holmes.

Chair:

DIV.	REG.	POS.	EM/ GEN	NAME AND INSTITUTION	CONFERENCE	9/11-9/12	9/12-9/13	9/13-9/14	9/14-9/15
II (M)	West	C	Y/M	Christopher Asher California State University, Los Angeles	California Collegiate Athletic	Asher	Asher	Asher	Asher *
II (M)	So	C	N/M	Jamie Moreno Florida Southern College	Sunshine State	Moreno	Moreno*		
II (M)	Cen (SoC 9/12)	Asst AD	N/M	Scott Groom Western State College of Colorado	Rocky Mountain Athletic	Groom	Groom	Groom*	
II (M)	SoE	C/A	N/M	Mike Mead Clayton State University	Peach Belt	Mead*			
II (W)	East	Asst C	N/M	Richard Hart Stonehill College	Northest-10	Hart	Hart	Hart*	
II (W)	SoC	C	N/M	Kirk Pedersen University of Central Missouri	Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics	Pedersen*			
II (W)	MidW	Asst Comm	N/F	Penny Allen-Cook Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic	Allen-Cook	Allen-Cook	Allen-Cook	Allen-Cook*
II (W)	Atl	Assoc AD	Y/F	Kristene Kelly St. Augustine's College	Central Intercollegiate Athletic	Kelly	Kelly*		

* Not eligible for reappointment
 1/27/12

Division II Men's and Women's Track and Field Committee Nominee Information

Name: Matthew van Lierop
Job Title: Head Coach Cross Country / Track & Field
Gender: M
Ethnic Minority: N
Institution: Mount Olive College
Conference: Conference Carolinas
Playing conference: Conference Carolinas
Meets 50% requirement: Y
Institution Sponsors sport: Y

Qualification Statement:

I've been involved with the sport of Track & Field for the past 20 years as an athlete and coach. I've coached on the high school level, as well as the Division III and Division II levels. Level 1 certification. Recently took over the ranking duties for the Southeast Region.

Past Committee Service:

Professional Development participation:

Employment History:

Asst. Coach T&F - Port Jefferson HS - 1996
Asst. Coach XC - Susquehanna Community HS - 2007
Head Coach XC/T&F - Keystone College - 2004 to 2009
Head Coach XC/T&F - Mount Olive College - 2009 to present

Education:

Bachelors - Lehigh University - '95

NCAA championship exp:

Helped an individual qualify for the 2007 and 2008 NCAA D3 XC championships, and 2009 NCAA D3 indoor t&f championships.
Helped two individuals qualify for 2008 NCAA D3 outdoor t&f championships.
Helped an individual female and male team qualify for the NCAA D2 2011 XC championships.

References:

Jeff Eisen - Athletic Director - Mount Olive College

Nominee has contacted listed references:

Y

Former high school S/A (sports):

Former college S/A:

Former high school coach (sports):

Former college coach (sports):

Regional Advisory Committee exp:

Regional ranker for the Southeast
Region

Conference champs mgt exp:

While coaching at the Division III level we hosted the Cross Country Conference Championships.

Division II Men's and Women's Track and Field Committee Nominee Information

Name: William Bright Jr.

Job Title: Asst. AD/Compliance and Communications

Gender: M

Ethnic Minority: Y

Institution: Stillman College

Conference: Southern Intercol. Ath. Conf.

Playing conference: Southern Intercol. Ath. Conf.

Meets 50% requirement: Y

Institution Sponsors sport: Y

Qualification Statement:

Having served on the Division I conference level, I served as liaison to the track and field coaches and student athletes. Currently, I have secondary supervision over the track and field program under the supervision of the Director of Athletics. I have hosted several track and field events as well as been a member of the planning and steering committee of several conference championships.

Past Committee Service:

Professional Development participation: College Sports Information Directors of America

Employment History:

Currently serve as assistant director for athletics at Stillman College. **COMPLIANCE:** Responsibilities include monitoring compliance with NCAA, SIAC and institutional rules and regulations; enhancing a rules education program for coaches, staff, student-athletes and boosters; providing rules interpretations, monitoring recruiting activities, preparing waivers and violation reports, assisting the registrar and admissions director with certification of eligibility of student-athletes, working with the financial aid director in updating and maintaining NCAA squad lists, generating and maintaining all compliance forms, including transfer releases, practice schedules, NCAA Eligibility Center forms, recruiting forms, official visit forms and records related to the awarding and the distribution of athletics aid.

COMMUNICATIONS: Responsible for leading the media and public relations efforts for intercollegiate athletics including identifying and developing creative strategies to support athletic and university brand identities. Oversees publications, releases, game programs, online information and social media for all 12 Stillman College intercollegiate sports, associated teams and organizations. Generation of computer statistics at all home events, handling postgame press conferences and the dissemination of results to the media, SIAC and NCAA. Further responsibilities entail but are not limited to promotion of sport teams, coaches and student-athletes to local, regional and national media.

Have also served as director of communications at Mississippi Valley State University (2009-2011), the Southwestern Athletic Conference (2005-2009) and Alabama A&M University (2004-2005). I have also served as an communications assistant at Jackson State University (2001-2003) and Alcorn State University (1997-2000).

Education: 2000-Bachelor's degree-Broadcast Communications; Minor-Political Science from Alcorn State University

NCAA championship exp:

References:

Curtis Campbell, Director of Athletics, Stillman College,
Tuscaloosa, Ala.

Darrol Woods, Ph.D., Associate Director of Athletics, Jackson
State University, Jackson, Miss.

Tom Galbraith, Assistant Commissioner, Southwestern
Athletic Conference, Birmingham, Ala.

Kevin Manns, Assistant Director of Athletics, Winston-Salem
State University, Winston-Salem, N.C.

Nominee has contacted listed references:

Y

Former high school S/A (sports):

Former college S/A:

Former high school coach (sports):

Former college coach (sports):

Regional Advisory Committee exp:

Conference champs mgt exp:

Having served for more than four years at the Southwestern Athletic Conference, I was a primary member of the championships and communications teams. As a member

of the championships operations group, I supervised and managed operational duties not limited to communications, operations, pre-planning and evaluation.

DIVISION II MEN'S AND WOMEN'S TRACK AND FIELD COMMITTEE COMPOSITION								
REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Christopher Asher	X					X		X
Jamie Moreno	X					X		
Scott Groom					X	X		
Mike Mead	X				X	X		
Richard Hart	X					X		
Kirk Pedersen	X					X		
Penny Allen-Cook					X		X	
Kristene Kelly					X		X	X
TOTALS	5	0	0	0	4	6	2	2

WITH RECOMMENDATION

REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Christopher Asher	X					X		X
William Bright					X	X		X
Scott Groom					X	X		
Matthew van Lierop	X					X		
Richard Hart	X					X		
Kirk Pedersen	X					X		
Penny Allen-Cook					X		X	
Kristene Kelly					X		X	X
TOTALS	4	0	0	0	4	6	2	3

2011-12 DIVISION II BASEBALL COMMITTEE

Composition: Eight members. One from each of the Division II baseball regions (West, Central, South Central, Midwest, South, Southeast, Atlantic, East).
Quota of 50 percent administrators: 4.

Vacancies: Three September 2012 vacancies. Southeast, Atlantic and Central regions. Coaches or administrators.
[NOTE: Kevin Brooks, Angelo State, stepped off the committee in September 2012 due to duplicate representation due to regional realignment. He may rejoin the committee when the South Central region slot becomes available and may serve the remainder of his term (three years).]

Committee preference: 50% coaches.

Reappoint: Kenny Leonesio.

Staff Liaison: Russ Yurk

Chair:

REG	POS	EM/ GEN	NAME, INSTITUTION	CONFERENCE	9/11-9/12	9/12-9/13	9/13-9/14	9/14-9/15
East	Asst AD	N/M	Jason Trufant Molloy College	East Coast	Trufant	Trufant*		
Atl	C	Y/M	Terrance Whittle Elizabeth City State University	Central Intercollegiate Athletic	Whittle*			
So	Comm	N/M	Nate Salant Gulf South Conference	Gulf South	Salant	Salant*		
SoC	C	N/M	Kevin Brooks Angelo State University	Lone Star	Brooks	Brooks	Brooks	Brooks*
West	C	N/M	Kenny Leonesio California State University, Stanislaus	California Collegiate Athletic	Leonesio			
SoE	SID	N/M	Christian Stryker Coker College	Conference Carolinas	Stryker*			
Mid W	Assoc AD	N/M	Jim Givens University of Findlay	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletics	Givens	Givens*		
Cen (SoC 9/12)	AD	Y/M	Ed Manzanares New Mexico Highlands University	Rocky Mountain Athletic	Manzanares	Manzanares	Manzanares*	

*Not eligible for reappointment 10/25/11

Division II Baseball Committee Nominee Information

Name: Douglas Nelson Jones
Job Title: Head Baseball Coach
Gender: M
Ethnic Minority: N
Institution: Tusculum College
Conference: South Atlantic Conference
Playing conference: South Atlantic Conference
Meets 50% requirement: Y
Institution Sponsors sport: Y

Qualification Statement:

I have served on the selection committee on 3 different occasions both in the south and southeast regions. I have a good understanding of the criteria and have the organizational skills to run the committee.

Past Committee Service:

South Region Selection Committee - 2003-2004, 2006 - 2007. Southeast Rgional Selection Committee - 2008 - 2009.

Professional Development participation:

Employment History:

Asst. Baseball Coach - Gardner-Webb University - 4 Years.
Head Baseball Coach - Tusculum College - 15 Years.

Education:

BS from Gardner-Webb University.
Master of Arts - Gardner-Webb University.

NCAA championship exp:

References:

Jim Gantt - Catawba College - Head Baseball Coach.
Patrick Britz - Commissioner - South Atlantic Conference.

Nominee has contacted listed references:

Y

Former high school S/A (sports):

Former college S/A:

Former high school coach (sports):

Former college coach (sports):

Regional Advisory Committee exp:

Served on the regional selection committee 3 different times (6 years).

Conference champs mgt exp:

I have served as the baseball chair for our conference for a total of 4 years (2 terms).

DIVISION II BASEBALL COMMITTEE COMPOSITION								
REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Jason Trufant					X	X		
Terrance Whittle	X					X		X
Nate Salant				X		X		
Kevin Brooks	X					X		
Kenny Leonesio	X					X		
Christian Stryker					X	X		
Jim Givens					X	X		
Ed Manzanares		X				X		X
TOTALS	3	1	0	1	3	8		2

WITH RECOMMENDATION

REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Jason Trufant					X	X		
Terrance Whittle	X					X		X
Nate Salant				X		X		
Kevin Brooks	X					X		
Kenny Leonesio	X					X		
Douglas Jones	X					X		
Jim Givens					X	X		
Ed Manzanares		X				X		X
TOTALS	4	1	0	1	2	8		2

2011-12 DIVISION II MEN'S BASKETBALL COMMITTEE

Composition: Eight members. One from each of the Division II men's basketball regions (West, Central, South Central, Midwest, South, Southeast, Atlantic, East). Quota of 50 percent administrators: 4.
[NOTE: Due to changes in conference regional alignments, Jim Johnson, Pittsburg State, will leave the committee September 1, 2012. Mr. Johnson may rejoin the committee to complete his last year of service when the Central region comes open when Eric Schoh leaves the committee.]

Vacancies: Three September 2012 vacancies. South Central, Midwest and Southeast regions. Coaches or administrators.
Committee preference: Two coaches.

Reappoint: Joseph Clinton.
Staff Liaison: Donnie Wagner
Chair: Jim Johnson (9/10-9/12)

REG	POS	EM/G EN	NAME AND INSTITUTION	CONFERENCE	9/11-9/12	9/12-9/13	9/13-9/14	9/14-9/15
So	C/A	N/M	Tom Ryan Eckerd College	Sunshine State	Ryan	Ryan*		
Mid W	Asst Com	N/M	Jeff Ligney Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic	Ligney*			
East	C/A	N/M	Joseph Clinton Dominican College (NY)	Central Atlantic Collegiate	Clinton			
SoC (Cen 9/1 2)	AD	N/M	Jim Johnson Pittsburg State University	Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic	Johnson*			
Atl	AD	N/M	Ken Tyler West Virginia Wesleyan College	West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic	Tyler	Tyler	Tyler*	
Cen	AD	N/M	Eric Schoh Wayne State College (NE)	Northern Sun Intercollegiate	Schoh	Schoh	Schoh*	
SoE	AD/ C	N/M	Mark Peeler Erskine College	Conference Carolinas	Peeler*			
W	AD	Y/M	Kevin Hatcher California State University, San Bernardino	California Collegiate Athletic	Hatcher	Hatcher	Hatcher	Hatcher*

10/25/11

Division II Men's Basketball Committee Nominee Information

Name: Stan Wagnon
Job Title: Commissioner
Designation: COM
Gender: M
Ethnic Minority: N
Institution: Lone Star Conference
Conference: Lone Star Conference
Playing conference:
Meets 50% requirement: Y
Institution Sponsors sport: Y

Qualification Statement:

My personal background and professional experiences provide what I hope is an ideal match for service on the men's basketball committee, specifically representing the South Central Region. Over the past two decades, I've worked at three institutions and a conference office that all reside within the South Central Region. I've been fortunate that each of these three institutions (and the conference in general) has experienced a fair amount of success in men's basketball during that span. As such, I have attended 13 of the past 20 regional men's basketball tournaments, having helped to host the event three times in addition to twice serving as NCAA Site Representative on behalf of the men's basketball committee. Further, I'm completing my third year of service on the Regional Advisory Committee for men's basketball in this region. I am passionate about this sport, these teams, and this region, and I welcome an opportunity to enhance the championship experience for these student-athletes.

Past Committee Service:

Division II Men's Basketball Regional Advisory Committee, 2009-Present... Division II Nominating Committee, 2008-Present (Chair, Sept. 2011-Present)... Legislative Committee for Division II CCA, 2007-Present... Deacon at The Heights Baptist Church, 2010-Present.

Professional Development participation:

Voting delegate at NCAA Convention multiple years... Attendee at Division II Presidents/Chancellors Summit multiple years... CoSida Convention/Workshop multiple years... Member of Division II Conference Commissioners Association... Speaker at NACWAA Convention 2010 in Fort Worth.

Employment History:

Commissioner, Lone Star Conference, 2007-Present... Interim Commissioner, Lone Star Conference, 2006... Assistant Commissioner, Lone Star Conference, 2003-2006... Sports Information Director, Tarleton State University, 2000-2003... Sports Information Director, Midwestern State University, 1996-2000.

Education:

Bachelor's in Journalism/Public Relations, University of Central Oklahoma, 1995... Graduate Work in Kinesiology/Sports Management, Midwestern State University.

NCAA championship exp:

Having worked previously as sports information director and currently as a conference administrator, I have been fortunate to attend NCAA regional and/or national events in 15 different sports. I've been involved in varying capacities, from administrator of a participating team to tournament manager to NCAA site representative. As stated earlier, I've attended 13 of the past 20 men's basketball regional tournaments. I also have twice attended the Division II Men's Basketball Elite Eight. I have served as NCAA site representative on numerous occasions in the sports of men's basketball, football and men's soccer.

References:

Pat O'Brien, President, West Texas A&M,
pobrien@wtamu.edu... Kathleen Brasfield, Athletic Director,
Angelo State, kbrasfield@angelo.edu... Jim Johnson, Athletic
Director, Pittsburg State, jjohnson@pittstate.edu... Lon
Reisman, Men's Basketball Coach, Tarleton State,
reisman@tarleton.edu.

Nominee has contacted listed references:

Y

Wagnon (cont)

Former high school S/A (sports):

Baseball

Former college S/A:

Former high school coach (sports):

Baseball

Former college coach (sports):

Regional Advisory Committee exp:

I'm currently in my third year on the Regional Advisory Committee for men's basketball. Further, I've had the opportunity to be involved with the selection calls and regional tournament administration in the sports of football and men's soccer. I am well versed in the ranking process and have a tremendous understanding of the selection criteria, both in its present form and historically.

Conference champs mgt exp:

Over the past nine years as a conference staff member, I have been heavily involved in the management of Lone Star Conference championship events. Most notably, I provided oversight of our basketball tournament's transition from an on-campus model to a predetermined neutral site and from men/women at separate sites to men/women combined at one site. In four years, the event has been widely recognized as the league's top asset and moves this year to a new home in the Dallas-Fort Worth suburb of Allen, Texas. I've also worked closely with neutral site championships in the sports of men/women golf, men/women tennis, and softball. Lastly, while not a conference championship, I successfully created and implemented the Lone Star Football Festival at Cowboys Stadium this past fall, whereby three Division II football games were played in the largest, most technologically advanced sports and entertainment venue in the world. The event will expand this fall to include five D-II football games.

Division II Men's Basketball Committee Nominee Information

Name: Wendell Staton

Job Title: AD

Gender: M

Ethnic Minority: N

Institution: Georgia College & State University

Conference: Peach Belt Conference

Playing conference:

Meets 50% requirement: Y

Institution Sponsors sport: Y

Qualification Statement:

I have completed one year of service on the Southeast Region RAC for Men's Basketball. I served as an assistant men's basketball coach in NCAA Division II from 1991 through 2002. I was a men's basketball player as a student-athlete in college. I was also a board member of the NABC Assistant Coaches committee. My knowledge, experience, and respect developed during my coaching years has prepared me well to serve in this role.

Past Committee Service: NABC Assistant Coaches Committee/Board of Directors, 1999

Professional Development participation:

Participated in the NCAA Division II Community Engagement Workshop in June 2011. This workshop has greatly impacted our department with an increased effort with community engagement.

Employment History:

Men's Basketball Assistant, Campbell University, 1990-91

Head Men's and Women's Cross Country Coach, Men's Basketball Assistant, Georgia College 1991-93

Men's Basketball Assistant, HPER Instructor, Elon University, 1993-95

Men's Basketball Assistant, HPER Instructor, Armstrong Atlantic State University, 1995-96

Head Men's Golf Coach, Men's Basketball Assistant, UNC Pembroke, 1996-2002

Recreation & Parks Director, City of Lumberton, NC, 2002-2005

Associate Vice Chancellor for Advancement, UNC Pembroke, 2005-2009

Director of Athletics, Georgia College, 2009-Present

Education:

BA in Education, St. Andrews College, 1990

MEd. in Education, Georgia College, 1993

NCAA championship exp: None

References:

Dan Kenney, Director of Athletics, UNC Pembroke,
daniel.kenney@uncp.edu, 910-521-6560

Clint Bryant, Director of Athletics, Augusta State University,
cbryant@aug.edu, 706-737-1626

Nominee has contacted listed references:

Y

Former high school S/A (sports):

Basketball

Cross Country

Former college S/A:

Basketball

Cross Country

Former high school coach (sports):

Baseball

Former college coach (sports):

Men's Basketball

Golf

Cross Country

Conference champs mgt exp:

None

Regional Advisory Committee exp:

I have completed one year as a member of the Southeast Region RAC.

DIVISION II MEN'S BASKETBALL COMMITTEE COMPOSITION								
REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Tom Ryan	X				X	X		
Jeff Ligney					X	X		
Joseph Clinton	X	X				X		
Jim Johnson		X				X		
Ken Tyler		X				X		
Eric Schoh		X				X		
Mark Peeler	X	X				X		
Kevin Hatcher		X				X		X
TOTALS	3	6	0	0	2	8		1

WITH RECOMMENDATION

REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Tom Ryan	X				X	X		
Jeff Ligney					X	X		
Joseph Clinton	X	X				X		
Stan Wagnon				X		X		
Ken Tyler		X				X		
Eric Schoh		X				X		
Wendell Staton		X				X		
Kevin Hatcher		X				X		X
TOTALS	2	5	0	1	2	8		1

2011-12 MEN'S BASKETBALL RULES COMMITTEE

(Association-Wide Rules Administration)

Thirteen members, including six members from Division I, three members from Division II and three members from Division III. An additional member shall be a nonvoting secretary-rules editor. Quota of 25 percent administrators: 3. Quota of 50 percent coaches: 6. Two representatives from each of the following four geographical regions:

Region 1: Districts 1 and 2; Region 3: Districts 4 and 5

Region 2: District 3

Region 4: Districts 6, 7 and 8.

Policy: Each division will adhere to the 50 percent coaches independently.

Vacancies: Two September 2012 vacancies. Two Division II (coaches or administrators); one Region 4.

Staff Liaison: Ty Halpin

Chair:

DIV	REG/ DST	POS	EM/ GEN	NAME, INSTITUTION	CONFERENCE	9/11-9/12	9/12-9/13	9/13-9/14	9/14-9/15
FBS	2	Assoc Comm	Y/M	Karl Hicks Atlantic Coast Conference	Atlantic Coast	Hicks	Hicks	Hicks	Hicks*
FBS	4	A	N/M	Gerald Myers Texas Tech University	Big 12	Myers	Myers*		
FCS (FCS)	2 (1)	Assoc AD (C)	N/M (N/M)	Adam Brick George Mason University (Howie Dickenman Central Connecticut State)	Colonial Athletic (Northeast)	Brick*	(Dickenman)	(Dickenman)	(Dickenman 9/16*)
DI	2	C	N/M	Rick Byrd Belmont University	Atlantic Sun	Byrd	Byrd	Byrd	Byrd*
DI	1	C	N/M	John Dunne St. Peter's College	Metro Atlantic Athletic	Dunne	Dunne*		
DI	3	C	N/M	Jim Molinari Western Illinois University	Summit	Molinari	Molinari	Molinari*	
II	2	AD	N/M	Scott Eaton Northern Kentucky University	Great Lakes Valley	Eaton*			
II	4	AD	Y/M	Albert Kenyon Wagner Brigham Young University, Hawaii	Pacific West	Wagner*			
II	2	C/A	N/M	Mark Corino Caldwell College	Central Atlantic Collegiate	Corino	Corino	Corino	Corino*
III	1	C	Y/M	Ed Silva Elms College	New England Collegiate	Silva	Silva	Silva	Silva*
III	1	AD	N/M	James Zalacca State University of New York at Potsdam	State University of New York Athletic	Zalacca	Zalacca	Zalacca*	
III	3	A/C	N/M	Robert Passage Kalamazoo College	Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic	Passage	Passage*		

*Not eligible for reappointment 2/15/12

Men's Basketball Rules Committee Nominee Information

Name: Mark Peeler
Job Title: Director of Athletics/Men Bball
Gender: M
Ethnic Minority: N
Institution: Erskine College
Conference: Conference Carolinas
Playing conference: Conference Carolinas
Meets 50% requirement: Y
Institution Sponsors sport: Y

Qualification Statement:

Have been Division II head men's basketball coach for 15 years, served as D-II athletics director for 10 years, served on NCAA D-II men's basketball committee from 2008-2012.

Past Committee Service:

D-II Men's Basketball 2008-2012

Professional Development participation:

Employment History:

St. Andrews College AD/Basketball Coach 1996-99
Erskine College Basketball Coach 1999-2003
Erskine College AD/Basketball Coach 2004-present

Education:

Master's in Education Winthrop University 1994
Bachelor of Arts University of the South (Sewanee) 1984

NCAA championship exp:

2008-2012 Men's basketball national committee, served as officials liaison at Elite 8.

References:

Alan Patterson, Commissioner, Conference Carolinas
Rich Sanders, AD Northwest Nazarene
Dan Kenney, AD, UNC-Pembroke
Jim Johnson, AD, Pittsburg State

Nominee has contacted listed references:

Y

Former high school S/A (sports):

Basketball
Former Basketball
Baseball

Former college S/A:

Basketball
Golf

Former high school coach (sports):

Former baseball
Cross Country

Former college coach (sports):

Basketball
Cross Country
Tennis

Regional Advisory Committee exp:

2008-2012 Men's basketball
Committee, chair Southeast region in
charge of rankings

Conference champs mgt exp:

Erskine College has hosted
Conference Carolinas tennis
championships last 8 years and hosted
Conference Carolinas Basketball
Championships in 2004

MEN'S BASKETBALL RULES COMMITTEE COMPOSITION								
REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Karl Hicks (DI)					X	X		X
Gerald Myers (DI)					X	X		
Adam Brick (DI)					X	X		
Rick Byrd (DI)	X					X		
John Dunne (DI)	X					X		
Jim Molinari (DI)	X					X		
Scott Eaton (DII)		X				X		
Albert Kenyon Wagner (DII)		X				X		X
Mark Corino (DII)	X	X				X		
Ed Silva (DIII)	X					X		X
James Zalacca (DIII)		X				X		
Robert Passage (DIII)	X				X	X		
TOTALS	6	4	0	0	4	12	0	3

WITH RECOMMENDATION

REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Karl Hicks (DI)					X	X		X
Gerald Myers (DI)					X	X		
Adam Brick (DI)					X	X		
Rick Byrd (DI)	X					X		
John Dunne (DI)	X					X		
Jim Molinari (DI)	X					X		
Mark Peeler (DII)	X	X				X		
Albert Kenyon Wagner (DII)		X				X		X
Mark Corino (DII)	X	X				X		
Ed Silva (DIII)	X					X		X
James Zalacca (DIII)		X				X		
Robert Passage (DIII)	X				X	X		
TOTALS	7	4	0	0	4	12	0	3

2011-12 DIVISION II WOMEN'S BASKETBALL COMMITTEE

Composition: Eight members. One representative from each of the women's basketball regions (West, Central, South Central, Midwest, South, Southeast, Atlantic, East). Quota of 50 percent administrators: 4.

Vacancies: Two September 2012 vacancies. South Central and East regions. Coaches or administrators.

Staff Liaison: Roberta Page

Chair: Sandee Mott (9/10-9/12)

REG	POS	EM/ GEN	NAME, INSTITUTION	CONFERENCE	9/11-9/12	9/12-9/13	9/13-9/14	9/14-9/15
SoE	C/A	N/F	Wendee Saintsing Barton College	Conference Carolinas	Saintsing	Saintsing	Saintsing*	
East	Sr. Assoc AD	N/F	Joan Lehoullier University of Massachusetts at Lowell	Northeast-10	Lehouillier*			
Atl	AD	N/M	Greg Bamberger Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania State Athletic	Bamberger	Bamberger*		
SoC (Cen 9/12)	Assoc AD	N/F	Kathy Anderson University of Central Missouri	Mid-America Intercollegiate	Anderson	Anderson*		
MidW	Assoc AD	N/M	David Marsh Northwood University (MI)	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic	Marsh	Marsh	Marsh	Marsh*
West	Assoc AD	N/F	Dede Allen University of Alaska Anchorage	Great Northwest	Allen	Allen	Allen*	
So	C	N/M	Kiley Hill Valdosta State University	Gulf South	Hill	Hill	Hill	Hill*
Central	Assoc AD	N/F	Sandee Mott Metropolitan State College	Rocky Mountain Athletic	Mott*			

*Not eligible for reappointment 10/25/11

Division II Women's Basketball Committee Nominee Information

Name: Lynne Andrew

Job Title: Assistant Athletic Director

Gender: F

Ethnic Minority: N

Institution: Fort Lewis College

Conference: Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference

Playing conference: Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference

Meets 50% requirement: Y

Institution Sponsors sport: Y

Qualification Statement:

17 years of collegiate basketball coaching experience at the DII and DI levels. 4 years of athletic administrator experience at the DII level. Very hard worker with excellent organizational skills. Great communicator with coaches and administrators. Outgoing and personable with a true passion for the game of basketball. There is no task that is too small or big, if it needs to get done I will find someone to do it or do it myself. I take pride in putting on a professional, well run event. I take pride in my work and do it without hesitation.

Past Committee Service: Currently on the RMAC Academic Committee

Professional Development participation: Attended NCAA National Convention (last 3 years), attended NACWAA Convention in 2009, attended Regional Rules Seminars in 2009 and 2011.

Employment History: 1989-91 Assistant WBB Coach - Montana State University

1991-1995 Assistant WBB Coach - University of North Dakota; 1995-1997 Assistant WBB Coach - Weber State University

1997-2001 Assistant WBB Coach - Idaho State University; 2003-2008 Head WBB Coach - University of Alaska Fairbanks

2008-Present Assistant Athletic Director - Fort Lewis College

Education: 1991 Bachelor of Science in Physical Education; 2002 Master of Science in Athletic Administration

NCAA championship exp: I have been directly involved in hosting NCAA Championship games during the following years in the following sports: 2009 and 2011 Men's Soccer 1st, 2nd and Quarterfinals games, 2009 Women Soccer 2nd round game, 2010 Women's Soccer 1st round game, 2009-10 and 2010-11 Women's Basketball Regional Tournament. During these events I worked directly with the NCAA reps to set up practice times, locker room assignments, game officials coordination, facility preparation, coaches meetings and anything else required.

References:

Gary Hunter, Director of Athletics, Fort Lewis College, 970-247-7224, ghunter@fortlewis.edu

Sandee Mott, Associate Athletic Director, Metro State College, 303-556-4875, smott1@mscd.edu

Kelly Higgins, Former AD, Fort Lewis College, 402-926-9824, oldnumber83@yahoo.com

Steve Stovall, Faculty Athletic Representative, Fort Lewis College, 970-247-7445, stovall_s@fortlewis.edu

Mark Kellogg, Head WBB Coach, Fort Lewis College, 970-247-7607, kellogg_m@fortlewis.edu

Nominee has contacted listed references:

Y

Former high school S/A (sports):

Basketball, Soccer, Volleyball

Former college S/A: Basketball

Former high school coach (sports):

Basketball

Former college coach (sports):

Basketball

Regional Advisory Committee exp:

In 2007-08 as the Head Women's Basketball Coach at the University of Alaska Fairbanks, I was put on the regional committee towards the end of

the season due to a conflict with another member. I was involved in the last couple of calls prior to the final selection. I am familiar with the ranking criteria for basketball.

Conference champs mgt exp:

In the past 4 years at Fort Lewis I have been directly involved in hosting RMAC Championships games and tournaments in the sports of Men's Soccer, Women's Soccer, Men's Basketball and Women's Basketball. I

have worked hand in hand with the RMAC administrators to ensure the events were run according to policies and procedures. I was in charge of organizing all workers, assigning locker rooms, assigning practices times, coordinating with game officials, and any other game management duties that needed to be done.

Division II Women's Basketball Committee Nominee Information

Name: Shantey Hill

Job Title: Sr. Assoc. Director of Athletics/SWA

Gender: F

Ethnic Minority: Y

Institution: C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University

Conference: East Coast Conference

Playing conference: East Coast Conference

Meets 50% requirement: Y

Institution Sponsors sport: Y

Qualification Statement:

Personal interest in helping to advance the sport of Women's Basketball. Current member of the DII Women's Basketball East Regional Advisory Committee and thoroughly enjoy the weekly discussions and debate with peers in regards to statistics, rankings and games. Would be a privilege to be a part of the national committee that discusses this same information. Current Chair of the East Coast Conference Women's Basketball Committee which provides me the opportunity to interact with other institutions coaches as well as to plan and operate the Conference Tournament. Willingness and experience to serve as tournament director and host for regional/national games.

Past Committee Service:

Member, NCAA Division II Women's Basketball Regional Advisory Committee-Present

Member, NACWAA Sponsorship Committee-Present

Chair, East Coast Conference Women's Basketball Committee-Present

Chair, NACWAA Membership Recruitment Committee-2009-2011

Treasurer, East Coast Conference Senior Woman Administrator Committee -2007-2009

President, East Coast Conference Athletic Trainers Committee - 2006-2007

Member, Long Island University-C.W. Post Campus Safety and Security Committee, 2008-Present

Member, Long Island University-C.W. Post Campus ACE Internationalization Project Committee-Present

Member, Long Island University-C.W. Post Campus Experiential Education Committee- Present

Member, Long Island University Middle States Accreditation Sub-Committee-Present

Professional Development participation:

Graduate, 2009-2010 NCAA Leadership Institute for Ethnic Minority Males and Females - Indianapolis, IN

Graduate, 2009 NACWAA HERS/Institute West- Denver, Colorado

Selected Mentee, 2011 NCAA & Division II Athletic Directors Association Women & Minorities Mentoring Program

Presenter, 2011 National College Fair-Long Island ("College Athletics and the Admissions Process")

Presenter, 2010 National College Fair-Long Island ("Transitioning from High School to College Athletics")

Facilitator, 2010 NCAA Inaugural Career in Sports Forum- Indianapolis, IN

Employment History:

Long Island University-C.W. Post Campus, Brookville, NY

Senior Associate Director of Athletics/Senior Woman Administrator/Compliance Director,

August 2007-Present

Long Island University-C.W. Post Campus, Brookville, NY

Director of Sports Medicine/Head Athletic Trainer, August 2003-July 2007

Columbia University, New York, NY

Athletic Trainer/Associate in Physical Education, August 2001-July 2003

Ultimate Athlete Sports Performance Training, LLC

Owner/CEO, January 2005-February 2010

Suffolk Y JCC, Hauppauge, NY

Assistant Director Fitness and Sports, June 1999-June 2000

Education:

Teachers College Columbia University, New York, NY; Master of Arts, Health Education, May 2004

California University of Pennsylvania, California, PA; Master of Science, Athletic Training, May 2001

Long Island University -C.W. Post Campus, Brookville, NY

Bachelor of Science, Physical Education, May 1999

Hill (cont)

NCAA championship exp:

Successfully hosted 14 NCAA regional tournaments in various sports to include basketball within the past 2 years. Served as past NCAA host institution tournament director. Attended Elight 8 (Men's Basketball) and National Championship games subsequently won by institutions teams in Men's and Women's lacrosse.

References:

Bryan Collins
Director of Athletics/Head Football Coach
Long Island University-C.W. Post
516-299-2847
bryan.collins@liu.edu

Robert Dranoff
Commissioner
East Coast Conference
631-348-3451
rdranoff@eccsports.org

Irma Garcia
Director of Athletics
St. Francis College
718-489-5485
igarcia@stfranciscollege.edu

Kimberly Ford
Director of Diversity and Inclusion
National Collegiate Athletic Association
317-917-6360

Jacqueline Blackett

Former high school S/A (sports):
Women's Basketball
Women's Lacrosse
Former college S/A:
Women's Basketball
Former high school coach (sports):
Women's Cross Country

Former college coach (sports):

Regional Advisory Committee exp:
Member of the DII Women's
Basketball East Regional Advisory
Committee for the past 3 years.

Conference champs mgt exp:
Chair of the East Coast Conference
Women's Basketball Committee with
direct involvement of planning and
operations for the end of season
Conference Tournament.

Senior Associate Director of Athletics/SWA
Columbia University
212-854-2544
jpb3@columbia.edu

William Biddington
Faculty Athletic Representative
California University of Pennsylvania
724-938-4562
biddington_w@calu.edu

Deirdre Moore
Head Women's Basketball Coach
Long Island University-C.W. Post
516-299-3853
deirdre.moore@lin.edu

Nominee has contacted listed references:
Y

DIVISION II WOMEN'S BASKETBALL COMMITTEE COMPOSITION								
REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Wendee Saintsing	X				X		X	
Joan Lehoullier					X		X	
Greg Bamberger		X				X		
Kathy Anderson					X		X	
David Marsh					X	X		
Dede Allen					X		X	
Kiley Hill	X					X		
Sandee Mott					X		X	
TOTALS	2	1	0	0	6	3	5	

WITH RECOMMENDATION

REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Wendee Saintsing	X				X		X	
Shantey Hill					X		X	X
Greg Bamberger		X				X		
Kathy Anderson					X		X	
David Marsh					X	X		
Dede Allen					X		X	
Kiley Hill	X					X		
Lynne Andrew					X		X	
TOTALS	2	1	0	0	6	3	5	1

2011-12 DIVISION II FIELD HOCKEY COMMITTEE

Composition: Four members. Two from each of the Division II field hockey regions – North (East region); South (Atlantic, Midwest and Southeast regions).
Quota of 50 percent administrators: 2 Coach: 2

Vacancies: One September 2012 vacancy. North region; coach.

Preference: Coach and administrator from each region.

Staff Liaison: Roberta Page

Chair:

REG	POS	EM/ GEN	NAME, INSTITUTION	CONFERENCE	9/11-9/12	9/12-9/13	9/13-9/14	9/14-9/15
N	Asst Com	N/F	Molly Myers Northeast-10 Conference	Northeast 10	Myers	Myers*		
S	C	N/F	Stacey Gaudette Mercyhurst College	Pennsylvania State Athletic	Gaudette	Gaudette	Gaudette*	
S	A	N/M	Kevin Wood Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania State Athletic	Wood	Wood	Wood	Wood*
N	C	N/F	Kelley Frassinelli Southern Connecticut University	Northeast-10	Frassinelli*			

*Not eligible for reappointment

10/25/11

Division II Field Hockey Committee Nominee Information

Name: Shelly Morris
Job Title: Head Field Hockey Coach
Gender: F
Ethnic Minority: N
Institution: Stonehill College
Conference: Northeast-10 Conference
Playing conference: Northeast-10 Conference
Meets 50% requirement: Y
Institution Sponsors sport: Y

Qualification Statement:

I have 2yrs of service on North RAC for DII field hockey- 3 yrs of service on DI West RAC from 2001-2004

Past Committee Service:

Current North Region RAC Aug 2010- present
DII All- American Committee Aug 2010-present
DII Coach of the year committee Aug 2010- present
DI West Region RAC 2001- 2004
DI West Region All-American committee 2001-2004

Professional Development participation:

NCAA Women's Symposium March 2009
USA Field Hockey Coaches Level II certification July 2011
NE-10 Diversity Training May 2011

Employment History:

Current Head coach Stonehill College 2008-present
Head Coach Ohio University - 1999-2005
Asst Coach Ohio Univ. 1997-1999
Asst Coach Northeastern Univ. 1995-1996

Education: BS from Northeastern University 1994

NCAA championship exp:

Been involved as a participant on several occasions taking part in all of the tournament meetings and conference calls from the 1st round and 2 final fours. Also helped run the DII NCAA 1st round game this fall as a RAC member.

References:

Julie Ruppert, Kelley Frassinelli and Molly Meyers

Nominee has contacted listed references:

Y

Former high school S/A (sports):

Field Hockey Agawam High School
Fr. Softball- Brookline HS
Softball - Agawam High School

Former college S/A:

Field Hockey Northeastern Univ

Former high school coach (sports):

Former college coach (sports):

Field Hockey Stonehill College
Field Hockey Ohio University
Asst coach- Northeastern Univ

Regional Advisory Committee exp:

I have served on the DII North RAC for the past two years. As well as the DI West Region RAC for 3yrs in the early 2000's. So have 5 yrs experience on Regional Ranking committees.

Conference champs mgt exp:

As a head coach have been involved in hosting and participating in several conference tournaments. Mostly on the coaching side, but have been to all meetings that lead up to the tournament and have a strong understanding of the process.

DIVISION II FIELD HOCKEY COMMITTEE COMPOSITION								
REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Molly Myers					X		X	
Stacey Gaudette	X						X	
Kevin Wood					X	X		
Kelley Frassinelli	X						X	
TOTALS	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	

WITH RECOMMENDATION

REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Molly Myers					X		X	
Stacey Gaudette	X						X	
Kevin Wood					X	X		
Shelly Morris	X						X	
TOTALS	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	

2011-12 DIVISION II WOMEN'S GOLF COMMITTEE

Composition: Four members. One from each of the Division II regions: East (East, Atlantic and Midwest regions), South (South and Southeast regions), Central (Central region), West (South Central and West regions). Quota of 50 percent athletic administrators: 2.

Vacancies: One September 2012 vacancy. Central region; coach or administrator.

Reappoint: Rebecca Mailloux.

Staff Liaison: Roberta Page

Chair: Matt Higgins (9/10-9/12)

REG	POS	EM/ GEN	NAME, INSTITUTION	CONFERENCE	9/11-9/12	9/12-9/13	9/13-9/14	9/14-9/15
So	Ath Coord	N/F	Robin Dezarn University of West Florida	Gulf South	Dezarn	Dezarn	Dezarn	Dezarn*
Cen	C	Y/M	Matthew Higgins Concordia University, St. Paul	Northern Sun Intercollegiate	Higgins*			
East	C	N/F	Rebecca Mailloux Grand Valley State University	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic	Mailloux			
West	Assoc AD	Y/M	James DeMello University of Hawaii at Hilo	Pacific West	DeMello	DeMello*		

*Not eligible for reappointment

10/25/11

Division II Women's Golf Committee Nominee Information

Name: Chad Markuson

Job Title: Associate Athletic Director

Gender: M

Ethnic Minority: N

Institution: Minnesota State University Moorhead

Conference: Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference

Playing conference:

Meets 50% requirement: Y

Institution Sponsors sport: Y

Qualification Statement:

I have served from 2004-2011 as the Head Men's and Women's golf coach at Upper Iowa University. In addition I have served on the men's regional ranking committee for DII men's golf. Over my time as the golf coach I had the opportunity to serve on committees that have hosted both a woman's golf regional championships in 2007 and the national wrestling championship in 2008. As a coach my teams have earned invitations to both regional and national golf championships every year from 2005 to 2011. I have experienced the many great golf championships.

Past Committee Service:

Served on the DII Men's Golf Regional Ranking Committee

Professional Development participation:

NCAA Athletics business Officers Program in 2011

Attended the NCAA convention both in 2009 and 2011

Attended the NACDA convention in 2010

Employment History:

Minnesota State University Moorhead; Moorhead MN, Aug 2011 to present, Associate Athletic Director.

Upper Iowa University (NCAA DIV II), Fayette, IA July 2008 to August 2011 Associate Athletic Director for

Internal Affairs (NCAA Division II)

Upper Iowa University (NCAA Div. II) Fayette, IA Jan 2006 to June 2008 Assistant Athletic Director for Internal Affairs

Upper Iowa University (NCAA Div II) Fayette, IA Feb 2004 to present

Head Men's and Women's Golf Coach (NCAA Division II)

The Ridges Golf Course Wisconsin Rapids, WI May 1996 to Feb 2004 Director of Golf/ General Manager

Assumption High School Wisconsin Rapids, WI Jan 1997 to Feb 2004 Assistant Varsity Girls Basketball Coach

Assumption High School Wisconsin Rapids, WI Jan 1999 to Feb 2004 Head Varsity Boys Golf Coach

Lincoln High School Wisconsin Rapids, WI Jul 2000 to Feb 2004 Head Varsity Girls Golf Coach (Volunteer)

Education:

Upper Iowa University Fayette, IA

May 2011 Masters in Business

Administration

- Emphasis on in Organizational Development

Minnesota State Mankato Mankato, MN

Dec 1995 Bachelor of Science

- Business Administration; Corporate Finance; Minor: Accounting (36 credits)

NCAA championship exp:

2007 hosted the NCAA Women's Golf Regional Championships for the north region. Duties included the selection and procurement of the Country Club, Coordination of host hotel lodging and championship banquet. Solicited volunteers to conduct various duties in the championship and created the overall championship feeling throughout the championship. 2008 Hosted the NCAA Wrestling National Championships. Duties included the procurement and the assignment of all hotels for competitors, NCAA committee and referees. Coordinated the food and beverage for various banquets and hospitality areas. Worked closely with facility manager to assure proper staging and crowd control. Oversaw the mat side video system for all matches.

Markuson (cont)

References:

Doug Peters
Athletic Director
Minnesota State University Moorhead
218 477 2306 office
petersd@mnstate.edu

Gil Cloud
Former Athletic Director
Upper Iowa University
918 845 1409
gil.cloud@cox.net

David Miller

Former high school S/A (sports):

Soccer
Golf

Former college S/A:

Former high school coach (sports):
Basketball

Former college coach (sports):

Golf

Regional Advisory Committee exp:

Served on the regional ranking
committee for Men's golf for NCAA
Div II. From 2006-2009.

Athletic Director
Upper Iowa University
563 425 5293
millerds@uiiu.edu

Nominee has contacted listed references:

Y

Conference champs mgt exp:

At this time I don't have any
collegiate Conference management
Experience. During my time as a
High School coach I was involved in
the hosting and administration of two
conference golf tournaments. This
included the logistics of hosting a golf
tournament that included course set
up, formation of a rules committee,
and the creation of a championship
experience.

DIVISION II WOMEN'S GOLF COMMITTEE COMPOSITION								
REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Robin Dezarn					X		X	
Matthew Higgins	X					X		X
Rebecca Mailloux	X						X	
James DeMello					X	X		
TOTALS	3	0	0	0	2	2	2	1

WITH RECOMMENDATION

REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Robin Dezarn					X		X	
Chad Markuson					X	X		
Rebecca Mailloux	X						X	
James DeMello					X	X		
TOTALS	1	0	0	0	3	2	2	0

2011-12 WOMEN'S ICE HOCKEY COMMITTEE

(National Collegiate Championship)

Legislated Requirements: Four members: **Three from Division I, one from Division II.** Required number of administrators – 50%: 2

Vacancies: **One September 2012 vacancy; Division II. Coach or administrator.**

Committee preference:

Staff Liaison: Russ Yurk

Chair:

REGION	DIV	POS	EM/ GEN	NAME AND INSTITUTION	CONFERENCE	9/11-9/12	9/12-9/13	9/13-9/14	9/14-9/15
West	FBS	Assoc AD	N/M	Chris Schneider Ohio State University	Big Ten/Western Collegiate Hockey	Schneider	Schneider*		
East	FCS (FCS)	C (Sr Assoc AD)	N/M (N/F)	Rick Seeley Quinnipiac University (Amanda Braun Northeastern University)	Northeast (Colonial Athletic/Hockey East)	Seeley	(Braun)	(Braun)	(Braun 9/16*)
East	FCS	Asst Dir	N/F	Megan McHugo Ivy Group	Ivy Group/ECAC Hockey	McHugo	McHugo	McHugo*	
West	II	C	N/F	Shannon Miller University of Minnesota Duluth	Northern Sun Intercollegiate/Western Collegiate Hockey	Miller*			

Women's Ice Hockey Committee Nominee Information

Name: Jeffrey L. Giesen

Job Title: Head Women's Hockey Coach

Gender: M

Ethnic Minority: N

Institution: St. Cloud State University

Conference: Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference

Playing conference:

Meets 50% requirement: Y

Institution Sponsors sport: Y

Qualification Statement:

I have served on the western regional committee from 2007-2010. I have served on the championships committee as an alternate member in 2008 and in 2010, stepping in for a coach that made the frozen four and an administrator that had a family situation come up during the championship. I feel I have a good understanding of the committee's role and its duties and would like to serve a full term on the committee.

Past Committee Service:

Alternate (fill-in) for women's hockey championship committee 2008 and 2010. Served on conference calls and was at the championship site. Active member in the AHCA 1992 to present and the AWHCA 2003 to present. Member of St. Cloud State's gender equity committee

Professional Development participation:

Employment History:

Head Women's Hockey Coach 2006 to present St. Cloud State University

Assistant Coach Women's hockey 2003-2006 St. Cloud State University, MN

Associate Head Coach Men's hockey 1998-2003 St. John's University, MN

Assistant Coach Men's hockey from 1992-1998 St. John's University, MN

Education:

B.S. degree in physical education with minors in coaching and adapted physical education from St. Cloud State 1993.

M.S. Degree in sports management from St. Cloud State 2010

NCAA championship exp:

I have twice filled in as an alternate on the women's hockey championship committee, once for a coach that made the Frozen Four and an administrator that had a family emergency. I have also been a site rep as the NCAA representative for three different quarterfinals (2009, 2010, and 2011). I have contributed in all duties associated with being on the championships committee including attending championship and fulfilling on site duties, attending all coaches and administrator meetings as well as other duties assigned by the NCAA liaison. Running conference call's for regional and taking part in all pre event conference calls and seedlings.

References:

Russ Yurk, NCAA, phone 317-917-6054

Chris Schneider, The Ohio State Assistant Athletic Director,
phone 614-292-0012

John Harrington, former NCAA ice hockey rules editor, phone
320-492-6645

Sara Martin, WCHA Women's Hockey Commissioner, phone
608-829-0104

Nominee has contacted listed references:

Y

Former high school S/A (sports):

Former college S/A:

Former high school coach (sports):

Former college coach (sports):

men's ice hockey

women's ice hockey

I served from 2007-2010 on the western regional women's ice hockey committee. Participated in all conference calls and conducted final rankings to move forward to the championship committee.

Conference champs mgt exp:

I have attended and participated in our conference championship as a head coach over the last 6 years

Regional Advisory Committee exp:

WOMEN'S ICE HOCKEY COMMITTEE COMPOSITION								
REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Chris Schneider (DI)					X	X		
Rick Seeley (DI)	X					X		
Megan McHugo					X		X	
Shanon Miller	X						X	
TOTALS	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	0

WITH RECOMMENDATION

REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Chris Schneider (DI)					X	X		
Rick Seeley (DI)	X					X		
Megan McHugo					X		X	
Jeffrey Giesen	X					X		
TOTALS	2	0	0	0	2	3	1	0

2011-12 DIVISION II MEN'S LACROSSE COMMITTEE

(Division II Championships Administration Only)

Composition: Three members. One representative from the North (East-N: Northeast-10), one representative from the Central (East-S: East Coast; Midwest and Atlantic) and one representative from the South (Southeast and South). Quota of 50 percent administrators: **2. The committee composition will change in 2012-13 to four members – two from the North region (Northeast-10, RMAC, East Coast and independents); and two from the South region (Conference Carolinas and independents).**

Vacancies: Two September 2012 vacancies. Both must be from the South region. One must be an administrator.

Staff Liaison: Will Hopkins

Chair:

LC DIST/ REG	POS	EM/ GEN	NAME AND INSTITUTION	CONFERENCE	9/11-9/12	9/12-9/13	9/13-9/14	9/14-9/15
South	AD	N/M	Michael Cerino Limestone College	Conference Carolinas	Cerino*			
North	AD	N/M	Glenn Hofmann Merrimack College	Northeast-10	Hofmann	Hofmann*		
Central (North 2012-13)	C	N/M	Timothy Boyle Dowling College	East Coast	Boyle	Boyle	Boyle	Boyle*
(South 2012-13)								

*Not eligible for reappointment

10/25/11

Division II Men's Lacrosse Committee Nominee Information

Name: Bradley Jorgensen
Job Title: Assistant AD/Head Lacrosse Coach
Gender: M
Ethnic Minority: N
Institution: Saint Leo University
Conference: Sunshine State Conference
Playing conference:
Meets 50% requirement: Y
Institution Sponsors sport: Y

Qualification Statement: -15 years experience as a Head Coach for collegiate lacrosse.
-Experience as an administrator, coach, and student-athlete at the DII level.
-NCAA Men's Lacrosse Playing Rules Committee (term expired 9/1/11).
-Current member of South Region RAC

Past Committee Service:

NCAA Lacrosse Rules Committee	Summer 2006 – Fall 2011
Division II representative	
Responsibilities include forming and streamlining the game rules for NCAA lacrosse.	
NCAA Division II Regional Advisory Committee	Fall 2009-Present
Deep South Conference Representative	
NCAA Division III Regional Advisory Committee	Spring 2001 – Winter 2004
Pilgrim Lacrosse League Representative	
Responsibilities included serving as site representative for 2004 NCAA Division III Semifinal.	
US Lacrosse Convention Presenter	Winter 2005 and 2007
Philadelphia, PA	
Presented personal philosophies on preparing teams for transition play and keys to practice organization and planning.	

Professional Development participation: N/A

Employment History:

Head Men's Lacrosse Coach/Assistant Athletic Director	Winter 2005 – Present
Saint Leo University; Saint Leo, Florida	
Responsibilities include recruiting, budgeting, fundraising, academic enrichment, and community outreach for an NCAA Division II varsity lacrosse team. Additional responsibilities include:	
Athletic Department/Office of Admission Liaison	2005-Present
Student Employment Supervisor	2006-Present
Head Men's Lacrosse Coach	Fall 1997 – Winter 2005
Wheaton College; Norton, Massachusetts	
Responsibilities included recruiting, budgeting, fundraising, scheduling and the academic enrichment of an NCAA Division III varsity lacrosse team. Additional responsibilities included:	
Contest management	1998 – 2000
Director of Club Athletics	2000 – 2004
Lecturer in the Department of Physical Education	2000 – 2004
Director of Physical and Outdoor Education	2003 – 2004
Defensive Coordinator, Men's Lacrosse	Fall 1995 - Fall 1997
Amherst College; Amherst, Massachusetts	
Responsibilities included defensive game-planning, recruiting, arranging travel itineraries, daily and seasonal practice planning.	

Jorgensen (cont)

Education:

Saint Leo University
Saint Leo, Florida

Winter 2008

Master of Business Administration; Special concentration in Sport Business.

Springfield College

Spring 1995

Springfield, Massachusetts

Bachelor of Science, Movement and Sport Science; Concentrations include: physical education pedagogy, injury prevention and care, sport ethics, biomechanics and kinesiology.

NCAA championship exp:

I have served as an NCAA site rep at the Division III level for a National Semi-Final. I was also a participant in the 1994 and 1995 NCAA DII National Championship.

References:

Francis X. Reidy
Director of Athletics
Saint Leo University
Saint Leo, FL 33574-6665
(325)588-8246
fran.reidy@saintleo.edu

Head Lacrosse Coach
Western New England College
1215 Wilbraham Rd.
Springfield, MA 01119-2684
(413)782-1367
jklepack@wnec.edu

Sean Quirk
Head Lacrosse Coach/Assistant Athletic Director
Endicott College
376 Hale St.
Beverly, MA 01915
(978)232-2010
squirk@endicott.edu

Nominee has contacted listed references:
Y

John Klepacki

Former high school S/A (sports):

Lacrosse
Football

Former college S/A:

Lacrosse
Football

Former high school coach (sports):

Ice Hockey

Former college coach (sports):

Lacrosse

Regional Advisory Committee exp:

I have served as a RAC member at both the DII and DIII levels. For the past two years I have represented the South in the RAC, and sat in the sub-committee for selection purposes in 2011 (Mike Cerino from Limestone's institution was under consideration).

Conference champs mgt exp:

I have served as game administrator for Sunshine State Conference tournament games, as well as serving as the host for the 2011 Deep South Lacrosse Conference Championship.

DIVISION II MEN'S LACROSSE COMMITTEE COMPOSITION								
REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Michael Cerino		X				X		
Glenn Hoffmann		X				X		
Timothy Boyle	X					X		
NEW POSITION								
TOTALS	1	2	0	0	0	3	0	0

WITH RECOMMENDATION

REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Michael Cerino		X				X		
Glenn Hoffmann		X				X		
Timothy Boyle	X					X		
Brad Jorgensen	X				X	X		
TOTALS	2	2	0	0	1	4	0	0

2011-12 MEN'S AND WOMEN'S SKIING COMMITTEE

(Association-Wide Rules Administration and National Collegiate Championship)

**Legislated
Requirements:**

Seven members including representatives from all divisions and subdivisions of Division I in which a substantial number of schools sponsor the sport of skiing. Two members must represent men's skiing interests, two members must represent women's skiing interests and three unallocated positions. One member must from the West region, two members must be from the East region, three members selected at large and one member who is the secretary-rules editor. Two members must be coaches who represent downhill alpine skiing and two members must be coaches who represent Nordic skiing. The secretary rules editor may be counted towards satisfying the coaches' requirement.

The committee has an exception to the 25 percent administrator composition requirement in Bylaw 21.1.3.1.2.

Waiver:

Division III waived Bylaw 21.8.1.3 to allow for a conference member to serve directly after a member from the same conference. (10/03)

Vacancy:

One September 2012 vacancy. Any division or subdivision. Alpine coach.

Staff Liaison:

Mark Bedics, Teresa Smith (rules)

Chair:

DIV.	REG.	POS.	EM/ GEN	NAME AND INSTITUTION	CONFERENCE	9/11-9/12	9/12-9/13	9/13-9/14	9/14-9/15
FBS	West (M/W)	Assoc AD	N/F	Mary Bowman University of Utah	Pac-12 (Mountain West Conference until 9/11)	Bowman	Bowman*		
FBS (FCS)	West (East) (W) (M/W)	C Alpine (C Nordic)	N/M (N/F)	Andy LeRoy University of Denver (Cami Thompson-Graves Dartmouth College)	Sun Belt (Ivy League)	LeRoy*	(Thompson- Graves)	(Thompson- Graves)	(Thompson- Graves 9/16*)
DI	East (M/W)	Dep AD	N/M	Steve Metcalf University of New Hampshire	America East	Metcalf	Metcalf	Metcalf	Metcalf*
III	East (M/W)	C Alpine	N/M	Rogan Connell Bates College	New England Small College Athletic	Connell	Connell*		
II	West (M/W)	C Nordic	N/M	Scott Jerome University of Alaska, Fairbanks	Great Northwest Athletic	Jerome*			
III	Central (M/W)	C Nordic	N/M	Chad Salmela The College of St. Scholasfica	Upper Midwest Athletic	Salmela	Salmela	Salmela	Salmela*

2/16/12

Men's and Women's Skiing Committee Nominee Information

Name: Mark (Sparky) Anderson

Job Title: Head Ski Coach

Gender: M

Ethnic Minority: N

Institution: University of Alaska Anchorage

Conference: Great Northwest Athletic Conference

Playing conference:

Meets 50% requirement: Y

Institution Sponsors sport: Y

Qualification Statement:

Please consider me for a position on the NCAA Skiing Committee. I have been a professional coach for 20 years, 10 of which have been with a college program. I am very familiar with NCAA ski racing as a former college athlete, a head coach at Brown University, and as both an assistant and head coach at the University of Alaska, Anchorage. I hold the highest coaches certification at the USSA level, and I am a certified official with USSA as both a referee and technical delegate (TD). I understand the rules of skiing through the FIS, USSA, and NCAA organizations, and how they have changed and adapted to the sport over the past 30 years. I am very excited about the opportunity to serve on the NCAA sport and rules committee, and to make a positive impact on the sport of ski racing at the NCAA level. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Past Committee Service:

Alaska Alpine Competition Committee 2000 to present

Western Region Alpine Competition Committee 2001 to present

RMISA representative to the Western Region Alpine Competition Committee 2008-present.

Professional Development participation:

If selected to serve, this will be my first NCAA committee.

Employment History:

Flori Woerndle Schi Schule, Garmisch, Germany 1991-92 - Ski Instructor

Innsbruck International School, Innsbruck, Austria 1992-1994 - FIS Coach

Holderness School, Plymouth, NH 1994-1996 - FIS Coach

Brown University, Providence, RI 1996-2000 - Head Ski Coach

Alyeska Ski Club, Girdwood, AK 2000-2007 - Director

University of Alaska, Anchorage, 2001-2002 - Interim Alpine Coach

University of Alaska, Anchorage, 2007-2011 - Assistant Coach, Head Alpine Coach

University of Alaska, Anchorage, 2011-present - Head Ski Coach

Education:

Piedmont High School, Piedmont, CA - Class of 1987

University of Nevada, Reno - BA in Journalism, Class of 1991

National USSA Coaches Academy - 1992, 2000, 2002 - International Certification

NCAA championship exp:

In 2002, I assisted UAA and Paul Crews with the RMISA Regional Championships and the NCAA Skiing Championships. At that time I was the Director of the Alyeska Ski Club and the Interim Alpine Coach for UAA. The past four seasons I have taken the UAA ski team to the NCAA Skiing Championships as the head alpine coach.

References:

Andy Leroy

Fredrik Landsted

Richard Rokos

Paul Crews

Nominee has contacted listed references:

Y

Anderson (cont)

Former high school S/A (sports):

Football

Ski Racing

Rugby

Former college S/A:

Ski Racing

Rugby

Former high school coach (sports):

Piedmont High, CA

John Hoff

Piedmont International Touring Side

Former college coach (sports):

Gary Steffensen

Washoe Zephers

Regional Advisory Committee exp:

While at UAA, I have been involved each season during the selection process for RMISA qualifying to the NCAA Skiing Championships. As the director of the Alyeska Ski Club, I was responsible for ranking all Alaska athletes for regional FIS quotas.

Conference champs mgt exp:

In 2002, I assisted UAA and Paul Crews with the RMISA Regional Championships and the NCAA Skiing Championships. At that time I was the Director of the Alyeska Ski Club and the Interim Alpine Coach for UAA. As a current NCAA coach, I have brought our team to RMISA Regionals and NCAA Nationals for the past four seasons. As director of the Alyeska Ski Club, I was responsible for bringing three US National Alpine Championships to Alyeska Resort, and served as the Chief of Race in 2007. I have also managed seven state junior championship events at Alyeska.

SKIING COMMITTEE COMPOSITION								
REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Mary Bowman (DI)					X		X	
Andy Leroy (DI)	X					X		
Steve Metcalf (DI)					X	X		
Rogan Connell (DIII)	X					X		
Scott Jerome (DII)	X					X		
Chad Salmela (DIII)	X					X		
TOTALS	4	0	0	0	2	5	1	0

WITH RECOMMENDATION

REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Mary Bowman (DI)					X		X	
Andy Leroy (DI)	X					X		
Steve Metcalf (DI)					X	X		
Rogan Connell (DIII)	X					X		
Mary (Sparky) Anderson	X					X		
Chad Salmela (DIII)	X					X		
TOTALS	4	0	0	0	2	5	1	0

2011-12 MEN'S AND WOMEN'S SOCCER RULES COMMITTEE

Composition: Nine members, including four members from Division I, two members from Division II, two members from Division III and a secretary-rules editor. Within each division, one-half of the members shall represent men's soccer interests and one-half of the members shall represent women's soccer interests. An additional member shall be elected as secretary-rules editor. Quota of 25 percent administrators: **2.** Quota of 50 percent coaches: **4.**

Policy: Each division will adhere to the 50 percent coaches independently.

Vacancies: **One Division II (coach or administrator; women's interests).**

Staff Liaison: Teresa Smith

Chair: Tim Lenahan (9/11-9/12)

DIV	POS	EM/ GEN	NAME, INSTITUTION	CONFERENCE	9/11-9/12	9/12-9/13	9/13-9/14	9/14-9/15
FBS (DI) (M)	C (Asst Com)	N/M (Y/F)	Tim Lenahan Northwestern University (Angie Torain The Summit League)	Big Ten (Summit League)	Lenahan*	(Torain)	(Torain)	(Torain 9/16*)
FCS (M)	C	N/M	Ralph Polson Wofford College	Southern	Polson	Polson	Polson	Polson*
II (M)	C	Y/M	Ike Ofoje University of South Carolina Aiken	Peach Belt	Ofoje	Ofoje*		
III (M)	AD	N/M	Les Poolman Dickinson College	Centennial	Poolman	Poolman*		
FBS (W)	C	N/F	Amanda Cromwell University of Central Florida	Conference USA	Cromwell	Cromwell	Cromwell*	
DI (W)	Assoc Com	N/M	Matt Wilson Atlantic Sun Conference	Atlantic Sun	Wilson	Wilson	Wilson	Wilson*
II (W)	C -	N/M	Jack Hyde San Francisco State University	California Collegiate Athletic	Hyde*			
III (W)	C	N/F	Colleen Bruley State University College at New Paltz	State University of New York Athletic	Bruley	Bruley	Bruley*	

*Not eligible for reappointment
2/15/12

Men's and Women's Soccer Rules Committee Nominee Information

Name: Peter Andrew Campbell

Job Title: Senior Associate Director of Athletics

Gender: M

Ethnic Minority: N

Institution: Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania

Conference: Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference

Playing conference: Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference

Meets 50% requirement: Y

Institution Sponsors sport: Y

Qualification Statement:

I have been involved in all aspects of soccer since a young age back in Northern Ireland. I was a collegiate soccer player at Gannon University. I coached both on the women's and men's side at Baldwin-Wallace College an NCAA Division III institution. I have also coached at the NCAA Division II level at Lock Haven University (women) and been an administrator for the men's and women's programs at the same institution. At the conference level, I have acted as event manager for contests scheduled at Lock Haven University during the regular season for the past ten (10) years and when hosting post-season contests. I have been a Regional Chair of both the NSCAA and the NCAA Regional Committees and was a member of the NCAA Division II Women's National Soccer committee from 2003-2008, acting as the Chair from 2006-2008. I have been Regional coach of the year on two occasions at the Division II level and have acted as an NCAA site rep for NCAA Division I and II contests from 2003-2009.

Past Committee Service: NSCAA - Regional Committee - DII - Women - 2000-2004;

NCAA - Regional Committee - DII - Women - 2002-2008 (Chair 2003-2008)

NCAA - National Committee - DII - Women - 2003-2008 (Chair 2006-2008)

Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference - Officiating Committee - 2001-Present

Professional Development participation: I have attended the NCAA Conference on a yearly basis since 2001. I have also attended the NSCAA conference for soccer from 1992-2009. I have been to Gender Equity programs and Regional Compliance seminars for the NCAA and Leadership training programs organized by the US Army in 2006.

Employment History: 2011-Present - Senior Associate Director of Athletics - Lock Haven University

2003-2011 - Assoc. AD - Lock Haven University; 2001-2003 - Asst AD - Lock Haven University

1999-2001 - Head Women's Soccer Coach - Lock Haven University

1997-1999 - Head Men's Soccer Coach - Baldwin-Wallace College, NCAA Div. III.

1992-1997 - Assistant Women's Soccer Coach - Baldwin-Wallace College.

1992-1999 - High School Soccer Official; 1990-1992 - Semi-Professional Soccer Player - Canada/Northern Ireland

1995-Present - Licensed Attorney, Ohio

Education: Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, Cleveland, Ohio, Juris Doctorate (J.D.) - May, 1995

Gannon University, Erie, Pennsylvania, Bachelor of Science - Management Information Systems - (B.S.) - May, 1992

NCAA championship exp: As a soccer player, I participated in the NCAA Tournament three times at the Division II level. As a coach, I led my team to two NCAA tournaments. As an administrator, I have been on the NCAA Division II National Women's Soccer Committee during two (2) Fall sports festivals. I have also been involved in hosting the NCAA Division II Championships for women from 2003-2009. I have also acted as Tournament Director for numerous NCAA Championship events including Field Hockey, Volleyball, Cross Country, Women's lacrosse, Softball, and Women's Soccer.

References:

Sharon E. Taylor, Director of Athletics, Lock Haven University, Lock Haven, PA 17745 (570) 484-2093

Steve Murray, Conference Commissioner, Pennsylvania State

Athletic Conference, Lock Haven, PA 17745 (570) 484-2103

Russ Yurk, NCAA Championships, NCAA, PO Box 6222, Indianapolis IN 46206-6222 (317) 917-6222

D'Ann Keller, NCAA Championships, NCAA, PO Box 6222, Indianapolis IN 46206-6222 (317) 917-6494

Nominee has contacted listed references: Y

Campbell (cont)

Former high school S/A (sports):

Soccer, Basketball

Former college S/A:

Men's Soccer

Former high school coach (sports): Track & Field, Boy's Soccer

Former college coach (sports):

Men's Soccer - Division III

Women's Soccer - Division III

Women's Soccer - Division II

Regional Advisory Committee exp:

I was a member of the NSCAA committee for women's soccer from 2000-2004. I was also on the National Committee from 2002-04.

I was a member of the NCAA Regional Ranking Committee for the Northeast Region (Now Atlantic) from 2002-2008. I chaired the committee from 2003-2008.

Conference champs mgt exp:

I have acted as event manager for all regular season contests, tournaments, and post season tournament games in men's and women's soccer at Lock Haven University. I have handled all aspects of management of these contests and events, including the NCAA Regional (Division I & II) and National (Division II- women's) level.

MEN'S AND WOMEN'S SOCCER RULES COMMITTEE COMPOSITION								
REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Tim Lenahan (DI)	X					X		
Ralph Polson (DI)	X					X		
Ike Ofoje (DII)	X					X		X
Les Poolman (DIII)		X				X		
Amanda Cromwell (DI)	X						X	
Matt Wilson (DI)					X	X		
Jack Hyde (DII)	X					X		
Colleen Bruley (DIII)	X						X	
TOTALS	6	1	0	0	1	6	2	1

WITH RECOMMENDATION

REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Tim Lenahan (DI)	X					X		
Ralph Polson (DI)	X					X		
Ike Ofoje (DII)	X					X		X
Les Poolman (DIII)		X				X		
Amanda Cromwell (DI)	X						X	
Matt Wilson (DI)					X	X		
Peter Campbell (DII)					X	X		
Colleen Bruley (DIII)	X						X	
TOTALS	5	1	0	0	2	6	2	1

2011-12 DIVISION II WOMEN'S SOFTBALL COMMITTEE

Composition: Eight members. One from each Division II softball region (West, Central, South Central, Midwest, South, Southeast, Atlantic, East). Quota of 50 percent administrators: 4.

Vacancies: Three September 2012 vacancies. One from the West, one from the Central and one from the Southeast. One must be an administrator. [NOTE: Joan McDermott, Metropolitan State College of Denver, is stepping down from the committee due to regional realignment. Ms. McDermott may rejoin the committee when Beth Watson's term ends in September 2014. She can serve the remaining three years of her term (until September 1, 2017).

Staff Liaison: Amy Reis
Chair: Pamela Knox (9/10-9/12)

REG	POS	EM/ GEN	NAME, INSTITUTION	CONFERENCE	9/11-9/12	9/12-9/13	9/13-9/14	9/14-9/15
Mid W	SWA	N/F	Keri Becker Grand Valley State University	Great Lakes Intercollegiate	Becker	Becker		
W	C	N/F	Pamela Knox Western Oregon University	Great Northwest Athletic	Knox*			
Atl	Assoc AD	N/F	Kris Decker Mansfield University of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania State Athletic	Decker	Decker	Decker	Decker*
Cen (SoC 9/12)	AD	N/F	Joan McDermott Metropolitan State College of Denver	Rocky Mountain Athletic	McDermott	McDermott	McDermott	McDermott*
So	C	N/F	Danielle Penner Barry University	Sunshine State	Penner	Penner*		
SoC	C	N/F	Beth Watson Cameron University	Lone Star	Watson	Watson	Watson*	
East	A	N/M	Brian DeMasters Queens College (New York)	East Coast	DeMasters	DeMasters	DeMasters*	
SoE	A/C	N/M	Jimmy Martin Limestone College	Conference Carolinas	Martin*			

*Not eligible for reappointment 1/20/11

Division II Women's Softball Committee Nominee Information

Name: Yvonne Burbank

Job Title: SWA

Gender: F

Ethnic Minority: N

Institution: Sonoma State University

Conference: California Collegiate Athletic Association

Playing conference: California Collegiate Athletic Association

Meets 50% requirement: Y

Institution Sponsors sport: Y

Qualification Statement:

I am excited about the opportunity to represent the Conference and Sonoma State University as a member of the Div. II Softball Committee. I consider myself fortunate to have traveled with many of our sports teams and experienced what the NCAA Championship experience is. I look forward to assisting in the development and management of meaningful experiences for the Student-Athletes. I have spanned the student-athlete experience full circle and believe that I have a breadth of knowledge and experience that will add to the work the committee is responsible for. I have prior sport committee experience and understand the need for attention to detail as well as a solid grasp of the bigger picture in order to diligently select participants and locations of events.

Past Committee Service:

Although I continue to seek out other committee work opportunities, I have only served on the W. Tennis RAC committee. I do offer my time to support conference efforts by volunteering for involvement in various committee work of our Executive Council. I served on the Men's Soccer Sportsmanship committee for the CCAA. The focus of that committee was to address growing concerns of lack of attention to sportsmanship in the sport of Men's Soccer and to further, implement action that would lead to better behavior of our Coaches and Student-Athletes. I also serve on a committee that is charged with updating the CCAA Strategic Plan.

Professional Development participation:

I continue to engage myself if the broader experience of being involved with the NCAA. As our budget allows I attend development sessions in order to bring new perspective and knowledge to my career. I attended the NCAA Gender Equity Forum in 2010, the NACWA convention in 2010 and I currently work closely with our campus's Academic Senate Diversity sub-committee in addressing the concerns of lack of diversity on our campus.

Employment History:

I began working at Sonoma State as an Assistant Coach in 1999 and served two years under the current head coach. I then assumed the graduate assistant position at the University of San Francisco. I was a graduate assistant for one year and was then promoted to third assistant. After receiving my Master's Degree I assumed an administrative/teaching and coaching job at Sonoma Academy High School in Santa Rosa, Ca. I served in that capacity for 3 years before starting my current position at Sonoma State University. As the Associate Athletic Director for Compliance and Student-Athlete Services/SWA I manage many aspects of the Intercollegiate Athletic Department. My responsibilities include; oversight of the NCAA compliance program, financial aid and scholarships, admissions, monitoring of gender equity, academic advising and eligibility guidance, Drug testing and Education program, special facility projects and game management.

Education: Bachelor of Arts, Liberal Studies-Sonoma State Univ.; Master of Arts, Sports Mgmt-Univ. of San Francisco

NCAA championship exp:

As a student-athlete, coach and administrator I been involved in the experience of post-season play. I participated in back to back West Regional Basketball Tournaments (1997/98 & 1998/99). As a coach I helped lead a team to the Div. I Women's National Invitation Tournament in 2003. I have also served and the Administrator for various Sonoma State teams during Championship travel (Volleyball 2008, Cross Country 2007-2010, Men's Soccer 2007, W. Basketball 2008, Men's Golf 2008, Softball 2010 & 2011, Baseball 2011) In addition to serving as the travel administrator I also served as the site director for the 2010 West Regional Softball sub-regional tournament in Rohnert Park, CA.

References:

Carol Rivera, Assistant Commissioner-California Collegiate Athletic Association

Bill Fusco, Athletic Director-Sonoma State University

Dan Bridges, Athletic Director-Cal State L.A.

Dan Condryn-Athletic Director-Humboldt State University

Anita Barker-Athletic Director-Chico State University

Nominee has contacted listed references:

Y

Burbank (cont)

Former high school S/A (sports):

Volleyball, Basketball

Former college S/A:

Basketball

Former high school coach (sports):

Basketball

Former college coach (sports):

Basketball

Regional Advisory Committee exp:

I am currently in my third and final year as a member of the West Regional W. Tennis Committee and I am beginning my first year on the West Regional W. Basketball Committee.

Conference champs mgt exp:

As the Meet Director for the 2011 CCAA Cross Country Championships, I understand the detail and organization that is vital for a successful event. At the time, Sonoma State had not hosted a Conference Championship in 9 years. I am proud of the manner in which we added a spotlight to the sport of Cross Country in our area and included community partners in order to maximize the impact of having such an event in Santa Rosa, Ca. All aspects of the event were successful; the race venue was challenging and unique, the banquet and awards ceremony celebrated the great efforts of the hard working student-athletes and the orchestrated team effort between the Santa Rosa/Rohnert Park Community, the CCAA and Sonoma State University made the event so memorable.

DIVISION II SOFTBALL COMMITTEE COMPOSITION								
REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Keri Becker					X		X	
Pamela Knox	X						X	
Kris Decker						X		
Joan McDermott		X					X	
Danielle Penner	X						X	
Beth Watson	X						X	
Brian DeMasters					X	X		
Jimmy Martin	X				X	X		
TOTALS	4	1	0	0	3	3	5	0

WITH RECOMMENDATION

REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Keri Becker					X		X	
Yvonne Burbank					X		X	
Kris Decker						X		
Joan McDermott		X					X	
Danielle Penner	X						X	
Beth Watson	X						X	
Brian DeMasters					X	X		
Jimmy Martin	X				X	X		
TOTALS	3	1	0	0	4	3	5	0

2011-12 PLAYING RULES OVERSIGHT PANEL

(Association-Wide Rules Administration)

Twelve members. Six Division I: three Championships/Sports Management Cabinet members (one of which must have experience working with playing rules); the remaining three shall be appointed by the Division I Collegiate Commissioners Association. Three Division II members: one current member of the Division II Championships Committee; two at-large members (one of which must have officiating experience, previous service on a rules committee or on a championships committee with responsibility for playing rules administration or coaching experience). Three Division III members: one current member of the Division III Championships Committee; two at-large members (one of which must have officiating experience, previous service on a rules committee or on a championships committee with responsibility for playing rules administration or coaching experience). A single conference may not have more than one representative on the panel.

Must have officiating experience, previous service on a rules committee or on a championships committee with responsibility for playing rules administration or coaching experience.

Vacancies: One September 2012 vacancy. Division II.

Staff Liaison: Ty Halpin, Rachel Seewald, Teresa Smith.

Chair: Ted Gumbart

DIV	POS	EM/ GEN	NAME, INSTITUTION	CONFERENCE	9/11-9/12	9/12-9/13	9/13-9/14	9/14-9/15
FCS	C/SM	M/N	Jim Fallis Northern Arizona University	Big Sky	Fallis (7/12*)			
FCS	C/SM	M/N	James Fiore Stony Brook University	America East Conference	Fiore (7/12*)			
FCS	C/SM	F/N	Shelley Appelbaum Michigan State University	Big Ten	Appelbaum	Appelbaum	Appelbaum (7/1/14*)	
FBS	CCA	M/N	Larry Scott Pacific-10 Conference	Pacific-12 Conference	No legislated terms			
FCS	CCA	F/N	Noreen Morris	Northeast Conference	No legislated terms			
DI	CCA	M/N	Ted Gumbart Atlantic Sun Conference	Atlantic Sun Conference	No legislated terms			
II	CC	F/N	Erin Lind Northern Sun Intercollegiate	Northern Sun Intercollegiate	Lind	Lind*		
II	At-L Asst AD	N/F	Kristy Bayer Arkansas Tech University	Great American Conference	Bayer	Bayer	Bayer	Bayer*
II	At-L COM M	N/M	Alan Patterson Conference Carolinas	Conference Carolinas	Patterson*			
III	CC	Y/M	Stuart Robinson State University College at New Paltz	State University of New York Athletic	Robinson	Robinson (1/13*)		
III	At-L Comm	N/M	Tom Byrnes Capital Athletic Conference	Capital Athletic	Byrnes	Byrnes*		
III	At-L AD	N/M	Dick Hack State University of New York Maritime College	Skyline	Hack	Hack	Hack*	

*Not eligible for reappointment 1/18/12

Playing Rules Oversight Panel Nominee Information

Name: Doug Blais

Job Title: FAR

Gender: M

Ethnic Minority: N

Institution: Southern New Hampshire University

Conference: Northeast-10 Conference

Meets 50% requirement: Y

Qualification Statement:

I believe I am qualified to serve on the PROP for several reasons. I have been a NCAA college soccer official for 17 years. I am the NH representative to the regional board. My experiences as a former DII student-athlete, DII assistant coach (men's & women's teams – 10 years combined) and SAAC advisor provide me with a strong understanding of the demands put on athletes and their unique needs. I attended the DII FAR Leadership Institute hosted by the NCAA in 1996 and I also attended the inaugural DII Advance FAR Leadership Institute this Oct. I am certain this training will provide me with the insight and knowledge necessary to make significant contributions to PROP.

Past Committee Service:

Professional Development participation:

I participated in both the DII FAR Fellows Institute (1996) and the Advanced FAR Leadership Institute (2011).

Employment History:

1996 - Present

Chair & Professor, Southern New Hampshire University
Sport Management Department – School of Business

Education:

University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT

Ph.D. in Sport, Leisure, and Exercise Sciences

Field of Study: Sport Management

Southern New Hampshire University

Master's in Business Administration

Southern New Hampshire University, Manchester, NH

B.S., Economics/Finance

References:

Julie Ruppert, Northeast 10 Commissioner,

jruppert@northeast10.org, 508-230-9844

Chip Polak, A.D., Southern New Hampshire University,

j.polak@snhu.edu, 603-668-2211

Nominee has contacted listed references:

Y

Playing Rules Oversight Panel Nominee Information

Name: Michael J. Simpson

Job Title: AD

Gender: M

Ethnic Minority: N

Institution: San Francisco State University

Conference: California Collegiate Athletic Association

Meets 50% requirement: Y

Qualification Statement:

My experience as a teacher, coach and administrator, across a broad spectrum of educational settings (including Divisions I, II and III), has provided me with the knowledge, skill and acumen to be a useful and productive member of the Playing Rules Oversight Panel. Perhaps, of equal or more importance is the fact that the programs I have coached or supervised have demonstrated a commitment (in addition to academic and athletic excellence) to abide by the established rules and regulations of their sport. The student-athlete participants have been taught and encouraged to comport themselves in a civil and ethical manner. One that brings favorable acclaim to themselves, their sport and their University. They have been successful, for the most part, as exemplars of good sportsmanship and honorable play.

Past Committee Service: San Francisco State University, San Francisco CA.

Chair, Athletic Advisory Board, Faculty Affairs Committee, WASC Committee Graduation Planning Committee, Curriculum Committee, Graduate Program Evaluation Sub-Committee, Department Chair Review Committee, Operations Committee, Athletic Governance Committee, Hiring Advisory Committee.

American Baseball Coaches Association: National Convention Clinic Committee, Editorial Board, Summer Collegiate Baseball Committee

National Collegiate Athletic Association: Chair, West Region Division II

Baseball Committee, National Division II Baseball Committee

Representative Professional and Service Associations:

American Association of Baseball Coaches, San Francisco Sports Council: Board of Directors

National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics, City of San Francisco Mayor's Physical Activity Council: Board Member

Professional Development participation: Research Presentations, Publications and Papers:

1987 Simpson, M.J. & Bodell, Y.G. New Majority Needs Survey, Academic Senate, California Community College System.

1985 Friedkin, N.E. & Simpson, M.J. Effect of Competition on Member's Identification With Their Subunits. Administrative Science Quarterly 30, 377-394.

1985 Simpson, M.J. Maximizing Resource Allocation. Preferences Among Subunit Managers: The Case of Intercollegiate Athletics. Doctoral Dissertation University of California-Santa Barbara.

Awards:

1997 San Francisco State University, San Francisco CA. Management Personnel Plan Award.

1990 San Francisco State University, San Francisco CA. Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Award.

1986, 1989 & 1995 Northern California Athletic Conference, Baseball Coach-of-the-Year

1978 Fulbright Exchange Fellowship. Awarded (Brighton, England).

Employment History: 1997- Present San Francisco State University, San Francisco CA. Director of Athletics

1992 (Summer) Austrian National Baseball Federation, Austria

Consultant/Coach, Austrian National Baseball Team.

1985-1997 San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA. Head Baseball Coach.

1983-1985 Santa Barbara City College, Santa Barbara CA. Lecturer, Physical Education

1981-1982 Santa Barbara City College, Santa Barbara CA. Baseball Hitting Instructor.

1980-1985 Santa Barbara High School District, Santa Barbara CA. Physical Education Teacher

1978-1980 University of California-Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara CA. Head Baseball Coach.

1978 (Summer) Humboldt Crabs Semi-Professional Baseball Club, Eureka, CA. Head Baseball Coach.

1977-1978 University of California-Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA. Assistant Baseball Coach.

1973-1977 Westmont College, Santa Barbara CA. Head Baseball Coach.

1971-1978 Santa Barbara High School District, Santa Barbara CA. Physical Education Teacher

1969-1970 Carpinteria High School District, Carpinteria, CA. Frosh Basketball Coach/Study Hall Supervisor

1969-1975 425th Civil Affairs Company, United States Army Reserve, Santa Barbara CA.

Positions held: Chief Administrative Officer, Personnel Officer, and Finance Officer

1969-1973 University of California Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA. Assistant Baseball Coach.

1969 Santa Barbara City College, Santa Barbara, CA. Lecturer, Physical Education

1968-1969 University of California Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA. Junior Varsity Baseball Coach

Simpson (cont)

Education:

University of California-Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara CA.

Ph.D., Educational Policy and Organizational Studies.

M.A., Education, Physical Education Emphasis.

B.A., Geography, Physical Education.

Long Beach City College, Long Beach CA.

A.A., Liberal Arts.

References:

Robert J. Hiebert, Commissioner, CCAA (925) 472-8299 -
Office

Dr. Bill White, Coordinator of Officiating, CCAA (661) 510-
2104 - Mobile

Patricia Bartscher, Legal Council (former FAR), San
Francisco State University (415) 338-2998 - Office

Troy Arthur, NCAA Director of Academic and Membership
Affairs, (317) 292-8014 - Mobile

Tim Selgo, Director of Athletics, Grand Valley State
University, (616) 331-2246 - Office

Nominee has contacted listed references:

Y

PLAYING RULES OVERSIGHT PANEL COMPOSITION								
REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Jim Fallis (DI)		X				X		
James Fiore (DI)		X				X		
Shelley Appelbaum (DI)					X		X	
Larry Scott (DI)				X		X		
Noreen Morris (DI)				X			X	
Ted Gumbart (DI)				X		X		
Erin Lind (DII)					X		X	
Kristy Bayer (DII)					X		X	
Alan Patterson (DII)				X		X		
Stuart Robinson (DIII)		X				X		X
Tom Byrnes (DIII)				X		X		
Dick Hack (DIII)		X				X		
TOTALS	0	4	0	5	3	8	4	1

WITH RECOMMENDATION

REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Jim Fallis (DI)		X				X		
James Fiore (DI)		X				X		
Shelley Appelbaum (DI)					X		X	
Larry Scott (DI)				X		X		
Noreen Morris (DI)				X			X	
Ted Gumbart (DI)				X		X		
Erin Lind (DII)					X		X	
Kristy Bayer (DII)					X		X	
Douglas Blais			X			X		
Stuart Robinson (DIII)		X				X		X
Tom Byrnes (DIII)				X		X		
Dick Hack (DIII)		X				X		
TOTALS	0	4	1	4	3	8	4	1

PLAYING RULES OVERSIGHT PANEL COMPOSITION
PLAYING RULES OVERSIGHT PANEL COMPOSITION

WITH RECOMMENDATION

REPRESENTATIVE	COACH	AD	FAR	COMM	OTHER	MALE	FEMALE	ETHIC MINORITY
Jim Fallis (DI)		X				X		
James Fiore (DI)		X				X		
Shelley Appelbaum (DI)					X		X	
Larry Scott (DI)				X		X		
Noreen Morris (DI)				X			X	
Ted Gumbart (DI)				X		X		
Erin Lind (DII)					X		X	
Kristy Bayer (DII)					X		X	
Michael Simpson		X				X		
Stuart Robinson (DIII)		X				X		X
Tom Byrnes (DIII)				X		X		
Dick Hack (DIII)		X				X		
TOTALS	0	5	0	4	3	8	4	1

From: Charles Acuff [mailto:acuffl@uah.edu]
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2012 12:29 PM
To: Wagner, Donnie
Subject: 2013 NCAA Divison II Men's Basketball Championship game

Donnie,


Thanks for updating me on the possibility of playing the 2013 NCAA Division II Men's Basketball game at the Final Four in Atlanta. As one of the Division II representatives on the NABC Board of Directors, I strongly support this idea and am convinced that it would be a tremendous shot in the arm for Division II basketball. I have actually mentioned the idea to a couple of DII coaches and they agreed that it would be an opportunity to showcase our level of basketball like never before. The student-athletes at the Divison II level would be presented with the experience of a lifetime.

Please let me know if there is anything we can do to make this a reality.

Best Wishes,
Lennie Acuff
Men's Basketball Coach
University of Alabama-Huntsville
(256) 652-0662 cell phone
(256) 824-2212 office phone

Item	Itemized Costs	Notes	Total Costs
Institutional Travel			
- Charter Airline Travel	\$ 100,000	\$50,000 per institution (20 persons)	
- Lodging	\$ -	Amount figured into per diem rate: \$250 per room; 20 persons; 5 nights for non-winning team; 6 nights for winning team	
- Per Diem	\$ 49,500	\$225 per person (DI MBB rate); 20 persons; 5 days for non-winning team; 6 days for winning team	
- Bus Transportation	\$ 8,800	\$800 per bus/day; 5 days for non-winning team; 6 days for winning team	
		Sub Total for Each Division	\$158,300
Basketball Committees			
- Travel	\$ 5,200	\$650 travel costs per committee member; 8 members	
- Per Diem	\$ 4,200	\$75 per day; 8 members; 7 days	
- Lodging	\$ 10,000	\$250 per night; 8 members; 5 nights	
		Sub Total for Each Division	\$19,400
Game Officials			
- Travel	\$ 2,600	\$650 travel costs per official; 4 officials	
- Per Diem	\$ 900	\$75 per day; 4 officials; 3 days	
- Lodging	\$ 2,000	\$250 per night; 4 officials; 2 nights	
- Game Fees	\$ 1,550	\$450 per official; 3 officials; \$200 for standby	
- Hospitality	\$ 500	Hotel and/or meal at venue on game day	
		Sub Total for Each Division	\$7,550
		TOTAL COST	\$185,250

2012 NCAA Division II Men's Soccer Championship



2011 ACTUAL			
Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Travel Cost	Per Diem Cost	Game Exp Cost	Total
\$ 478,902	\$ 258,230	\$ 82,064	\$ 819,000

2012 PROPOSAL			
Estimated	Estimated	Estimated Game	Estimated
Travel Cost	Per Diem Cost	Expense Cost	Total
\$ 494,073	\$ 282,030	\$ 85,632	\$ 862,000

Cost of Proposal \$ 43,000

Note 1: This analysis provides an estimate of the costs to change the format of the championship to reallocate available berths among the regions.

Note 2: Transportation and per diem costs were obtained from actual costs for the 2011 championship. Amounts for proposals A and B were arrived at using the actual costs from 2011 for trips of similar length. Game expenses were calculated using final costs for the 2010 championship.

2009-10

Total Sponsorship: 54

School Name	Region	Conference
Adelphi University	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
American International College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Assumption College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Belmont Abbey College	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Bentley University	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Bryant University	NORTH REGION	Northeast Conference
C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
Chestnut Hill College	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference
Converse College	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Dominican College (New York)	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference
Dowling College	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Erskine College	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Fort Lewis College	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Franklin Pierce University	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Gannon University	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Georgian Court University	NORTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Holy Family University	NORTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Lake Erie College	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
Lees-McRae College	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Limestone College	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Mercy College	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
Mercyhurst College	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Merrimack College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Millersville University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Molloy College	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
University of New Haven	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Notre Dame College (Ohio)	NORTH REGION	Independent
Pfeiffer University	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Philadelphia University	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference
Post University	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference
Presbyterian College	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Queens College (New York)	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
Queens University of Charlotte	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Regis University (Colorado)	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Rollins College	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Seton Hill University	SOUTH REGION	West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference
Shepherd University	SOUTH REGION	West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference

2009-10**Total Sponsorship: 54**

School Name	Region	Conference
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Southern Connecticut State	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Southern New Hampshire University	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Saint Anselm College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Saint Michael's College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
St. Thomas Aquinas College	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
Stonehill College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Tiffin University	NORTH REGION	Independent
West Chester University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Wilmington University (Delaware)	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference

2010-11

Total Sponsorship: 62

School Name	Region	Conference
Adams State College	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Adelphi University	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
American International College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Assumption College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Belmont Abbey College	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Bentley University	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
University of Bridgeport	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
Bryant University	NORTH REGION	Northeast Conference
C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
Chestnut Hill College	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference
Colorado Mesa University	SOUTH REGION	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference
Converse College	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Dominican College (New York)	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference
Dowling College	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Erskine College	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Fort Lewis College	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Franklin Pierce University	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Gannon University	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic
Georgian Court University	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference
Holy Family University	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Lake Erie College	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
Le Moyne College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Lees-McRae College	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Lenoir-Rhyne University	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Limestone College	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Lindenwood University	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Lock Haven University of	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Mercy College	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
Mercyhurst College	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Merrimack College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Millersville University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Molloy College	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
University of New Haven	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Notre Dame College (Ohio)	NORTH REGION	Independent
Pfeiffer University	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Philadelphia University	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference
Post University	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference
Presbyterian College	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Queens College (New York)	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
Queens University of Charlotte	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Regis University(Colorado)	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Rollins College	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Seton Hill University	SOUTH REGION	West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference
Shepherd University	SOUTH REGION	West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Southern Connecticut State University	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Southern New Hampshire University	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Saint Anselm College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Saint Michael's College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference

2010-11**Total Sponsorship: 62**

School Name	Region	Conference
St. Thomas Aquinas College	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
Stonehill College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Tiffin University	NORTH REGION	Independent
Urbana University	NORTH REGION	Independent
West Chester University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
West Virginia Wesleyan College	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Wilmington University (Delaware)	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference

2011-12

Total Sponsorship: 67

School Name	Region	Conference
Adams State College	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Adelphi University	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
American International College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Assumption College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Belmont Abbey College	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Bentley University	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
University of Bridgeport	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
Bryant University	NORTH REGION	Northeast Conference
C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
Chestnut Hill College	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference
Colorado Mesa University	SOUTH REGION	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference
Converse College	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Dominican College (New York)	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference
Dowling College	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Erskine College	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Florida Southern College	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Fort Lewis College	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Franklin Pierce University	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Gannon University	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Georgian Court University	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference
Grand Valley State University	NORTH REGION	Independent
Holy Family University	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Lake Erie College	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
Le Moyne College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Lees-McRae College	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Lenoir-Rhyne University	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Limestone College	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Lindenwood University	SOUTH REGION	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Mercy College	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
Mercyhurst College	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Merrimack College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Millersville University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Molloy College	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
University of New Haven	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Newberry College	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Notre Dame College (Ohio)	NORTH REGION	Independent
Pfeiffer University	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Philadelphia University	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference
Post University	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference
Presbyterian College	SOUTH REGION	National Lacrosse Conference
Queens College (New York)	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
Queens University of Charlotte	SOUTH REGION	Conference Carolinas
Regis University (Colorado)	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Rollins College	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Seton Hill University	SOUTH REGION	West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference
Shepherd University	SOUTH REGION	West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference

2011-12**Total Sponsorship: 67**

School Name	Region	Conference
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Shorter University	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Southern Connecticut State University	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Southern New Hampshire University	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Saint Anselm College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Saint Leo University	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Saint Michael's College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
St. Thomas Aquinas College	NORTH REGION	East Coast Conference
Stonehill College	NORTH REGION	Northeast-10 Conference
Tiffin University	NORTH REGION	Independent
Urbana University	NORTH REGION	Independent
West Chester University of Pennsylvania	SOUTH REGION	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
West Virginia Wesleyan College	SOUTH REGION	Independent
Wilmington University (Delaware)	NORTH REGION	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Future Sponsorship</u>
Alderson-Broadbush College		2012-13
Catawba College	X	
Coker College		2013-14
McKendree University (prov. 14-15)		2012-13
Mount Olive College		2012-13
Nyack College		2012-13
Roberts Wesleyan University (prov. 14-15)	X	
University of Findlay		2012-13
Wheeling Jesuit University	X	

ORIGINALLY PROPOSED REGIONAL ALIGNMENT

Mid-Atlantic

Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference

Chestnut Hill College
Dominican College (New York)
Georgian Court University
Holy Family University
Philadelphia University
Post University
Wilmington University (Delaware)

East Coast Conference

C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University
Dowling College
Lake Erie College
Mercy College
Molloy College
Queens College (New York)
Seton Hill University
St. Thomas Aquinas College

Total: 15 Institutions

Northeast

Northeast-10 Conference

Adelphi University
American International
Assumption College
Bentley University
Franklin Pierce University
Merrimack College
University of New Haven
Southern Connecticut State University
Southern New Hampshire University
Saint Anselm College
Saint Michael's College
Stonehill College

Total: 12 Institutions

South

Conference Carolinas

Belmont Abbey College
Converse College
Erskine College
Lees-McRae College
Limestone College
Pfeiffer University
Queens University of Charlotte
St. Andrews Presbyterian College

Independent

Fort Lewis College
Presbyterian College
Regis University Colorado
Rollins College
Tiffin University
West Virginia Wesleyan

Sponsoring 2011-12

Grand Valley State University

Total: 15 Institutions

West

Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference

Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
Gannon University
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania
Mercyhurst College
Millersville University of Pennsylvania
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania
West Chester University of Pennsylvania

Total: 12 Institutions

UPDATED REGIONAL ALIGNMENT

Mid-Atlantic

Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference

Chestnut Hill College
Dominican College (New York)
Georgian Court University
Holy Family University
Philadelphia University
Post University
Wilmington University (Delaware)

East Coast Conference

University of Bridgeport
C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University
Dowling College
Mercy College
Molloy College
Queens College (New York)
Roberts Wesleyan University (prov. 14-15)
St. Thomas Aquinas College

Independent

Lake Erie College
Notre Dame College (Ohio) (Prov. 12-13)
Seton Hill University
Shepherd University
Urbana University
West Virginia Wesleyan College
Wheeling Jesuit University (Not listed)

Sponsoring 2012-13

Alderson-Broadus College
University of Findlay
McKendree University (prov. 14-15)
Nyack College (CACC)

Total: 26 Institutions (Includes 3 prov.)

Northeast

Northeast-10 Conference

Adelphi University
American International College
Assumption College
Bentley University
Franklin Pierce University
Le Moyne College
Merrimack College
University of New Haven
Southern Connecticut State
Southern New Hampshire University
Saint Anselm College
Saint Michael's College
Stonehill College

Total: 13 Institutions

South

Conference Carolinas

Belmont Abbey College
Converse College
Erskine College
Lees-McRae College
Limestone College
Pfeiffer University
Queens University of Charlotte

Independent

Adams State College
Catawba College (Not Listed)
Colorado Mesa University
Florida Southern College
Fort Lewis College
Grand Valley State University
Lenoir-Rhyne University
Lindenwood University (Prov. 13-14)
Newberry College
Regis University (Colorado)
Rollins College
Saint Leo University
Shorter University (Prov. 14-15)
Tiffin University

Sponsoring 2012-13

Mount Olive College (CC)

Sponsoring 2013-14

Coker College (CC)

**Total: 23 Institutions (Includes 2 prov.
And 1 future sponsor)**

West

Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference

Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
Gannon University
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania
Mercyhurst College
Millersville University of Pennsylvania
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania
West Chester University of Pennsylvania

Total: 12 Institutions

CURRENT REGIONAL ALIGNMENT

North

Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference

Chestnut Hill College
Dominican College (New York)
Georgian Court University
Holy Family University
Philadelphia University
Post University
Wilmington University (Delaware)

East Coast Conference

University of Bridgeport
C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University
Dowling College
Mercy College
Molloy College
Queens College (New York)
Roberts Wesleyan University (prov. 14-15)
St. Thomas Aquinas College

Northeast-10 Conference

Adelphi University
American International College
Assumption College
Bentley University
Franklin Pierce University
Le Moyne College
Merrimack College
University of New Haven
Southern Connecticut State
Southern New Hampshire University
Saint Anselm College
Saint Michael's College
Stonehill College

Independent

Grand Valley State University
Lake Erie College
Lindenwood University (Prov. 13-14)
Notre Dame College (Ohio) (Prov. 12-13)
Tiffin University
Urbana University

Sponsoring 2012-13

University of Findlay
McKendree University (prov. 14-15)
Nyack College (CACC)

Total: 37 Institutions (Includes: 4 prov.)

South

Conference Carolinas

Belmont Abbey College
Converse College
Erskine College
Lees-McRae College
Limestone College
Pfeiffer University
Queens University of Charlotte

Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference

Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
Gannon University
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania
Mercyhurst College
Millersville University of Pennsylvania
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania
West Chester University of Pennsylvania

Independent

Adams State College
Catawba College (Not Listed)
Colorado Mesa University
Florida Southern College
Fort Lewis College
Lenoir-Rhyne University
Newberry College
Regis University (Colorado)
Rollins College
Saint Leo University
Seton Hill University
Shepherd University
Shorter University (Prov. 14-15)
West Virginia Wesleyan College
Wheeling Jesuit University (Not listed)

Sponsoring 2012-13

Alderson-Broadus College
Mount Olive College (CC)

Sponsoring 2013-14

Coker College (CC)

Total: 37 Institutions (Includes: 1 prov. And 1 future sponsor)

AMENDED FOUR-REGION ALIGNMENT

Atlantic

Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference

Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania
 East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania
 Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
 Gannon University
 Indiana University of Pennsylvania
 Kutztown University of Pennsylvania
 Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania
 Mercyhurst College
 Millersville University of Pennsylvania
 Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania
 Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania
 West Chester University of Pennsylvania

Independent

Seton Hill University
 Shepherd University
 West Virginia Wesleyan College
 Wheeling Jesuit University (Not listed)

Sponsoring 2012-13

Alderson-Broaddus College

Total: 17 Institutions

Mid-Atlantic

Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference

Chestnut Hill College
 Dominican College (New York)
 Georgian Court University
 Holy Family University
 Philadelphia University
 Post University
 Wilmington University (Delaware)

Independent

University of Findlay
 Grand Valley State University
 Lake Erie College
 Lindenwood University (Prov. 13-14)
 Notre Dame College (Ohio) (Prov. 12-13)
 Tiffin University
 Urbana University

Sponsoring 2012-13

McKendree University (prov. 14-15)
 Nyack College (CACC)

Total: 16 Institutions (Includes 2 prov.)

North

East Coast Conference

University of Bridgeport
 C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University
 Dowling College
 Mercy College
 Molloy College
 Queens College (New York)
 Roberts Wesleyan University (prov. 14-15)
 St. Thomas Aquinas College

Northeast-10 Conference

Adelphi University
 American International College
 Assumption College
 Bentley University
 Franklin Pierce University
 Le Moyne College
 Merrimack College
 University of New Haven
 Southern Connecticut State
 Southern New Hampshire University
 Saint Anselm College
 Saint Michael's College
 Stonehill College

Total: 21 Institutions (Includes 1 prov.)

South Central

Conference Carolinas

Belmont Abbey College
 Converse College
 Erskine College
 Lees-McRae College
 Limestone College
 Pfeiffer University
 Queens University of Charlotte

Independent

Adams State College
 Catawba College (Not Listed)
 Colorado Mesa University
 Florida Southern College
 Fort Lewis College
 Lenoir-Rhyne University
 Newberry College
 Regis University (Colorado)
 Rollins College
 Saint Leo University
 Shorter University (Prov. 14-15)

Sponsoring 2012-13

Mount Olive College (CC)

Sponsoring 2013-14

Coker College (CC)

Total: 20 Institutions (Includes 1 prov. And 1 future sponsor)

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE
April 5, 2012 Teleconference

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

a. Amendment to the Regional Bid Allocations and Championship Bracket.

- (1) Recommendation. Approve that, effective with the 2012 championship, the men's soccer championship bracket be expanded to 35-teams based on funds available. The Men's Soccer Committee had provided options of 35, 36 or 38 teams which are provided below (Attachment A).

Proposed Regional Alignment – 35 Team Bracket

Region	Sponsorship	Bids/Region	Regional Access Ratio
Atlantic	24	4	6.00
Central	9	2	4.50
East	37	6	6.17
Midwest	30	5	6.00
South	18	3	6.00
South Central	18	3	6.00
Southeast	33	6	5.50
West	33	6	5.50

Average access ratio – 5.71

National access ratio – 6.31

Lowest access ratio – 4.50

Highest access ratio – 6.17

Proposed Regional Alignment – 36 Team Bracket

Region	Sponsorship	Bids/Region	Regional Access Ratio
Atlantic	24	4	6.00
Central	9	2	4.50
East	37	7	5.29
Midwest	30	5	6.00
South	18	3	6.00
South Central	18	3	6.00
Southeast	33	6	5.50
West	33	6	5.50

Average access ratio – 5.60
National access ratio – 6.31
Lowest access ratio – 4.50
Highest access ratio – 6.00

Proposed Regional Alignment – 38 Team Bracket

Region	Sponsorship	Bids/Region	Regional Access Ratio
Atlantic	24	5	4.80
Central	9	2	4.50
East	37	7	5.29
Midwest	30	6	5.00
South	18	3	6.00
South Central	18	3	6.00
Southeast	33	6	5.50
West	33	6	5.50

Average access ratio – 5.32
National access ratio – 6.31
Lowest access ratio – 4.50
Highest access ratio – 6.00

- (2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.
- (3) Rationale. Currently, among all championships with 32-team brackets or larger, men's soccer has the highest bracket access ratio of all Division II team sports at 6.31.
- (4) Estimated Budget Impact. The estimated budget impact as determined by the NCAA administrative services group would be as follows:

35-Team Bracket	\$85,140
Additional Transportation	\$46,500
Additional Per Diem	\$25,500
Additional Game Expense	\$5,400
Projected Overhead	\$7,740

36-Team Bracket	\$113,520
Additional Transportation	\$62,000
Additional Per Diem	\$34,000
Additional Game Expense	\$7,200
Projected Overhead	\$10,320

38-Team Bracket	\$170,280
Additional Transportation	\$93,000
Additional Per Diem	\$51,000
Additional Game Expense	\$10,800
Projected Overhead	\$15,480

- (5) Student-Athlete Impact. The addition of three, four or six teams will provide championship participation opportunities to an additional 66, 88 or 132 student-athletes.

[NOTE: This budgetary item has been forwarded to the Division II Planning and Finance Committee for review.]

b. Volleyball – Coordinator of Officials at Final Site.

- (1) Recommendation. Approve that a coordinator of officials be assigned to the final site to make evaluations and assignments.
- (2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.
- (3) Rationale. Currently, the Division II Women's Volleyball Committee is charged with the evaluation and assignment of officials at the final site of the women's volleyball championship. Having an assigned coordinator would remove that responsibility from the committee and would allow a knowledgeable and experienced person to serve in that capacity. It would also be consistent with Division II men's and women's basketball, as well as Division I women's volleyball.
- (4) Estimated Budget Impact. Expenses will include per diem (\$45 for up to 5 days), travel reimbursement (average ticket cost of \$650) and hotel reimbursement (not more than \$140 for up to 4 nights), for a maximum estimated expense of \$1,435.
- (5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

[NOTE: This budgetary item has been forwarded to the Division II Planning and Finance Committee for review.]

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Regionalization Consultant RFP.** The Division II Championships Committee did not approve the establishment of a retainer agreement with Crowe Horwath, LLP (Crowe) to serve as a third-party reviewer and to provide an analysis and recommendation for the Division II regionalization model when necessitated by new conference membership application(s) received in accordance with the December 1 application deadline.

The Championships Committee noted that the RFP process was one that provided the cost analysis for the services that would be obtained for providing a third-party recommendation regarding the regionalization model for Division II championships. The committee noted that having a third party recommendation would be beneficial, but the cost associated with the services was more than what the committee felt was merited by the third-party work being asked to be done.

2. **Great Midwest Athletic Conference (G-MAC) In-Region Waiver Request—Trevecca Nazarene University.** The Division II Championships Committee approved the waiver request to consider the contests between G-MAC member institutions in-region contests for the 2012-13 academic year. The Championships Committee noted that the impact is most notable with Trevecca Nazarene University (Nashville, TN), which is outside the Midwest Region. However, due to their current membership status, the implications of allowing the waiver were determined to be beneficial to assisting the newly formed conference build familiarity and provide Trevecca Nazarene University to schedule more Division II contests as they work through the membership process.
3. **2012 South Central Men's and Women's Cross Country Regional Site.** The Division II Championships Committee approved that Denver, Colorado, be designated as the site for the 2012 Division II South Central cross country regional meet. Regis University will serve as host, to be conducted at the Willis Case Golf Course.
4. **2013 West/South Central Men's Golf Regional Site Selection.** The Division II Championships Committee approved that DuPont, Washington, be designated as the site for the 2013 West/South Central regional with the Great Northwest Athletic Conference serving as the host for the competition to be conducted at the Home Course.
5. **2012-13 Women's Lacrosse In-Region Waiver—Grand Valley State.** The Division II Championships Committee approved that a waiver of the Division II women's lacrosse selection criteria be granted to Grand Valley State University and for their opponents to consider contests against them as in-region.

The Women's Lacrosse Committee, during its March 14 conference call, approved a waiver of the in-region selection criteria for Grand Valley State. The in-region criterion states that a team must play a minimum of 10 games in-region.

During the 2010-11 academic year, Grand Valley State was developing their 2011-12 schedule based on the approved four-region alignment. The approved regional alignment had listed them in the same conference as the Conference Carolinas institutions. Therefore, assuming it would be aligned to the south region, Grand Valley State scheduled four institutions from the Conference Carolinas, as well as other south-region institutions.

Based on its schedule, if Grand Valley State had been a south-region institution, 15 of its 17 games would have been considered in-region, whereas currently only eight are considered in-region. With that said, when Grand Valley State found out that the four-region model would likely not be implemented, a request was submitted to waive the in-region selection criteria for the 2011-12 season.

6. **2012-13 Women's Soccer Selection Criteria.** The Championships Committee tabled action on the recommendation for the following modifications to the selection criteria, effective with the

2012-13 season, due to the continued review of the overall Division II selection criteria white paper.

When selecting teams, the women's soccer committee will evaluate the following criteria (not in priority order):

- In-region Division II won-lost record;
- Strength-of-schedule (average opponents' winning percentage);
- Head-to-head competition;
- Results versus common opponents;
- Results versus ranked teams;
- **Once ranked, always ranked;**
- Results versus Division II opponents outside of conference; and
- Strength-of-schedule versus Division II opponents outside of conference (opponents' average winning and opponent's opponents' average winning percentage);

The Women's Soccer Committee revised the selection criteria to avoid the shift of teams up and down in the rankings week after week due to the inconsistencies of teams going in and out of the rankings. The above changes will provide a smoother ranking system and leave room for the human element.

7. **2013 NCAA Division II National Championships Festival—Site Selection.** The Division II Championships Committee approved that Cleveland, Ohio, be designated as the site for the 2013 NCAA Division II National Championships Festival with Notre Dame College, the Greater Cleveland Sports Commission and the Spire Institute serving as hosts for the competition, to be conducted at the Spire Institute in Geneva, Ohio.
8. **Selection Criteria White Paper and Recap.** The Championships Committee approved the endorsement of the updated selection criteria white paper, following discussion by the Championships Committee at their February 2012 meeting, and included the discussion conclusions by the Division II selection criteria focus group, as the Championships Committee felt all points provided in the document were valuable to share with the Division II membership (Attachment B).

The Championships Committee remains committed to the timeline to provide final recommendations related to the selection criteria white paper following their September 2012 meeting.

9. **Women's Rowing—Additional Travel Party Member.** The Championships Committee did not approve a recommendation that, for the two At-Large Eight boats, the squad size be increased from 11 to 12 and the travel party increased from 14 to 15. This item would have had an estimated budget impact of \$3,000.

- 10. Future Meetings.** The Division II Championships Committee reviewed their upcoming meeting schedule and have cancelled the May teleconference. The next in-person meeting is scheduled for May 30 and 31. Travel information will be forthcoming to the Championships Committee.
- 11. Other Business.** The Championships Committee was provided an update on the interim executive vice president position interview process, noting that this weekend interviews were being conducted in Indianapolis. The timetable for the announcement of the intended individual is expected within the next two weeks.

Committee Chair: Erin Lind, Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference (NSIC)
Staff Liaisons: Roberta Page, Championships and Alliances
Amy Reis, Championships and Alliances

TELECONFERENCE Thursday, April 5, 2012

<u>ATTENDEES</u>	<u>ABSENTEES</u>
Bob Boerigter, Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association	Ann Martin, Regis University (<i>MC chair</i>)
Bob Dranoff, East Coast Conference	
Kris Dunbar, Lake Superior State University	
Frank Keenan, NCAA DII SAAC Representative	
Erin Lind, Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference (<i>chair</i>)	
Claudie Mackey, Elizabeth City State University	
Francis Reidy, Saint Leo University	
Richard Sanders, Northwest Nazarene University	
Dr. Michael Scales, Nyack College and Alliance Theological Seminary (<i>PC liaison</i>)	
David Sharp, Ouachita Baptist University	
J.R. Smith, Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	

Patsy Smith, Missouri Western State University	
Bren Stevens, University of Charleston (<i>MC vice chair</i>)	
Lisa Sweany, Armstrong Atlantic State University	

OTHER PARTICIPANTS:

Amanda Conklin, Michelle Forkner, Tamara Gingerich, Katie Holmes, Jeff Jarnecke, Jarrett Newby, Roberta Page, Laura Peterson, Carol Reep, Amy Reis, Terri Steeb-Gronau, Donnie Wagner and Russ Yurk (*NCAA staff*)

2012-13 Division II Sport Budget Requests

<i>Items proposed to DII Planning and Finance Committee</i>					
<i>Division</i>	<i>Sport</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Original Cost</i>	<i>Approved Cost</i>	<i>Tri-annual Budget Cost</i>
II	M Golf	Increase travel party for finals round by 1 non-athlete	\$ 23,000	\$ 23,000	\$ 69,000
II	M Golf	Increase travel party for regionals round by 1 non-athlete	\$ 33,000	\$ 33,000	\$ 99,000
II	W Golf	Increase travel party for finals round by 1 non-athlete	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 48,000
II	W Golf	Increase travel party for regionals round by 1 non-athlete	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 45,000
II	M Soccer	35-team bracket expansion	\$ 85,140	\$ 85,140	\$ 255,420
Total cost			\$ 172,140	\$ 172,140	\$ 516,420

<i>Items noted to be absorbed by current budget allocation</i>					
II	Football	Extra day per diem for early arrival		\$ 6,300	
II	M Soccer	Regional re-alignment		\$ 43,000	
II	M Soccer	Additional official		\$ 1,550	
II	W Soccer	Additional official		\$ 1,550	
II	Volleyball	Coordinator of officials at final site		\$ 1,435	
Total Cost				\$ 52,400	

<i>Items that received prior approval by all committees for 2012-13 (to be absorbed in current budget allocations)</i>					
II	Football	Added evaluators to review officials		\$ 4,600	
II	M Swimming	Increase field by 15 SAs and 4 non-athletes		\$ 31,000	
II	M/W Tennis	Additional official		\$ 1,400	
II	M/W Tennis	Host allowance		\$ 1,200	
Total cost				\$ 38,200	

<i>Items Denied by Championships Committee</i>					
II	Baseball	Add 1 team to each regional (8 total)	\$ 197,000		
II	Baseball	Add 2 teams to each regional (16 total)	\$ 573,000		
II	M Golf	Added rules official	\$ 12,600		
II	Lacrosse	Tournament format change - four teams at semifinals	\$ 37,000		
II	M Soccer	36-team bracket expansion	\$ 113,520		
II	M Soccer	38-team bracket expansion	\$ 170,280		
II	Rowing	Add 1 non-athlete for individual qualifying boats	\$ 3,000		
II	Wrestling	Increase in championship qualifiers by 20 student-athletes	\$ 28,775		


Absorbed: Intent is for additional expense to be incurred against current budget allocation.
New Monies: Request for new budget dollars going forward. Any new dollars come from the Division II reserve fund.

No further budget requests can be made unless effective for the 2015-16 year or beyond.

Division II Men's Soccer - Bracket Expansion Financial Breakdown


Approved 32 Team Bracket			Additional Costs				
Average Transp	Average Per Diem	Average Game Exp	Transp	Per Diem	Game Exp	Overhead	Total
\$ 15,500	\$ 8,500	\$ 1,800	3 Teams \$ 46,500	\$ 25,500	\$ 5,400	\$ 7,740	\$ 85,140
			4 Teams \$ 62,000	\$ 34,000	\$ 7,200	\$ 10,320	\$ 113,520
			6 Teams \$ 93,000	\$ 51,000	\$ 10,800	\$ 15,480	\$ 170,280

2012 NCAA Division II Men's Soccer Championship




* Host Site

2012 NCAA Division II Men's Soccer Championship




* Host Site

2012 NCAA Division II Men's Soccer Championship



* Host Site

2011 NCAA Division II Men's Soccer Championship



DIVISION II SELECTION CRITERIA WHITE PAPER
CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE & FOCUS GROUP RECAP

The Division II Championships Committee reviewed the membership feedback, conference scheduling statistics and the recap supplement provided from the Division II Selection Criteria Focus Group during their February 20 and 21, 2012 meeting.

The Championships Committee provided additional parameters and feedback to include in the recap provided which the Championships Committee noted was beneficial to their discussion at their February meeting. The Championships Committee provided the following key points reiterating the work done by the focus group along with a few new items for consideration including:

- The Championships Committee supported the focus groups opinion that the selection criteria is not a broken system but education of the key constituents would be a beneficial step in the process.
- Education of coaches, conference offices, regional advisory committees (RACs) and national committee members is a key point that needs addressed in moving forward related to selection criteria. Additionally, the opportunity to provide conference offices with training materials would be key to the process and maintain the expectations for all serving on committees for consistency purposes.
- A consideration to include both incoming and out-going national committee members during annual meetings would be beneficial as well.
- Transparency related to the selection criteria process should be a primary focus to allow membership and the public better understanding of the selection criteria process.
- An evaluation of the contingent states policy should be undertaken during the May 2012 Championships Committee meeting as part of the selection criteria discussion.
- The short-term focus was determined to be education with a discussion for a long-term evaluation related to providing regions the autonomy of determining their qualifying teams. A much further analysis of the latter needs to take place to see if the idea is feasible, develop the processes that could be implemented and get further membership feedback related to the topic.
- The Championships Committee noted that much further discussion and review of requested information from NCAA staff will continue per the timeline provided in the Selection Criteria White Paper shared with NCAA membership. The Championships Committee will continue formulating ideas and formulate recommendations at the May 2012 meeting.

- Are teams that have goals of making it into the NCAA Championships playing in-region/non-conference schedules or is the issue with those teams that have no plans to participate in NCAA Division II Championships?
- What are Division II's priorities during selections? Should criteria across sports be similar or is each sport different from a selection criteria perspective?
- The focus group recognizes that the selection criteria must be solid and sport specific, yet more weight should be added behind criteria that matches Division II's priorities and then make selections under those expectations.
- Selection criteria should have a length of time set to evaluate changes made to a sport's criteria and the impact. A suggested time line would be every three – four years to allow for scheduling implications by members schools.
- Should Division II consider Division I, III or NAIA contests in postseason selections? The focus group suggested that to be selected for Division II Championship, teams should be only selected based on Division II opponents. Yet, the focus group noted that the NCAA should not be in the habit of mandating when or who a team plays. Rather, if provided by the NCAA the selection criteria based on Division II priorities then teams must meet that criteria to be considered. If a team wants to participate in a Division II Championship then they must play a Division II schedule.
- Can you begin to prioritize Division II selection criteria principles under the following elements (in no particular order):

- Overall Division II Schedule / Strength of schedules
 - Head-to-Head competition
 - In-Region Division II games
 - In-region/non-conference competition
- Could sport committees consider earned access to address the issues of in-region, non-conference competition (i.e., soccer)? The focus group reiterated that no mandate should be put in place yet thought that earned access may address the issue related to in-region, non-conference competition for the sports experiencing the most difficulties in evaluation at selections.
 - Should reseeding occur at NCAA Championships if in-region/non-conference competition is encouraged during the regular season? Should committees be given autonomy to make decision on seeding?
 - Overall, is selection criteria the issue? The focus group indicated that they felt that wasn't the core issue. Rather, they identified the following key items to better address the topic:
 - Develop Division II priorities on selection criteria.
 - Consistent criteria
(minimize the number of changes to the criteria and how often it is allowed by sport committees to change)
 - Educate NCAA membership on selection criteria of each sport.
 - Provide training and education of committees
(RACs and National Committees)
 - The focus group also encouraged each group that reviews the topic to keep the evaluation at a global perspective to ensure it's as fair to all Division II members as possible and in the best interest of Division II as a whole.

2011-12 NCAA DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE

Revised May 22, 2012

<p>Robert Boerigter (“Bob”) Commissioner MIAA 114 West Eleventh Street, Suite 105 Kansas City, Missouri 64105 Phone: 660/562-1306 Fax: (816) 421-6423 Email: bboer@themiaa.com <i>Jan 2014</i></p>	<p>Ann Martin. – MC chair Director of Athletics Regis University 3333 Regis Boulevard Denver, Colorado 80221 Phone: 303/964-5718 Fax: 303/964-5499 Email: amartin@regis.edu <i>Sept 2016</i></p>
<p>Lisa Sweany Director of Athletics Armstrong Atlantic State University 11935 Abercorn Street Savannah, Georgia 31419 Phone: 912/344-2730 Fax: 912/344-3422 Email: lisa.sweany@armstrong.edu <i>*Sept 2012</i></p>	<p>Bob Dranoff Commissioner East Coast Conference 300 Carleton Avenue, SAC 210 Central Islip, New York 11722 Phone: 631/348-3451 Fax: 631/348-3015 Email: rdranoff@eccsports.org <i>Sept 2014</i></p>
<p>Francis Reidy Director of Athletics Saint Leo University 33701 State Road 52 Saint Leo, Florida 33574 Phone: 352/ 588-8246 Fax: 352/ 588-8290 Email: fran.reidy@saintleo.edu <i>Sept 2015</i></p>	<p>Richard F. Sanders Director of Athletics Northwest Nazarene University 623 South University Boulevard Nampa, Idaho 83686 Phone: 208/467-8825 Fax: 208/467-8396 Email: rfsanders@nnu.edu <i>Sept 2015</i></p>
<p>Erin Lind - chair Associate Commissioner/SWA Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference 2999 West County Road 42, Suite 136 Burnsville, Minnesota 55306 Phone: 952/500-8053 Fax: 952/378-1694 Email: lind@northernsun.org <i>Sept 2013</i></p>	<p>Claudie Mackey Faculty Athletics Representative Elizabeth City State University 1704 Weeksville Road Elizabeth City, North Carolina 27909 Phone: 252/335-3479 Fax: 252/335-3469 Email: cjmackey@mail.ecsu.edu <i>Sept 2014</i></p>
<p>Frank Keenan - SAAC Representative Football Student-Athlete Fairmont State University College Park Apartments #209G Fairmont, West Virginia 26554 Phone: 304/838-1116 Email: fkeen@students.fairmontstate.edu <i>Jan 2013</i></p>	<p>Bren Stevens – MC vice chair Director of Athletics/SWA University of Charleston 2300 MacCorkle Avenue Charleston, West Virginia 25304 Phone: 304/357-4911 Fax: 304/357-4989 Email: brenstevens@ucwv.edu <i>Sept 2015</i></p>

Kris Dunbar Director of Athletics Lake Superior State University 650 W. Easterday Ave. Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan 49783 Phone: 906/635-2625 Fax: 906/635-2753 Email: kdunbar@lssu.edu <i>Sept 2013</i>	David Sharp Director of Athletics/Head Men's Golf Coach Ouachita Baptist University 410 Ouachita Street Arkadelphia, Arkansas 71998 Phone: 870/245-5181 Fax: 870/245-5598 Email: sharpd@obu.edu <i>Sept 2014</i>
Joel R. Smith Jr. Commissioner Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference 1867 Austin Bluffs Parkway 101 Colorado Springs, Colorado 80918 Phone: 719/471-4813 Fax: 719/471-0088 Email: jrsmith@rmacsports.org <i>Sept 2012</i>	Patsy Smith Associate Athletics Director /SWA Missouri Western State University 4525 Downs Drive St. Joseph, Missouri 64507 Phone: 816/271-5903 Fax: 816/271-5901 Email: pssmith@missouriwestern.edu <i>Sept 2012</i>
Michael G. Scales, Ed.D. – PC liaison President Nyack College & Alliance Theological Seminary 1 South Blvd. Nyack, New York 10960 Phone (845) 675-4794 Fax (845) 358-1751 Email: president@nyack.edu	
Amy Reis Assistant Director of Championships NCAA P.O. Box 6222 Indianapolis, Indiana 46206 Phone: 317/917-6502 Fax: 317/917-6826 Email: areis@ncaa.org	Roberta Page Director of Championships NCAA P.O. Box 6222 Indianapolis, Indiana 46206 Phone: 317/917-6493 Fax: 317/917-6826 Email: rpage@ncaa.org

** Eligible for reappointment.*

2011-12 NCAA Championships Committee Liaison and Point Person Assignments

SPORT	CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE LIAISON	NCAA POINT PERSON
Baseball	Bob Boerigter <i>Commissioner</i> MIAA bboer@themiaa.com	Russ Yurk ryurk@ncaa.org
Men's Basketball	Lisa Sweany <i>Director of Athletics</i> Armstrong Atlantic State University lisa.sweany@armstrong.edu	Donnie Wagner dwagner@ncaa.org
Women's Basketball	Erin Lind <i>Associate Commissioner/SWA</i> Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference lind@northernsun.org	Roberta Page rpage@ncaa.org
M/W XC, Track (I / O)	Rich Sanders <i>Director of Athletics</i> Northwest Nazarene University rfsanders@nnu.edu	Katie Holmes kholmes@ncaa.org
Field Hockey	Kris Dunbar <i>Director of Athletics</i> Lake Superior State University kdunbar@lssu.edu	Roberta Page rpage@ncaa.org
Football	JR Smith <i>Commissioner</i> Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference jrsmith@rmacsports.org	Donnie Wagner dwagner@ncaa.org
Men's Golf	David Sharp <i>Director of Athletics/Head Men's Golf Coach</i> Ouachita Baptist University sharpd@obu.edu	Donnie Wagner dwagner@ncaa.org
Women's Golf	David Sharp <i>Director of Athletics/Head Men's Golf Coach</i> Ouachita Baptist University sharpd@obu.edu	Roberta Page rpage@ncaa.org
Men's Lacrosse	Bob Dranoff <i>Commissioner</i> East Coast Conference rdranoff@eccsports.org	Jeff Jarnecke jjarnecke@ncaa.org
Women's Lacrosse	Bob Dranoff <i>Commissioner</i> East Coast Conference rdranoff@eccsports.org	Michelle Forkner mforkner@ncaa.org

NCAA Championships Committee Liaison
and Point Person Assignments
February 8, 2011
Page No. 2

Women's Rowing	Kris Dunbar <i>Director of Athletics</i> Lake Superior State University kdunbar@lssu.edu	Rachel Kay rkay@ncaa.org
Men's Soccer	Francis Reidy <i>Director of Athletics</i> Saint Leo University fran.reidy@saintleo.edu	Russ Yurk ryurk@ncaa.org
Women's Soccer	Claudie Mackey <i>Faculty Athletics Representative</i> Elizabeth City State University cjmackey@mail.ecsu.edu	Ashley Dunigan adunigan@ncaa.org
Softball	Patsy Smith <i>Associate Athletics Director /SWA</i> Missouri Western State University pssmith@missouriwestern.edu	Amy Reis areis@ncaa.org
M/W Swimming & Diving	Patsy Smith <i>Associate Athletics Director /SWA</i> Missouri Western State University pssmith@missouriwestern.edu	Carol Reep careep@ncaa.org
M/W Tennis	Erin Lind <i>Associate Commissioner/SWA</i> Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference lind@northernsun.org	John Baldwin jbaldwin@ncaa.org
Women's Volleyball	Bob Boerigter <i>Commissioner</i> MIAA bboer@themiaa.com	Katie Holmes kholmes@ncaa.org
Men's Wrestling	JR Smith <i>Commissioner</i> Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference jrsmith@rmacsports.org	John Baldwin jbaldwin@ncaa.org

To contact a specific sport manager, call the NCAA at 317-917-6222 or email them directly at the address listed above.

Division II Sport Committee Liaisons & Support Staff (Effective 5/22/2012)

Sport Committee	Tournament Operations (Phone: 317/917-xxxx)	
	Point	Team
Baseball	Russ Yurk - 6054 ryurk@ncaa.org	Heidi Wurster – 6527 hwurster@ncaa.org
Men's Basketball	Donnie Wagner - 6813 dwagner@ncaa.org	TBD
Women's Basketball	Roberta Page - 6493 rpage@ncaa.org	Carla Laster – 6548 claster@ncaa.org
Field Hockey	Roberta Page - 6493 rpage@ncaa.org	Carla Laster – 6548 claster@ncaa.org
Football	Donnie Wagner - 6813 dwagner@ncaa.org	TBD
Men's Golf	Donnie Wagner - 6813 dwagner@ncaa.org	Keith Willard – 6767 kwillard@ncaa.org
Women's Golf	Roberta Page - 6493 rpage@ncaa.org	Ebony Strong – 6186 strong@ncaa.org
Men's Lacrosse	Jeff Jarnecke – 6229 jjarnecke@ncaa.org	Leslie Cagle – 6483 lcagle@ncaa.org
Women's Lacrosse	Michelle Forkner – 6775 mforkner@ncaa.org	Abby Bisesi – 6688 abisesi@ncaa.org
Women's Rowing	Rachel Kay - 6549 rkay@ncaa.org	TBD
Men's Soccer	Russ Yurk - 6054 ryurk@ncaa.org	Heidi Wurster – 6527 hwurster@ncaa.org
Women's Soccer	Ashley Dunigan – 6515 adunigan@ncaa.org	Heidi Wurster – 6527 hwurster@ncaa.org
Softball	Amy Reis - 6580 areis@ncaa.org	Carla Laster – 6548 claster@ncaa.org
Men's and Women's Swimming and Diving	Carol Reep - 6678 careep@ncaa.org	TBD
Men's and Women's Tennis	John Baldwin – 6442 jbaldwin@ncaa.org	Carla Laster – 6548 claster@ncaa.org
Men's and Women's Track and Field	Katie Holmes - 6206 kholmes@ncaa.org	Morgan DeSpain - 6505 mdespain@ncaa.org
Women's Volleyball	Katie Holmes - 6206 kholmes@ncaa.org	Courtney Perry - 6834 cperry@ncaa.org
Wrestling	John Baldwin – 6442 jbaldwin@ncaa.org	Leslie Cagle – 6483 lcagle@ncaa.org

2011-12 Candidacy/Provisional/Reclassifying Institutions
Selection Criteria Policies

Institutions Entering Division II.

Candidacy Period Year-One Membership – Waiver Process:

The waiver consists of the institution sending its schedules to Roberta Page **no later than September 1** of the academic year in which the waiver is being sought for review to determine whether the institution has met the scheduling requirements for championships eligibility. Ms. Page will follow-up with both the championships manager and the institution to let the institution know whether it would be counted in the strength of schedule and considered in-region for other Division II opponents.

Candidacy Period Year-Two Membership – Considered in strength of schedule and as an in-region contest – waiver is not necessary.

Provisional Membership – Considered in strength of schedule and as an in-region contest – waiver is not necessary.

NOTE: To be eligible for NCAA Division II Championships, an institution must be an active member in good standing per NCAA Division II Bylaw 18.4.2.1 (a).

Institutions Leaving Division II.

Exploratory year – Institutions leaving Division II shall be treated in the selection process as active and are still eligible for Division II championships until they enter the reclassifying process.

Once an institution has entered the reclassifying process, it will be treated in the selection process as an institution in the division in which they are reclassifying (e.g., Division III or Division I).

Selection Criteria	Candidacy Year One (C1)	Candidacy Year Two (C2)	Provisional (P)	Reclassifying Out of Division II
Minimum number of Division II contests for selection	Count as Division II	Count as Division II	Count as Division II	Division II to Division III - Count as Division III Division II to Division I - Count as Division I
Overall won/lost	Count	Count	Count	Count
Strength of schedule	Do not count *	Count as Division II	Count as Division II	Division II to Division III - Count as Division III Division II to Division I - Count as Division I
In-region strength of schedule	Do not count *	Count as Division II	Count as Division II	Do not count
Division II won/lost	Do not count *	Count as Division II	Count as Division II	Do not count
In-region won/lost	Do not count *	Count as Division II	Count as Division II	Do not count

*May count the same as C2 if requested and granted a waiver.

2011-12 Candidacy and Provisional Institutions

Candidacy Year One (C1)	Candidacy Year Two (C2)	Provisional (P)
Azusa Pacific University (CA) Fresno Pacific University (CA) McMurry University (TX) Point Loma Nazarene University (CA) Roberts Wesleyan University (NY) Shorter University (GA) Southern Nazarene University (OK) Trevecca Nazarene University (TN) Union University (TN) Young Harris College (GA)	Black Hills State University (SD) California Baptist University (CA) Lindenwood University (MO) Malone University (OH) McKendree University (IL) South Dakota School of Mines (SD) Ursuline College (OH) Walsh University (OH)	Academy of Art University (CA) Cedarville University (OH) Minot State University (ND) Notre Dame College (OH) Simon Fraser University (B.C.) University of Sioux Falls (SD) William Jewell College (MO)

Institutions Leaving Division I and Entering Division II.

Once an institution has been accepted by the NCAA Division II Membership Committee to reclassify its entire athletics program from Division I to Division II, these institutions will be treated in the selection process using the following criteria:

Selection Criteria	
Minimum number of Division II contests for selection	Count as Division II
Overall won/lost	Count
Strength of schedule	Count as Division II
In-region strength of schedule	Count as Division II
Division II won/lost	Count as Division II
In-region won/lost	Count as Division II

Conflict of Interest and Recusal Policy

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.

Committee members will not receive paperwork related to discussion and deliberation of the institution or conference office of which they are employed.

NCAA Championships and Alliances

Guiding Principles

Consistent with Association and Divisional mission and values (e.g., fair play, sportsmanship), we will strive to be recognized as operating the finest athletic event properties in the world by:

- **Ensuring** student-athletes' optimal experience as our fundamental guiding principle.
- **Executing** championships reflecting appropriate quality and values to/for all stakeholders – student-athletes, administrators, member-institutions, coaches, fans, broadcast partners, corporate champions/partners and championship sport committees.
- **Coordinating** all aspects of championships in an efficient, effective manner through common operating policies and practices, utilizing internal and external resources.
- **Integrating** championships with broadcast and corporate relationships in a manner that supports the mission while maintaining the rich tradition and decorum of such events.
- **Assuring** effective management of the business aspects of championships as well as the elements that are part of the collegiate model of the NCAA.
- **Enhancing** the various assets of the NCAA and their value and collaborating with internal and external expertise to implement the championship experience with more efficiency and through heightened exposure (i.e., youth clinics, community programs, fan events, banquets, anniversaries, etc.)

Operating Principles

In delivering NCAA Championships, we will:

- **Assess** current processes and identify “best practice” opportunities for the broadest possible implementation.
- **Deliver** a core student-athlete experience in terms of championship environment, provided services, health and safety standards, and overall deliverables.
- **Commit** to the highest standards of communication, collaboration and accountability for external and internal stakeholders that enhance confidence and support of the championship experience.
- **Define, plan and coordinate** championships marketing/promotions to increase awareness, ticket sales, attendance, build and sustain fan loyalty, and otherwise maximize fans' consumption of all NCAA championship elements.
- **Highly integrate** the various functions of championships (e.g. statistics, playing rules, media coordination, corporate and broadcast alliances, etc.), in order to best leverage identified championships and optimize such relationships with corporate champions/partners and broadcast partners.
- **Identify** the best delivery means including possible alternative methods (i.e. outsource, agency, etc.) when financial or qualitative efficiencies and/or expertise may be provided.
- Serve a prominent role in **creating, defining and maintaining** a nationally recognized standard of excellence for regular-season event operations including identification of best practices.
- **Encourage** ongoing and continuous pursuit of new innovative approaches to improve the execution of championships
- **Commit** to a defined, stable program and delivery system that utilizes the most up-to-date tools and technology, seek high-performing staff members, and assure stability of staff and championship administration (e.g., staff training and cross-training, succession planning).

DIVISION II STRATEGIC POSITIONING PLATFORM

NCAA mission

What the brand wants to accomplish

To govern competition in a fair, safe, equitable and sportsmanlike manner, and to integrate intercollegiate athletics into higher education so that the educational experience of the student-athlete is paramount.


DII positioning statement

Who we are

Life in the Balance. Higher education has lasting importance on an individual's future success. For this reason, the emphasis for the student-athlete experience in Division II is a comprehensive program of learning and development in a personal setting. The Division II approach provides growth opportunities through academic achievement, learning in high-level athletic competition and development of positive societal attitudes in service to community. The balance and integration of these different areas of learning opportunity provide Division II student-athletes a path to graduation while cultivating a variety of skills and knowledge for life ahead.

DII attributes

What we stand for



Audience benefits

Key benefits of the DII experience

Student-Athletes / Parents

- Participation in high-level athletic competition without an overemphasis of sports in student life
- Availability of faculty and sports staff in a personal setting
- With the broad, versatile range of experiences, student-athletes are more likely to find interest and value in school and therefore stay to graduate
- Upon graduation, the student-athlete will leave with broader experiences, skills and knowledge as resources for the future
- With personal setting and multiple areas of learning, student-athletes can have an impact with peers, community and school

DII Membership

- Achieve educational mission and graduation success for student-athletes through a comprehensive program that provides path to graduation and develops broad skill set
- High-level athletic competition for institution, region, community and student-athlete without an overemphasis on sports at the institution
- Opportunity for personal mentoring, coaching, teaching with student-athletes

- Impact local community / develop key local relationships through participation in Division II national community-engagement program

General Public

- High-level, passionate athletic competition for local communities and region in an intimate, family-friendly environment
- Opportunities to interface face-to-face with student-athletes in different venues
- Positive impact in local communities and region through Division II national program
- Show support for educational mission of student-athletes and development of youth

Key Stakeholders

- Invest in the educational mission of student-athletes and development of youth into productive citizens
- Promote high-level athletic competition in local communities and region
- Impact local community / develop key local relationships through support of Division II national community-engagement program

Division II features

12 reasons to believe in Division II

- 1. Graduation Rate.** Division II student-athlete graduation rate is consistently 10 to 15 percentage points higher than the total student body.
- 2. Class Time.** Division II's regionalization philosophy rewards the scheduling of local or regional opponents in the regular season, resulting in limited missed class time for student-athletes.
- 3. Athletics Scholarships.** Many Division II student-athletes receive athletics scholarships and other forms of financial aid to pay for school.
- 4. Personal Attention.** Student-athletes receive a quality education at DII institutions that often feature an exceptional teacher-to-student ratio.
- 5. Additional Assistance.** The Degree-Completion Scholarship Program provides deserving Division II student-athletes who have exhausted their collegiate eligibility with financial assistance.
- 6. National Championships Opportunities.** Division II features unparalleled opportunity for student-athletes to advance to national championship competition as a result of the division's generous championship access ratios.
- 7. Community Partnerships.** Division II has initiated national community partnerships with the Make-A-Wish Foundation and Habitat for Humanity.
- 8. Unique Fiscal Model.** Division II offers a unique fiscal model for intercollegiate athletics that redefines the institutional value for sponsoring sports and offering athletics scholarships.
- 9. Innovative Solutions.** Division II encourages innovative policy and program decisions unique to the NCAA, such as the development of Division II National Championships Festivals and a national community-engagement program.
- 10. Teacher/Coaches.** Many Division II coaches continue to provide other services for their institution and in the community, including teaching and mentoring.
- 11. Proud Alumni.** Former Division II student-athletes include governors, senators, entertainers, corporate leaders and professional athletes.
- 12. National Recognition.** Division II student-athletes have received the NCAA's highest individual honors, including winning the Walter Byers Scholarship Award (the Association's top student-athlete) and the NCAA Woman of the Year Award.



Division II Strategic Plan

January 2012 through January 2015

Division II Vision Statement: *The NCAA's purpose is to govern competition in a fair, safe, equitable and sportsmanlike manner, and to integrate intercollegiate athletics into higher education so that the educational experience of the student-athlete is paramount. Through a shared effort, Division II intercollegiate athletics also seeks to provide value and significance for its members by supporting the mission of higher education and striking a balance among academic excellence, athletics competition and social growth while its colleges and universities prepare student-athletes to thrive in their lives and careers.*

Endorsed by: NCAA Division II Management Council, NCAA Division II Presidents Council



POSITIONING STATEMENT

Life in the Balance. Higher education has lasting importance on an individual's future success. For this reason, the emphasis for the student-athlete experience in Division II is a comprehensive program of learning and development in a personal setting. The Division II approach provides growth opportunities through academic achievement, learning in high-level athletic competition and development of positive societal attitudes in service to community. The balance and integration of these different areas of learning opportunity provide Division II student-athletes a path to graduation while cultivating a variety of skills and knowledge for life ahead.

Attributes Highlighted in a NCAA Division II Student-Athlete Experience:

Learning: multiple opportunities to broaden knowledge and skills

Service: positive societal attitude through contributions to community

Passion: enthusiastic dedication and desire in effort

Sportsmanship: respect for fairness, courtesy; ethical conduct toward others

Resourcefulness: versatile skill set drawn from broad range of experiences

Balance: emphasis on collective knowledge; integration of skills

Reasons to Believe in NCAA Division II:

- Academic Success and Graduation Rates
- Athletics Scholarships/Unique Fiscal Model
- Championships Opportunities
- Community Partnerships
- Proud Alumni and Fans
- Innovative Solutions
- High-Level Athletics

Goal One: Academics and Life Skills

Provide Division II student-athletes a path to graduation while cultivating skills and knowledge for life ahead; learning in high-level athletics competition; and developing positive societal attitudes through service to community.

Goal One stresses the importance of promoting and honoring student-athlete success, protecting student-athlete well-being, developing positive societal attitudes through contributions to community, providing opportunities for student-athletes to have an active role in the governance process, and fostering partnerships to enhance the success of both student-athletes and the student body.

Goal Two: Athletics Operations and Compliance

Commit to institutional control by establishing a system for operations and compliance that is engaged and functioning.

Goal Two emphasizes presidential commitment and involvement, leadership and professional development opportunities for athletics personnel, coaches and faculty and commits conferences and institutions to effective, engaging and functioning compliance programs.

Goal Three: Game Day and Conference and National Championships

Provide fair and equitable competition and a quality, positive and rewarding game day and conference and national championship experiences.

Goal Three emphasizes the need to promote and enhance a quality student-athlete experience in Division II athletics competition and conference and national championships and to ensure game environments are competitive, safe, positive, respectful and entertaining.

Goal Four: Membership and Positioning Initiatives

Utilize the uniqueness of the Division II model to establish Division II as a membership destination and to ensure long-lasting stability.

Goal Four supports a commitment to fiscal responsibility and to the allocation of athletics funds and resources consistent with the identity of Division II. Additionally, Goal Four emphasizes the importance of attracting and retaining members that support the strategic position and philosophy of Division II intercollegiate athletics; promoting the Division II identity through collaborative partnerships and relationships; and strengthening the public's knowledge and appreciation for Division II.

Goal Five: Diversity and Inclusion

Promote diversity and foster an environment of inclusion.

Goal Five supports the importance, value, benefits and role of diversity and inclusion in higher education and intercollegiate athletics.

Goal One: Academics and Life Skills

Provide Division II student-athletes a path to graduation while cultivating skills and knowledge for life ahead; learning in high-level athletics competition; and developing positive societal attitudes through service to community.

- Priority 1.1: Promote and honor academic measures of success and retention, including graduation rates.
Oversight: Division II Academic Requirements Committee
- Priority 1.2: Analyze and assess research to establish requirements that impact and advance the academic success of student-athletes.
Oversight: Division II Academic Requirements Committee
- Priority 1.3: Provide leadership, development and service opportunities for student-athletes.
Oversight: NCAA Educational Affairs staff, Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
- Priority 1.4: Promote and honor student-athlete service, achievement and success through various Division II platforms (e.g., championships, convention).
Oversight: NCAA Honors Committee, Division II Faculty Athletics Representatives, Division II Academic Requirements Committee, Division II Championships Committee
- Priority 1.5: Strengthen student-athlete communications and voice in the governance process at the local, conference and national levels.
Oversight: Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
- Priority 1.6: Protect the health, safety and well-being of student-athletes.
Oversight: NCAA Educational Affairs staff, NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sport, Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, Division II Committee for Legislative Relief
- Priority 1.7: Enhance the partnerships and the integration among the conference and campus community to support and foster the success of student-athletes and the student body.
Oversight: Campus and Conferences SAACs, Division II Faculty Athletics Representatives, Division II Directors of Athletics, Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee

Primary Standards and/or Metrics of Measure for Goal One

- Academic Success Rate
- Federal Graduation Rate
- Academic Performance Census
- GOALS survey data
- SCORE survey data
- Number of student-athletes nominated and awarded Division II Degree Completion Scholarships
- Drug use data for Division II student-athletes
- Injury rate for Division II student-athletes

Goal Two: Athletics Operations and Compliance

Commit to institutional control by establishing a system for operations and compliance that is engaged and functioning

- Priority 2.1: Continue to enhance and support presidential commitment and involvement in the affairs of athletics at the local, conference and national levels.
Oversight: Division II Presidents Council, Division II Committee on Infractions
- Priority 2.2: Provide leadership and development opportunities for athletics administrators, coaches and faculty.
Oversight: Division II Diversity Project Team, Division II Nominating Committee, Division II Management Council
- Priority 2.3: Involve, enhance and recognize the role of athletics administrators, coaches and faculty in the governance process at the local, conference and national levels.
Oversight: Division II Conferences, Division II Nominating Committee, Division II Management Council, Division II Faculty Athletics Representatives
- Priority 2.4: Develop the role of Division II conference offices as leaders and advocates for rules compliance and academic achievement.
Oversight: Division II Conference Commissioners Association, Division II Conference Office Compliance Administrators
- Priority 2.5: Develop, enhance and increase educational materials, resources (e.g., technology), tools and services that support and maintain an effective compliance system.
Oversight: Division II Committee for Legislative Relief, Division II Legislation Committee, Division II Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee

Primary Standards and/or Metrics of Measure for Goal Two

- Number of Division II institutions using the NCAA Compliance Assistant or other compliance software
- Secondary violations reported by Division II institutions
- Division II infraction cases
- Number of national and conference-office conducted compliance reviews
- Attendance by presidents/chancellors at annual NCAA conventions
- Attendance at NCAA Division II Faculty Athletics Representative Fellows Institute
- Enhancement Fund distribution by conference

Goal Three: Game Day and Conference and National Championships

Provide fair and equitable competition and a quality, positive and rewarding game day and conference and national championship experiences

- Priority 3.1: Provide game environments and atmospheres that are competitive, safe, fun, positive, respectful and entertaining.
Oversight: Division II Conferences, Division II Directors of Athletics, Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
- Priority 3.2: Enhance and increase the opportunities to strengthen the experience for game day, conference championships and national championships for Division II student-athletes, coaches, officials, fans and spectators.
Oversight: Division II Directors of Athletics, Division II Identity Subcommittee, Division II Championships Committee
- Priority 3.3: Commit to fair and equitable regional and national competition by developing appropriate and disseminated selection, seeding and bracketing processes, policies and guidelines.
Oversight: Division II Championships Committee
- Priority 3.4: Strengthen partnerships and relationships with host communities, schools, coaches associations, media and sponsors at the local, regional and national levels.
Oversight: Division II Championships Committee
- Priority 3.5: Provide opportunities to develop, establish and improve standards in officiating and increase the pool of qualified officials.
Oversight: Division II Conferences, Division II Championships Committee
- Priority 3.6: Enhance and increase the use of resources (e.g., technology), tools and services to improve the effectiveness and efficiencies of game day, conference and national championships' operations.
Oversight: Division II Championships Committee

Primary Standards and/or Metrics of Measure for Goal Three

- Experience by student-athletes at conference and national championships (post-championship surveys)
- Championships participation opportunities
- Experience by attendees at Division II National Championships Festivals (survey)
- Number of Division II championships on national television and/or broadband technology
- Total attendance at Division II sporting events (aggregate numbers)
- Number of ideas that work on game environment website
- Game environment award nominees and winners
- Number of community engagement ideas that work

Goal Four: Membership and Positioning Initiatives

Utilize the uniqueness of the Division II model to establish Division II as a membership destination and to ensure long-lasting stability

- Priority 4.1: Commit to fiscal responsibility at the local, conference, regional and national levels.
Oversight: Division II Institutions, Division II Conferences, Division II Planning and Finance Committee, Division II Championships Committee
- Priority 4.2: Allocate funds and resources in a manner that recognizes and supports the unique characteristics and attributes of Division II.
Oversight: Division II Planning and Finance Committee, Division II Management Council
- Priority 4.3: Analyze and assess budget policies and procedures to position for new media contracts for the division and the Association.
Oversight: Division II Media Advisory Group, Division II Planning and Finance Committee
- Priority 4.4: Attract and retain members that support the strategic position and philosophy of Division II intercollegiate athletics.
Oversight: Division II Membership Committee
- Priority 4.5: Commit to develop tools and resources that assist active member institutions and conferences with evaluating its position in conjunction with the strategic position and philosophy of Division II intercollegiate athletics.
Oversight: Division II Legislation Committee, Division II Membership Committee, Division II Presidents Council
- Priority 4.6: Promote the use of tools and resources that assess the value of Division II intercollegiate athletics and strengthen the awareness of Division II and its characteristics and attributes.
Oversight: Division II Membership Committee, Division II Identity Subcommittee
- Priority 4.7: Enhance communication and partnerships with the media and other organizations to provide opportunities for communicating the unique characteristics and attributes of Division II membership.
Oversight: Division II Institutions, Division II Conferences, Division II Management Council
- Priority 4.8: Recognize outstanding achievements with strategic initiatives (e.g., community engagement) by Division II institutions and conferences.
Oversight: Division II Identity Subcommittee
- Priority 4.9: Commit to the strategic management of Division II membership growth.
Oversight: Division II Membership Committee
- Priority 4.10: Analyze the costs associated with sponsoring Division II intercollegiate athletics programs and institutional compliance to ensure strategic use of limited resources.
Oversight: Division II Planning and Finance Committee, Division II Presidents Council

Primary Standards and/or Metrics of Measure for Goal Four

- Division II Network website hits
- Facebook users who “like” Division II
- Game environment website hits
- Community engagement website hits
- Community engagement award nominees and winners
- Division II stories in local, regional and national papers
- Number of active Division II institutions and conferences
- Number of schools in the Division I, II and III membership processes
- Partnership with Make-A-Wish foundation

Goal Five: Diversity and Inclusion

Promote diversity and foster an environment of inclusion

- Priority 5.1: Continue to partner and build collaborative relationships with other organizations to support and enhance the diversity of administrators, coaches and student-athletes at the local, conference and national levels.
Oversight: NCAA Office of Inclusion, Division II Diversity Project Team, Division II Conferences, Division II Institutions
- Priority 5.2: Enhance commitment by presidents/chancellors, athletics administrators, coaches, faculty and student-athletes to be advocates for establishing environments that foster diversity and inclusion.
Oversight: NCAA Office of Inclusion, Division II Diversity Project Team, Division II Nominating Committee, Division II Conferences, Division II Institutions
- Priority 5.3: Analyze and assess research and current programming to provide programs, tools and resources that support environments of diversity and inclusion.
Oversight: NCAA Office of Inclusion, Division II Diversity Project Team
- Priority 5.4: Provide tools and resources that assist schools and conferences in recruiting, hiring and retaining diverse groups and individuals.
Oversight: NCAA Office of Inclusion, Division II Diversity Project Team
- Priority 5.5: Provide tools and resources to schools and conferences that provide education on the importance, value, benefits and role of diversity and inclusion in higher education and intercollegiate athletics.
Oversight: NCAA Office of Inclusion, Division II Diversity Project Team, Division II Nominating Committee

Primary Standards and/or Metrics of Measure for Goal Five

- Number of Division II coaches by gender and ethnicity
- Number of Division II administrators by gender and ethnicity
- Number of Division II student-athletes by gender and ethnicity
- Nominees and awardees for the Division II assistant coaches grant
- Nominees and awardees for the Division II strategic alliance matching grant
- Number of Division II institutions requesting programming from the NCAA Office of Inclusion
- Gender and ethnicity representation on Division II committees

NCAA Division II 2012 Strategic Priorities

The fall of 2011 marked the five-year anniversary of the creation and initial implementation of the NCAA Division II strategic positioning platform. Since the release of the strategic positioning platform, the division has created tools and resources for the membership, including initiatives centered on community engagement and game environment. An interactive website at diinetwork.org provides the membership an opportunity to share and learn about the successes of these initiatives at the local level. Further, within the last year, the division has launched a website geared specifically toward Division II student-athletes—D2SA.org. This interactive website includes videos, pictures, a blog and a poll. In addition to the website, the division launched a Facebook page.

Division II priorities have centered on enhancing the student-athlete experience and aligning the division's governance operations with its strategic objectives. For example, the division has developed a strategic plan with specific goals and priorities that relate to the overall strategic positioning platform. In addition, the division also passed landmark legislation that amended Bylaw 17 playing and practice season regulations by shortening seasons, reducing contests and creating a winter break that has provided "Life in the Balance" for student-athletes, coaches and athletics administrators.

Further, at the 2012 NCAA Convention, the membership considered two significant packages of proposals centered on the strategic growth of the division and easing the burden on coaches, administrators and compliance personnel by amending several key recruiting regulations, including telephone calls, contacts and electronic communications (e.g., email, text messaging).

The 2012-15 strategic plan will be released to the Division II membership at the 2012 NCAA Convention. The plan includes five strategic goals and funding initiatives: 1) Academics and Life Skills; 2) Athletics Operations and Compliance; 3) Game Day and Conference and National Championships; 4) Membership and Positioning Initiatives; and 5) Diversity and Inclusion. These goals and funding initiatives will be at the forefront for the division during the next several years, as we strive to continue with our focus on "Life in the Balance" in Division II. To help accomplish these goals, the division will emphasize three overarching strategies in 2012:

-
1. *Promote the success of our student-athletes—in the classroom, on the playing field and in the community—by striking a balance among athletics competition, academic excellence and social growth as we prepare student-athletes for lifelong success.*
 2. *Emphasize Division II not only as a membership destination, but also as a division that offers exceptional value to its members—a division where schools, in a fiscally responsible way, can offer highly skilled student-athletes a place to compete for championships and enjoy a balanced collegiate experience.*
 3. *Continue to live the 'collegiate model' philosophy in Division II—those who participate in college sports are students and intercollegiate athletics is embedded in the values and mission of higher education.*

NCAA Division II 2012 Priorities

Overarching Strategy No. 1

Promote the success of our student-athletes.

1. Championships Review of Selection Criteria. The Championships Committee has been charged with reviewing selection criteria to determine methods that would encourage schools to schedule in-region, nonconference competition and to discourage schools from scheduling contests that will not aid the sports committees in the selection of teams for the national championships. The committee will be asked to look at an incentive plan and/or a penalty structure to encourage cross competition among conferences. The committee will reach out to various constituent groups for feedback and thoughts, including the Division II Athletics Directors Association and the Division II Conference Commissioners Association.

2. Academic Standards Review. With the continued collection of APC (Academic Performance Census) data, the Academic Requirements Committee (ARC) is conducting a thorough review of initial-eligibility, progress-toward-degree and transfer legislation and requirements. The division is able to use the APC data to ensure the standards for eligibility are consistent with the academic performance and academic expectations of Division II student-athletes. ARC will conduct its review over the next 18 months and will host several education sessions at the 2013 NCAA Convention, including a special meeting of Division II presidents and chancellors. It is expected that a set of legislative proposals will be before the Division II membership at the 2014 NCAA Convention.

3. Championships Festival. The division will conduct its third spring championships festival (sixth overall) May 14-19 in Louisville, Kentucky, featuring the sports of men's and women's golf, women's lacrosse, softball and men's and women's tennis. Further, the winning bid for the 2013 Festival will be determined. Continuing the success of the festivals for the student-athletes will be a top priority.



Overarching Strategy No. 2

Emphasize Division II as a division that offers exceptional value to its membership.

1. Strategic Communications and Use of Technology. Recently, the division launched a model document that emphasizes the need to develop and build purposeful and strategic communications. Building on the release of the model strategic communications document, the division will work to coordinate Division II communication tools and initiatives with overall NCAA strategies, including the presence of Division II messages and interactive communication tools (e.g., websites, social media) on ncaa.com and ncaa.org.

2. Ease of Burden Review. With the passage of the first set of legislative proposals in the 'ease of burden' package, Division II committees will continue to look for procedures and various ways to try to alleviate more of the compliance and financial burdens that current regulations place on NCAA Division II intercollegiate athletics. The main goals of the initiative are: (1) to ease the burden of compliance; (2) to assist Division II administrators and coaches with better time management; and (3) to identify potential cost savings for better allocation of resources. The division will continue to work with various constituent groups on the creation of legislative concepts and policy changes.

3. Diversity Initiatives. In collaboration with the Division II Diversity Project Team, the NCAA Inclusion Office and other appropriate committees, the division will work to implement the initiatives and strategies recommended from the NCAA Inclusion Summit and the Division II Minority Coaches Summit. Additionally, emphasis will be placed on the diversity and inclusion area of the Division II conference grant program to ensure conferences and institutions are moving forward in implementing a culture of inclusion in the division. Finally, the division will work to coordinate a summit in 2012 focused on the representation of female coaches in Division II.

4. Measuring the Success of Division II Initiatives. The Planning and Finance Committee, working with the appropriate Division II committees and associations, will make certain the strategic plan goals and priorities, and the related initiatives to support those goals and priorities, are accurately measured to ensure implementation and success of the initiatives. Additionally, the committee will continue to emphasize the importance of measurable standards as part of the conference grant program, including the importance of providing a detailed rationale statement for the conference's ranking of each strategic positioning outcome area. The division will continue to use its strategic plan scorecards to reflect the measurements of success for the initiatives in the division.

Overarching Strategy No. 3

Continue to live the 'collegiate model' philosophy in Division II.

1. Coaches' Education. The coaches' certification exam has been an initiative to ensure the education of coaches on the recruiting rules and regulations. However, in light of the changing landscape in intercollegiate athletics, are there other appropriate means to educate coaches not only on the rules and regulations, but to provide knowledge and understanding on the key initiatives in the division, including community engagement, game environment and the division's positioning platform. The division will focus on developing coach-specific tools and resources to aid in the greater utilization of the current divisional tools and resources.

2. Enforcement Process. This review will concentrate on where the division should focus its efforts in the enforcement process and the penalty structure to determine what is important to the integrity of Division II intercollegiate athletics. Discussions will begin at the division-specific chancellors and presidents program at the 2012 Convention, and feedback will be sought from various constituent groups. The review may result in policy and/or legislative changes.

3. SCORE Data. SCORE is a longitudinal study designed to collect data on former college student-athletes. The topics explored in SCORE are related to the impact of the respondent's educational experiences and athletics participation on his or her current life. For the 2011 survey, the division over-sampled the number of former Division II student-athletes, and additional questions were asked about the Division II-specific experience. The division will use the data collected in the 2011 survey to determine the accuracy of the strategic positioning platform and whether the Division II experience has aided student-athletes in their post-graduation achievement.



SUMMARY OF SPRING 2012 QUARTERLY MEETINGS

The National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division II Management Council April 16-17, 2012 Indianapolis, IN	Division II Presidents Council April 26, 2012 Indianapolis, IN
ATTENDEES	ATTENDEES
Anita Barker, California State University, Chico Bob Boerigter, Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association Clint Bryant, Augusta State University Brenda Cates, Mount Olive College Rick Cole Jr., Dowling College Kris Dunbar, Lake Superior State College Barbara Hannum, Hawaii Pacific University Kathy Heitzman, Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania Denisha Hendricks, Kentucky State University Dan Kenney, University of North Carolina Pembroke Timothy Ladd, Palm Beach Atlantic University Leonza Loftin, Fayetteville State University Larry Marfise, University of Tampa Ann Martin, Regis University (<i>chair</i>) Sandy Michael, Holy Family University Janet Montgomery, University of West Alabama Jared Mosley, Abilene Christian University Jim Naumovich, Great Lakes Valley Conference Erin O'Connell, Seattle Pacific University Chip Polak, South New Hampshire University Steve Poston, Wingate University Will Prewitt, Great American Conference Bren Stevens, University of Charleston (<i>vice chair</i>) Karen Stromme, University of Minnesota Duluth Kathy Turner, Oklahoma Panhandle State University Brent Wren, University of Alabama in Huntsville	Judith Bense, University of West Florida Mickey Burnim, Bowie State University Robin Capehart, West Liberty University James Gaudino, Central Washington University Tom Haas, Grand Valley State University (<i>vice chair</i>) Dianne Harrison, California State University, Monterey Bay Carolyn Mahoney, Lincoln University (Missouri) Ernest McNealey, Stillman College Pat O'Brien, West Texas A&M University (<i>chair</i>) Michael Scales, Nyack College Allen Sessoms, University of the District of Columbia Robert Wyatt, Coker College

ABSENTEES	ABSENTEES
	F. Javier Cevallos, Kutztown University of Pennsylvania Arthur Kirk Jr., Saint Leo University Judith Ramaley, Winona State University
OTHER PARTICIPANTS	OTHER PARTICIPANTS
Amanda Conklin, NCAA Mark Emmert, NCAA President Kim Ford, NCAA Bernard Franklin, NCAA Jennifer Fraser, NCAA Maritza Jones, Division II Consultant Cari Klecka, NCAA Jarrett Newby, NCAA Xiaomu Niu, NCAA Gwendolyn Packnett, ACE Fellow Roberta Page, NCAA David Pickle, NCAA Mike Racy, NCAA Ronnie Ramos, NCAA Ruth Reinhardt, NCAA (<i>recording secretary</i>) Amy Reis, NCAA Cam Schuh, NCAA Stephanie Smith, NCAA Terri Steeb-Gronau, NCAA Naima Stevenson, NCAA Gregg Summers, NCAA Wendy Walters, NCAA	Dan Calandro, NCAA Amanda Conklin, NCAA Jennifer Fraser, NCAA Maritza Jones, Division II Consultant Jarrett Newby, NCAA David Pickle, NCAA Mike Racy, NCAA Ruth Reinhardt, NCAA (<i>recording secretary</i>) Jess Rigler, NCAA Stephanie Smith, NCAA Terri Steeb-Gronau, NCAA Gregg Summers, NCAA

[Note: This summary reflects only actions (formal votes or “sense of meeting”) in accordance with the established policy governing minutes of all NCAA entities. The only discussion included is that ordered by the chair or a member of the group.]

1. WELCOME AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.

Management Council. The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m. by the chair, Ann Martin. The chair again welcomed those members who were new to the Council, noting the absence of Steve Poston, who would be in attendance following adjournment of another NCAA committee meeting. The chair recognized the three Pathway participants

from Division II who were present—William T. Orr, Livingstone College; Shantey Hill, C. W. Post Campus-Long Island University; and Julie Wengert, Missouri Southern State University.

Presidents Council. The meeting was called to order at 9:08 a.m. by the chair, Pat O'Brien. The chair welcomed those members who were new to the Council—Robin Capehart, West Liberty University; Art Kirk Jr., Saint Leo University (who was not in attendance); Allen Sessoms, University of the District of Columbia; and Robert Wyatt, Coker College. Additionally, the chair noted that this would be the last meeting for Judith Ramaley, (who could not be in attendance) as well as for Dianne Harrison (who is taking over the presidency of California State University, Northridge). Carolyn Mahoney will be retiring from Lincoln University August 15, but will attend the August Presidents Council meeting. He noted that the Council would elect a person to replace Judith at this meeting, as well as contemplate its action for an at-large position and a Region 4 position.

The Council engaged in a discussion concerning the meeting the previous evening, giving its observations of the topics discussed and the complexities surrounding academic requirements, diversity and inclusion issues and health and safety matters. The chair also indicated his intentions to conduct a summer presidents/chancellors teleconference with Division II leaders, as well as the possibility of administering a survey to the membership to garner information on issues where the membership feels the division should be focused. No formal action was taken.

2. *REVIEW OF PREVIOUS MINUTES.*

a. Management Council Meeting—January 11; Presidents Council Meeting—January 12; and post-Convention Management Council Meeting—January 14.

Management Council. The Management Council approved the meeting summary from the January 11 and January 14 meetings, as presented.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council approved the meeting summary from the January 12 meeting.

b. Executive Committee Meeting—January 13.

Management Council. The Management Council reviewed the report from the January 13 Executive Committee meeting. No formal action was necessary.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council reviewed the report of the January 13 Executive Committee meeting, noting specifically the items from the Executive Committee Finance Committee and the items from the Division II Presidents Council. No formal action was necessary.

c. Administrative Committee—Interim Actions.

Management Council. The Management Council approved the report from the March 7 teleconference, as submitted.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council approved the report from the March 7 teleconference, as submitted.

3. 2012 DIVISION II PRIORITIES.

Management Council. The Management Council reviewed the 2012 Division II priorities and received a verbal update on the accomplishments thus far in 2012. No action was necessary.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

4. NCAA CONVENTION AND LEGISLATION.

a. Presidents Council-Sponsored Proposals for the 2013 Convention.

Management Council. The Management Council approved the legislative drafts of the proposals for the 2013 Convention.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council approved the legislative drafts of the proposals for the 2013 Convention.

b. Noncontroversial Legislation per Constitution 5.3.1.1.1.

Management Council. The Management Council approved the legislative form of the noncontroversial proposals, as presented.

Presidents Council. No formal action was necessary.

c. Administrative Regulations.

Management Council. The Management Council reviewed the legislative form of the administrative regulation, which had previously been approved by the Management Council and Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council reviewed the legislative form of the administrative regulation. No formal action was necessary.

d. Incorporation of Interpretations.

Management Council. The Management Council reviewed the legislative form of the incorporations recommended for inclusion in the NCAA Division II Manual, which had previously been approved by the Management Council, without taking any action.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

e. Modification of Wording.

Management Council. The Management Council reviewed the legislative form of the modification of wording proposal, which had previously been approved by the Management Council, without taking any action.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

f. Inclusion of Proposals into the 2012-13 Division II Manual.

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to recommend that the Presidents Council approve including into the 2012-13 Manual the legislative proposals approved in legislative form and in concept that are considered the running supplements of noncontroversial, administrative regulations, incorporations and modifications based on intent.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council approved the recommendation.

g. Bylaw 17.1.6.2—Misapplication of Legislation.

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to provide full relief from the filing of a violation(s) and the accompanying penalties to institutions that misapplied Division II Bylaw 17.1.6.2-(e) between August 1, 2011, and April 17, 2012.

At the 2011 NCAA Convention, the membership adopted Proposal No. 2011-7 (playing and practice seasons—weekly hour limitations—outside of playing season—weight training, conditioning, team activities and skill instruction—sports other than football) with an August 1, 2011, effective date. The proposal established “windows” or time periods outside of the playing season during the academic year when specific countable athletically related activities by student-athletes are permissible. One part of Proposal No. 2011-7 specified that, outside of the playing season after the Division II championship through one week before the beginning of the institution’s final examination period, a student-athlete may participate in not more than two hours per week of skill instruction as part of the permissible eight hours of required countable athletically related activities. The proposal changed the “window” when student-athletes could begin participating in countable athletically related activities following the last regular-season contest or date of competition and/or elimination from postseason competition.

In light of the widespread confusion about when student-athletes could begin out-of-season activities following the last regular-season contest and/or elimination from the postseason, the Council agreed that relief was warranted.

Additionally, the Management Council agreed to refer back to the Legislation Committee for further review the issue of an appropriate period of time to be designated as ‘down time,’ from the end of the institution’s season in the particular sport and prior to participation in out-of-season activities. The Council will review any recommendation(s) at its summer meeting and determine whether to request sponsorship of legislation for the 2013 NCAA Convention.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

h. Noncontroversial Legislation—End-of-Season Meetings.

Management Council. The Management Council recommended that the Presidents Council adopt noncontroversial legislation, effective immediately, to specify that end of season team and individual meetings are permitted at any time; further, to specify that such meetings are not considered countable athletically related activities (CARA) provided the meetings do not include athletically related activities. The legislation will appear in the 2012-13 Division II Manual, as follows:

17.02.1 Countable Athletically Related Activities. Countable athletically related activities include any required activity with an athletics purpose involving student-athletes and at the direction of, or supervised by, one or more of an institution's coaching staff (including strength and conditioning coaches) and must be counted within the weekly and daily limitations under

Bylaws 17.1.6.1 and 17.1.6.2. Administrative activities (e.g., academic meetings, compliance meetings) shall not be considered as countable athletically related activities.

17.02.1.1 Exception—End of Season Meetings. It is permissible to have end of season team and individual meetings at any time (e.g., conclusion of a regular academic term, conclusion of the playing season). An end of season meeting is not considered a countable athletically related activity provided the meeting does not include any athletically related activities (e.g., watching game film, physical activities).

It was noted that meetings that occur at the conclusion of the playing season or the conclusion of a regular academic term are essential to the ongoing development of student-athletes. Generally, end of season meetings are intended to provide coaches and student-athletes with time to discuss off-season development and expectations and to create a plan for the upcoming term or academic year. Creating an exception for end of season meetings to be permissible at any time, and not considered a countable activity, aligns the legislation with current practice.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council adopted the noncontroversial legislation, as presented.

5. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AFFECTING DIVISION II.

a. Division II Committees.

(1) Academic Requirements Committee.

Management Council. The Management Council reviewed the committee's report. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(2) Championships Committee.

(a) Bylaw 31.2.1.7.1 (midseason eligibility verification form).

Management Council. The Management Council recommended that the Presidents Council sponsor an administrative regulation to amend NCAA Division II Bylaw 31.2.1.7.1 to eliminate the requirement that an institution must submit a midseason eligibility

verification form, effective September 1, 2012. The Council agreed that by eliminating the mid-season verification form, efficiencies will be gained by the membership as it will be one less form that is required to be submitted.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council agreed to sponsor the administrative regulation as presented.

(b) Football—Teams' Arrival at the National Championship Game Site.

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to refer to the Planning and Finance Committee the recommendation that, effective with the 2011 championship, both teams participating in the national championship game need to arrive at the finals site on Wednesday night prior to the championship game (which is conducted on a Saturday based on the championship date formula). As such, the teams would arrive at the national championship site three days prior to the game.

Because this recommendation has an estimated budget impact of \$6,300 (which would be the additional expense to the NCAA for an additional half-day per diem for each participating team in the national championship game), the Planning and Finance Committee will need to approve the change. Each championship finalist is currently provided per diem for two days prior to competition, and such a policy change would require them to receive 2.5 days per diem. This is based on \$90 per day per diem in 2012 for 70 people in the official travel party for each team (\$45 extra per diem for 70 people for this half-day equates to \$3,150 per team). This would result in an additional NCAA expense of \$6,300 combined for both teams.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

[NOTE: This budgetary item was approved by the Division II Planning and Finance Committee at its April 25 meeting.]

(c) Men's Golf—Travel Party.

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to refer to the Planning and Finance Committee the recommendation that the travel party be increased from six to seven, for both the regionals

and finals, effective with the 2013 NCAA Division II Men's Golf Championship.

It is the committee's belief that more programs have added assistant coaches over the past few years. At both the regionals and finals sites, those assistant coaches are considered spectators as the men's golf committee has not adopted the United States Golf Association's (USGA) decision that allows a second coach to give advice. The committee has not previously adopted the decision as they believe it provides for an unfair competitive advantage for those programs that have the funds to send a second coach. However, the committee would allow the decision to provide for a second coach if the travel party were increased from six to seven to allow an assistant coach to travel with the team. The committee also believes that a travel party of six can be a safety issue as well. With fewer large passenger vans available, there have been instances in which institutions allow a student-athlete to drive a second vehicle.

Because this recommendation has an estimated budget impact of \$56,000, the Planning and Finance Committee will have to approve the increase.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

[NOTE: This budgetary item was approved by the Division II Planning and Finance Committee at its April 25 meeting.]

(d) Women's Golf--Increase in Travel Party Size.

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to refer to the Planning and Finance Committee the recommendation that the official travel party size be increased from six to seven, for both the regionals and finals, effective for the 2013 NCAA Division II Women's Golf Championships.

It is commonplace during the regular season for both the head coach and assistant coach to travel with their team to tournaments. Furthermore, with the rule change a year ago allowing two coaches to provide advice to players during competition, the current NCAA travel party size limits no longer include the full coaching staff (head coach and assistant coach) for reimbursement.

Because this recommendation has an estimated budget impact of \$31,000 (regional costs-\$15,000; final site costs-\$16,000), the Planning and Finance Committee will have to approve the increase.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

[NOTE: This budgetary item was approved by the Division II Planning and Finance Committee at its April 25 meeting.]

(e) Men's Soccer—Amendment to Regional Bid Allocations and Championship Bracket Expansion.

Management Council. The Management Council approved the recommendation that, effective with the 2012 championship, the number of regional bids be amended and the championship bracket be expanded as outlined below:

Current Allocations with 2012 Regional Alignment

Region	Sponsorship	Bids/Region	Regional Access Ratio
Atlantic	24	4	6.00
Central	9	2	4.50
East	37	6	6.17
Midwest	30	4	7.50
South	18	4	4.50
South Central	18	2	9.00
Southeast	33	6	5.50
West	33	4	8.25

Average access ratio – 6.43

National access ratio – 6.31

Lowest access ratio – 4.50

Highest access ratio – 9.00

Regional Alignment with Amended Bid Allocations

Region	Sponsorship	Bids/Region	Regional Access Ratio
Atlantic	24	4	6.00
Central	9	2	4.50
East	37	5	7.40

Midwest	30	5	6.00
South	18	3	6.00
South Central	18	3	6.00
Southeast	33	5	6.60
West	33	5	6.60

Average access ratio – 6.14

National access ratio – 6.31

Lowest access ratio – 4.50

Highest access ratio – 7.40

Regional Alignment with Bracket Expansion

Region	Sponsorship	Bids/Region	Regional Access Ratio
Atlantic	24	4	6.00
Central	9	2	4.50
East	37	6	6.17
Midwest	30	5	6.00
South	18	3	6.00
South Central	18	3	6.00
Southeast	33	6	5.50
West	33	6	5.50

Average access ratio – 5.71

National access ratio – 6.31

Lowest access ratio – 4.50

Highest access ratio – 6.17

Because this recommendation has an estimated budget impact of 85,140, for the bracket expansion and \$43,000 for the amended bid allocation, the Planning and Finance Committee will have to approve this change.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

[NOTE: This budgetary item was approved by the Division II Planning and Finance Committee at its April 25 meeting.]

(f) Volleyball-Coordinator of Officials at Final Site:

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to approve that a coordinator of officials be assigned to the final site to make evaluations and assignments, effective September 1, 2012.

Because this recommendation has an estimated budget impact of \$1,435, the Planning and Finance Committee will have to approve this change.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

[NOTE: This budgetary item was approved by the Division II Planning and Finance Committee at its April 25 meeting.]

(g) Committee Appointments/Reappointments.

Management Council. The Management Council ratified the following committee appointments and reappointments, as noted:

(i) Extension of Term.

Men's Lacrosse. **Michael Cerino**, athletics director at Limestone College, to extend service for a one-year appointment.

(ii) Immediate Appointments.

- Men's and Women's Track and Field. **William Bright**, assistant athletics director for compliance and communication at Stillman College, to replace Jamie Moreno, former head coach at Florida Southern College.

(iii) September 1, 2012, Appointments.

- Baseball. **Douglas Jones**, head baseball coach at Tusculum College, to replace Christian Stryker, sports information director at Coker College, due to the expiration of committee term.
- Men's Basketball. **Stan Wagnon**, commissioner of the Lone Star Conference, to replace Jim Johnson,

athletics director at Pittsburg State University, due to the expiration of committee term.

- Men's Basketball. **Wendall Staton**, director of athletics at Georgia College and State University, to replace Mark Peeler, men's basketball coach and athletics director at Erskine College, due to the expiration of committee term.
- Men's Basketball Rules. **Mark Peeler**, men's basketball coach and athletics director at Erskine College, to replace Scott Eaton, athletics director at Northern Kentucky University, due to the expiration of committee term.
- Women's Basketball. **Shantey Hill**, senior associate athletics director at C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University, to replace Joan Lehoullier, senior associate athletics director at the University of Massachusetts at Lowell, due to the expiration of committee term.
- Women's Basketball. **Lynne Andrew**, assistant director of athletics at Fort Lewis College, to replace Sandee Mott, associate athletics director at Metropolitan State University, due to the expiration of committee term.
- Field Hockey. **Shelly Morris**, head field hockey coach at Stonehill College, to replace Kelley Frassinelli, women's field hockey coach at Southern Connecticut University, due to the expiration of committee term.
- Women's Golf. **Chad Markuson**, associate athletics director at Minnesota State University Moorhead, to replace Matthew Higgins, women's golf coach at Concordia University, St. Paul, due to the expiration of committee term.
- Women's Ice Hockey. **Jeffrey Giesen**, head women's hockey coach at St. Cloud University, to replace Shannon Miller, women's ice hockey coach

at the University of Minnesota Duluth, due to the expiration of committee term.

- Men's Lacrosse. **Brad Jorgensen**, assistant athletics director and head men's lacrosse coach at Saint Leo University, due to the expansion of the committee from three members to four members.
- Men's and Women's Skiing. **Mark (Sparky) Anderson**, head skiing coach (alpine and nordic), to replace Scott Jerome, Nordic skiing coach at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, due to the expiration of committee term.
- Men's and Women's Soccer Rules Committee. **Peter Campbell**, senior associate director of athletics at Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania, to replace Jack Hyde, head coach soccer coach at San Francisco State University, due to the expiration of committee term.
- Softball. **Yvonne Burbank**, associate senior woman administrator at Sonoma State University, to replace Pam Knox, head softball coach at Western Oregon University due to the expiration of committee term.
- Men's and Women's Track and Field. **Matthew van Lierop**, head men's and women's cross country/track and field coach at Mount Olive College, to replace Mike Mead, head coach and athletics administrator at Clayton State University due to the expiration of committee term.
- Playing Rules Oversight Panel. **Dr. Douglas Blais**, faculty athletics representative at Southern New Hampshire University, to replace Alan Patterson, commissioner of Conference Carolinas due to the expiration of committee term.

(iv) September 1, 2012, Reappointments.

- Baseball. **Kenny Leonesio**, head baseball coach at California State University, Stanislaus.
- Men's Basketball. **Joseph Clinton**, basketball coach and administrator at Dominican College (New York).
- Women's Golf. **Rebecca Mailloux**, head women's golf coach at Grand Valley State University.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(h) **Division II Championships Festivals.**

Management Council. The Management Council noted that the 2012 Spring Championships Festival will be held May 14-19 in Louisville, Kentucky. The Championships Committee has approved dates for the 2014-2024 National Championships Festivals, as indicated below:

2013	Winter Festival	March 3-9, 2013 (<i>Cleveland, Ohio</i>)*
2014-15	Fall Festival	December 2-6, 2014
2015-16	Spring Festival	May 16-21, 2016
2016-17	Winter Festival	March 5-11, 2017
2018-19	Fall Festival	November 27-December 1, 2018
2019-20	Spring Festival	May 11-16, 2020
2020-21	Winter Festival	March 7-13, 2021
2022-23	Fall Festival	November 29-December 3, 2022
2023-24	Spring Festival	May 13-18, 2024

*Notre Dame College, the Greater Cleveland Sports Commission and the Spire Institute will serve as hosts for the competition, to be conducted at the Spire Institute in Geneva, Ohio.

The Council noted that the Championships Committee will review and approve the championships date formulas for the specific sports during the festival years, based on the selected festival dates, at its May meeting.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council noted the dates of upcoming festivals. No action was necessary.

(i) **Great American Conference (GAC) Automatic Qualification (AQ) Waiver Review.**

Management Council. The Management Council noted that the committee had denied the GAC's request for an automatic waiver during the 2012-13 academic year. The committee felt that it was important to uphold the legislation that outlines a two-year wait for automatic qualification. No action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(j) **Great Midwest Athletic Conference (G-MAC) In-Region Waiver Request.**

Management Council. The Management Council noted that the committee had approved the waiver request to consider the contests between G-MAC member institutions in-region contests for the 2012-13 academic year.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(k) **Women's Lacrosse In-Region Waiver—Grand Valley State University.**

Management Council. The Management Council noted that the committee had approved a waiver of the Division II women's lacrosse selection criteria to Grand Valley State University and their opponents so that they could consider contests against them as in-region.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(l) **Selection Criteria White Paper.**

Management Council. The Management Council noted that the committee had endorsed the updated selection criteria white paper and will continue to focus on recommendations and timetable relative to the white paper. No action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(m) Men's Basketball—2013 Championships Venue.

Management Council. The Management Council noted that the committee had approved that the 2013 Division II Men's Basketball Championship take place at Philips Arena in Atlanta, Georgia, as part of the 75th anniversary of the Division I Men's Final Four. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee believes that this would be a tremendous opportunity for Division II basketball and would provide an outstanding student-athlete experience for the two teams that advance to Atlanta, as well as an opportunity for greater exposure at the Men's Final Four.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council also noted that the 2013 Division II Men's Basketball Championship had been approved to take place in conjunction with the 2013 Men's Final Four. No action was necessary.

[Note that the Division II Administrative Committee approved the funding that was necessary for this championship to occur in 2013 during its March 7, 2012, teleconference. A final decision is forthcoming regarding the 75th Anniversary activities at the 2013 Final Four.]

(3) Committee for Legislative Relief.

(a) Noncontroversial Legislation—NCAA Bylaw 14.8.1.2—Eligibility—Additional Waivers for Eligibility Requirements—Management Council Waivers—Residence Requirement.

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to sponsor noncontroversial legislation to amend Bylaw 14.8.1.2 (residence requirement) to specify that the NCAA Division II Committee for Legislative Relief shall process all requests for waivers of the residence requirement set forth in Bylaw 14.8.1.2.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(b) Information Standards and Guidelines for Waivers Involving Bylaw 14.5 (Transfer Regulations) and Assertions that a Student-Athlete was “Run Off” by Previous Institution.

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to establish new information standards and guidelines for the review of requests seeking relief of Bylaw 14.5.1 (residence requirement—general principle) in cases where an institution is asserting that the student-athlete was “run off” by his or her previous institution. This new guideline would provide the opportunity for a student-athlete who is ‘run off’ from his/her previous institution to receive relief from the transfer year in residence, provided the individual was otherwise eligible for use of the one-time transfer exception, but could not use the exception due to a previous transfer (e.g., 4-4-4 transfer). The Management Council agreed that the new guideline should be reviewed after a one year period, after which the committee should analyze the data and report back to the Council with its findings.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(c) Blanket Waiver for NCAA Bylaws 13.17.4 (Dead Periods for Other Sports) and 13.17.4.1 (National Letter of Intent Signing Date).

Management Council. The Management Council noted that the committee had approved with conditions, a blanket waiver to permit Division II women's ice hockey coaches to attend the April 7-14 International Ice Hockey Federation (IIHF) Women's World Championship. The Council noted this is a one-time request and future similar requests may be denied.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(4) Legislation Committee.

(a) 2013 NCAA Convention Legislation—NCAA Constitution 5.1.4.2 and 5.4.3—Legislative Process—Operational Procedures—Parliamentary Rules and General Business Sessions—Motion to Divide—Debatable Motion.

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to recommend that the Presidents Council sponsor legislation for the

2013 Convention to amend Constitution 5.1.4.2 (parliamentary rules) and 5.4.3.2 (division business sessions) to specify that a motion “to divide the question” of a properly moved proposal is a debatable motion, effective August 1, 2013.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council agreed to sponsor the legislation for the 2013 Convention.

(b) Noncontroversial Legislation—NCAA Bylaw 12—Amateurism—General Regulations—Amateur Status—Reorganization.

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to adopt noncontroversial legislation to reorganize Bylaw 12.1 (amateurism – general regulations) into categories of permissible and nonpermissible activities, based on whether the activity occurred prior to or after full-time collegiate enrollment. Reorganizing the legislation in this manner will make the legislation easier for the user to apply, thus meeting the prong of providing time back to institutional personnel under the Ease of Burden initiative.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(c) Noncontroversial Legislation—Bylaw 12.2.2.1—Amateurism—Involvement with Professional Teams—Elimination of Prohibition of the Involvement of the Institution’s Coach.

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to adopt noncontroversial legislation to eliminate Bylaw 12.2.2.1 (prohibited involvement of institution’s coach).

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(d) Noncontroversial Legislation—Bylaw 12.4.3—Amateurism—Employment—Camp/Clinic Employment, General Rule.

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to adopt noncontroversial legislation to eliminate Bylaw 12.4.3 (camp/clinic employment, general rule).

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

- (e) **Noncontroversial Legislation—Bylaw 13.2—Recruiting—Offers and Inducements—Benefits to Prospective Student-Athlete’s Relative(s) or Legal Guardian(s).**

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to adopt noncontroversial legislation to amend Bylaw 13.2 (offers and inducements) to permit institutional staff members to provide benefits to a relative(s) or legal guardian(s) of a prospective student-athlete provided the benefit is consistent with the nature and level of benefits provided prior to the student becoming a prospective student-athlete.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

- (f) **Noncontroversial Legislation—Bylaws 14.1 and 15.5.5—Eligibility and Financial Aid—General Eligibility Requirements—Certification of Eligibility Form—Squad-List Form.**

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to adopt noncontroversial legislation to amend Bylaws 14.1 (general eligibility requirements) and 15.5.5 (squad list) to eliminate the requirement that a member institution’s athletics director shall use the squad-list form as the instrument to certify the eligibility of a student-athlete; further, to specify that an institution shall use a general eligibility form developed by the NCAA to certify the eligibility of student-athletes, effective August 1, 2013.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

- (g) **Noncontroversial Legislation—Bylaw 14.5.5.4—Eligibility—Transfers—Four-Year College Transfers—Competition in the Year of Transfer.**

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to adopt noncontroversial legislation to amend Bylaw 14.5.5.4 (competition in year of transfer) to eliminate the reference to championship and nonchampionship segments.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(h) Referrals to Committees—Ease of Burden Initiative.

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to refer the following concepts to the appropriate committees, as follows, for review and possible action:

- (i) To the Committee on Women's Athletics.

NCAA Gender Equity Report. Whether the current iteration of the NCAA Gender Equity Report collects relevant data; further, whether more or less data is needed in each area of the report.

- (ii) To the Academic Requirements Committee.

Submission of the Academic Performance Census (APC) Data. Whether the institutional deadline to submit APC data should be extended from 12 weeks after an institution's first day of classes to 15 weeks after an institution's first day of classes.

- (iii) To the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

Bylaw 12.1.2.1.6 (Preferential Treatment, Benefits or Services). Whether current prohibitions on prospective student-athletes receiving preferential treatment, benefits or services prior to enrollment should be eliminated while maintaining such prohibitions following collegiate enrollment.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(i) Review of Bylaw 13 (Recruiting).

Management Council. The Management Council noted that the committee had begun its review of Bylaw 13, specifically in the areas of tryouts and campus visits, and had made the following recommendations:

Recruiting Calendars. For staff to continue monitoring the impact of the earlier start date for many of the recruiting functions and to bring the topic back for broader discussion at a future meeting.

First Permissible Date for Official Visit. For staff to bring back the topic of moving the first permissible date for an official visit to a future meeting.

Transportation on Visits. For staff to create a discussion document outlining the various places that transportation on of ficial and unofficial visits appears and recommend a streamlined approach to the legislation.

(j) **Official Interpretations.**

Management Council. The Management Council noted that the following official interpretations had been issued:

- **Bylaw 12.5.1.1—Amateurism—Promotional Activities—Institutional, Charitable, Educational or Nonprofit Promotions.** In addition to updating Figure 14-3 (initial eligibility) to include specific examples of the activities that a partial and nonqualifier may permissibly take part in to clarify the application of the legislation and associated interpretations, the committee approved the archival of a staff interpretation [Reference: 11/3/1989, Item No. g] and issued the following official interpretation to clarify the application of the legislation:

Nonqualifiers and Partial Qualifiers Participating in Institutional Promotional Activities. (II)

The NCAA Division II Legislation Committee confirmed that a student-athlete who is certified as a nonqualifier or partial qualifier is not permitted to participate as a member of the team in any promotional activities during the summer prior to enrollment and during the first academic year of residence at the certifying institution.

[References: NCAA Division II Bylaws 12.5.1 (promotional activities), 14.3.2.1.1 (partial qualifier – eligibility for aid, practice and competition) and 14.3.2.2.1 (nonqualifier – eligibility or aid, practice and competition), Figure 14-3 (initial eligibility); and a staff interpretation (11/3/89, Item No. g), which has been archived]

- Recruiting Functions Used in the Recruitment of Two-Year and Four-Year College Transfers. (II)

The NCAA Division II Legislation Committee confirmed that there is no limit on the number or frequency of in-person off-campus contacts, telephone calls, printed recruiting materials, electronic media and electronic transmissions with two-year college transfers or four-year college transfers for whom the institution has received permission to contact.

[References: NCAA Division II Bylaws 13.1.6 (contacts), 13.1.3.1 (time period for telephone calls – general rule) and 13.4.1 (printed recruiting materials), 13.4.2 (electronic media) and 13.4.5 (electronic transmissions); and Proposal Nos. 2012-11, 2012-12 and 2012-13]

- Application of the First Permissible Date for Contacts, Telephone Calls, Printed Recruiting Materials, Electronic Media and Electronic Transmissions to an Individual Who Attends an Educational Institution that Uses a Nontraditional Academic Calendar. (II)

The NCAA Division II Legislation Committee determined that an institution may have unlimited in-person off-campus contacts, may make unlimited telephone calls and may send printed recruiting materials, electronic media and electronic transmissions on an unlimited basis to an individual (or his or her relatives or legal guardians) who attends an educational institution that uses a nontraditional academic calendar (e.g., southern hemisphere) beginning the day after the conclusion of the prospective student-athlete's sophomore year in high school.

[References: NCAA Division II Bylaws 13.1.6 (contacts), 13.1.3.1 (time period for telephone calls – general rule) and 13.4.1 (printed recruiting materials), 13.4.2 (electronic media) and 13.4.5 (electronic transmissions); and Proposal Nos. 2012-11, 2012-12 and 2012-13]

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(k) Phase III of Manual Enhancements Underway.

Management Council. The Management Council noted that the 2012-13 NCAA Division II Manual will include additional improvements designed to enhance user efficiency and consistency among bylaws. These changes were developed from the NCAA academic and membership affairs staff's extensive review of the Manual. Last year's enhancements included easier identification of *de minimis* violations and restitution bylaws and more consistent use of words and phrases throughout the Manual.

The upcoming hard copy publication of the Manual will feature only select articles and bylaws (Constitution 3, Bylaws 10 through 17 and 20) with the full Manual available online and e-publication version of the Manual being made available on a quarterly basis. Resources, educational materials and timely updates will be provided throughout this process to assist the membership with the transition.

An ePub and interactive PDF versions of the NCAA Division II Manual is now available online at the following link: www.ncaapublications.com. The Manual will be made available in these formats to the membership on a quarterly basis for use on many mobile devices such as the iPad or iPhone. The January 2012 version can now be accessed and contains any legislative proposals adopted since August 1, 2011. Printed Manuals will continue to be mailed to the membership every August.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary

(5) **Membership Committee.**

(a) **Noncontroversial Legislation—NCAA Constitution 3.3.1.2.1, 3.3.1.5 and 3.3.2.2.6 and NCAA Bylaw 31.3.4.5.3—Member Conference—Eligibility—Privileges.**

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to sponsor noncontroversial legislation to amend Constitutions 3.3.1 (eligibility) and 3.3.2 (privileges) to include the provision for the Division II Management Council to hear and act on a conference's appeal of a decision made by the NCAA Division II Membership Committee in regard to a conference's standing as a member, effective August 1, 2013.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(b) **Noncontroversial Legislation—Bylaw 20.3.2.1—Division II Membership Process—Division II Membership Process—Provisional and Reclassifying Institutions—Application and Sponsorship.**

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to sponsor noncontroversial legislation to amend Bylaw 20.3.2.1 (application and sponsorship) to modify the membership application deadline from June 1 to February 1, effective immediately, for any institution that submits an application for acceptance into the membership process to begin year one of the candidacy period September 1, 2013, and thereafter.

The timetable, effective Spring 2013, is below:

February 1:	Deadline for submitting initial membership application.
February-June:	One-day site visit conducted.
June 1:	Deadline for submitting supplemental membership application information (e.g., sports sponsorship)
July:	Committee completes selection process.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(c) **Referral to the Division II Athletic Directors Association—Request for Update to the "Models For Success For A Division II Athletics Program" Document.**

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to refer the committee's request to update the "Model For Success For A Division II Athletics Program" document to the Division II Athletics Directors Association for its consideration.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(d) Application and Waiver Request from the Great Midwest Athletic Conference.

Management Council. The Management Council noted that the committee had approved a request from the Great Midwest Athletic Conference to waive Constitution 3.3.1.4 to allow the conference to enter the conference membership process, although it does not meet sports-sponsorship requirements. It was noted that the conference would not be an active Division II member until completing an educational assessment program during the 2012-13 academic year and satisfying all applicable conference requirements (e.g., sports sponsorship). Also noted was that the year in which the conference is completing the educational assessment program does not count for purposes of meeting automatic qualification requirements in Bylaw 31. Further, the committee will not be invited to active status until it satisfies the six active-member requirements and all applicable legislation to become a Division II conference. The conference was accepted to enter the conference membership process based on current NCAA legislation that requires a minimum of six active-member institutions. Additionally, the conference has satisfied the application fee and that it will not be charged an additional fee in the future and will be invited into active Division II status once it satisfies all of the applicable membership requirements.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(e) Millersville University—Reclassification of Wrestling Program.

Management Council. The Management Council noted that the committee reviewed and approved a request to reclassify the Millersville wrestling program from Division I to Division II, effective September 1, 2011. The committee agreed that if the institution successfully completes the two-year reclassification process, the institution's wrestling program will be an active Division II sport during the 2013-14 academic year.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(f) Division II Conference Application Fee.

Management Council. The Council noted that the committee will increase the conference application fee to be consistent with the new legislation that increases the minimum number of member institutions from six to 10, effective August 1, 2013. The current fee is \$60,000, with an additional \$10,000 fee for each institution beyond the minimum of six. The committee agreed to increase the fee to \$100,000, with an additional \$10,000 fee for each institution beyond the minimum of 10.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(6) Nominating Committee—Appointments/Reappointments.

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to recommend that the Presidents Council ratify the following committee appointments and reappointments, effective as noted:

- (i) International Student Records Committee—Reappoint Jennifer Minke,** assistant director of admissions, Texas A&M University, Kingsville, to term 2; and **Eileen McDonough,** faculty athletics representative, Barry University, to term 3, effective September 1, 2012.
- (ii) Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee—Appoint China Jude,** assistant vice president for athletics, Queens College (New York), effective September 1, 2012.
- (iii) Committee on Women's Athletics—Appoint Christopher McKibben,** assistant director of athletics, Georgian Court University, effective September 1, 2012.
- (iv) Academic Requirements Committee—Appoint Damon Arnold,** director of academic services, Grand Valley State University, and **Karen Hjerpe,** senior woman administrator/senior compliance officer, California University of Pennsylvania, effective September 1, 2012.
- (v) Championships Committee—Reappoint Lisa Sweany,** director of athletics, Armstrong Atlantic State University; appoint **Sandee Mott,** associate director of athletics, Metropolitan State College of

Denver; **Kim Duyst**, associate director of athletics, California State University, Stanislaus, effective September 1, 2012.

- (vi) **Committee on Infractions**—Reappoint **Jean Paul Bradshaw**, attorney, Lathrop & Gage, to term 3, and **Julie Rochester**, faculty athletics representative, Northern Michigan University, to term 2; appoint **Jane Teixeira**, assistant commissioner for compliance, Pacific West Conference, effective September 1, 2012.
- (vii) **Infraction Appeals Committee**—Reappoint **Gregory Moore**, commissioner, Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference to term 2, and **LaKeisha Marsh**, attorney, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology, to term 2, effective September 1, 2012.
- (viii) **Legislation Committee**—Appoint **Tracee Passeggi**, associate director of athletics, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, effective September 1, 2012.
- (ix) **Committee for Legislative Relief**—Reappoint **Wispeny Ellis**, compliance director, Lynn University, to term 2, effective September 1, 2012.
- (x) **Membership Committee**—Appoint **Tonia Walker**, senior woman administrator, Winston-Salem State University; **Tim Selgo**, director of athletics, Grand Valley State University; and **Kaye Crook**, faculty athletics representative, Coker College, effective September 1, 2012.
- (xi) **Nominating Committee**—Appoint **Barry Blizzard**, commissioner, West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; and **Lynn Tubman**, director of athletics, Chestnut Hill College, effective September 1, 2012.
- (xii) **Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement**—Appoint **Kristina Giddings**, associate director of athletics for compliance, University of Alaska Fairbanks, effective September 1, 2012.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council approved the appointments, as presented.

(7) Planning and Finance Committee.

Management Council. The Management Council reviewed the budget to actual results as of February 29. No action was taken.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council reviewed the budget to actual results as of February 29 and was given an oral update on the April 25 Planning and Finance Committee meeting. No action was taken.

(8) Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

Management Council. The Management Council reviewed the committee report. No action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

b. Association-wide and Common Committees.

(1) Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports—Executive Regulations—Eligibility for Championships—Ineligibility for Use of Banned Drugs—Manipulation of Drug Test Sample.

Management Council. The Management Council reviewed a recommendation from the committee to sponsor noncontroversial legislation that would specify that a student-athlete who is involved in a case of clearly observed manipulation of an NCAA drug test shall be declared ineligible for further participation in postseason and regular-season competition during the time period ending two calendar years (730) days after the student-athlete was involved in the manipulation of a drug test.

The Management Council agreed to send the recommendation back to the committee for clarification of the term ‘manipulation’ versus ‘masking.’ The issue will be on the agenda at the July management Council/SAAC Summit as part of the legislative review.

The Management Council also agreed to establish a project team to study the issue of education and testing related to alcohol and drug usage in Division II. This project team will be comprised of members of the Management Council and NCAA affiliated associations and will undertake a comprehensive study of the relevant issues to determine where Division II should focus its future efforts.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council received information on the formation of a project team without taking any formal action.

(2) Honors Committee.

(i) Today's Top VIII Award.

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to approve in concept the recommendation that NCAA Bylaw 21.2.3.3 (duties) be amended to change the Today's Top VIII Award to the Today's Top 10 Award, effective January 2013.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

[The estimated budget impact per year would be \$18,400 for the addition of the two awards. The Association-wide funding must be approved prior to the change becoming effective.]

(ii) Today's Top VIII Selection Criteria.

Management Council. The Management Council noted that the committee had voted to make the following changes to the selection criteria for the Today's Top VIII Award.

- (1) Increase the required GPA from 3.000 to 3.200.
- (2) Reallocate the percentages for the award criteria as follows: athletics achievement—50 percent; academic achievement—30 percent; service and leadership—15 percent; and a discretionary five percent that can be allocated by each committee member. (This discretionary allocation is allowed so that outstanding achievement in any particular area can be recognized.)

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(3) Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee.

Management Council. The Management Council reviewed the committee's report, noting the concerns expressed by the committee on Legislative Proposal No. 2013-5 (Awards and Benefits—Awards—Purchase Restrictions—Student Contribution to Purchase Up to Specified Value Limitations). No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(4) Postgraduate Scholarship Committee.

Management Council. The Management Council reviewed the Postgraduate Scholarship Committee's fall sports awardees. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(5) Committee on Women's Athletics.

Management Council. The Management Council reviewed the committee's report. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(6) Student-Athlete Affairs Advisory Group.

Management Council. The Management Council reviewed the committee's report. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

6. DIVISION II PROJECT TEAMS.

a. Convention Planning Project Team.

Management Council. The Management Council received an update on the first teleconference that was conducted by the project team and provided several suggestions for educational sessions at the Convention. The Management Council also discussed a possible alternative for use of funds that typically go toward purchasing boxed lunches for the delegates at the end of the Division II Business Session on Saturday. It was the general consensus of the Council that spending the money to purchase a hot breakfast that morning might be a better use of the funds. Staff will discuss the issue with the Convention management team to discern options available to the division.

Once the overall Convention schedule has been determined, the project team will meet again via teleconference to set the Division II schedule and will advise the

Management Council and Presidents Council of anticipated activities. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council reviewed the project team's report without taking any action.

b. Identity Subcommittee.

Management Council. The Management Council received an oral report on the meeting conducted by the subcommittee Tuesday morning, which consisted of a presentation by Textcaster, a company whose business primarily deals with effective permission-based communication. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

7. *DIVISION II MANAGEMENT COUNCIL.*

a. Round Table Discussions.

• Academic Requirements Review.

Management Council. The Management Council conducted round table sessions to discuss the review of Division II academic requirements. The Council discussed the current concepts coming from the Division II Academic Requirements Task Force regarding initial-eligibility, progress-toward-degree, and two-year college transfer requirements. The Council noted that the Task Force will meet again in person in September; an education session is planned for the full Division II membership at the 2013 NCAA Convention; and legislative proposals will be considered by the Division II membership at the 2014 NCAA Convention.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council discussed the first part of the white paper, which covers initial-eligibility, as well as received an initial overview on the progress-toward degree discussions, at its meeting Wednesday evening with conference board chairs and commissioners. No formal action was taken.

b. Division II Management Council Vice-Chair Election.

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to recommend that the Presidents Council appoint Bren Stevens to a second term as vice-chair of the Management Council, beginning September 1, 2012.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council approved the recommendation.

[Note that Bren Stevens' term on the Management Council will expire at the conclusion of the 2013 Division II Business Session. The Management Council will need to take action at its October meeting to appoint a person to replace Bren at that time, with the term beginning at the close of the business session.]

c. Management Council/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Summit.

Management Council. The Management Council was given an overview of the July Management Council/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Summit, noting that the July Summit will be held at the Renaissance Indianapolis North Hotel, located in Carmel, Indiana. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

d. Model FAR Document.

Management Council. The Management Council agreed to recommend that the Presidents Council endorse the Division II Model Faculty Athletics Representative Document, as presented. The Management Council noted that the document should be viewed and used as a model, not a mandate, as referenced on Page No. 1 (Purpose) of the document.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council endorsed the document as presented, also noting that it should be viewed and used as a model, not a mandate, as referenced on Page No. 1 (Purpose) of the document.

e. Update on Review of Drug Education and Drug Testing.

Management Council. The Management Council was updated on drug testing in Division II and given an overview of the partnership between NCAA Division III and Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education (NASPA). Please see Item 5-b-(1) earlier in this document for more information on Management Council action.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

f. Division II/ADA Mentor Program.

Management Council. The Management Council was provided with an update on the inaugural class (2011-12) of the Division II/ADA Mentor Program, as well as the pairings for the 2012-13 class. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

g. Division II Chancellors/Presidents Summit.

Management Council. The Management Council received a preliminary schedule for the Division II Chancellors and Presidents Summit, which will be held during the 2013 NCAA Convention in Grapevine, Texas. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council received information on the Summit and was asked to encourage their fellow presidents/chancellors to attend. No formal action was taken.

8. DIVISION II PRESIDENTS COUNCIL.

a. Academic Accreditation in Canada.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council agreed to recommend that the Executive Committee take action to permit an international institution that is part of the NCAA international pilot program to satisfy the NCAA constitutional requirement of accreditation and/or maintain active membership in the Association by meeting one of the following standards:

- (1) The international institution is accredited by one of the six U.S. regional accrediting agencies; or
- (2) The international institution is a candidate for accreditation with one of the six U.S. regional accrediting agencies and is in good standing with its country's national, regional or provincial accreditation agency.

The recommendation is specific to schools that are a part of the NCAA's international pilot program. The Executive Committee will review the Council's recommendation at its August meeting and, if approved, the Council will amend the current Division II legislation in August. It is the intent of the Council that international institutions in the NCAA's international pilot program ultimately achieve accreditation with one of the six U.S. regional accrediting agencies. Candidate for Accreditation is a status of affiliation with one of the six U.S.

regional accrediting agencies, which indicates that the institution has achieved initial recognition and is progressing toward accreditation. Candidacy lapses when an institution fails to achieve accredited status within five years, the maximum allowed by the U.S. Department of Education. Additionally, a regional accrediting agency reserves the right during the Candidacy period to withdraw an institution's Candidacy status, after due notice, if evidence of progress is lacking or if the conditions on which the institution was admitted to Candidacy are substantially altered. Per the recommendation, if the institution fails to achieve accreditation or its candidacy status lapses or is withdrawn, the international institution shall not be considered an active member of the Association.

b. Presidents Council Composition.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council received updated information on numbers of Division II institutions within each region in Division II and based on the figures presented, agreed to increase the size of the Presidents Council from 15 to 16 representatives, with the new representative representing Region 3. The new representative would be elected at the current meeting and would begin his/her term immediately.

c. Region 3 Election.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council agreed unanimously to elect Deborah Ford, University of Wisconsin, Parkside, to replace Judith Ramaley, Winona State University, as the Region 3 representative.

The Presidents Council also agreed unanimously to elect Steven Scott, Pittsburg State University, to fill the new position created in Region 3.

Both newly elected representatives will serve out the remainder of 2012 and then complete a four-year term on the Council, until the close of the 2017 NCAA Convention.

d. Recognition of Outgoing Representatives.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council recognized the service of Dianne Harrison, California State University-Monterey Bay, as well as Judith Ramaley, Winona State University.

e. Vice-chair's Report.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council received a report from the vice-chair, which included a report on the budget-to-actual figures, as well as an oral report from the Planning and Finance Committee, which met the previous day.

f. Vice President's Report.

Presidents Council. Division II Vice President Mike Racy updated the Council on the MOAA Governance Academy, the Division II Purchasing Website, the 2013 Chancellors and Presidents Summit (in conjunction with the 2013 Convention), and 2012 Division II priorities. No action was taken.

9. *AFFILIATED ASSOCIATION UPDATES.*

a. Division II Athletics Directors Association (ADA).

Management Council. The Management Council received an update on the Division II Athletics Directors Association. No action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

b. Division II Conference Commissioners Association (CCA).

Management Council. The Management Council was informed that the conference commissioners would meet in June in Lake Tahoe. NCAA governance director Terri Steeb-Gronau was congratulated on her selection as the 2012 recipient of the CCA Award of Merit. No action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

c. Co-SIDA.

Management Council. The Management Council was informed that CoSIDA would meet June 23-26 in St. Louis, Missouri. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

d. Faculty Athletics Representative Association (FARA).

Management Council. The Management Council received an update on the Division II FAR Institute, which will be held October 19-21, as well as other presentations and issues that FARA is involved with. No action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

e. Minority Opportunity Athletics Administrators Association (MOAA).

Management Council. The Management Council was updated on the MOAA symposium that would be held later this year, which includes the Division II Governance Academy. No action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

f. National Association for Collegiate Women Athletics Administrators (NACWAA).

Management Council. The Management Council was updated on activities of NACWAA, including the dates of October 7-10 for their annual Convention. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

g. National Association for Athletics Compliance (NAAC).

Management Council. The Management Council received an update on the need for new members in the organization. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

10. NATIONAL OFFICE STAFF UPDATES.

a. Community Engagement Award of Excellence.

Management Council. The Management Council was reminded that the Community Engagement Award of Excellence would be presented at the Division II Championships Festival in Louisville in May. Of the 23 Division II conferences, 20 had institutions that submitted entries for the award. The University of Nebraska @ Kearney is the overall winner for 2012, with its entry

titled, “Lopers Under the Lights--Welcome Back Week.” No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

b. May Division II Championships Festival.

Management Council. The Management Council received a rundown of activities associated with the 2012 Championships Festival, which includes the sports of men’s and women’s golf; men’s and women’s tennis; women’s lacrosse; and softball. Opening ceremonies will be held at Churchill Down Monday, May 14, with closing ceremonies conducted at Bowman Field Saturday, May 19. Council members were encouraged to attend and take advantage of the Olympic-type championships. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council was updated on the activities at the Festival. No action was taken.

c. Division II Purchasing Website.

Management Council. The Management Council received information on those conferences and institutions that had made purchases from the Source One Digital/Division II Purchasing Website. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council received a report on the purchasing website without taking any action.

d. Division II “Week of Wishes.”

Management Council. The Management Council was updated on Division II’s Week of Wishes, in collaboration with the Make-A-Wish organization. Council members encouraged early notification of the dates for the celebration to ensure enough time for member institutions and conferences to plan events. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

e. NCAA Communications Task Force.

Management Council. The Management Council received a presentation from members of the Communications Task Force, which is an all-encompassing initiative to communicate with the members. Council members were informed of

a pilot for ncaa.org accounts and asked to let staff know if they would like to participate. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

f. Division II Chancellors/Presidents/Commissioners Meeting.

Management Council. The Management Council reviewed the agenda for the upcoming meeting of Division II Presidents Council members, conference board chairs and commissioners. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

g. Litigation Update.

Management Council. The Management Council received a litigation update from the office of the general counsel. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

h. President's Update.

Management Council. The Management Council was updated by President Emmert on current issues the NCAA is dealing with, including student-athlete huddles and the new executive vice president of championships. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. President Emmert visited with the presidents and chancellors at their meeting Wednesday evening and again at breakfast on Thursday morning. No formal action was taken.

i. Office of Inclusion.

Management Council. The Management Council received an update from the executive vice president of membership & student-athlete affairs/chief inclusion officer on its initiative surrounding the inclusion endeavor. The Council was encouraged to invite inclusion personnel to their conference meetings. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council received an update from the office of inclusion during its Wednesday evening meeting. No formal action was taken.

11. MEETING RECAP/THINGS TO REPORT BACK TO CONFERENCES.

Management Council. The Council noted several items/issues that would need to be reported back to their conferences: 1) Division II Festival dates through 2024 and forthcoming information concerning the date formulas for the specific sports during the festival years; 2) Relief from Bylaw 17.1.6.2; 3) ASR Data due in June; 4) Selection Criteria White Paper; 5) NACDA June 24 and to email Maritza if you would like to participate in a simulated Management Council meeting; and 6) Division II Purchasing Website. No formal action was taken.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

12. FUTURE MEETINGS.

Management Council. The Council reviewed the meetings for the remainder of 2012 and early 2013.

Presidents Council. The Council reviewed the meetings for the remainder of 2012 and early 2013.

13. ADJOURNMENT.

Management Council. The chair adjourned the meeting at 11:25 a.m.

Presidents Council. The chair adjourned the meeting at 11:12 p.m.



BENEFITS OF NCAA DIVISION II MEMBERSHIP CLASSIFICATION

1. **Background.** In June 2005, 150 c hancellors and presidents of Division II member institutions came together to discuss the future for the division. During this historic meeting, the division's leaders agreed to implement a comprehensive strategic study related to the division's defining characteristics and key attributes. This data-driven process was designed to create a proactive position that clearly identified the defining characteristics and aspirations for the member institutions of Division II. Presidents and chancellors initiated this effort with the goal of enhancing the regional awareness and local engagement of Division II members and the constituencies that they serve. The result has been the development of a strategic positioning platform for Division II and subsequent creative work and regulatory/policy changes to bring this platform to life.

2. **Division II Strategic Positioning Platform.** (What is Division II and what does it stand for?)

Life in the Balance. Higher education has lasting importance on an individual's future success. For this reason, the emphasis for the student-athlete experience in Division II is a comprehensive program of learning and development in a personal setting. The Division II approach provides growth opportunities through academic achievement, learning in high-level athletic competition and development of positive societal attitudes in service to community. The balance and integration of these different areas of learning opportunity provide Division II student-athletes a path to graduation while cultivating a variety of skills and knowledge for life ahead.

3. **Why Choose Division II for Membership?**

- a. **Data-Driven Analysis.**

- In 2005, the study titled, "Empirical Effects of Division II Intercollegiate Athletics," by Jonathan and Peter Orszag demonstrated that a school moving from Division II to Division I experienced an average real increase in athletics spending of \$3.7 million each year. Only \$500,000—on average—was offset by new revenue (tickets, media, agreements, donors, NCAA distribution, sponsorships). Therefore, approximately \$3.2 million each year must come from other sources of funding (e.g., increased student fees, state government support, transfer of funds from other campus departments). This study has been supported by subsequent financial studies, including a reclassification study by researchers at Purdue University in 2006.

Leaders of Division II institutions that have received pressure from local boosters to reclassify to Division I note these studies and explain, "We can compete for national championships in Division II, offer intercollegiate athletics in a fiscally responsible way and, in the

process, offer all of our student-athletes a positive intercollegiate athletics experience.”

- In 2006, various membership and public focus groups were conducted throughout the country to gain an understanding of Division II perceptions. In March of that year, an online quantitative research survey was launched to test existing themes and ideas about Division II membership (e.g., balance) and to explore many new concepts about the attributes for Division II. The ultimate objective for this project was to clarify the division’s strategic position and, thus, provide Division II institutions with an opportunity to celebrate who they are, what they believe in, and the potential that they can reach together.
- In 2007, the Division II Presidents Council commissioned a new study to determine “the value” of a Division II intercollegiate athletics program. This financial study was intended to assist member schools and conferences to make informed decisions about Division II membership classification. The Presidents Council believes this study and model helps current Division II members validate their membership affiliation and assists some non-Division II members, especially some institutions in Division III, to re-evaluate what institutional value might be achieved if operations occurred in a Division II partial athletics scholarship model. The Division II Simulation Model allows institutions to enter their own information and estimate the impact of changes to the athletic scholarship program.



- In 2010, the Presidents Council and Division II chancellors and presidents who attended the 2010 Chancellors and Presidents Summit urged a study of membership matters to model Division II membership at different numbers of institutions. As part of this modeling, the value of affiliation in Division II was calculated, taking into consideration the different programs and initiatives that translate into financial benefits to the Division II membership each year. These include reimbursements for championship travel, championship per diem, enhancement fund, conference grants, strategic alliance matching grant, leadership

conferences, degree-completion award program, assistant coaches grant, television contract allocation, Conference Commissioners Association grant, Athletics Directors Association support, Faculty Athletics Representative Association grant, mentoring program and officiating fund. Division II institutions pay \$900 annually to the Association for membership dues, whereas the average amount of money distributed back to Division II institutions in 2009-10 was \$80,000 per institution. Therefore, the estimated value of being a Division II member institution is \$79,100 per year in financial benefits.

- In the first NCAA revenues and expenses report compiled since 2004, Division II athletics expenses in 2008-09 at schools with football programs represented less than 6 percent of the institutional budget and 5 percent for schools without football. Moreover, the report shows that the rate of increase in spending on Division II athletics continues to parallel that of overall institutional spending at Division II schools and is less than the inflationary effect during the past two years.

b. Philosophical Reasons.

- **Why Do Student-Athletes Choose Division II?**

Many Division II student-athletes had opportunities to play in NCAA Division I or Division III or the NAIA. But they chose Division II, and for almost all of them, the choice was a good one. In a recent survey, 90 percent of Division II student-athletes indicated that they would recommend a Division II experience to a prospective student-athlete. In Division II, a “balance” exists that emphasizes both academic excellence and athletics achievement, and an environment is created that leads to the student-athlete’s total personal development.

The Division II strategic positioning platform now emphasizes the integration of athletics into the learning environment in ways that allow institutional members to focus on the total and comprehensive co-curricular experience of their student-athletes.

Very few of the 90,000 student-athletes competing in Division II will receive a full athletics grant that covers all of their expenses, but most of them will receive some financial aid to help them through school. For the rest of their expenses, student-athletes are on their own—using academic scholarships, student loans and employment earnings just like most other students attending the Division II institution. This healthy partnership is the essence of Division II, where student-athletes are valued for their athletics contribution and for being an important part of the overall student body.

Division II student-athletes compete at a high level, and they most often play close to home. Division II emphasizes regional competition so that student-athletes miss less class time because of travel.

- **Why Do Institutions Choose To Be Division II?**

Division II's conservative fiscal model permits its members to conduct high-level athletics that are fully integrated into the overall institution. Rather than being financially self-sustaining, almost all Division II programs are funded through the institution itself—just like other departments of the college or university.

Division II's regionalization philosophy encourages responsible spending by limiting travel. It also creates a local student-athlete emphasis for recruiting that lowers recruiting expenses.

Does the Division II model work?

The median expense for Division II schools with football is a little less than \$4 million, while that figure is about \$8.6 million for FCS programs. The operating cost is about \$10.1 million for programs in the Division I Football Bowl Subdivision.

The division's "comprehensive program of learning and development" and research-based initial- and continuing-eligibility standards result in Division II student-athletes consistently graduating 10 to 15 percentage points higher than the total student body. Specifically, in 2010, Division II reported an academic success rate of 73 percent for scholarship and nonscholarship student-athletes who initially enrolled in the fall of 2003.

The division's budgeting philosophy to prioritize expenses that enhance the championships experience has benefited Division II student-athletes. For example, Division II has some of the Association's largest championships brackets and, as a result, Division II has the best access ratio to national championships competition among the three NCAA divisions. This fiscal philosophy also has given the division an opportunity to be innovative by hosting the Association's first National Championships Festival in 2004 and subsequent festivals in 2006, 2008, 2009 and 2010.

The division's regionalization philosophy for championships selection emphasizes local opponents for regular-season competition. The result is reduced travel expenses for regular-season competition and limited missed-class time for student-athletes.

Do fans support Division II?

In 2010, Division II football attendance climbed to a record of 2,987,493 fans. Home attendance in 2010 surpassed the previous year's attendance number by 148,934 fans. Division II men's basketball also set an all-time NCAA attendance record in 2007 with 2,892,820 fans.

Research indicates that fans appreciate the environment that exists in Division II. The division's commitments to deregulation, integration of the athletics department to the institution's oversight and control, focus on community engagement, emphasis on the development of student-athletes as leaders and the division's commitment to academic excellence all support the NCAA's mission: *"We are preparing student-athletes to be professional in something other than sports."*

4. Division II Membership—Exposure Opportunities.

- a. **Division II National Championships Television Coverage.** Along with the regular season coverage given to Division II by the CBS College Sports Network (formerly CSTV) on national television, regional syndication, and via broadband, several of the Division II semifinals and championships games have been broadcast on CBS, CBS College Sports Network, ESPN, ESPNU and ESPN2. Last fall, the Division II football championship was showcased on ESPN2. This past winter, the Division II men's basketball championship game was carried live on CBS, the women's basketball semifinals were covered by ESPNU and the women's basketball championship game was shown on ESPN2. Division II is committed to increased promotion of its student-athletes competing in championships through national television. Since 2000-01, the number of national exposures for Division II championships-related events has increased from five championships broadcasts to 20 championships broadcasts annually over the past five years (through 2010-11 academic year.)
- b. **Division II Regular Season Football and Basketball Television Agreement.** In the fall of 2006, Division II entered into the first season of a multi-year television and broadband partnership that will showcase nearly 100 live Division II regular-season football and basketball games. The first games featured were broadcast during the 2006 football season. The games continue to air on the CBS College Sports Network (formerly CSTV), a national cable network of CBS dedicated to the coverage of college sports. The CBS College Sports Network reaches nearly 40 million households and, with television syndication affiliates and a simulcast of these broadcasts on www.NCAA.com, these games reach approximately 50 million homes each week. At NCAA.com, the addition of stories, scores, blogs, video and audio that are dedicated to Division II sports makes the site not only a destination for live games, but the best way for fans to follow Division II sports.

- c. **Division II Identity Activation Toolkit and Online Purchasing and Resources Store.** Key insights from the research and the platform used to construct the creative look included the six key attributes that describe Division II and the language from the research and platform such as “personal setting,” “family friendly environment,” and “comprehensive program of learning and development.” Further, it was important that the creative look and messaging be told in more than one voice (e.g., voice of the student-athlete, athletics administrator, coach, faculty member, alumni, booster). The overall creative look provides considerable emphasis on Division II, but continues to complement the NCAA parent brand.

The “I Chose Division II” theme, the hexagon images and the creative designs have received very positive feedback since the successful launches that occurred during the Fall 2006 Division II Championships Festival and at the NCAA Convention in January.



Featured in the Division II identity activation toolkit, released in the Spring of 2007, are a series of books that outline communication strategies and promotional tips for member conferences and institutions. In addition, an online purchasing store has been launched that gives Division II institutions and conferences a chance to order various signage and visuals to assist in the implementation and activation of the toolkit. Also included in the list of resources are items where a school or conference can co-brand their messaging by including their institutional or conference logo.

To provide incentive for ordering these visual resources, every Division II conference and institution received a \$1,000 credit for orders placed between January and June 2009. 238 institutions took advantage of this credit.

5. **Division II Membership—Benefiting from Innovations and Creativity.**

- a. **Division II National Championship Festivals.** The first ever Division II National Championships Festival was conducted in May 2004 in Orlando, Florida, and included men's and women's golf, women's lacrosse, softball, and men's and women's tennis. In November 2006, the second Division II Festival was held in Pensacola, Florida, and included men's and women's cross country, field hockey, men's and women's soccer and women's volleyball.

Houston, Texas was the site for both the Spring 2008 and Winter 2009 Festivals. The Winter 2009 championships marked the first time men's and women's swimming, men's and women's indoor track and field, and wrestling competed in a Division II Sports Festival.

Most recently, the Division II National Championships Festival for fall sports was conducted in Louisville November 30-December 4, 2010. The 2010 Festival was the fifth time Division II has staged the Olympic-style event and the second time for fall sports. More than 800 student-athletes from 70 teams competed in six sports—men's and women's cross country, field hockey, men's and women's soccer and women's volleyball.

A priority in Division II is to enhance the student-athlete's collegiate experience, and these Olympic-style festivals do that by allowing outstanding student-athletes to interact and celebrate their successes together. The Festivals also create more exposure for Division II sports and provide the Division II membership an event each year to celebrate the division.

- b. **Division II Regionalization Philosophy for Evaluating and Selecting Championship Participants.** Regionalization is a significant part of the Division II philosophy and is included in a championship policy that requires sport committees to select a predetermined number of teams in each of the regions of the sports involved. This policy is based on an assumption that due to the regional nature of most Division II schools, sport committees should evaluate and select championships participants based on regional results, as opposed to a national evaluation in which head-to-head and common opponents' results are less prevalent or nonexistent.

Regionalization guarantees access to national championships from every geographic area of the country. Division II is spread from Texas to Alaska and from Puerto Rico to Hawaii, so this policy is important in serving the diverse Division II membership. In addition, regionalization encourages a member school to compete against opponents within its region, instead of seeking contests against opponents outside the geographical region. This scheduling incentive is aimed at helping schools manage their regular-season travel budgets and limit missed class time for Division II student-athletes.

- c. **Division II Management Council/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Summit.** What started out as a simple meeting in July 1997 between athletics administrators and faculty on the Division II Management Council and student-athletes on the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee has grown into one of the most important events each year to foster communication within the division. Each July, members of the Management Council and SAAC gather jointly to share ideas on issues affecting Division II. This annual summit has given the student-athletes in Division II a significant voice on legislative issues that affect them, both on and off the field of play.
- d. **Division II Faculty Athletics Representatives (FAR) Fellows Institute.** A major goal of the NCAA, Division II and the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association (FARA) is to better define and enhance the role of the faculty athletics representative (FAR) at the campus, conference and national levels. The mission of the Division II FAR Fellows Institute is to provide an intense developmental opportunity for a core group of FARs to enhance their ability to perform the critical functions of a Division II faculty athletics representative. Through networking with other Division II FARs, enhancing their skills as leaders and engaging in case studies, FARs are both inspired and challenged to enrich the Division II student-athlete intercollegiate athletics experience. 2010 marked the sixth annual FAR Fellows Institute for Division II. At their December 2010 meeting, the Division II Planning and Finance Committee approved a proposal to conduct a Division II FAR Fellows Advanced Leadership Institute to expand and continue the education of Division II FAR Fellows. In 2011, the first Advanced Leadership Institute will be offered and will continue on an annual rotating basis with the FAR Fellows Institute.
- e. **Division II Community Engagement Initiative.** Research data indicates that community is a key attribute for Division II. Division II member schools have an unwavering enthusiasm about building support for athletics and other institutional programs by strengthening relationships with communities through a coordinated initiative. Division II is positioned to offer intercollegiate athletics competition as the gathering place for community on a college campus (e.g., the new “town square”). In an effort to offer key administrators from every Division II conference hands on training for this community initiative, the Presidents Council and Management Council have created an annual community engagement workshop. The first of these was held in April 2007; the most recent was held in Philadelphia in April 2009 and included over 70 directors of athletics and conference commissioners. These workshops are important meetings for Division II as the Division II strategic positioning platform to enhance the division’s identity is implemented. In addition, 19 institutions were given Community Engagement Awards of Excellence at this event. The individuals selected to participate are expected to take the information back to share with others in their conference.

Creative Street Media Group has been instrumental in this initiative. For a more in-depth look at the progress to date, please see the Division II community Web site at www.diicommunity.org.

Additionally, the Division II community engagement initiative lends itself to another important aspect of Division II—game environment. This initiative directly ties to the strategic platform and what Division II stands for and serves as an important way to reconnect our educational mission with the environments of Division II intercollegiate athletics events.

In the summer of 2007, a hearing on game environment took place that brought representatives from key constituencies together to discuss takeaways and suggestions for the role our institutions and communities play in improving and enhancing game environments. The Division II community engagement Web site (diicommunity.org) includes a link to more information regarding game environment and the positive impact it can have for our communities to enjoy themselves at events and attend others, as well.

- f. Division II Online Network. The NCAA Division II network is an online resource that showcases the best of what is happening in Division II. The DII Network is a global network home page that allows easy access to the Community Engagement and Game Environment sites. Beginning in 2010, a new component was added to the Division II Network – www.D2SA.org – to focus on the Division II student-athlete experience. The new site allows Division II student-athletes the opportunity to share their experience and to interact in a way that has never been done in the NCAA. The site features student-athlete blogging and facilitates discussions on important matters such as legislation and fund-raising for the Make-A-Wish Foundation. The new site is highly visual, relying extensively on photo galleries and a video player. In 2010, Division II also launched a new Facebook page. Fans of Division II can now utilize the online network to stay up to date with all of the latest news and content from Division II.

The Division II home page – accessed through the membership portal on www.NCAA.org – includes additional resources for Division II members, including the Division II Compliance Blueprint, the Division II Membership Report and committee reports. The home page also includes access to the print version of the Division II Strategic Communications Toolkit, a resource developed in 2010 for campus and conference sports communications directors as a “one-stop shop” to help better promote the Division II strategic positioning platform.

6. **Division II Membership—Benefits to Community.**

- a. **Division II's Lead Gift for the NCAA Partnership with Habitat for Humanity—The NCAA "Home Team" Project.** In September 2005, the Division II Presidents Council launched the "Home Team" Project for the NCAA by contributing a lead gift of \$1,000,000 to Habitat for Humanity®. This lead gift was followed by a \$500,000 matching gift from the national office. Division II has participated in several home builds since its initial gift, including builds on the University of Indianapolis campus and six homes constructed at the Fall 2006 National Championships Festival in Pensacola. The partnership lasting from 2005-2008 provided donations through additional fundraising and volunteers for the long-term rebuilding effort on the Gulf Coast following Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.
- b. **Division II SAAC Fundraising Initiative for the National Make-A-Wish® Foundation.** At the 2003 NCAA Convention, the Division II SAAC committed to raising \$5,000 for the National Make-A-Wish® Foundation. Each Division II college and university was asked to help raise funds for the project through campus, conference and community fundraising initiatives. During that first year \$45,757 was raised, and since that initial contribution in 2004, the Division II SAAC has raised an increasing amount of money each year. In 2009-10 \$407,683 was raised—by far the most money collected in a single year—bringing the grand total to \$1,535,486!
- c. **Division II Community Engagement Strategy and Tools/Resources.** The Division II Strategic Positioning Platform is an important tool that will continue to pay dividends for our member institutions for many years. The platform identifies the importance of community engagement to Division II member schools. Division II operates in a crowded marketplace for public recognition and attention. One place where 'bridges' do exist or can easily be built to achieve recognition is in the communities where our member institutions exist. Success at the local level through community connections that foster greater support for all campus activities, including athletics, will benefit Division II members and, in turn, help enhance the identity for the division. The ultimate goal should be to establish a "connection" between the community and the school in a manner that involves intercollegiate athletics.

7. **Division II Membership—Financial Benefits to Institutions and Conferences.**

- a. **Division II Enhancement Fund Distribution Program.** (\$5.1 million annually) The Division II Enhancement Fund is a membership fund that has existed for approximately 15 years. The fund is distributed to both Division II active member schools and conferences. The revised distribution model, which was effective in 2000-01, distributed one-third of the funds equally to Division II active institutions; one-third of the funds to Division II conferences based on performance in the Division II men's and women's basketball championships;

and one-third of the funds to Division II conferences based on the number of championships the conference sponsors.

In August 2010, the Presidents Council endorsed the decision of the Division II Planning and Finance Committee, which voted to approve a change in the enhancement fund allocation, effective May 2012. The new allocation will provide 75 percent to conference offices based on sports sponsorship and 25 percent via an equal distribution to Division II active member institutions. The new distribution model eliminates the performance in the men's and women's basketball championship as a part of the distribution and precludes independent institutions from receiving a distribution related to sports sponsorship (independent member institutions will only receive the equal distribution). The committee agreed that a distribution formula based in part on success in only two national championships (men's and women's basketball) is inconsistent with the division's comprehensive platform. The Planning and Finance Committee will implement a transition fund to offset any losses to the conferences in the first year.

- b. **Division II Conference Grant Program.** (\$2.8M annually) The allocation of conference grant funds for 2009-10 provides a base amount of \$85,000 to each active Division II conference in good standing and a premium amount based on the number of active Division II institutions in the conference during the previous academic year. The incremental increase in the grant dollars that began in 2001-02 is designed to provide conference offices with additional dollars to enhance conference operations consistent with the Division II strategic plan. At least ten percent of the grant must be directed at each of the five Division II strategic positioning outcomes (50 percent total.) These dollars are allocated through specific enhancement and strategic areas, but provide for flexibility among conferences in the allocation of the remaining 50 percent of dollars.
- c. **Division II Administrator and Coaching Enhancement Grant Programs.** (\$1M annually) The Strategic Alliance Matching Grant Enhancement Program, which was piloted in 2000-01, was created to aid Division II conferences and member institutions in enhancing gender and ethnic minority representation in intercollegiate athletics. For those selected to be part of the program, Division II funds 75 percent of the grant request in the first year, 50 percent in the second year and 25 percent in the third year. Subsequent to termination of funding after the third year, the institution and/or conference will be required to maintain the position for a minimum of two years, and preferably incorporate the position into the ongoing operations of the institution or conference office. Since its inception, Division II institutions and conferences have created approximately 60 new administrative positions as a result of this grant funding.

The Division II Coaching Enhancement Grant Program is in its fourth year of being a new DII grant program. This program was developed to address the issues of access, recruitment, selection and long-term success of women, ethnic minorities and other individuals in Division II who seek to overcome hiring

barriers by providing grant money for the creation of assistant coaching positions in Division II.

- d. **Division II Degree-Completion Scholarship Awards Program.** (\$450,000 annually) The purpose of the Division II Degree-Completion Award Program is to provide deserving student-athletes financial assistance in order for them to complete their first baccalaureate degree. Candidates are Division II student-athletes who have exhausted their athletics eligibility and who have received athletics financial aid during their collegiate career. The selection process for the national award emphasizes the academic performance of the student-athlete. Other factors considered are financial circumstances, athletics achievement and involvement in campus and community activities.
- e. **Transportation Expenses and Per Diem for Coaches and Student-Athletes Participating at all Levels of Division II National Championships.** (\$19 M Annual Budget) The Division II championships budget is set up to cover transportation expenses and provides a per diem for coaches and student-athletes participating in Division II national championships.

8. **Division II Membership—Student-Athlete Benefits.**

- a. **National Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.** The mission of the NCAA Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) is to enhance the total student-athlete experience by promoting opportunity for all student-athletes; protecting student-athlete well-being; and fostering a positive student-athlete image. The Division II SAAC is comprised in the same manner as that of the Division II Management Council, with one student-athlete from each of the Division II voting conferences, as well as two at-large representatives and one independent representative.

The SAAC is a standing committee in Division II and conducts meetings on a quarterly basis. SAAC members also serve as representatives on the Division II Academic Requirements Committee, the Division II Championships Committee, the Division II Legislation Committee and the Division II Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee. Although not given a vote at the annual Convention, the SAAC is very much a part of the proceedings and consistently participates on proposals that are important to student-athletes.

- b. **National Division II Drug-Testing Program.** The NCAA Drug-Testing Program was created to protect the health and safety of Division II student-athletes and to ensure that no one participant might have an artificially induced advantage or be pressured to use chemical substances. The Presidents Council approved the expansion of drug testing in Division II, to include all championships sports in a year-round drug-testing program, effective August 1, 2004.

- c. **NCAA Student-Athlete Leadership Forum.** In 2002, the NCAA began divisional regionally based leadership academies for Divisions I, II and III student-athletes, coaches and administrators. Beginning with the fall of 2010, the Divisions I, II and III leadership conferences will take place at one site on the same weekend. The NCAA Student-Athlete Leadership Forum is a weekend-long opportunity for student-athletes, coaches, administrators and faculty to develop their leadership skills, become more familiar with the Division II experience and develop a plan for action. In a forum intended to foster partnerships, participants are equipped to be active leaders and change agents within their campus, conference and community spheres of influence. Participants engage in sessions that promote their understanding of the NCAA, Division II governance structure and the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Using information and knowledge gained throughout the weekend, participants representing the same institution create "action plans" for implementation on their campuses in order to influence positive change in cooperation with other campus leaders.
- d. **Most Generous National Championship Access Ratios of any Division in the NCAA.** Division II provides a uniquely outstanding experience for student-athletes in Division II championships competition. In 2008-9, the ratio of total participants to championships opportunities in Division II was 7.54:1—the most access to championships among the three divisions. Access to championship competition is an important part of Division II's 'student-athlete first' based philosophy. In addition, the division has balanced the championships opportunities provided male and female student-athletes. The 50/50 split between championships opportunities for each gender is a guiding principle for the Division II Championships Committee.

REPORT OF THE
NCAA PLAYING RULES OVERSIGHT PANEL

KEY ITEMS.

- The Panel has held two conference calls since their annual meeting at Convention.

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

- **Action Taken by Panel.** Since the annual meeting held in January at the Convention, the Panel has had conference calls in February and April. Approval was given to reports, rules proposals, rules modifications and language for the directive to playing rules committees for review of all rules relating to a) game environment and sportsmanship; and b) appeal/protest/forfeit procedures.
 1. The football report, which included several safety-related changes in the non-rules-making year of the two-year cycle, was approved.
 2. Playing rules proposals were approved for bowling, soccer, women's volleyball, and water polo.
 3. Approval was given for field hockey modifications.
 4. The draft memorandum to each rules committee was given approval. The directive asks for a review of rules for potential enhancement in the areas of game environment and sportsmanship; appeals, protests and forfeits; and the impact of technology.

Committee Chair: Ted Gumbart, Atlantic Sun Conference

Staff Liaisons: Ty Halpin, Championships and Alliances – Playing Rules and Officiating

Rachel Seewald, Championships and Alliances – Playing Rules and Officiating

Teresa Smith, Championships and Alliances – Playing Rules and Officiating

February 21, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Shelley Appelbaum, Michigan State University	Jim Fiore, Stony Brook University
Kristy Bayer, Arkansas Tech University	Stuart Robinson, SUNY New Paltz
Tom Byrnes, Capital Athletic Conference Inc.	
Jim Fallis, Northern Arizona University	
Dick Hack, State University of New York Maritime	
Erin Lind, Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
Noreen Morris, Northeast Conference	
Alan Patterson, Conference Carolinas	
Larry Scott, Pacific-12 Conference	

April 17, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Shelley Appelbaum, Michigan State University	Jim Fallis, Northern Arizona University
Kristy Bayer, Arkansas Tech University	Jim Fiore, Stony Brook University
Tom Byrnes, Capital Athletic Conference Inc.	Stuart Robinson, SUNY New Paltz
Ted Gumbart, Atlantic Sun Conference	
Dick Hack, State University of New York Maritime	
Erin Lind, Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
Noreen Morris, Northeast Conference	
Alan Patterson, Conference Carolinas	
Larry Scott, Pacific-12 Conference	

2011-12 Division II Winter Championship Report

SPORT: Men's Basketball

Championship Site: Northern Kentucky University, Highland Heights, KY

Please describe how things went in each of the following categories:

- 1. Rankings: the rankings went well. No major issues. The RAC balloting went well and the committee would like to see it continue with the national committee still having oversight to modify a RAC ranking.**
- 2. Selections: Selections went well. I thought the selection show was well done but also maybe too late (10:30 pm eastern). However, with conference championship games taking place on Sunday afternoon there is not much that can be done. It does make it more difficult especially if there are upsets along the way.**
- 3. Banquet. The banquet was outstanding and a great experience for the student-athletes. It was at a terrific location overlooking the city of Cincinnati. Our guest speaker (Jack Givens) did a nice job of relating to the kids and what they were about to embark upon. Very well done.**
- 4. Hotels: the hotels were very good and did a great job hosting the eight teams. They were excited for the teams to be there and were very hospitable.**
- 5. Facilities: the venue was terrific. Great experience for the student-athletes competing. May have been the best venue in Div. II.**
- 6. Games/Competition: we had great games in the quarterfinals with games being decided by a total of 13 points. Semifinals and finals were also very competitive**
- 7. Officiating: the officiating was good with no major issues**
- 8. Student Athlete Mementos: Mementoes were fine.**
- 9. Press Conference: the press conferences went well...a little tight in the space but no major issues. Media meals were good and our media coordinator did a great job.**
- 10. Media Coverage: we had coverage from several newspapers/television stations of the competing teams. We had good coverage in the local newspaper on a daily basis and considering we were battling with 6 other Div. I teams in the tri-state area for coverage that week it was pretty good.**
- 11. Additional Division II Specific Signage used (did you request additional signage from Nathan Arkins and how was it used): We had great signage in and around the venue. Katie Carls did a nice job of incorporating signage throughout the venue.**

2011-12 Division II Winter Championship Report

SPORT: Women's Basketball

Championship Site: St. Mary's University, San Antonio Texas

Please describe how things went in each of the following categories:

- 1. Rankings: The RAC balloting system worked very well. The committee would like to continue using the system in the future.**
- 2. Selections: Selections went very smooth this year due to the work of Carla Laster.**
- 3. Banquet. The banquet was very nice. A new site will be chosen for next year. The emcee will be asked to speak about each team participating at the tournament.**
- 4. Hotels: The student-athletes thought the hotel was awesome. It was very close to the River Walk which gave them options for meals and site seeing.**
- 5. Facilities: The arena at St. Mary's is a great site for Division II Women's Basketball.**
- 6. Games/Competition: We had seven great games of women's basketball with Shaw University winning the national title.**
- 7. Officiating: Very good officiating! Greg Small served as the official evaluator. The committee would like to use him moving forward.**
- 8. Student Athlete Mementos: The student-athletes had the opportunity to try on the jacket which aided them in sizing.**
- 9. Press Conference: The area used for the press conference was great. We will encourage participation from all SID's at the press conferences.**
- 10. Media Coverage: We had local media coverage each day of the tournament.**
- 11. Additional Division II Specific Signage used (did you request additional signage from Nathan Arkins and how was it used): The signage was awesome. Katie Carls work with the host to ensure all areas were covered. Feather flags were a nice addition to the venue.**

2011-12 Division II Winter Championship Report

SPORT: DII Men's and Women's Swimming and Diving

Championship Site: Mansfield ISD Natatorium; Mansfield, Texas

Please describe how things went in each of the following categories:

- 1. Rankings: Not applicable to this championships**
- 2. Selections: This was the second year of implementation of the field cap size limits. The adjustments made to the selection process from last year, along with the addition of the 15 male participants made the process more effective and fair to the participants.**
- 3. Banquet. Food distribution was slower than should have been due to catering service reducing service lines without approval, but overall evening was good.**
- 4. Hotels: Headquarters hotel only used for committee and officials, and selected property met the needs of the group. Participating institutions secure housing accommodations on their own due to the variable number of participants from each school selected.**
- 5. Facilities: One of the best facilities that has hosted the championships. Aquatics director and staff were outstanding in every way.**
- 6. Games/Competition: First time national champion on the women's side with Wayne State (Michigan), and a total of 15 NCAA records were broken.**
- 7. Officiating: No issues – crew did a great job.**
- 8. Student Athlete Mementos: Student-athletes looked forward to receiving the item.**
- 9. Press Conference: Not applicable to this sport.**
- 10. Media Coverage: The quality and length of coverage for the webcast each day was outstanding, but announcer was not familiar enough with the sport to provide the event by event coverage.**
- 11. Additional Division II Specific Signage used (did you request additional signage from Nathan Arkins and how was it used): Additional signage was used to dress up the competition pool and diving well areas, to enhance the look and feel of the championship venue.**

CHAMPIONSHIPS ELIGIBILITY FOR 2011-12
NCAA DIVISION II PRINCIPLES OF NULLIFICATION

1. Opponents of an ineligible individual or team that competes with an ineligible player should not be adversely affected.
2. The ineligible student-athlete and the institution he or she represents will be penalized. As it relates to access to NCAA championships, a penalty will be assessed to the selection criteria, which may impact the individual's and/or team's opportunity for selection to postseason competition.
3. All contests in which an ineligible student-athlete competes will be nullified (win, lose or tie). The nullification of a contest will penalize only the individual and/or institution using an ineligible student-athlete.
4. The number of nullified contests is identified and the penalty is assessed for each nullified contest. If a student-athlete was deemed ineligible and then reinstated through the NCAA reinstatement process, only those contests in which the student-athlete competed while ineligible will be nullified. The competition prior to or after that time will not be nullified.
5. A penalty will be applied in two categories: the win-loss record percentage and the strength-of-schedule index (overall and in-region, if applicable).
6. The penalty assessed will vary from sport to sport. It will be a mathematical calculation that is relevant to each sport and reduces the percentage of the win-loss record and the strength-of-schedule index. The calculation will be determined in conjunction with the NCAA statistics department.
7. The value of the nullification will be consistent across sports; however, the actual mathematical calculation (number) could be different because of factors such as number of games played. (Example: The nullification may be worth 2 percentage points; however, that equates to .025 for one sport and .063 for another sport).
8. Information regarding the penalties for nullification will be part of the selection criteria for each sport.
9. In team sports, a team's won-lost record that falls below .500 after adjustments for nullification(s) will be ineligible for championships selections to fill at-large berths. In addition, in football, a conference will lose earned access privileges to the championship if nullification penalties drop all conference teams out of the top eight super regional ranking.

10. For individual sports (i.e., qualifying standards in swimming and diving), if a student-athlete achieved the qualifying standard while ineligible, the qualifying standard would not be recognized as eligible for selection to the championship. If the student-athlete achieved the qualifying standard while eligible, became ineligible and was reinstated, the qualifying standard would be eligible for selection to the championship.
11. For individual/team sports (i.e., golf); if the student-athlete competed while ineligible, the score achieved by the student-athlete would be deleted from the team score. In the case of golf (play 5 count 4), the fifth score would be calculated into the team score.
12. Nullifications do not carry over to the next academic year for eligibility violations detected after the season is complete.

The penalties for using an ineligible student-athlete during the 2011-12 season are as follows:

	Overall Won/Loss Percentage	DII W/L	DII Avg Opp W/L	DII Avg Opp/Opp W/L	In Region W/L	In Region Avg Opp W/L	In-Region Avg Opp/Opp W/L
<u>FALL SPORTS</u>							
Field Hockey	-	0.073	0.017	0.005	0.073	-	-
Football	0.024	0.024	0.006	0.003	0.024	-	-
Men's Soccer	-	-	-	-	0.043	0.010	0.004
Women's Soccer	-	-	-	-	0.031	0.009	0.004
Volleyball	-	0.026	0.009	0.003	0.027	0.008	0.004
<u>WINTER SPORTS</u>							
Men's Basketball	-	0.023	0.007	0.002	0.023	0.007	0.002
Women's Basketball	-	0.025	0.005	0.003	0.025	0.005	0.003
<u>SPRING SPORTS</u>							
Baseball	-	0.024	0.006	0.003	0.025	0.006	0.003
Men's Lacrosse	-	0.066	0.015	0.007	0.068	-	-
Women's Lacrosse	-	0.033	0.013	-	0.032	-	-
Softball	-	0.023	0.008	0.002	0.024	0.008	0.003
Men's Tennis	0.049	0.052	0.022	0.008	0.055	-	-
Women's Tennis	0.036	0.038	0.016	0.007	0.040	-	-

In addition, each team must submit the mid-season verification form. The form will be used to verify the eligibility of student-athletes for NCAA championships selections. The form is not intended to require schools to recertify the eligibility of every student-athlete. Rather, the form is to ensure that eligibility questions are resolved during the season instead of schools delaying eligibility questions until after the championship has been completed.

**Secondary Enforcement & Student-Athlete Reinstatement Process
for Notifying Championships of DII/Bylaw 14 Ineligible Competition Violations and Nullification
Issues**

Prior to Selections:

1. The championships staff will be charged with posting a copy of all DII championship selection dates to the Nullification Collaboration Zone document list and calendar each year.
2. A copy of any Bylaw 14 ineligible competition violations received by SAR will be forwarded to SAR staff for the maintenance of a master tracking chart on the Nullification Collaboration Zone. *The chart will be accessed throughout the year by SAR, Enforcement and Championships staff.*
3. As Bylaw 14 ineligible competition violations are received and processed by SAR and the enforcement staff, specifics of such cases will be added and / or updated in the master tracking chart.

Approximately One Week Prior to Selections (see date chart):

1. The championships staff will review the current copy of the Excel tracking chart detailing all Bylaw 14 ineligible competition violations and eligibility cases that have been received by SAR and the enforcement staff.
2. Any ineligible competition cases received by SAR or the enforcement staff during this week will be immediately updated in Nullification Collaboration Zone. Championships staff will also be directly notified prior to case processing by SAR or the enforcement staff. Once any such cases are processed to completion, final case information will be updated for the championships staff in Nullification Collaboration Zone by the SAR and secondary enforcement staff.
3. The Championships staff will update the Director of Championships on all information gathered prior to selections.

Subsequent to Selections but Prior to Championships:

1. Any ineligible competition cases received by SAR or the enforcement staff during this time will be immediately updated to Nullification Collaboration Zone for the championships staff prior to being processed by SAR or the enforcement staff. Championships staff will also be directly notified prior to case processing by SAR or the enforcement staff.
2. If it is determined after the conclusion of the championship that an ineligible student-athlete or team participated in a championship, the provisions of Bylaws 31.2.2.3 and 31.2.2.4 may be applied by the enforcement staff.

Subsequent to Championships:

1. If it is determined after selections that an institution knowingly withheld information that an ineligible student-athlete participated in countable contests for championship selections the institution may be subject to misconduct penalties per Bylaw 31.1.10. Championships staff will convene the Championships Committee (Appeals Subcommittee) to assess whether misconduct has occurred and identify applicable penalties.

2. The Championships staff will notify the institution of the possible misconduct and serve as primary contact throughout the misconduct process.

Appeals Process:

1. Bylaw 31.1.1.2 outlines the nullification appeals process which will be conducted under the authority of Championships staff.
2. Championship staff will communicate the appeals decision to the institution, championship manager, as soon as possible and to the Championships Committee at their next meeting.
3. An AMA representative must be on the call. On an as needed basis enforcement will also provide a representative.



P.O. Box 6222

Indianapolis, Indiana 46206

Telephone: 317/917-6222

Shipping/Overnight Address:

1802 Alonzo Watford Sr. Drive

Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

www.ncaa.org

MEMORANDUM

July 21, 2010

TO: NCAA Division II Conference Commissioners.

FROM: Shonna Brown
Assistant Director of Championships

Roberta Page
Director of Championships.

Subject: Regional Tournament Format and Site Selection.

At its June meeting, the NCAA Division II Championships Committee agreed to continue the process of allowing regions the opportunity to recommend a different regional tournament format for the current eight-team bracket in men's and women's basketball and women's volleyball.

The regional championship site may be determined on a scheduled ranking teleconference prior to selections. Each region will identify which teleconference date (from a predetermined set of dates) it will use to determine the site for the regional tournament, and the sites will be notified as soon as possible thereafter. Even though sites will be determined prior to selections, this does NOT guarantee that an institution will get in the tournament. **If the institution that is chosen on the ranking teleconference to host a regional does not get selected to the championship, the institution will forfeit its hosting opportunity.**

Attached are a guiding principles document which outlines the intent and process of the regional tournament format, site selection process and a financial simulation model specific to your region including three possible formats/models. The three models include (1) one site hosting seven teams (current format), (2) two sites each hosting three teams, and (3) four sites each hosting one team. Additionally, alternative options may be submitted for review by the championships committee.

If you have any questions regarding this process for recommending a regional tournament format, please contact either one of us at the national office.

SB/RP:tw

Attachments

cc: Selected NCAA Staff Members

National Collegiate Athletic Association

An association of more than 1,200 members serving the student-athlete
Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

NCAA DIVISION II REGIONAL TOURNAMENT FORMAT
GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. Conferences within each region will work together to establish a regional format advisory group. The suggested composition of this group is approximately 10 members and must include all conference commissioners in the region; at least one NCAA Division II Championships Committee member; the national committee regional representative and other members of the regional advisory committee (RAC) from women's volleyball, men's basketball and women's basketball. Any other members must be approved by the championships committee.
2. The regional format advisory group shall provide its recommendations for its suggested regional tournament formats to the championships committee for volleyball by August 1 and for men's and women's basketball by September 1.
3. Recommendations on regional formats must be unanimous from each region. Each conference will receive one vote within the regional advisory group. If a unanimous decision cannot be reached, the region will follow the one site hosting seven teams.
4. Recommendations from the regional format advisory group may be different for all three sports (volleyball, men's basketball and women's basketball).
5. Regions may recommend any format/model to the championships committee. The championships committee will analyze the recommendations and make all final decisions.
6. Expenses for running an eight-team bracket at one site have set the baseline number the championships committee will be using when reviewing all recommendations. This is an opportunity to establish better business practices for Division II Championships, so a more expensive recommendation will be difficult to approve.
7. Final decisions made by the championships committee will include integrity of the bracket, overall student-athlete experience and financial implications. Decisions for women's volleyball will be communicated late August and decisions for men's and women's basketball will be communicated late September.
8. The regional championship site may be determined on a scheduled ranking teleconference prior to selections. Each region will identify which teleconference date (from a predetermined set of dates) it will use to determine the site for the regional tournament, and the sites will be notified as soon as possible thereafter. Even though sites will be determined prior to selections, this does NOT guarantee that an institution will get in the tournament. **If the institution that is chosen on the ranking teleconference to host a regional does not get selected to the championship, the institution will forfeit its hosting opportunity.**

Great Midwest Athletic Conference (GMAC) Formation & Timeline

In fall 2011, presidents of six institutions announced the formation of a new conference, to be named the Great Midwest Athletic Conference (GMAC).

The six member institutions include: Cedarville University (Cedarville, Ohio); Central State University (Wilberforce, Ohio); Kentucky Wesleyan College (Owensboro, Kentucky); TrevaCCA Nazarene (Nashville, Tennessee); Urbana University (Urbana, Ohio); and Ursuline College (Pepper Pike, Ohio).

The new conference will begin competition in the fall of 2013, pending approval by the Division II Membership Committee.

Currently, Kentucky Wesleyan holds membership in the Great Lakes Valley Conference and Central State and Urbana are independent member institutions. The other three schools are in the Division II membership process.

Until the conference is an active conference meeting NCAA requirements, the institutions in the conferences are considered independents for championship purposes and eligible for at-large berths based on their active status and the region that their state resides.

GMAC Conference Formation Timeline and Eligibility for Conference Benefits:

Note: The following timeline is based on the conference's active status as of September 1, 2013. If the conference is not an active conference as of September 1, 2013, the timeline will be amended, as necessary.

2013-14

February 2013	Division II Championships Committee recommends placement of conference in the regionalization map contingent on Division II Membership Committee approval in July 2013.
July 2013	Division II Membership Committee approves/denies conference's active status.
September 1, 2013	Representation on the Division II Management Council and Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (elections shall occur during the July 2013 meetings).
September 1, 2013	Eligible to receive Conference Grant Funds (application submitted by June 30, 2013. deadline).
September 1, 2013	Conference appointments to Regional Advisory Committees.
January 2014	Eligible to vote at the NCAA Convention.

2014-15

May 2015 Eligible for conference portion of enhancement fund distribution
(based on 2013-14 sport sponsorship numbers).

2015-16

September 1, 2015 Automatic qualification for championships is granted to conference.
*(Note: For 2013-14 and 2014-15, the active institutions in the
conference are eligible for at-large berths.)*

If not approved as an active conference for 2013-14, the above timeline shall be amended,
including:

February 2014 Division II Championship Committee recommends placement of
conference in the regionalization map contingent on Division II
Membership Committee approval in July 2014.
*(Note: It is necessary for the Championships Committee to reevaluate
the placement of the conference in light of possible new institutions
joining the conference.)*

July 2014 Division II Membership Committee approves/denies conference's
active status.

September 1, 2016 Automatic qualification for championships is granted to conference.
*(Note: For 2015-16, the active institutions in the conference are
eligible for at-large berths.)*

Regionalization Talking Points

- ✓ The Division II philosophy statement (as legislated in Division II Bylaw 20.10) indicates that a Division II member "believes in scheduling the majority of its athletics competition with other members of Division II, insofar as regional qualification, geographical location and traditional conference scheduling patterns permit."
- ✓ Regionalization is a Division II championships policy that requires sport committees to select a predetermined number of teams in each of the regions of the sports involved. This policy is based on an assumption that due to the regional nature of most Division II schools, sport committees should evaluate and select championships participants based on regional results, as opposed to a national evaluation in which head-to-head and common opponents' results are less prevalent.
- ✓ The Division II regionalization philosophy provides access to national championships from every region of the country. Regionalization does not guarantee that the best eight programs in the country will compete for a national championship, but does guarantee that the different regions of the country will be represented at the championship by each region's best team.
- ✓ In addition, regionalization encourages a member school to compete against opponents within its region, instead of seeking contests against opponents outside the geographical region. This scheduling incentive is aimed at helping schools manage their regular-season travel budgets and limit missed class time for Division II student-athletes.
- ✓ The Great American Conference applied for active conference membership by December 1, 2010. Per the authority of the Division II Membership Committee, the committee approved the application from the Great American Conference inasmuch as the conference satisfied all legislated requirements. The conference shall be an active Division II conference, effective September 1, 2011.
- ✓ With the approval of a new conference, the Division II Championships Committee was required to place the conference in a geographic region for championships selections.
- ✓ Per Bylaw 31.3.4.5, to be eligible for automatic qualification, a conference must be a member of the Association for two consecutive academic years, unless granted a waiver by the Championships Committee. Thus, the Great American Conference shall not be eligible for automatic qualification until September 1, 2013. The Great American Conference shall be eligible for at-large selections in 2011-12 and 2012-13.
- ✓ During its deliberations, the Championships Committee considered three models. With each model, the following factors were considered in totality as all factors must be considered together and not as stand-alone items (i.e., no one factor is more important than another):
 - conference membership and location of institutions;
 - number of institutions in each region to ensure fair access ratios to the championships;

- size of each region (e.g., mileage between institutions);
- possible future growth of new conferences;
- maintaining no more than three AQ conferences in each region; and
- a transition time for institutions to either adjust or begin scheduling institutions in their new region.

At no time during the deliberations by the Championships Committee did historical or perceived strength of conferences factor into the recommendation.

Recommendation by the Championships Committee:

Effective 2012-13, the Great American Conference and the MIAA will move to the Central Region and the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference will move to the South Central Region.

Effective 2012-13

Central Region – 39 Institutions

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

South Central Region – 32 Institutions

Lone Star Conference
Heartland Conference
Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference

Effective 2013-14

(Projected Membership)

Central Region – 40 Institutions

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

South Central Region – 34 Institutions

Lone Star Conference
Heartland Conference
Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference

Please contact Roberta Page, Director of Championships, and Amy Reis, Assistant Director of Championships, and liaisons to the Division II Championships Committee with questions regarding regionalization.

DIVISION II REGIONALIZATION MODEL

The following regionalization model was approved June 2007 by the NCAA Division II Championships Committee with a mandatory implementation date of 2008-09.

Principles for establishing regions:

- Regions will be determined by state boundaries.
- A state may reside in more than one region.
- All opponents within your geographic region are in-region contests.
- Conferences will be assigned to specific regions for automatic qualification and post-season competition.
- Conference opponents will count as in-region contest regardless of geographic location.
- Opponents residing within your state regardless of conference affiliation are in-region contests.
- All opponents (regardless of conference affiliation) in states contiguous to your state are in-region contests.

The committee has approved the following principles and any changes or additions to these principles must be approved by the committee.

Additional Principles:

- Institutions in the state of Montana will be able to consider Nebraska and Colorado as contiguous states (and vice versa). (There are no Division II institutions currently in state contiguous to Montana's southern border.)
- The west region may consider the states of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado and New Mexico as contiguous states (and vice versa).
- Institutions located in MINNESOTA and MICHIGAN may compete against each other and be considered as contiguous states (those contests count as in-region).
- Institutions located in Colorado and Texas are considered contiguous and may count competitions between these institutions as in-region contests.
- Institutions located in Texas and Mississippi are considered contiguous and may count competitions between these institutions as in-region contests.
- Institutions and conferences with a common mission (i.e. Historically Black Colleges and Universities) may consider interconference contests or independent contests against schools with similar missions as in-region, regardless of their geographic location and/or regional assignment.
- Institutions in the Atlantic and East Regions will be able to consider the District of Columbia as in-region contests.

Conference regional assignments for automatic qualification and post-season competition.

Effective 2012-13


REGION	CONFERENCES
West	California Collegiate Athletic Association Great Northwest Athletic Conference Pacific West Conference
Central	Great American Conference (eligible only for at-large selections) Mid-American Athletic Conference Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference
South Central	Heartland Conference Lone Star Conference Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference
Midwest	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference Great Lakes Valley Conference
South	Gulf South Conference Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference Sunshine State Athletic Conference
Southeast	Conference Carolinas Peach Belt Conference South Atlantic Conference
Atlantic	Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference
East	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference East Coast Conference Northeast 10 Conference

Effective 2013-14

REGION	CONFERENCES
West	California Collegiate Athletic Association Great Northwest Athletic Conference Pacific West Conference
Central	Great American Conference Mid-American Athletic Conference Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference
South Central	Heartland Conference Lone Star Conference Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference
Midwest	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference Great Lakes Valley Conference
South	Gulf South Conference Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference Sunshine State Athletic Conference
Southeast	Conference Carolinas Peach Belt Conference South Atlantic Conference
Atlantic	Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference
East	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference East Coast Conference Northeast 10 Conference

Note: as a point of clarification, an institution that is a single sport member of a conference will compete as a member of that conference for selection and ranking purposes.

2012-13 Division II Projected Regionalization Map



Note: The Championships Committee, in consultation with the Management Council and Presidents Council, may amend the regionalization model due to approved changes in the membership (for example, the addition of new schools of conferences, realignment or current conferences).
 Revised 05/22/2012

NCAA DIVISION II IN-REGION COMPETITION BY STATE

Effective for 2012-13 (Revised 06/26/2012)

Atlantic Region	
DC	CT, DE, MA, MD, ME*, NC, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VA, VT, WV
MD	DC, DE, NC, PA, VA, WV
NC	AL, DC, FL, GA, MD, PA, SC, TN, VA, WV
PA	CT, DC, DE, MA, MD, ME*, NC, NH, NJ, NY, OH, RI, VA, VT, WV
VA	DC, KY, MD, NC, PA, TN, WV
WV	DC, KY, MD, NC, OH, PA, VA

Central Region	
AR	IA, KS, LA*, MN, MO, MS, ND, NE, OK, SD, TN, TX
IA	AR, IL, KS, MN, MO, ND, NE, OK, SD, WI
KS	AR, CO, IA, MN, MO, ND, NE, NM, OK, SD, TX
MN	AR, IA, KS, MI, MO, ND, NE, OK, SD, WI
MO	AR, IA, IL, IN, KS, KY, MI, MN, ND, NE, OH, OK, SD, TN, WI
ND	AK, AR, AZ, BC, CA, HI, IA, ID, KS, MN, MO, MT, NE, NV*, OK, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
NE	AK, AR, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, IA, ID, KS, MN, MO, MT, ND, NM, NV*, OK, OR, SD, TX, UT, WA, WY*
OK	AR, CO, IA, KS, MN, MO, ND, NE, NM, SD, TX
SD	AK, AR, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, IA, ID, KS, MN, MO, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OK, OR, TX, UT, WA, WY*

East Region	
CT	DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
DC	CT, DE, MA, MD, ME*, NC, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VA, VT, WV
DE	CT, DC, MA, MD, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
MA	CT, DC, DE, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
NH	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
NJ	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NY, PA, RI, VT
NY	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NJ, PA, RI, VT
PA	CT, DC, DE, MA, MD, ME*, NC, NH, NJ, NY, OH, RI, VA, VT, WV
RI	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, VT
VT	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI

Midwest Region	
IL	IA, IN, KY, MI, MO, OH, WI
IN	IL, KY, MI, MO, OH, WI
MO	AR, IA, IL, IN, KS, KY, MI, MN, ND, NE, OH, OK, SD, TN, WI
MI	IN, IL, KY, MN, MO, OH, WI
OH	IN, IL, KY, MI, MO, PA, WI, WV
WI	IA, IN, IL, KY, MI, MN, MO, OH
KY	AL, AR, FL, GA, IN, IL, LA*, MI, MO, MS, OH, PR, SC, TN, VA, WI, WV

* State currently does not have any Division II institutions.

South Region	
AL	FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
FL	AL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
GA	AL, FL, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
KY	AL, FL, GA, IN, IL, LA*, MI, MO, MS, OH, PR, SC, TN, VA, WI, WV
MS	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, PR, SC, TN, TX
PR	AL, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, SC, TN
SC	AL, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, TN
TN	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MO, MS, NC, PR, SC, VA

Southeast Region	
AL	AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
FL	AL, AR, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
GA	AL, AR, FL, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
NC	AL, DC, FL, GA, MD, PA, SC, TN, VA, WV
SC	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, TN
TN	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MO, MS, PR, NC, SC, VA


South Central Region	
CO	AR, AK, AZ, BC, CA, HI, ID, KS, MT, NE, NM, NV*, OK, OR, SD, TX, UT, WA, WY*
KS	AR, CO, MO, NE, NM, OK, SD, TX
NE	AR, AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, IA, ID, KS, MO, MN, MT, ND, NM, NV*, OK, OR, SD, TX, UT, WA, WY*
NM	AR, AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, KS, MT, NE, NV*, OK, OR, SD, TX, UT, WA, WY*
OK	AR, CO, IA, KS, MN, MO, ND, NE, NM, SD, TX
SD	AK, AR, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, IA, ID, KS, MN, MO, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OK, OR, TX, UT, WA, WY*
TX	AR, CO, KS, LA*, MS, NE, NM, OK, SD

West Region	
AK	AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
AZ	AK, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
BC	AK, AZ, CA, HI, NV*, OR, UT, WA, ID, MT, WY*
CA	AK, AZ, BC, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
HI	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
ID	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
MT	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
OR	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, SD, UT, WA, WY*
UT	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, WA, WY*
WA	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WY*

Note - The Championships Committee, in consultation with the Management Council and Presidents Council, may amend the regionalization model due to changes in the membership (for example, the addition of new schools or conference, realignment of current conferences).

* State currently does not have any Division II institutions.

2013-14 Division II Projected Regionalization Map



Note: The Championships Committee, in consultation with the Management Council and Presidents Council, may amend the regionalization model due to approved changes in the membership (for example, the addition of new schools of conferences, realignment or current conferences).
 Revised 06/26/2012

NCAA DIVISION II IN-REGION COMPETITION BY STATE

Effective for 2013-14 (Revised 06/26/2012)

Atlantic Region	
DC	CT, DE, MA, MD, ME*, NC, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VA, VT, WV
MD	DC, DE, NC, PA, VA, WV
NC	AL, DC, FL, GA, MD, PA, SC, TN, VA, WV
PA	CT, DC, DE, MA, MD, ME*, NC, NH, NJ, NY, OH, RI, VA, VT, WV
VA	DC, KY, MD, NC, PA, TN, WV
WV	DC, KY, MD, NC, OH, PA, VA

Central Region	
AR	IA, KS, LA*, MN, MO, MS, ND, NE, OK, SD, TN, TX
IA	AR, IL, KS, MN, MO, ND, NE, OK, SD, WI
KS	AR, CO, IA, MN, MO, ND, NE, NM, OK, SD, TX
MN	AR, IA, KS, MI, MO, ND, NE, OK, SD, WI
MO	AR, IA, IL, IN, KS, KY, MI, MN, ND, NE, OH, OK, SD, TN, WI
ND	AK, AR, AZ, BC, CA, HI, IA, ID, KS, MN, MO, MT, NE, NV*, OK, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
NE	AK, AR, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, IA, ID, KS, MN, MO, MT, ND, NM, NV*, OK, OR, SD, TX, UT, WA, WY*
OK	AR, CO, IA, KS, MN, MO, ND, NE, NM, SD, TX
SD	AK, AR, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, IA, ID, KS, MN, MO, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OK, OR, TX, UT, WA, WY*

East Region	
CT	DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
DC	CT, DE, MA, MD, ME*, NC, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VA, VT, WV
DE	CT, DC, MA, MD, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
MA	CT, DC, DE, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
NH	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
NJ	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NY, PA, RI, VT
NY	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NJ, PA, RI, VT
PA	CT, DC, DE, MA, MD, ME*, NC, NH, NJ, NY, OH, RI, VA, VT, WV
RI	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, VT
VT	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI

Midwest Region	
IL	IA, IN, KY, MI, MO, OH, WI
IN	IL, KY, MI, MO, OH, WI
MO	AR, IA, IL, IN, KS, KY, MI, MN, ND, NE, OH, OK, SD, TN, WI
MI	IN, IL, KY, MN, MO, OH, WI
OH	IN, IL, KY, MI, MO, PA, WI, WV
WI	IA, IN, IL, KY, MI, MN, MO, OH
KY	AL, AR, FL, GA, IN, IL, LA*, MI, MO, MS, OH, PR, SC, TN, VA, WI, WV

* State currently does not have any Division II institutions.

South Region	
AL	FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
FL	AL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
GA	AL, FL, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
KY	AL, FL, GA, IN, IL, LA*, MI, MO, MS, OH, PR, SC, TN, VA, WI, WV
MS	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, PR, SC, TN, TX
PR	AL, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, SC, TN
SC	AL, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, TN
TN	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MO, MS, NC, PR, SC, VA

Southeast Region	
AL	AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
FL	AL, AR, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
GA	AL, AR, FL, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
NC	AL, DC, FL, GA, MD, PA, SC, TN, VA, WV
SC	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, TN
TN	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MO, MS, PR, NC, SC, VA

South Central Region	
CO	AR, AK, AZ, BC, CA, HI, ID, KS, MT, NE, NM, NV*, OK, OR, SD, TX, UT, WA, WY*
KS	AR, CO, MO, NE, NM, OK, SD, TX
NE	AR, AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, IA, ID, KS, MO, MN, MT, ND, NM, NV*, OK, OR, SD, TX, UT, WA, WY*
NM	AR, AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, KS, MT, NE, NV*, OK, OR, SD, TX, UT, WA, WY*
OK	AR, CO, IA, KS, MN, MO, ND, NE, NM, SD, TX
SD	AK, AR, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, IA, ID, KS, MN, MO, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OK, OR, TX, UT, WA, WY*
TX	AR, CO, KS, LA*, MS, NE, NM, OK, SD

West Region	
AK	AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
AZ	AK, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
BC	AK, AZ, CA, HI, NV*, OR, UT, WA, ID, MT, WY*
CA	AK, AZ, BC, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
HI	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
ID	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
MT	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
OR	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, SD, UT, WA, WY*
UT	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, WA, WY*
WA	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WY*

Note - The Championships Committee, in consultation with the Management Council and Presidents Council, may amend the regionalization model due to changes in the membership (for example, the addition of new schools or conference, realignment of current conferences).

* State currently does not have any Division II institutions.

Non-Divisional Postseason Hosts Bid Language

ACTION ITEMS.

- **Non-Divisional Postseason Hosts Bid Language.**
 - a. Recommendation. That the following language be applied to postseason hosts bid documentation:

“If an NCAA host institution or conference office leaves the Division for which application to host a postseason bid is submitted, the Division II Championships Committee has the authority to review the bid status and select an alternate host and location.”
 - b. Effective Date. Immediate.
 - c. Rationale. The ability to provide a Divisional connection to a postseason selection allows Division II to ensure the best location and hosts are selected. In a scenario where an NCAA member selects out of the Division, the Championships Committee would be allowed the opportunity to review the placement of the postseason bid to continue or be adjusted to best serve the interests of the Division II student-athletes participating in postseason competition.
 - d. Estimated Budget Impact. None.
 - e. Student-Athlete Impact. None.

Committee Chair: Erin Lind, Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference (NSIC)
Staff Liaisons: Roberta Page, Championships and Alliances
Amy Reis, Championships and Alliances

<u>The National Collegiate Athletic Association</u>				
<u>2011-12 Division II Budget-to-Actual Results as of April 30, 2012</u>				
	2010-2011 Year-end Actual	2011-12 Budget	2011-12 YTD Actual	Budget vs. Actual
Revenue:				
Division II 4.37% Revenue Allocation	35,231,686	33,955,000	33,955,000	-
Good of the Game Fund	-	-	-	-
Total Revenue	35,231,686	33,955,000	33,955,000	-
Expenses:				
Championships Expense:				
Men's Championships Expenses				
Baseball	1,670,648	1,725,690	20,505	1,705,185
Basketball	1,287,880	1,638,440	1,289,137	349,303
Cross Country	309,199	444,660	369,589	75,071
Football	1,207,203	1,786,550	1,527,380	259,170
Golf	626,156	740,380	19,701	720,679
Lacrosse	90,587	153,310	6,214	147,096
I/D Track	390,007	448,000	317,958	130,042
O/D Track	639,690	669,470	-	669,470
Soccer	578,189	784,260	878,005	(93,745)
Swimming & Diving	337,122	424,320	276,304	148,016
Tennis	411,394	880,740	14,852	865,888
Wrestling	312,124	418,640	331,523	87,117
Total Men's Championships Expenses	7,860,199	10,114,460	5,051,168	5,063,292
Women's Championships Expenses				
Basketball	1,584,534	1,717,810	1,148,391	569,419
Cross Country	348,803	451,020	396,595	54,425
Field Hockey	236,702	200,350	106,545	93,805
Golf	343,138	490,120	20,548	469,572
Lacrosse	155,760	364,520	5,023	359,497
I/D Track	384,362	441,140	302,334	138,806
O/D Track	631,504	691,720		691,720
Soccer	1,069,464	1,152,670	1,102,254	50,416
Softball	1,638,061	1,771,930	19,418	1,752,512
Swimming and Diving	415,177	464,130	324,463	139,667
Tennis	388,695	944,340	41,855	902,485
Volleyball	957,372	1,096,710	1,061,450	35,260
Rowing	191,744	234,960	2,873	232,087
Total Women's Championships Expenses	8,345,316	10,021,420	4,531,749	5,489,671
Total Championships Expense	16,205,515	20,135,880	9,582,917	10,552,963

DIVISION II SELECTION CRITERIA WHITE PAPER
CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE & FOCUS GROUP RECAP

The Division II Championships Committee reviewed the membership feedback, conference scheduling statistics and the recap supplement provided from the Division II Selection Criteria Focus Group during their February 20 and 21, 2012 meeting.

The Championships Committee provided additional parameters and feedback to include in the recap provided which the Championships Committee noted was beneficial to their discussion at their February meeting. The Championships Committee provided the following key points reiterating the work done by the focus group along with a few new items for consideration including:

- The Championships Committee supported the focus groups opinion that the selection criteria are not a broken system but education of the key constituents would be a beneficial step in the process.
- Education of coaches, conference offices, regional advisory committees (RACs) and national committee members is a key point that needs addressed in moving forward related to selection criteria. Additionally, the opportunity to provide conference offices with training materials would be key to the process and maintain the expectations for all serving on committees for consistency purposes.
- A consideration to include both incoming and out-going national committee members during annual meetings would be beneficial as well.
- Transparency related to the selection criteria process should be a primary focus to allow membership and the public better understanding of the selection criteria process.
- An evaluation of the contingent states policy should be undertaken during the May 2012 Championships Committee meeting as part of the selection criteria discussion.
- The short-term focus was determined to be education with a discussion for a long-term evaluation related to providing regions the autonomy of determining their qualifying teams. A much further analysis of the latter needs to take place to see if the idea is feasible, develop the processes that could be implemented and get further membership feedback related to the topic.
- The Championships Committee noted that much further discussion and review of requested information from NCAA staff will continue per the timeline provided in the Selection Criteria White Paper shared with NCAA membership. The Championships Committee will continue formulating ideas and formulate recommendations at the May 2012 meeting.

- Are teams that have goals of making it in to the NCAA Championships playing in-region/non-conference schedules or is the issue with those teams that have no plans to participate in NCAA Division II Championships?
- What are Division II's priorities during selections? Should criteria across sports be similar or is each sport different from a selection criteria perspective?
- The focus group recognizes that the selection criteria must be solid and sport specific, yet more weight should be added behind criteria that matches Division II's priorities and then make selections under those expectations.
- Selection criteria should have a length of time set to evaluate changes made to a sport's criteria and the impact. A suggested time line would be every three – four years to allow for scheduling implications by members schools.
- Should Division II consider Division I, III or NAIA contests in postseason selections? The focus group suggested that to be selected for Division II Championship, teams should be only selected based on Division II opponents. Yet, the focus group noted that the NCAA should not be in the habit of mandating when or who a team plays. Rather, if provided by the NCAA the selection criteria based on Division II priorities then teams must meet that criteria to be considered. If a team wants to participate in a Division II Championship then they must play a Division II schedule.
- Can you begin to prioritize Division II selection criteria principles under the following elements (in no particular order):

- Overall Division II Schedule / Strength of schedules
 - Head-to-Head competition
 - In-Region Division II games
 - In-region/non-conference competition
- Could sport committees consider earned access to address the issues of in-region, non-conference competition (i.e., soccer)? The focus group reiterated that no mandate should be put in place yet thought that earned access may address the issue related to in-region, non-conference competition for the sports experiencing the most difficulties in evaluation at selections.
 - Should reseeding occur at NCAA Championships if in-region/non-conference competition is encouraged during the regular season? Should committees be given autonomy to make decision on seeding?
 - Overall, is selection criteria the issue? The focus group indicated that they felt that wasn't the core issue. Rather, they identified the following key items to better address the topic:
 - Develop Division II priorities on selection criteria.
 - Consistent criteria
(minimize the number of changes to the criteria and how often it is allowed by sport committees to change)
 - Educate NCAA membership on selection criteria of each sport.
 - Provide training and education of committees
(RACs and National Committees)
 - The focus group also encouraged each group that reviews the topic to keep the evaluation at a global perspective to ensure it's as fair to all Division II members as possible and in the best interest of Division II as a whole.

A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association
Division II Selection Criteria Focus Group

NCAA National Office
Palmer Pierce A

February 8-9, 2012

Wednesday, February 8—4 to 6 p.m.

1. Welcome and introductions; Roberta Page.
2. Purpose and goals of the focus group; Page and Amy Reis. [Supplement No. 1]
 - Current selection criteria white paper. [Supplement No. 2]
3. Review of data and research.
 - a. Regionalization map and principles. [Supplement No. 3]
 - b. Regionalization maps by sport, including number of conferences and schools in each region. [Supplement No. 4]
 - c. Number of automatic qualifications and at-large berths by sport. [Supplement No. 5]
 - d. Selection criteria by sport. [Supplement No. 6]
 - Selection criteria for men's basketball. [Supplement No. 7]
 - e. Nullification process. [Supplement No. 8]
 - f. Figure 17-1 (maximum number of contest or dates of competition per sport). [Supplement No. 9]
 - g. Bylaw 31.3 (selection of teams and individuals for championships participation). [Supplement No. 10]
 - h. Requirements comparison chart (sports sponsorship, selections, Bylaw 17). [Supplement No. 11]
 - i. Current number of in-region games by sport. [Supplement No. 12 will be distributed at the meeting]

4. Review of feedback received from the Division II membership. [Supplement No. 13]
5. Discussion (thoughts, conclusions, leanings).
6. Dinner at 6:30 pm, Osteria Pronto

Thursday, February 9—8 a.m. to 1 p.m.

7. Discussion of main issues/trends/themes.
 - Sport(s) specific or across all sports?
 - Conference(s) specific or across all conferences?
 - Region(s) specific or across all regions?
 - AQ sports vs. non-AQ sports?
 - Other?
8. Specific feedback for the Division II Championships Committee.
9. Recommendations for talking points and “pain” points.
10. Other items.
11. Next steps.
12. Adjournment and lunch.

#

NCAA Division II Selection Criteria Focus Group

Objective

To encourage schools in similar geographic areas to build Division II schedules and identify geographic areas, member institutions or conferences that intentionally are avoiding Division II schedules to get wins and determine ways through selection criteria in which to encourage Division II game schedules.

Note—The intended outcome is not to have Division II member institutions cut back on scheduling conference games or by reducing scheduled “money” games.

Focus Group Member Selection

The focus group is not a decision-making body. The members participating in the focus group were not selected by appointment. Members of the focus group were selected by NCAA staff members and consist of former Division II Management Council chairs and the current chair of the Division II Championships Committee. The focus group is a sounding board to take membership feedback received by NCAA staff, analyze that feedback on selection criteria, and provide a former divisional leadership perspective to the Division II Championships Committee. At this focus group meeting, feedback is aimed at assisting to identify the short-term issues, rather than long-term, to provide prioritization of the issues shared by Division II membership.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division II Focus Group to Review Selection Criteria

R O S T E R

Kathleen Brasfield
Director of Athletics
Angelo State University
Kathleen.brasfield@angelo.edu
Phone: 325/942-2267

Ann Martin
Director of Athletics
Regis University
amartin@regis.edu
303/964-5718

Debbie Chin
Director of Athletics
University of New Haven
dchin@newhaven.edu
203/932-7020

Tim Selgo
Director of Athletics
Grand Valley State University
selgot@gvsu.edu
616/331-2246

Rick Cole
Director of Athletics
Dowling College
coler@dowling.edu
Phone: 631/244-1113

Sue Willey
Director of Athletics
University of Indianapolis
swilley@uindy.edu
317-788/3412

Erin Lind
Associate Commissioner
Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference
Lind@northernsun.org
952/500-8053

S T A F F L I A I S O N S

Amanda Conklin
Assistant Director of Membership and
Student-Athlete Affairs
aconklin@ncaa.org
317/917-6340

Mike Racy
Vice President of Division II
mracy@ncaa.org
317/917-6934

Roberta Page
Director of Championships
rpage@ncaa.org
317/917-6493

Amy Reis
Assistant Director of Championships
areis@ncaa.org
317/917-6580

Terri Steeb-Gronau
Director of Division II
tsteeb@ncaa.org
317/917-6935

**Division II White Paper Regarding Selection Criteria
Procedural and Policy Recommendations**

As of 11/17/2011

Background:

The Division II philosophy statement (as legislated in Division II Bylaw 20.10) indicates that a Division II member "believes in scheduling the majority of its athletics competition with other members of Division II, insofar as regional qualification, geographical location and traditional conference scheduling patterns permit."

Regionalization is a Division II championships policy that requires sports committees to select a predetermined number of teams in each of the regions of the sports involved. This policy is based on an assumption that due to the regional nature of most Division II schools, sports committees should evaluate and select championships participants based on regional results, as opposed to a national evaluation in which head-to-head and common opponents' results are less prevalent.

The Division II regionalization philosophy provides access to national championships from every region of the country. Regionalization does not guarantee that the best eight programs in the country will compete for a national championship, but does guarantee that the different regions of the country will be represented at the championships by each region's best team.

In addition, regionalization encourages a member school to compete against opponents within its region, instead of seeking contests against opponents outside the geographical region. This scheduling review is aimed at helping schools manage their regular-season travel budgets and limit missed class time for Division II student-athletes.

At the 2012 N CAA Convention, the Division II membership will vote on a package of legislative proposals designed to manage the strategic growth of the division. As a part of this legislative package, conferences will be required to have 8 active member institutions by 2017 and 10 active member institutions by 2022. Additionally, any new conference that is formed following August 1, 2013, will be required to have 10 members. The intent is to encourage the stabilization of conferences and requiring conferences to grow meets the desired outcome.

When the Division II Membership Committee was developing these concepts for the Division II membership's consideration, the Membership Committee noted that larger conferences will inevitably include more conference contests during the regular season and the potential for fewer in-region/non-conference contests. As a result, there is potential for increased scheduling issues for smaller conferences. Therefore, the Membership Committee recommended the creation of an incentive program to encourage conferences to schedule in-region/non-conference competition.

In July 2011, the Management Council supported the concept of creating an incentive plan, but believed the plan needed additional review and consideration. It had been noted by many administrators and coaches in the Division II membership that building a regular season

schedule is difficult. Additionally, Division II sports committees sometimes have a difficult time ranking and selecting teams for national championships because there are few opportunities to compare schools across conferences.

Thus, the Division II Championships Committee has been charged with reviewing selection criteria to determine methods that would encourage Division II member schools to schedule in-region/nonconference competition and to discourage schools from scheduling contests that will not aid the sports committees in the selection of teams for the national championships. The Championships Committee will be looking at an incentive plan; a penalty structure; and/or policy or legislative changes to encourage cross competition among conferences. The Championships Committee believes it is important to have a national dialogue with the full Division II membership on these issues to gather feedback and ideas.

Review of the Issue:

The Championships Committee reviewed this charge at its September 2011 meeting and had some initial discussions with the chairs of the Division II sports committees. As a part of these discussions, the committee identified the following questions for further discussion and feedback within the Division II membership:

- Is the scheduling of in-region/non-conference competition important?
- Are the difficulties in developing a regular season schedule limited to certain sports or certain regions?
- Should the division implement a process similar to nullification that would include a mathematical deduction at the time of selections if an institution did not schedule any in-region/non-conference competition?
- Should sports committees' selection criteria mandate a specific number of required in-region/non-conference contest(s) in order to be eligible for the post-season?
- Should a weighted ranking system be developed as a part of the selection criteria to encourage institutions to schedule other Division II institutions rather than institutions in other associations or other divisions?
- Should a weighted ranking system be developed as a part of the selection criteria to encourage institutions to schedule other Division II institutions that have historically been stronger in the sport (e.g., bonus points for playing a Top 25 team, bonus points for beating a Top 25 team on the road, etc.)?
- If the division supports an incentive plan, what parameters should be included in the incentive plan and who should oversee the funds received from the incentive plan (e.g., schools, conferences)?
- Should conferences or institutions sponsor centrally located events to meet any new selection criteria requirements or to encourage in-region/non-conference competition?
- When should any proposed changes be implemented?

Please submit any feedback, comments or questions to the following email address: D2selectioncriteria@ncaa.org.

Next Steps and Timeline:

During the 2011 September Division II Championships Committee meeting, the Championships Committee agreed to form a small working group to continue these discussions. Additionally, the Championships Committee is seeking feedback from a variety of constituent groups.

September 2011	Division II Championships Committee and sport committee chairs meetings.
October 2011 – July 2012	Gathering of feedback from the Division II membership.
February 2012	Division II Championships Committee meets in Indianapolis to discuss feedback and will continue to seek information from the membership.
April 2012	Management Council and Presidents Councils meetings.
June 2012	Championships Committee meeting, NACDA Convention and CCA meeting.
September 2012	Championships Committee finalizes its recommendations for the Management Council and Presidents Council.
October 2012	Management Council and Presidents Councils meetings.
January 2013	NCAA Convention.
TBD	Recommendations implemented.

Regionalization Talking Points

- ✓ The Division II philosophy statement (as legislated in Division II Bylaw 20.10) indicates that a Division II member "believes in scheduling the majority of its athletics competition with other members of Division II, insofar as regional qualification, geographical location and traditional conference scheduling patterns permit."
- ✓ Regionalization is a Division II championships policy that requires sport committees to select a predetermined number of teams in each of the regions of the sports involved. This policy is based on an assumption that due to the regional nature of most Division II schools, sport committees should evaluate and select championships participants based on regional results, as opposed to a national evaluation in which head-to-head and common opponents' results are less prevalent.
- ✓ The Division II regionalization philosophy provides access to national championships from every region of the country. Regionalization does not guarantee that the best eight programs in the country will compete for a national championship, but does guarantee that the different regions of the country will be represented at the championship by each region's best team.
- ✓ In addition, regionalization encourages a member school to compete against opponents within its region, instead of seeking contests against opponents outside the geographical region. This scheduling incentive is aimed at helping schools manage their regular-season travel budgets and limit missed class time for Division II student-athletes.
- ✓ The Great American Conference applied for active conference membership by December 1, 2010. Per the authority of the Division II Membership Committee, the committee approved the application from the Great American Conference inasmuch as the conference satisfied all legislated requirements. The conference shall be an active Division II conference, effective September 1, 2011.
- ✓ With the approval of a new conference, the Division II Championships Committee was required to place the conference in a geographic region for championships selections.
- ✓ Per Bylaw 31.3.4.5, to be eligible for automatic qualification, a conference must be a member of the Association for two consecutive academic years, unless granted a waiver by the Championships Committee. Thus, the Great American Conference shall not be eligible for automatic qualification until September 1, 2013. The Great American Conference shall be eligible for at-large selections in 2011-12 and 2012-13.
- ✓ During its deliberations, the Championships Committee considered three models. With each model, the following factors were considered in totality as all factors must be considered together and not as stand-alone items (i.e., no one factor is more important than another):
 - conference membership and location of institutions;
 - number of institutions in each region to ensure fair access ratios to the championships;

- size of each region (e.g., mileage between institutions);
- possible future growth of new conferences;
- maintaining no more than three AQ conferences in each region; and
- a transition time for institutions to either adjust or begin scheduling institutions in their new region.

At no time during the deliberations by the Championships Committee did historical or perceived strength of conferences factor into the recommendation.

Recommendation by the Championships Committee:

Effective 2011-12, the Great American Conference shall be placed in the South Central region. With this placement, the Great American Conference 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 Great American Conference and the MIAA will move to the Central Region and the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference will move to the South Central Region.

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 – 39 Institutions

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

South Central Region – 34 Institutions

Lone Star Conference
Heartland Conference
Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference

Effective 2013-14

Central Region – 39 Institutions

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

South Central Region – 34 Institutions

Lone Star Conference
Heartland Conference
Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference

The Division II Management Council approved the Championships Committee recommendation at its April 2011 meeting. The Presidents Council will receive this as an information item at its April 2011 meeting.

Please contact Roberta Page, Director of Championships, and Amy Reis, Assistant Director of Championships, and liaisons to the Division II Championships Committee with questions regarding regionalization.

DIVISION II REGIONALIZATION MODEL

The following regionalization model was approved June 2007 by the NCAA Division II Championships Committee with a mandatory implementation date of 2008-09.

Principles for establishing regions:

- Regions will be determined by state boundaries.
- A state may reside in more than one region.
- All opponents within your geographic region are in-region contests.
- Conferences will be assigned to specific regions for automatic qualification and post-season competition.
- Conference opponents will count as in-region contests, regardless of geographic location.
- Opponents residing within your state, regardless of conference affiliation, are in-region contests.
- All opponents (regardless of conference affiliation) in states contiguous to your state are in-region contests.

The committee has approved the following principles, and any changes or additions to these principles must be approved by the committee.

Additional Principles:

- Institutions in the state of Montana will be able to consider Nebraska and Colorado as contiguous states (and vice versa). (There are no Division II institutions currently in states contiguous to Montana's southern border.)
- The west region may consider the states of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado and New Mexico as contiguous states (and vice versa).
- Institutions located in MINNESOTA and MICHIGAN may compete against each other and be considered as contiguous states (those contests count as in-region).
- Institutions located in Colorado and Texas are considered contiguous and may count competitions between these institutions as in-region contests.
- Institutions located in Texas and Mississippi are considered contiguous and may count competitions between these institutions as in-region contests.
- Institutions and conferences with a common mission (i.e. Historically Black Colleges and Universities) may consider interconference contests or independent contests against schools with similar missions as in-region, regardless of their geographic location and/or regional assignment.
- Institutions in the Atlantic and East Regions will be able to consider the District of Columbia as in-region contests.

Conference regional assignments for automatic qualification and post-season competition.

Effective 2011-12

REGION	CONFERENCES
West	California Collegiate Athletic Association Great Northwest Athletic Conference Pacific West Conference
Central	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference
South Central	Great American Conference (eligible only for at-large selections) Heartland Conference Lone Star Conference Mid-America Athletic Conference
Midwest	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference Great Lakes Valley Conference
South	Gulf South Conference Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference Sunshine State Athletic Conference
Southeast	Conference Carolinas Peach Belt Conference South Atlantic Conference
Atlantic	Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference
East	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference East Coast Conference Northeast 10 Conference

Effective 2012-13

REGION	CONFERENCES
West	California Collegiate Athletic Association Great Northwest Athletic Conference Pacific West Conference
Central	Great American Conference (eligible only for at-large selections) Mid-America Athletic Conference Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference
South Central	Heartland Conference Lone Star Conference Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference
Midwest	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference Great Lakes Valley Conference
South	Gulf South Conference Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference Sunshine State Athletic Conference
Southeast	Conference Carolinas Peach Belt Conference South Atlantic Conference
Atlantic	Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference
East	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference East Coast Conference Northeast 10 Conference


Note: as a point of clarification, an institution that is a single sport member of a conference will compete as a member of that conference for selection and ranking purposes.

2011-12 Division II Projected Regionalization Map



Note: The Championships Committee, in consultation with the Management Council and Presidents Council, may amend the regionalization model due to approved changes in the membership (for example, the addition of new schools or conferences, realignment of current conferences).
 Revised 10/20/2011

2012-13 Division II Projected Regionalization Map



Note: The Championships Committee, in consultation with the Management Council and Presidents Council, may amend the regionalization model due to approved changes in the membership (for example, the addition of new schools of conferences, realignment or current conferences).
 Revised 10/20/2011

NCAA DIVISION II IN-REGION COMPETITION BY STATE

Effective for 2011-12 (Revised 10/19/2011)

Atlantic Region	
DC	CT, DE, MA, MD, ME*, NC, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VA, VT, WV
MD	DC, DE, NC, PA, VA, WV
NC	AL, DC, FL, GA, MD, PA, SC, TN, VA, WV
PA	CT, DC, DE, MA, MD, ME*, NC, NH, NJ, NY, OH, RI, VA, VT, WV
VA	DC, KY, MD, NC, PA, TN, WV
WV	DC, KY, MD, NC, OH, PA, VA

Central Region	
CO	AK, AZ, CA, HI, IA, ID, KS, MN, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OK, OR, SD, TX, UT, WA, WY*
IA	CO, IL, MN, MO, ND, NE, NM, SD, WI
MN	CO, IA, MI, ND, NE, NM, SD, WI
ND	AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, IA, ID, MN, MT, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
NE	AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, IA, ID, KS, MN, MO, MT, ND, NM, NV*, OK, OR, SD, TX, UT, WA, WY*
NM	AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, IA, ID, KS, MN, MO, MT, ND, NE, NV*, OK, OR, SD, TX, UT, WA, WY*
SD	AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, IA, ID, MN, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, UT, WA, WY*

East Region	
CT	DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
DC	CT, DE, MA, MD, ME*, NC, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VA, VT, WV
DE	CT, DC, MA, MD, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
MA	CT, DC, DE, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
NH	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
NJ	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NY, PA, RI, VT
NY	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NJ, PA, RI, VT
PA	CT, DC, DE, MA, MD, ME*, NC, NH, NJ, NY, OH, RI, VA, VT, WV
RI	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, VT
VT	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI

Midwest Region	
IL	IA, IN, KY, MI, MO, OH, WI
IN	IL, KY, MI, MO, OH, WI
MO	AR, IA, IL, IN, KS, KY, MI, NE, NM, OH, OK, TN, TX, WI
MI	IN, IL, KY, MN, MO, OH, WI
OH	IN, IL, KY, MI, MO, PA, WI, WV
WI	IA, IN, IL, KY, MI, MN, MO, OH
KY	AL, AR, FL, GA, IN, IL, LA*, MI, MO, MS, OH, PR, SC, TN, VA, WI, WV

* State currently does not have any Division II institutions.

South Region	
AL	AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
AR	AL, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MO, MS, OK, PR, SC, TN, TX
FL	AL, AR, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
GA	AL, AR, FL, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
KY	AL, AR, FL, GA, IN, IL, LA*, MI, MO, MS, OH, PR, SC, TN, VA, WI, WV
MS	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, PR, SC, TN, TX
PR	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, SC, TN
SC	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, TN
TN	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MO, MS, NC, PR, SC, VA

Southeast Region	
AL	AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
FL	AL, AR, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
GA	AL, AR, FL, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
NC	AL, DC, FL, GA, MD, PA, SC, TN, VA, WV
SC	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, TN
TN	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MO, MS, NC, PR, SC, VA

South Central Region	
KS	AR, CO, MO, NE, NM, OK, TX
MO	AR, IA, IL, IN, KS, KY, MI, NE, NM, OH, OK, TN, TX, WI
NE	AR, AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, IA, ID, KS, MO, MN, MT, ND, NM, NV*, OK, OR, SD, TX, UT, WA, WY*
NM	AR, AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, IA, ID, KS, MO, MN, MT, ND, NE, NV*, OK, OR, SD, TX, UT, WA, WY*
OK	AR, CO, KS, MO, NE, NM, TX
TX	AR, CO, KS, LA*, MO, MS, NE, NM, OK

West Region	
AK	AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
AZ	AK, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
CA	AK, AZ, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
HI	AK, AZ, CA, CO, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
ID	AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
MT	AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
OR	AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, SD, UT, WA, WY*
UT	AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, WA, WY*
WA	AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, ME, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WY*

Note - The Championships Committee, in consultation with the Management Council and Presidents Council, may amend the regionalization model due to changes in the membership (for example, the addition of new schools or conference, realignment of current conferences).

* State currently does not have any Division II institutions.

NCAA DIVISION II IN-REGION COMPETITION BY STATE

Effective for 2012-13 (Revised 10/19/2011)

Atlantic Region	
DC	CT, DE, MA, MD, ME*, NC, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VA, VT, WV
MD	DC, DE, NC, PA, VA, WV
NC	AL, DC, FL, GA, MD, PA, SC, TN, VA, WV
PA	CT, DC, DE, MA, MD, ME*, NC, NH, NJ, NY, OH, RI, VA, VT, WV
VA	DC, KY, MD, NC, PA, TN, WV
WV	DC, KY, MD, NC, OH, PA, VA

Central Region	
AR	IA, KS, LA*, MN, MO, MS, ND, NE, OK, SD, TN, TX
IA	AR, IL, KS, MN, MO, ND, NE, OK, SD, WI
KS	AR, CO, IA, MN, MO, ND, NE, NM, OK, SD, TX
MN	AR, IA, KS, MI, MO, ND, NE, OK, SD, WI
MO	AR, IA, IL, IN, KS, KY, MI, MN, ND, NE, OH, OK, SD, TN, WI
ND	AK, AR, AZ, BC, CA, HI, IA, ID, KS, MN, MO, MT, NE, NV*, OK, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
NE	AK, AR, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, IA, ID, KS, MN, MO, MT, ND, NM, NV*, OK, OR, SD, TX, UT, WA, WY*
OK	AR, CO, IA, KS, MN, MO, ND, NE, NM, SD, TX
SD	AK, AR, AZ, BC, CA, HI, IA, ID, KS, MN, MO, MT, ND, NE, NV*, OK, OR, UT, WA, WY*

East Region	
CT	DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
DC	CT, DE, MA, MD, ME*, NC, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VA, VT, WV
DE	CT, DC, MA, MD, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
MA	CT, DC, DE, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
NH	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
NJ	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NY, PA, RI, VT
NY	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NJ, PA, RI, VT
PA	CT, DC, DE, MA, MD, ME*, NC, NH, NJ, NY, OH, RI, VA, VT, WV
RI	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, VT
VT	CT, DC, DE, MA, ME*, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI

Midwest Region	
IL	IA, IN, KY, MI, MO, OH, WI
IN	IL, KY, MI, MO, OH, WI
MO	AR, IA, IL, IN, KS, KY, MI, MN, ND, NE, OH, OK, SD, TN, WI
MI	IN, IL, KY, MN, MO, OH, WI
OH	IN, IL, KY, MI, MO, PA, WI, W\
WI	IA, IN, IL, KY, MI, MN, MO, OH
KY	AL, AR, FL, GA, IN, IL, LA*, MI, MO, MS, OH, PR, SC, TN, VA, WI, WV

* State currently does not have any Division II institutions.

South Region	
AL	FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
FL	AL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
GA	AL, FL, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
KY	AL, FL, GA, IN, IL, LA*, MI, MO, MS, OH, PR, SC, TN, VA, WI, WV
MS	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, PR, SC, TN, TX
PR	AL, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, SC, TN
SC	AL, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, TN
TN	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MO, MS, NC, PR, SC, VA

Southeast Region	
AL	AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
FL	AL, AR, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
GA	AL, AR, FL, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN
NC	AL, DC, FL, GA, MD, PA, SC, TN, VA, WV
SC	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MS, NC, PR, TN
TN	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA*, MO, MS, PR, NC, SC, VA


South Central Region	
CO	AR, AK, AZ, BC, CA, HI, ID, KS, MT, NE, NM, NV*, OK, OR, TX, UT, WA, WY*
KS	AR, CO, MO, NE, NM, OK, TX
NE	AR, AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, IA, ID, KS, MO, MN, MT, ND, NM, NV*, OK, OR, SD, TX, UT, WA, WY*
NM	AR, AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, KS, MT, NE, NV*, OK, OR, TX, UT, WA, WY*
OK	AR, CO, IA, KS, MN, MO, ND, NE, NM, SD, TX
TX	AR, CO, KS, LA*, MS, NE, NM, OK

West Region	
AK	AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
AZ	AK, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
BC	AK, AZ, CA, HI, NV*, OR, UT, WA, ID, MT, WY*
CA	AK, AZ, BC, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
HI	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
ID	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
MT	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WA, WY*
OR	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, SD, UT, WA, WY*
UT	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, NM, NV*, OR, SD, WA, WY*
WA	AK, AZ, BC, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, ND, NE, ME*, NM, NV*, OR, SD, UT, WY*

Note - The Championships Committee, in consultation with the Management Council and Presidents Council, may amend the regionalization model due to changes in the membership (for example, the addition of new schools or conference, realignment of current conferences).

* State currently does not have any Division II institutions.

2012-13 Division II Projected Regionalization Map



Note: The Championships Committee, in consultation with the Management Council and Presidents Council, may amend the regionalization model due to approved changes in the membership (for example, the addition of new schools of conferences, realignment or current conferences).
Revised 10/13/2011

SUPPLEMENT NO. 5

Sport	Baseball	M Basketball	W Basketball	Football	M Soccer	W Soccer	Softball	Volleyball
AQ	20	22	22	None	None	20	22	22
At- Large	28	42	42	24 (6 per region)	32	28	42	42
Bracket Size	48	64	64	24	32	48	64	64

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION II BASEBALL COMMITTEE

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Selection Criteria.

- a. Recommendation. That effective with the 2011-2012 season, the NCAA Division II Baseball Championship selection criteria be modified in the following ways, (1) to redefine that a record of 0.500 or above be based only on Division II contests; (2) that “results versus ranked opponents” be modified to “results versus ranked opponents and all teams with a winning percentage of 0.650 and above” and (3) that “regular-season conference standing” be removed from the primary criteria for selection.

The updated criteria would read as follows:

The following criteria as outlined in NCAA Bylaw 31.3.3 of the NCAA Division II Manual shall be employed by a governing sports committee in selecting participants for NCAA championships competition:

- Won-lost record;
- Strength of schedule;
- Availability of student-athletes for NCAA championships; and
- Nullification.

In addition to Bylaw 31.3.3, the Division II Baseball Committee has received approval from the NCAA Division II Championship Committee to consider the following criteria in the selection of at-large teams for the Division II Baseball Championship (not necessarily in priority order):

Primary Criteria

- In-region Division II won-lost results;
- In-region Division II strength of schedule (opponents’ average winning percentage and opponents’ opponents’ average winning percentage);
- Head-to-head competition (minimum of two contests);
- Results versus common opponents;
- Results against Division II teams .500 or better;
- Results against Division II teams out of conference .500 or better;
- Road results;
- **Results versus teams ranked in the previous regional ranking and all teams with a winning percentage of 0.650 and above; and**
- ~~Regular-season conference standing.~~

Tie Breaking Criteria

1. Head-to-head competition (minimum of two contests); and
2. Results versus common opponents.

- b. Rationale. Currently, the determination whether a team is 0.500 is based on an institution's overall record which includes all contests including NCAA Divisions I, III and NAIA. While nothing gained by that institution, there was a misconception that teams gained an advantage by playing NAIA schools. The baseball committee believes this redefinition is clearer and more closely aligns with the Division II regionalization philosophy.

With the increased baseball sponsorship within Division II, there are, on average, one to two teams per region with a winning percentage of 0.650 or higher that are not ranked. The baseball committee believes results against those teams are significant and would like to highlight those by adding that criteria to the existing results versus ranked teams.

The baseball committee agreed that regular season conference standing is no longer a relevant piece of criteria and should not have a bearing on postseason selection.

- c. Budget Impact. None.
- d. Student-Athlete Impact. None.
- e. Known Opposition to Proposal, if Any. None.

2. Bracket Allocation.

- a. Recommendation. That effective with the 2012 championship, that six teams will be selected for each of the eight regionals. Currently six regionals select six teams, the West region selects four teams and the South region selects eight teams.
- b. Rationale. With the growth in sponsorship and the revised regional assignments that will take place over the next two years, the number of institutions per region has leveled and no longer supports the proportional postseason allocations that are currently followed.
- c. Budget Impact. None.
- d. Student-Athlete Impact. None.
- e. Historical Treatment of the Item.

Participation Procedures

An institution desiring to participate in the championship must complete all games (including conference tournament games) before the final scheduled selection call of the Division II Men's Basketball Committee Sunday, March 4.

Qualifying Standards

Teams qualify automatically by conference berth and are also selected by the committee at large. Eight teams will compete in each of the eight regional tournaments and these teams shall be paired strictly within region.

To be considered during the selection process, a team must have:

- an overall Division II won-lost record of .500 or better; and
- compete in at least 22 contests against Division I or II institutions, of which a minimum of 18 games must be played against in-region Division II opponents.

Further, the minimum of 22 games must be played against NCAA Division I or II institutions. Only contests played against varsity intercollegiate teams of four-year degree-granting institutions that conduct a majority of their competition in that team sport against varsity intercollegiate teams of four-year, degree-granting institutions located in Canada and the United States, its territories or possessions shall be considered in meeting the 22-game minimum or counted in a team's win-loss record (conference tournament games do not count toward this minimum). The minimum 18 in-region contests must be played during the regular season. Competition against service teams, semiprofessional teams, amateur teams, two-year colleges and club teams shall be excluded. A member institution shall limit its total regular-season playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of basketball in any one year to 26 contests (games or scrimmages), except for those contests excluded per NCAA Bylaw 17.

An institution desiring to participate in the championship must complete all games (including conference tournament games) before the selection call on Sunday, March 4.

SECTION 2•4 SELECTION CRITERIA

The following criteria shall be employed by a governing sports committee in selecting the participants for NCAA championship competition [Bylaw 31.3.3; Criteria for Selection of Participants]:

- Won-lost record;
- Strength-of-schedule;
- Availability of student-athletes for NCAA championships; and
- Nullification.

In addition to Bylaw 31.3.3, the men's basketball committee has received approval from the Division II Championships Committee to consider the following criteria in the selection of at-large teams for the men's basketball championship (not necessarily in priority order):

Primary Criteria

- Overall Division II won-lost results;
- Overall Division II strength-of-schedule (opponents' average winning percentage and opponents' opponents' average winning percentage);
- Head-to-head competition;
- Results versus common opponents; and
- Results versus Division II ranked teams (all regions - once ranked, always ranked).
- Performance Indicator (see Appendix G)

Tiebreaker Criteria (in rank order):

1. Ratings Percentage Index (RPI).
2. Record in last 10 games.

Additionally, input is provided by regional advisory committees for consideration by the men's basketball committee. All Division II sports committees are no longer required to conduct a follow-up call with all respective regional advisory committee members in a given selection region before making a final decision during the selection call. The national committee must notify the respective regional advisory committee members of the changes prior to public release. Notification may be sent via e-mail. Coaches' polls and/or any other outside polls or rankings are not used as selection criterion by the men's basketball committee for selection purposes.

Selection Date. Announcement of the acceptance of invitations to teams shall be made by the NCAA national office in accordance with procedures established by the committee. Final selections will be announced Sunday, March 4.

SECTION 2.5 SITE SELECTION

Any institution or conference interested in hosting a preliminary round of the 2012 NCAA Division II Men's Basketball Championship must submit a proposed budget, facility evaluation form, key contact form and video board questionnaire (if applicable) to be considered to host. A separate proposed budget and key contacts form must be submitted for each round that an institution or conference is interested in hosting.

Note the proposed budget form has changed slightly to allow us to collect more detailed information when relevant. The form is now an expandable/collapsible tree format with the ability to upload supporting documents. Please note the unbudgeted expenditures section has been removed in the new budget form. As part of the bid, prospective hosts must enter a budgeted amount for the following items that previously were considered unbudgeted expenditures:

- Committee/site representative lodging
- Game officials lodging
- State and city taxes/fees
- Ticket and facility fees

Committee/site representative's per diem, mileage and luggage fees will now be paid by the NCAA instead of the host institution. Game officials will be reimbursed via the RefPay system for their game fee, per diem, mileage and luggage fees. Hosts will no longer pay these fees.

For both the game officials and committee/site representatives, hosts will pay for their lodging expenses and be reimbursed by the NCAA. However, if the NCAA manages the hotel block for the game officials, the officials' lodging expenses shall be directly billed to the NCAA. The NCAA typically manages the officials' hotel block at the final site for our championships.

All bid-related forms can be accessed via the following website: <https://web1.ncaa.org/champsBidV20/exec/login>. The deadline to submit all materials for hosting preliminary rounds is February 24.

Final Financial Report

[Reference: Bylaw 31.4 in the NCAA Manual.]

A final financial report from each championship site must be submitted via the online host reporting system to the NCAA not later than 60 days after the competition.

Contact Information.

If you have any questions regarding the bid process, please contact the NCAA Championships and Alliances staff at 317/917-6397 or championshipbid@ncaa.org.

Schedule/Rosters

Institutions were required to submit their 2011-12 schedules and rosters to the NCAA statistics staff for uploading into the score reporting system. If you have schedule date/opponent/location changes please email Jenn Rodgers (jrodgers@ncaa.org) and she will make those updates throughout the season, as you will not have access to make changes to your schedule. Note that the roster link on the statistics site should be updated prior to your team's first game. Adjustments can be made throughout the season as needed.

SECTION 2.3 SELECTION INFORMATION

Automatic Qualification

[Reference: Bylaws 31.3.4.3-(a) and 31.3.5 in the NCAA Division II Manual.]

For the women's championship, the following 22 conferences shall automatically qualify their conference champions for the 2012 championship.

- California Collegiate Athletic Association
- Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference
- Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association
- Conference Carolinas
- East Coast Conference
- Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference
- Great Lakes Valley Conference
- Great Northwest Athletic Conference
- Gulf South Conference
- Heartland 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
- West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference

In-Region Competition

[Reference: Bylaws 31.01.2, 31.01.3, 31.02.4 and 31.3 in the NCAA Division II Manual.]

A minimum of 22 games against Division II teams must be played during the regular season (conference tournament games do not count toward this minimum); of those 22, a minimum of 18 must be in-region games. Only games played against varsity intercollegiate teams of domestic, four-year, degree-granting institutions shall be considered in meeting the 22-game minimum or counted in a team's won-lost record.

Exhibition contest(s) against a non-Division II four-year collegiate institution exempted per Bylaw 17.3.6.4-(c) must be played between the first permissible date for practice and the first permissible contest date.

Participation Procedures

An institution desiring to participate in the championship must complete all games (including conference tournament games) before the final scheduled selection call of the Division II Women's Basketball Committee Sunday, March 4. If a conference is going to have a conflict with meeting this deadline, the conference commissioner should notify the Division II Women's Basketball Committee and/or the NCAA championship manager.

Qualifying Standards

Between teams that qualify automatically by conference berth and teams that are selected by the committee at large, eight teams will comprise each of the eight regional tournaments and these teams shall be paired strictly within region.

SECTION 2•4 SELECTION CRITERIA

The following criteria shall be employed by a governing sports committee in selecting participants for NCAA championships competition (Bylaw 31.3.3; Criteria for Selections of Participants):

- Won-lost record;
- Strength of schedule; and
- Nullification.

In addition to Bylaw 31.3.3, the women's basketball committee has received approval from the Division II Championships Committee to consider the following criteria in the selection of at-large teams for the women's basketball championship (not necessarily in priority order):

Primary Criteria.

- In-region Division II won-lost results;
- Overall Division II won-lost results;
- Head -to-head competition;
- Results versus common opponents;
- In-region Division II strength of schedule (opponents' average winning percentage and opponents' opponents' average winning percentage);
- Overall Division II strength of schedule (opponents' average winning percentage and opponents' opponents' average winning percentage);
- Results versus Division II ranked teams (all regions - previous week's rankings);
- Significant wins and losses (including, but not limited to the evaluation of results versus Division II opponents at and about .500; Division II road results (i.e. away or neutral sites.);
- Availability of student-athlete for championship competition.

Selection Date. Announcement of the acceptance of invitations to teams shall be made by the NCAA national office in accordance with procedures established by the committee. All selections will be completed on Sunday, March 4.

SECTION 2•5 SITE SELECTION

Any institution or conference interested in hosting a preliminary round of the 2012 NCAA Division II Women's Basketball Championship must submit a proposed budget, facility evaluation form, key contact form and video board questionnaire (if applicable) to be considered to host. A separate proposed budget and key contacts form must be submitted for each round that an institution or conference is interested in hosting.

Football

Determination of Competing Institutions

Proposed Budget/Financial Report

[Reference: Budgets in the Division II General Section and Bylaw 31.4 in the NCAA Manual.]

Institutions will be notified when proposed budget/financial report information is available for hosting preliminary rounds. Institutions interested in bidding for first-round, second-round, quarterfinal and/or semifinal competition should complete the online budget and other required forms.

The online version of the proposed budget and financial report form may be accessed on the NCAA Web site at http://web1.ncaa.org/champs_bid/exec/logout. Please note that the online form is password protected. Your institution's director of athletics should have the necessary membership database username and password on file. Written instructions on how to complete the automated forms are located at the site referenced above and on each sport specific Web site in the Documents and Forms section. If you have any questions regarding the process, please contact Mr. Wagner, championship manager for the NCAA Division II Football Championship.

Pertinent dates for the forms are as follows:

Information available on the NCAA website	Due date at the NCAA
October 12	November 3

An online financial report from each championship site must be submitted to the NCAA not later than 60 days after the competition. Failure to submit the online report by this deadline may result in financial penalties. Host institutions will access the forms online via the NCAA Web site.

Championship Structure

The Division II Football Championship provides for a maximum field of 24 teams. Eight first-round games will be conducted on the campus of one of the competing institutions. The top two seeds in each selection region (super regional) will receive a bye in the first round of the playoffs.

The winners of the first-round games in each super regional will advance to play one of the teams that received a bye in their super regional in the second round, on the campus of one of the competing institutions. The winners will meet in the quarterfinals on the campus of one of the competing institutions. Quarterfinal winners advance to play in the semifinals on the campus of one of the competing institutions.

The Division II championship bracket is listed in Appendix A.

Championship Selection

[Reference: Bylaws 31.01.2, 31.01.3, 31.02.4 and 31.3 in the NCAA Manual.]

Earned Access. No conference will receive automatic qualification for the 2011 NCAA Division II Football Championship. Earned access to the playoffs can be gained by a conference if a conference representative finishes in the top eight of the final super regional rankings. In addition, the top 10 teams will be ranked in each super regional.

All teams shall be selected by the Division II Football Committee, assisted by regional advisory committees that serve in an advisory capacity only. Teams will be selected no later than Sunday, November 13. All final regular-season games are encouraged to be started not later than 3 p.m. local time, Saturday, November 12.

All teams will be eligible for the Division II championship in the selection region (super regional) in which they are located geographically. There will be six teams selected per super regional to make up the field of 24 teams. The teams selected within each super regional will play each other in the first, second and quarterfinal rounds, with the super regional winners playing in the semifinals.

Pairings. Teams shall be paired according to seed.

The semifinals super regional rotation will be as follows:

- 2011—Super Regional Two vs. Super Regional Four/Super Regional One vs. Super Regional Three
2012—Super Regional Three vs. Super Regional Two/Super Regional One vs. Super Regional Four

The host institutions for semifinal competition shall be determined after quarterfinal competition, using seeding based on the selection criteria and the Division II site-selection criteria.

Selection Requirements. In order to be considered during the selection process, a

team must:

- Have an overall won-lost record of .500 or better against Division II opponents;
- Play at least eight Division II opponents during the regular season (there will be an appeals process available in 2011 if a given institution is not able to satisfy this requirement);
- Play at least 10 opponents during the regular season. An institution may submit a waiver request to the football committee for their consideration if a given institution is not able to satisfy this requirement.

Bylaw 31.3.3.1 – Countable Competition. For NCAA team-championship selection purposes, competition is countable only when the teams played are varsity intercollegiate teams of four-year, degree-granting institutions that conduct a majority of their competition in that team sport against varsity intercollegiate teams (see Constitution 3.2.4.4) of United States four-year, degree-granting institutions. Competition against service teams, professional teams, semiprofessional teams, amateur teams, two-year colleges and club teams shall be excluded.

Selection Criteria. The following criteria shall be employed by a governing sports committee in selecting participants for NCAA championships competition [Reference: *Bylaw 31.3.3 in the NCAA Manual; Criteria for Selection of Participants*]:

- Won-lost record;
- Strength of schedule;
- Availability of student-athletes for NCAA championships, and;
- Nullification.

In addition to Bylaw 31.3.3, the Division II Football Committee has received approval from the Division II Championships Committee to consider the following criteria in the selection of at-large teams for the Division II Football Championship (not necessarily in priority order):

Primary Criteria.

- In-region Division II won-lost results;
- Overall Division II won-lost results (winning percentage and total of Division II wins and losses);
- Overall Division II strength-of-schedule (SOS) (opponents' average winning percentage and opponents' opponents' average winning percentage) (see Appendix L for more details);
- Head-to-head competition;
- Results versus common opponents;
- Overall won-lost results;
- Division II won-lost results (games won-cumulative results of opponents; and games lost-cumulative results of opponents); and
- Results versus non-Division II opponents.

Tie-Breaking Procedures.

If the evaluation of the primary criteria does not result in a decision, the tie-breaking procedures will be reviewed. All the criteria listed below will be evaluated (listed in priority order).

- Head-to-head competition;

- Results against common opponents;
- Overall Division II Won-Lost Results (winning percentage and total of Division II wins and losses);
- Overall Division II Strength-of-Schedule (SOS).

Please note that this information above will be calculated for teams with a .500 or better Division II won-lost record. The evaluation of a team's Division II won-lost results will be weighted equally with the Division II SOS.

Additionally, input is provided by regional advisory committees for consideration by the football committee. Effective with the 2010 championship, all Division II sports committees are no longer required to conduct a follow-up call with all respective regional advisory committee members in a given selection region before making a final decision during the selection call. The national committee must notify the respective regional advisory committee members of the changes prior to public release. Notification may be sent via e-mail. Coaches' polls and/or any other outside polls or rankings are not used as a selection criterion by the football committee for selection purposes.

Forfeits

For the purpose of seeding and selection to the NCAA championship, there is no forfeit of a contest until the referee or other appropriate contest official has assumed jurisdiction of the contest in accordance with the applicable playing rules. When a team does not appear (e.g., due to weather conditions, accidents, breakdown of vehicles, illness or catastrophic causes), a forfeit is not recorded. An institution shall not, for statistical purposes, declare a forfeit for nonfulfillment of a contract. Such instances shall be considered a "no contest."

Certification of Eligibility/Availability

[Reference: *Certification of Eligibility/Availability in the Division II General Section, Constitution 3.2.4 and Bylaws 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 31.02.4 and 31.2.1.7 in the NCAA Manual.*]

Only student-athletes eligible under Bylaws 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 may compete in NCAA championships. In accordance with Constitution 3.2.4, member institutions are required to certify the eligibility of their student-athletes before the beginning of each academic year and to withhold ineligible student-athletes from all intercollegiate competition. Member institutions are reminded to notify the NCAA national office before the selection date for each championship of any student-athlete who may have participated in regular-season competition, but subsequently is determined to be ineligible or unavailable for NCAA championship competition.

Please note that based on the principles of nullification (see Appendix K for more details), a conference will lose earned access privileges to the championship if nullification penalties drop all conference teams out of the final top eight super regional ranking. The penalties for using an ineligible student-athlete during the 2011 season are as follows:

Overall Won/lost percentage: 0.025

Division II Won/lost percentage: 0.024

Division II Average Opponents' Won/lost percentage: 0.008

Division II Average Opponents' Opponents' Won/lost percentage: 0.003

In Region Won/lost percentage: 0.025

These penalties are applied to each game in which the ineligible student-athlete competed. This penalty is per student-athlete, per contest. If two student-athletes on a team were ineligible, multiply the penalty times two. The penalty would not be applied every week, but only at the end of the regular season (final ranking).

For the football championship, the NCAA championship manager must receive the eligibility verification form before October 27.

Instructions to Participants

Arrival Times at Playoff Sites

Institutions participating in first-round, second-round, quarterfinal and semifinal games shall arrive not later than two hours before the scheduled starting time. However, institutions must be represented by the head coach at the Friday night administrative meeting.

Teams participating in the national championship game shall arrive not later than noon Thursday. Exceptions to arrival times at competition sites must be approved by the Division II Football Committee.

Audio Coverage (Radio and Internet)

Please refer to the NCAA Broadcast Manual policies and guidelines that can be found at www.ncaa.com/broadcast.

Awards

[Reference: Awards in the Division II General Section and Bylaw 31.1.10 in the NCAA Manual.]

Official NCAA awards will be presented to the official traveling party for each championship. Trophies will be presented to the four teams that participate in the semifinal contests. Members of those teams will receive individual awards. Any member on the squad size of a team that participated in the championship, but did not advance to the semifinals, will receive participation awards. These awards will be sent to the institution's director of athletics after the competition.

Division II—Four trophies and 70 individual awards.

Balls

The Wilson F1001, F1003, F1004 and F1005 are the official balls of the championship, and will be used in all rounds of competition. Footballs to be used in all games are to be presented to the game officials at the pregame meeting.

Institutions will be allowed to choose which model of Wilson football they wish to use while on offense throughout the championship. Wilson will make the necessary preliminary arrangements to ensure that the correct model is shipped to each participating institution.

Game footballs will be distributed equally to each team after the game.

Banners, Cheerleaders, Mascots and Bands

Cheerleaders, dance team members and mascots shall be admitted, if in uniform, via the gate list furnished to the host institution by the competing schools' directors of athletics. A maximum of 24 cheerleaders plus one mascot and one cheerleader coach may be admitted. All other institutional representatives will be admitted only upon presentation of a ticket.

Score Reporting

The sports information director of the host institution, or an appointed representative, is responsible for reporting all tournament results promptly to the wire services, www.NCAA.com and regional news outlets. A standardized box score form for soccer will be sent in advance to the institutions serving as hosts to these games and also is available on the NCAA website.

Regular-Season Requirements. Throughout the regular season, all institutions sponsoring Division II men's soccer shall report their results in a timely fashion, regardless of their standing. Results (i.e., win-loss record and scores) must be entered into the online score reporting system making sure that the score, date and location are correct. This will ensure the men's soccer committee has accurate and complete information for its rankings and selections.

Even if scores are reported by the conference office, schools are ultimately responsible to ensure scores are entered by the deadline.

The host institutions shall be responsible for a general promotional campaign designed to highlight and increase interest in soccer competition in their respective districts. They shall channel information to their regional news outlets and other designated outlets, such as those at the site of the finals.

Releases should report up-to-date won-lost records of leading teams, selection and playoff plans, and data on outstanding players. Districts' publicity representatives will be the sports information directors of the institutions or the chairs of the respective advisory committees.

Your institution was required to provide your team's schedule on the statistics website by Wednesday, August 10. You will not need to access the score reporting system for men's soccer. Everything needed to supply the NCAA regarding statistics and score reporting for men's soccer will be handled through the statistics website at <http://web1.ncaa.org/stats/StatsSrv/login>. This information, along with instructions, was provided in an email sent to your institution July 21. Updated results will be gathered via XML files. Please contact Jeff Williams at 317/917-6138 or jswilliams@ncaa.org with questions regarding schedules and score reporting.

The regional advisory committee will conduct its weekly rankings on the following Tuesdays: October 11*, 18, 25 and November 1.

The national committee will conduct its weekly rankings on the following Wednesdays: October 12*, 19, 26 and November 2.

*Practice ranking, nonpublished

Scores for the final weekend of the season must be forwarded to the regional chair as soon as they are available, with final results due not later than 5 p.m. Sunday, November 6. As a reminder, please input these dates into your calendar. Additional results should be sent to ryurk@ncaa.org. If you have any questions regarding this process, please contact Russ Yurk at 317/917-6054.

Men's Soccer

Selection Information

[Reference: Bylaws 31.01.2, 31.01.3, 31.02.4 and 31.3 in the NCAA Division II Manual.]

Selections for the 2011 NCAA Division II Men's Soccer Championship will be announced Monday, November 7 via an online selection show on NCAA.com.

Selection Requirements. To be considered during the at-large selection process, a team must have an:

- Overall Division II won-lost-record of .500 or better.
- Compete in at least 15 contests, of which a minimum of 10 games must be played against in-region NCAA Division II opponents and at least one versus an in-region, non-conference NCAA Division II opponents, (if extenuating circumstances prevent an institution from meeting this requirement, the institution may request a waiver from the Men's Soccer Committee).

Bylaw 31.3.3.1 – Countable Competition. For NCAA team-championship selection purposes, competition is countable only when the teams played are varsity intercollegiate teams of four-year, degree-granting institutions that conduct a majority of their competition in that team sport against varsity intercollegiate teams (see Constitution 3.2.4.4) of four-year, degree-granting institutions located in Canada and the United States, its territories or possessions. Competition against service teams, professional teams, semiprofessional teams, amateur teams, two-year colleges and club teams shall be excluded.

Selection Criteria. The following criteria shall be employed by a governing sports committee in selecting participants for NCAA championships competition [Bylaw 31.3.3; Criteria for Selection of Participants]:

- Won-lost record;
- Strength of schedule;
- Availability of student-athletes for NCAA championships; and
- Nullification.

In addition to Bylaw 31.3.3, the Men's Soccer Committee has received approval from the Division II Championships Committee to consider the following criteria in the selection of at-large teams for the Division II Men's Soccer Championship (not in priority order):

Primary Criteria

- In-region Division II won-lost results;
- In-region Division II strength of schedule (opponents' average winning percentage and opponents' opponents' average winning percentage);
- Head-to-head competition;
- Results versus ranked (from the previous week) in-region teams;
- Results versus Division II opponents outside the conference;
- Strength of schedule versus Division II opponents outside the conference;
- Results versus common opponents;
- Results against Division II teams at or above .500 winning percentage; and

- Results against Division II teams below .500 winning percentage.

Once the Opponents' Average Winning Percentage (OWP) and Opponents' Opponents' Winning Percentage (OOWP) are calculated, they are to be combined on a weighted scale (e.g., 2/3 weight for OWP and 1/3 weight for OOWP) and this combined number becomes the strength of schedule.

Tie Breaker Criteria

If the evaluation of the primary criteria does not result in a decision, the tie breaking criteria will be reviewed. All the criteria listed will be evaluated (listed in priority order).

1. Head-to-head competition;
2. Results versus common opponents;
3. Results versus ranked (from the previous week) in-region teams; and
4. Division II in-region strength of schedule (opponents average winning percentage and opponents' opponents' average winning percentage).

Additionally, input is provided by regional advisory committees for consideration by the Men's Soccer Committee. A Division II governing sports committee must contact a regional advisory committee prior to making its final selection of teams if the committee selection differs from the regional advisory committee's. Coaches' polls and/or any other outside polls or rankings are not used as a selection criterion by the Men's Soccer Committee for selection purposes.

Pairings. Each participating team shall be assigned to a tournament site within the team's respective region.

1. Two to six teams will be selected from each of the eight geographic regions.
2. With the exception of the Central and South Central regions, teams from the same region will be paired for first round and second-round contests. Regions with four teams: The No. 1 seed of each region will play the No. 4 seed, while the No. 2 seed will play the No. 3 seed. Regions with six teams: The No. 3 seed of each region will play the No. 6 seed, while the No. 4 seed will play the No. 5 seed. Seeds No. 1 and 2 will have byes in the first round.
3. All pairings are outlined in Appendix A of this handbook.

Semifinal pairings will be rotated over a three-year period.

Travel Information. Transportation expenses and per diem will be provided for an official traveling party of 28. Please refer to the NCAA travel policies for all information regarding transportation and per diem expenses. Travel policies may be found online at www.ncaa.org. Registration with an institutional email address is required to access the membership portion of the NCAA website where the NCAA travel information is located. The NCAA travel department may be reached at 317/917-6757, or by email at travel@ncaa.org.

[Reference: Official Traveling Party, Transportation, Expense Forms and Per Diem in the Division II General Section, and Bylaw 31.4.6 in the NCAA Division II Manual]

Site Selection

General Requirements. The regional advisory committee chair, in consultation with the directors of athletics of the competing institutions, shall recommend the specific playing dates and times of the first-, second- and quarterfinal games. Those recommendations shall be subject to approval by the national committee.

It is recommended that all single-game sessions start at 1 p.m. or 7 p.m., if lights are available. Doubleheaders shall start at 10 a.m. or 4 p.m., if lights are available. All game times are subject to approval by the men's soccer committee. Game administration personnel should arrive at the site a minimum of two hours prior to kickoff. Scoreboards and public-address systems shall be tested the day before game day.

The first three rounds of the championship will be conducted on the campuses of the participating institutions. Third-place games will not be conducted. The 2011 semifinals and final will be hosted by the University of West Florida in Pensacola, Florida. It will be a dual championship with women's soccer.

A competing institution that cannot charge admission at its home facility, cannot establish a barrier to separate the spectators from the field of play or that does not have a field that meets minimum-size requirements (65 yards x 110 yards) may not serve as host. Preference will be given to institutions with grass fields 70 yards x 115 yards and larger. Grass-like artificial turf is considered a grass field. Institutions serving as host for all rounds of competition must charge admission.

An evaluation will be made of institutional facilities to determine if they are acceptable for championship play. Selection of host sites will be based partly on the quality of the playing facility. An online facility evaluation form must be completed by each institution interested in hosting the championship and will be one of the tools used in making this determination. The form must be submitted online to the NCAA national office by the indicated deadline.

Institutions with inadequate playing surfaces (e.g., artificial, carpet-like surface, minimum dimensions, etc.) may request a waiver of the policy. An institution with artificial turf that is requesting a waiver should submit two proposed budgets for each round of competition in which it is interested in hosting: one for its artificial-turf site and one for an alternate site with natural grass, in case the scenario develops that it may be paired with another institution that has artificial turf. If the opponent has no objection, the game could be played on artificial turf. It is the responsibility of the regional chair to speak with both institutions regarding this situation (if it presents itself) before the committee's Monday conference call to select subsequent-round sites. For purposes of this guideline, "artificial turf" means that an institution has played more than 50 percent of its home games on artificial turf. In Division II, carpet-like surfaces are considered an inadequate playing surface.

Site Selection. For the championship, the top-seeded team, as determined by the Men's Soccer Committee, shall be provided the opportunity to host the competition, provided the specific criteria that have been developed by the committee have been met as well as the following general site-selection criteria:

1. Quality and availability of the facility and other necessary accommodations;
 - a. Field surface and size. A competing institution that cannot charge admission at its

Women's Soccer

schedules and score reporting.

The regional advisory committee will conduct its weekly rankings on the following Tuesdays: October 11*, 18, 25 and November 1.

The national committee will conduct its weekly rankings on the following Wednesdays: October 12*, 19, 26 and November 2.

*Practice ranking, nonpublished.

Scores for the final weekend of the season must be forwarded to the regional chair as soon as they are available, with final results due not later than 5 p.m. Sunday, November 6. As a reminder, please input these dates into your calendar. Additional results should be sent to adunigan@ncaa.org. If you have any questions regarding this process, please contact Ashley Dunigan at 317/917-6515.

Selection Information

[Reference: Bylaws 31.01.2, 31.01.3 31.02.4 and 31.3 in the NCAA Division II Manual.]

Selections for the 2011 NCAA Division II Women's Soccer Championship will be announced Monday, November 7 via an online selection show on NCAA.com.

Countable Games. Only games listed on the institution's schedule submitted via the online reporting system will be considered for tournament selection purposes. A minimum number of 10 in-region games must be scheduled to be eligible for consideration for the women's soccer championship.

Pairings. Each participating team shall be assigned to a tournament site within the team's respective region. Regional seeding will be used in making pairings for first- and second-round competition.

1. Six teams will be selected from each of the eight geographical regions.
2. Teams will be paired in their respective regions with the No. 4 seed versus No. 5 seed; No. 3 seed versus No. 6 seed on Friday. The winner of No. 4/5 seed will play the No. 1 seed and the winner of No. 3/6 seed will play the No. 2 seed in the games played on Sunday.
3. For each round of competition, the top-seeded teams (for preliminary rounds) as determined by the committee, shall be offered the opportunity to host provided that minimum site selection criteria are met and a bid has been submitted.
4. The third and quarterfinal pairings along with the semifinal pairings are outlined on page 14-15 of this manual.

Selection Requirements. To be considered during the at-large selection process, a team must have an in-region won-lost record of .500 or better.

Bylaw 31.3.3.1 - Countable Competition. For NCAA team-championship selection purposes, competition is countable only when the teams played are varsity intercollegiate teams of four-year, degree-granting institutions that conduct a majority of their competition in that team sport against varsity intercollegiate teams (see Constitution 3.2.4.4) of four-year, degree-granting institutions located in Canada and the United States, its territories or possessions. Competition against service teams, professional teams, semiprofessional teams, amateur teams, two-year colleges and club teams shall be excluded.

Selection Criteria. The following criteria shall be employed by a governing sports

committee in selecting participants for NCAA championships competition [Bylaw 31.3.3; Criteria for Selection of Participants]:

- Won-lost record;
- Strength of schedule;
- Availability of student-athletes for NCAA championships; and
- Nullification;

In addition to Bylaw 31.3.3, the Division II Women's Soccer Committee has received approval from the Division II Championships Committee to consider the following criteria in the selection of at-large teams for the Division II Women's Soccer Championship (not necessarily in priority order):

Primary Criteria

- In-region Division II won-lost results;
- In-region Division II strength of schedule (opponents average winning percentage and opponents' opponents' average winning percentage);
- Head-to-head competition;
- Results versus ranked teams (previous week's ranking);
- Results versus Division II opponents outside the conference;
- Strength of schedule versus Division II opponents outside the conference (opponents average winning percentage and opponents' opponents' average winning percentage); and
- Results versus common opponents.

Once the Opponents' Average Winning Percentage (OWP) and Opponents' Opponents' Winning Percentage (OOWP) are calculated, they are to be combined on a weighted scale (e.g., 2/3 weight for OWP and 1/3 weight for OOWP) and this combined number becomes the strength of schedule.

Tie-Breaking Procedures

If the evaluation of the primary criteria does not result in a decision, the tie-breaking procedures will be reviewed. All the criteria listed will be evaluated listed in priority order:

1. Head to head competition;
2. Results versus common opponents;
3. Results versus ranked (from the previous week) in-region teams; and
4. Division II in-region strength of schedule (opponents average winning percentage and opponents' opponents' average winning percentage).

Additionally, input is provided by regional advisory committees for consideration by the Division II Women's Soccer Committee. A Division II governing sports committee must contact a regional advisory committee prior to making its final selection of teams or individuals if the committee selection differs from the regional advisory committee's. Coaches' polls and/or any other outside polls or rankings are not used as a selection criterion by the Division II Women's Soccer Committee for selection purposes.

Travel Information. Please refer to the NCAA travel policies for all information regarding transportation and per diem expenses. Travel policies may be found online at www.ncaa.org. Registration with an institutional email address is required to access

SECTION 2 • DETERMINATION OF CHAMPIONSHIP PARTICIPATION

SECTION 2.1 CHAMPIONSHIP FORMAT

The championship provides for a field of 64 teams. Four teams will participate at each of sixteen regional sites in a double-elimination tournament. The sixteen teams advancing from regional competition will participate in a two-team, best of three super regional at eight sites.

The finals will include the eight super regional winners.

Four-Team Regionals

The procedures outlined below shall be used in the conduct of all sixteen softball regional competitions.

The regionals will be conducted for a three-day period beginning Friday, May 4. All regional competition should be completed no later than the Sunday prior to the super regionals. [Exception (i.e. weather) may preclude the completion of competition by Sunday]

If the regular game schedule is altered because of weather or unforeseen circumstances, the following guidelines may be used and teams will be informed by the NCAA representatives: (1) No more than three games by any one team will be scheduled in one day; (2) If possible, games will not be scheduled to begin prior to 9 a.m. or after midnight; (3) If competition cannot be completed Saturday, the last time to start a regional championship game (i.e. Games 6 and "if" 7) to complete regional finals is the Sunday immediately preceding the super regional at 11:59 p.m.; (4) If play is suspended before games 6 and 7 and the regional competition ceases, see the rain delay advancement formula (page 17) outlined in this handbook.

Prospective host institutions must submit recommended starting times for all games with the pre-bid materials for approval by the Women's Softball Committee.

For all regional competitions the following procedure will be observed.

Day 1:	Game 1	Team A vs. Team B
	Game 2	Team C vs. Team D
Day 2:	Game 3	Winner Game 1 vs. Winner Game 2
	Game 4	Loser Game 1 vs. Loser Game 2
	Game 5	Winner Game 4 vs. Loser Game 3
Day 3:	Game 6	Winner Game 3 vs. Winner Game 5
	Game 7	Winner Game 6 vs. Loser Game 6 (if necessary)

It should be noted that the pairing in the bracket may not be altered, and the game times during the tournament may not be adjusted.

For additional information regarding the regional bracket, please refer to Appendix E.

Two-Team Super Regional

The procedures outlined below shall be used in the conduct of all eight super regional competitions.

The super regional will be conducted in a two-day period beginning Friday, May 11. All super regional competition should be completed not later than the Saturday prior to finals [Exception (i.e., weather) may preclude the completion of competition by Sunday].

Super regionals will follow the inclement weather policy stated on page 12.

Day 1	Game 1	Team A vs. Team B
Day 2	Game 2	Team A vs. Team B
	Game 3	(if necessary)

Start Times

Starting times for regionals and super regionals will be recommended by the host institutions during the bid process, subject to the approval of the NCAA softball committee. Game times should be set 2 hours apart and must follow the championship format on below.

Regional and super regional game time policies:

Thursday or Friday Games shall be scheduled between noon-8:30 p.m.

Saturday games shall be scheduled between 10 a.m. and 8:30 p.m.

Sunday games shall be schedule between noon and 8:30 p.m.

The committee shall determine game times for the finals.

Travel Party

[Reference: *Official Traveling Party, Uniforms in this handbook and Per Diem and Transportation in the Division II General Section*].

Transportation expenses and per diem will be provided for an official traveling party of 26.

Please refer to the NCAA Travel policies for all information regarding transportation and per diem expenses. Travel policies can be found online at www.ncaa.org/financial/travelforms.html.

Squad Size

Each team is limited to 20 eligible players in uniform.

After a regional has begun, no changes may be made in a team roster for any reason. This procedure also will be followed at the super regionals and finals, although the same players need not be designated for regional play and finals competition.

The number of people allowed in the dugout shall not exceed 26.

An institution that is advised it is in violation of this regulation and does not promptly conform to it automatically shall forfeit the competition. There shall be no inordinate delay of the contest to allow a competing institution to conform to the rule.

There will be no exceptions regarding this section.

SECTION 2.2 RESULTS

Team Schedules and Rosters. Deadline – January 20: Team schedules must be input on the stats site. Reference the schedule instructions for more information. Rosters should be updated prior to the team's first contest.

Regional Ranking

Published rankings will be released on www.NCAA.com the last three weeks of the regular season (April 11, 18, and 25)

Volleyball

At-Large Selection

Once the automatic qualification berths have been designated for each region, the remaining regional spots will be selected at-large. To be considered during the at-large selection process:

- Only the best three-of-five-set match format will be considered.
- A team must play a minimum of 60 percent of an institution's matches against other Division II teams.
- A team must play a minimum of 15 matches against Division II opponents.
- A team must have a Division II won-lost record of .500 or better.

Selection Criteria.

The following criteria shall be employed by a governing sports committee in selecting participants for NCAA championships competition [Bylaw 31.3.3; Criteria for Selection of Participants]:

- Won-lost record;
- Strength of schedule;
- Availability of student-athletes for NCAA championships; and
- Nullification;

In addition to Bylaw 31.3.3, the volleyball committee will use the following criteria to rank teams throughout the season and evaluate and select teams for the championship (not listed in priority order):

Primary Criteria

- Head-to-head results;
- In-region results (includes, not in priority order, in-region won-loss record, results versus regionally ranked teams in their region, teams in the region above and equal to .500 and teams in the region below .500);
- Results versus common opponents; and
- In-region strength of schedule/record and Division II strength of schedule/record (includes average opponents' winning percentage and average opponents' opponents' winning percentage).

Tie-Breaking Procedures

If the evaluation of the primary criteria does not result in a decision, the committee will select teams based on the following criteria, (listed in rank priority order):

- Head-to-head results;

- In-region results;
- Results versus in-region common opponents;
- In-region strength of schedule;
- Results versus out-of-region common opponents;
- Division II strength of schedule;
- In-region record; and
- Overall Division II record.

Bylaw 31.3.3.1 – Countable Competition.

For NCAA team-championship selection purposes, competition is countable only when the teams played are varsity intercollegiate teams of four-year, degree-granting institutions that conduct a majority of their competition in that team sport against varsity intercollegiate teams (see Constitution 3.2.4.4) of United States four-year, degree-granting institution. Competition against service teams, professional teams, semiprofessional teams, amateur teams, two-year colleges and club teams shall be excluded.

Site Selection

Regional competition will take place on the campus of a participating institution from each respective region. Regional hosts will be determined on November 13 when teams are selected to the championship. The quarterfinals, semifinals and finals matches will be played on the campus of one of the eight teams advancing to the national championship. The host will be announced November 20. Information and instructions for submitting bids to host regional and national competition will be distributed October 10 and will be posted on the NCAA website (NCAA.org, Championships, DII Women's Volleyball).

APPENDIX G • PERFORMANCE INDICATOR BREAKDOWN

Performance Indicator (PI)

- Division II Games only (with neutral option)
- 23-Win on road against a .750 or above team
- 22-Win neutral site game against a .750 or above team
- 21-Win at home against a .750 or above team
- 20-Win on road against a .500-.749 team
- 19-Win neutral site game against a .500-.749 team
- 18-Win at home against a .500-.749 team
- 17-Win on road against a .250-.499 team
- 16-Win neutral site game against a .250-.499 team
- 15-Win at home against a .250-.499 team
- 14-Win on road against a .000-.249 team
- 13-Win neutral site game against a .000-.249 team
- 12-Win at home against a .000-.249 team
- 11-Road loss to .750 or above team
- 10-Neutral site loss to a .750 or above team
- 9-Home loss to a .750 or above team
- 8-Road loss to a .500-.749 team
- 7-Neutral site loss to a .500-.749 team
- 6-Home loss to a .500-.749 team
- 5-Road loss to a .250-.499 team
- 4-Neutral site loss to a .250-.499 team
- 3-Home loss to a .250-.499 team
- 2-Road loss to a .000-.250 team
- 1-Neutral site loss to a .000-.250 team
- 0-Home loss to a .000-.250 team

Total points/total games = PI Value

Note: Point values change each time an opponent's record places them in a different winning percentage range.

**CHAMPIONSHIPS ELIGIBILITY FOR 2011-12
NCAA DIVISION II PRINCIPLES OF NULLIFICATION**

1. Opponents of an ineligible individual or team that competes with an ineligible player should not be adversely affected.
2. The ineligible student-athlete and the institution he or she represents will be penalized. As it relates to access to NCAA championships, a penalty will be assessed to the selection criteria, which may impact the individual's and/or team's opportunity for selection to postseason competition.
3. All contests in which an ineligible student-athlete competes will be nullified (win, lose or tie). The nullification of a contest will penalize only the individual and/or institution using an ineligible student-athlete.
4. The number of nullified contests is identified and the penalty is assessed for each nullified contest. If a student-athlete was deemed ineligible and then reinstated through the NCAA reinstatement process, only those contests in which the student-athlete competed while ineligible will be nullified. The competition prior to or after that time will not be nullified.
5. A penalty will be applied in two categories: the win-loss record percentage and the strength-of-schedule index (overall and in-region, if applicable).
6. The penalty assessed will vary from sport to sport. It will be a mathematical calculation that is relevant to each sport and reduces the percentage of the win- loss record and the strength-of-schedule index. The calculation will be determined in conjunction with the NCAA statistics department.
7. The value of the nullification will be consistent across sports; however, the actual mathematical calculation (number) could be different because of factors such as number of games played. (Example: The nullification may be worth 2 percentage points; however, that equates to .025 for one sport and .063 for another sport).
8. Information regarding the penalties for nullification will be part of the selection criteria for each sport.
9. In team sports, a team's won-lost record that falls below .500 after adjustments for nullification(s) will be ineligible for championships selections to fill at-large berths. In addition, in football, a conference will lose earned access privileges to the championship if nullification penalties drop all conference teams out of the top eight super regional ranking.

10. For individual sports (i.e., qualifying standards in swimming and diving), if a student-athlete achieved the qualifying standard while ineligible, the qualifying standard would not be recognized as eligible for selection to the championship. If the student-athlete achieved the qualifying standard while eligible, became ineligible and was reinstated, the qualifying standard would be eligible for selection to the championship.
11. For individual/team sports (i.e., golf); if the student-athlete competed while ineligible, the score achieved by the student-athlete would be deleted from the team score. In the case of golf (play 5 count 4), the fifth score would be calculated into the team score.
12. Nullifications do not carry over to the next academic year for eligibility violations detected after the season is complete.

The penalties for using an ineligible student-athlete during the 2011-12 season are as follows:

	Overall Won/Loss Percentage	DII W/L	DII Avg Opp W/L	DII Avg Opp/Opp W/L	In Region W/L	In Region Avg Opp W/L	In-Region Avg Opp/Opp W/L
<u>FALL SPORTS</u>							
Field Hockey	-	0.073	0.017	0.005	0.073	-	-
Football	0.024	0.024	0.006	0.003	0.024	-	-
Men's Soccer	-	-	-	-	0.043	0.010	0.004
Women's Soccer	-	-	-	-	0.031	0.009	0.004
Volleyball	-	0.026	0.009	0.003	0.027	0.008	0.004
<u>WINTER SPORTS</u>							
Men's Basketball	-	0.023	0.007	0.002	0.023	0.007	0.002
Women's Basketball	-	0.025	0.005	0.003	0.025	0.005	0.003
<u>SPRING SPORTS</u>							
Baseball	-	0.024	0.006	0.003	0.025	0.006	0.003
Men's Lacrosse	-	0.066	0.015	0.007	0.068	-	-
Women's Lacrosse	-	0.033	0.013	-	0.032	-	-
Softball	-	0.023	0.008	0.002	0.024	0.008	0.003
Men's Tennis	0.049	0.052	0.022	0.008	0.055	-	-
Women's Tennis	0.036	0.038	0.016	0.007	0.040	-	-

In addition, each team must submit the mid-season verification form. The form will be used to verify the eligibility of student-athletes for NCAA championships selections. The form is not intended to require schools to recertify the eligibility of every student-athlete. Rather, the form is to ensure that eligibility questions are resolved during the season instead of schools delaying eligibility questions until after the championship has been completed.

FIGURE 17-1
2011-12 Academic Year
Maximum Number of Contests and Dates of Competition for Each Sport

Sport	Contests	Dates of Competition
Baseball	50	
Basketball	26	
Bowling, Women's		26
Cross Country*		7
Equestrian		15
Fencing		11
Field Hockey		
Championship Segment	18	
Nonchampionship Segment		5
Football	11	
Golf		21
Gymnastics		13
Ice Hockey, Men's	32	
Ice Hockey, Women's	34	
Lacrosse, Men's		17
Lacrosse, Women's		
Championship Segment		17
Other Segment		5
Rifle		13
Rowing, Women's		20
Rugby, Women's	11	
Skiing		16 (Alpine) 16 (Nordic)
Soccer		
Championship Segment	18	
Other Segment		5
Softball	56	
Squash, Women's		15
Swimming		16
Tennis		
Overall**		25
Individual Singles and/or Doubles Tournaments		7
Track and Field (Indoor and Outdoor)***		18
Volleyball, Men's		
Championship Segment		28
Other Segment		4
Volleyball, Women's		
Championship Segment		26
Other Segment		4
Water Polo, Men's		21
Water Polo, Women's		21
Wrestling		16

* See Bylaw 17.5.7.1.1 for institutions that sponsor men's or women's cross country but do not sponsor indoor or outdoor track and field.

** See Bylaw 17.22.7.1 (25 dates of competition, including not more than seven individual singles and/or doubles tournaments).

*** See Bylaw 17.24.1 for institutions that sponsor indoor and outdoor track and field and participate in at least the minimum number of contests with at least the minimum number of participants.

- (b) **Local Anesthetics.** The Executive Committee will permit the limited use of local anesthetics under the following conditions:
 - (1) That procaine, xylocaine, carbocaine or any other local anesthetic may be used, but not cocaine; *(Revised: 12/9/91, 5/6/93)*
 - (2) That only local or topical injections can be used (i.e., intravenous injections are not permitted); and
 - (3) That use is medically justified only when permitting the athlete to continue the competition without potential risk to his or her health.
- (c) **Manipulation of Urine Samples.** The Executive Committee bans the use of substances and methods that alter the integrity and/or validity of urine samples provided during NCAA drug testing. Examples of banned methods are catheterization, urine substitution and/or tampering or modification of renal excretion by the use of diuretics, probenecid, bromantan or related compounds, and epitestosterone administration. *(Revised: 8/15/89, 6/17/92, 7/23/97)*
- (d) **Beta-2 Agonists.** The use of beta-2 agonists is permitted by inhalation only. *(Adopted: 8/13/93)*
- (e) **Additional Analysis.** Drug screening for select nonbanned substances may be conducted for non-punitive purposes. *(Revised: 8/15/89)*

31.2.3.4.2 Positive Drug Test—Non-NCAA Athletics Organization. A student-athlete under a drug-testing suspension from a national or international sports governing body that has adopted the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) code shall not participate in NCAA intercollegiate competition for the duration of the suspension. *(Adopted: 1/14/97 effective 8/1/97, Revised: 1/10/05 effective 8/1/05)*

31.2.3.5 Medical Exceptions. Exceptions for categories (a), (b), (c), (d), (f), (g) and (h) under Bylaw 31.2.3.4 may be made by the Executive Committee for those student-athletes with a documented medical history demonstrating the need for regular use of such a drug. *(Revised: 1/10/00, 4/11/06, 1/5/07 effective 8/1/07, 4/28/09)*

31.2.3.6 Methods for Drug Testing. The methods and any future modifications authorized by the Executive Committee for drug testing of student-athletes shall be posted on the NCAA website. Copies of the modifications shall be available to member institutions.

31.2.3.7 Events Identified for Drug Tests. The Executive Committee shall determine the regular-season and postseason competition for which drug tests shall be made and the procedures to be followed in disclosing its determinations.

31.2.3.8 Individual Eligibility—Team Sanctions. Executive regulations pertaining to team-eligibility sanctions for positive tests resulting from the NCAA drug-testing program shall apply only in the following situation: If a student-athlete is declared ineligible before an NCAA team championship or a certified postseason football game and the institution knowingly allows him or her to participate, all team-ineligibility sanctions shall apply (i.e., the team shall be required to forfeit its awards and any revenue distribution it may have earned, and the team's and student-athlete's performances shall be deleted from NCAA records). In the case of certified postseason football contests, the team's and student-athlete's performances shall be deleted from NCAA records. *(Revised: 1/10/90)*

31.3 SELECTION OF TEAMS AND INDIVIDUALS FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS PARTICIPATION

A list of the institutions in good standing shall be supplied by the championships staff liaison to the chair of each governing sports committee prior to selection of the championship participants in each Division II championship sport. *(Revised: 1/9/06 effective 8/1/06)*

31.3.1 Size of Championships Fields. The size of all NCAA championships fields shall be established by the Championships Committee to provide for efficient management of the events, adequate NCAA championship opportunities relative to the nationwide quality of competition and sound economic administration of the financial resources of the Association and its championships. *(Revised: 8/13/93, 1/14/97 effective 8/1/97)*

31.3.2 Selection Decisions of Sports Committees. The determination of sites, selection of teams or individuals, or their site assignment in championships competition made by a governing sports committee (or a designated subcommittee) may not be appealed.

31.3.3 Criteria for Selection of Participants. The following criteria shall be employed by a governing sports committee in selecting participants for NCAA championships competition, and a governing sports committee that wishes to use additional criteria must obtain Championships Committee approval before doing so:

- (a) Won-lost record;
- (b) Strength of schedule;
- (c) Availability of student-athletes for NCAA championships *(Revised: 1/9/06 effective 8/1/06)*; and
- (d) Nullification. *(Revised: 1/9/06 effective 8/1/06)*

31.3.3.1 Countable Competition. For NCAA team-championship selection purposes, competition is countable only when the teams played are varsity intercollegiate teams of four-year, degree-granting institutions that conduct a majority of their competition in that team sport against varsity intercollegiate teams (see Constitution 3.2.4.4) of four-year, degree-granting institutions located in Canada and the United States, its territories or possessions. Competition against service teams, professional teams, semiprofessional teams, amateur teams, two-year colleges and club teams shall be excluded. *(Revised: 2/4/08)*

31.3.3.2 Qualifying Standards. Individuals and teams required to meet performance standards to qualify for NCAA championships competition shall achieve such standards in meets held during the same academic year as the particular championship.

31.3.3.3 Unavailable Players on Team. The presence on a varsity squad of one or more players who are unavailable for NCAA championships competition does not necessarily disqualify that team from consideration. *(Revised: 1/9/06 effective 8/1/06)*

31.3.3.4 Nullification(s) when a Student-Athlete Participates in Competition while Ineligible for Use of Banned Drugs. Nullifications shall only be imposed when an institution permits a student-athlete to participate in intercollegiate competition after the institution and the student-athlete receive notification of the confirmed positive drug test. *(Adopted: 1/11/08)*

31.3.3.5 Committee Member Participation in Selection Process. All members of a governing sports committee may participate in committee deliberations and vote on the teams or student-athlete(s) under consideration for selection. If a team or student-athlete(s) of the institution of a member of the governing sports committee is under consideration for selection a member of the regional advisory committee in that sport, who represents another member conference, shall participate in the discussions affecting that particular selection. *(Revised: 10/28/10)*

31.3.3.5.1 Waiver Opportunity. The conference shall advise the NCAA championships staff in writing by September 1 of each year whether it wishes the selection process set forth in Bylaw 31.3.3.5 to be applied or waived. Once the conference has indicated its intention regarding the application or waiver of this regulation, it may not be changed during that year.

31.3.3.5.1.1 First Waiver. Conferences that fail to meet the deadline may appeal to the Management Council for a waiver of the deadline. Such an appeal must be submitted to the national office not later than October 15. If the Management Council grants the appeal, the conference shall be granted a waiver. *(Revised: 12/4/89)*

31.3.3.5.1.2 After Waivers. Such a conference that fails to meet the September 1 deadline in a future year may be granted a waiver only on payment of a penalty of \$150 for the second offense and \$300 for each additional offense during the five-year period after the last offense. On approval of the Management Council of such waiver and receipt of the conference's check in the national office, the conference may use the selection process set forth in Bylaw 31.3.3.5, provided it is otherwise eligible to do so.

31.3.3.6 Exclusion of Institution Reclassifying from Division II to Division I. In all sports, any Division II institution that has forwarded to the national office written notice of its intention to change its membership classification to Division I, no longer shall be eligible to participate in any future NCAA Division II championship. *(Adopted: 1/11/94 effective 8/1/94, Revised: 1/11/00 effective 8/1/00, for those institutions that begin the reclassification period 9/1/00)*

31.3.4 Automatic Qualification. Each governing sports committee may recommend annually to the Championships Committee those multisport voting conferences that should receive automatic qualification for their teams into NCAA championships conducted in team sports as identified in Bylaw 17.02.15.1. The decision of the Championships Committee shall be final. Before recommending that a conference receive automatic qualification, a governing sports committee shall ensure that the member conference meets the requirements specified in Bylaws 31.3.4.3 through 31.3.4.5. Further, automatic qualification will be considered only in those sports that have a championship bracket of 48 or more teams. *(Revised: 1/14/97 effective 8/1/97)*

31.3.4.1 Exception—Men's and Women's Tennis. Automatic qualification may be considered in men's or women's tennis once the championships field includes 48 or more teams. *(Adopted: 1/14/02)*

31.3.4.2 Exception—Men's Golf. Automatic qualification may be considered in men's golf once the championships field includes 48 or more teams. *(Adopted: 1/10/03)*

31.3.4.3 General Requirements—Division Championship. To be eligible for automatic qualification in any Division II championship, a member conference must meet the following general requirements: *(Revised: 1/9/06, 12/5/06)*

- (a) Conference competition conducted in accordance with Constitution 3.3.1 must be conducted in the applicable sport and the conference champion in that sport must be determined not later than the date on which participants are selected for the NCAA championship, either by regular in-season conference competition or a conference meet or tournament, as indicated at the time of application. If a conference's competition to determine its automatic qualifier is unexpectedly terminated (e.g., due to inclem-

ent weather), the conference may designate its qualifier, provided it has established objective criteria for making that designation and has communicated that information to the appropriate sports committee by a specified deadline. (*Revised: 8/13/93, 1/10/03*)

- (b) In the event of a tie for the conference championship, the conference shall have the responsibility of determining which team or individual shall represent the conference in NCAA competition. If a playoff is held, such competition shall be considered conference competition, not NCAA competition.
- (c) A conference may establish subdivisions and conduct competition within each subdivision to determine a conference champion, as long as each subdivision consists of at least four members. Conferences with subdivisions of four members must conduct double round-robin competition within each subdivision, plus a postseason tournament, to determine their champion. Conferences with subdivisions of five or more members may conduct either single or double round-robin competition within each subdivision, plus a postseason tournament to determine their champion. (*Revised: 12/9/91, 10/18/95*)
- (d) The conference must maintain and actively enforce compliance with eligibility rules at least as stringent as those in Bylaw 14 applicable to its members. The use of an ineligible player by a team in a conference that has been granted automatic qualification may result in the involved team being denied the right to be the automatic entry in the NCAA championship. The governing sports committee may recommend loss of the automatic-qualification privilege for the conference during the season in which the violation occurred or for a future championship.
- (e) Competition in the applicable sport must be of sufficient quality to warrant automatic qualification. The criteria for determining the quality of competition shall be win-loss record and strength of schedule of both the conference as a whole and its individual member institutions.
- (f) All eligible member institutions must agree to participate in the appropriate NCAA championship. If a conference champion is ineligible to compete, declines to compete or cannot compete for any reason, automatic qualification shall be withdrawn for that year, and the remaining conference members shall be considered at large. Automatic qualification for a conference shall not be withdrawn if a conference champion declines to compete in an NCAA championship for reasons related to written religious policies against competition on certain days. (*Revised: 1/10/00*)
- (g) All institutions may hold membership in only that conference in the sport in which automatic qualification is sought and may participate in only that conference's process to determine the automatic qualifier. (*Adopted: 12/5/94, Revised: 1/7/06*)

31.3.4.3.1 Notification, Automatic Qualification in Jeopardy. A governing sports committee must issue a written warning one year in advance to a conference that is in jeopardy of losing its automatic qualification.

31.3.4.4 Requirements—National Collegiate Championship. [#] To be eligible for automatic qualification in a National Collegiate Championship, a member conference must meet the following general requirements: (*Adopted: 1/9/06*)

- (a) Have at least six active members that sponsor the applicable sport in any division (Note: A provisional member in the process of becoming an NCAA member cannot be used to meet the requisite number);
- (b) The six active members must have conducted conference competition together for the preceding two years in the applicable sport;
- (c) There shall be no waivers of the two-year waiting period; and
- (d) Any new member added to a conference that is eligible for an automatic bid shall be immediately eligible to represent the conference as the automatic qualifier.

31.3.4.5 Additional Requirements. The conference must have:

- (a) Been a multisport voting member conference of the Association for two consecutive academic years. The Championships Committee may grant a waiver of the two-year waiting period; (*Revised: 12/6/92*)
- (b) Conducted competition in the sport in question for two consecutive years at the time of its application for automatic qualification. The Championships Committee may grant a waiver of the two-year waiting period; and
- (c) Have at least six members that sponsor the sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis in the division in which automatic qualification is sought and that are eligible for the NCAA championship, and have had at least six members that are eligible for the NCAA championship participate in the process that determines the automatic qualifier. (*Revised: 8/15/89*)

31.3.4.5.1 Exception—Multisport Conference. A multisport conference that adds a conference-sponsored sport may be considered for automatic qualification in that sport, provided the conference includes at least six active NCAA Division II institutions that have conducted conference competition together at the Division II level in the sport the preceding two years and the sport is sponsored by less than 50 percent of the Division II membership. (*Adopted: 1/5/07*)

31.3.4.5.2 Grace Period. A conference shall remain eligible for automatic qualification for two years following the date of withdrawal of the institution(s) that causes the conference's membership to fall below six institutions, provided the conference maintains at least five active members. *(Adopted: 7/22/08)*

31.3.4.6 Limitation on Automatic-Qualifying Positions per Conference. A member conference that satisfies the general requirements for automatic qualification is eligible for one automatic qualification per applicable sport (see Bylaws 31.3.4.3, 31.3.4.4 and 31.3.4.5). *(Adopted: 7/26/11)*

31.3.4.7 Limitations on Automatic-Qualifying Positions. The sports committees must limit the number of automatic-qualifying positions to be awarded in relationship to the size of the championships fields and the number of at-large positions that must remain open for other member institutions. *(Revised: 1/14/97 effective 8/1/97)*

31.3.4.8 Earned Access—Football. The Division II Football Committee shall award earned access to the NCAA Division II Football Championship to Division II football-playing conferences for which at least one member institution finishes in the top eight of the final NCAA Division II football regional ranking. The earned access shall go to the conference's highest-ranked team in the final regional Top 10 poll. *(Adopted: 1/12/04, Revised: 10/26/09)*

31.3.5 Selection of Balance of Championship Field. Once the official representative(s) of each qualifying conference is determined, the governing sports committee responsible for selection of the balance of the championship field shall consider objectively and without prejudice the competitive records of all other eligible student-athletes and teams (including representatives of the other members of the conferences receiving automatic qualification). To the best of its ability, the committee shall select the most highly qualified individuals and teams to complete the championship field in accordance with the regional structure, if any, approved for the particular championship.

31.3.6 Institution Trademarks. Participation in a National Collegiate Championship constitutes acquiescence by the member institution that the Association may use the institution's name, mascot and other identifying marks in championship-related activities, including television, promotion, licensing and merchandising programs incident to the championship. Revenues derived from such activities, less expenses, will be remitted to the member institution. *(Revised: 11/3/93)*

31.4 FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION OF CHAMPIONSHIPS

31.4.1 Host Institution's Responsibility. The host institution shall administer the finances of an NCAA championship in accordance with this bylaw and consistent with the institution's championship budget, as submitted to and approved by the governing sports committee and the Championships Committee.

31.4.1.1 Institution's Financial Report. A financial report from each championship site shall be submitted to the NCAA president not later than 60 days after the conclusion of the competition and shall bear certification of the athletics director of the host institution. The report shall be submitted on a form approved and provided by the NCAA president.

31.4.1.1.1 Exclusions. A host institution or sponsoring agency shall not include, in its financial report or in its percentage of net receipts, television rights fees or income from the sale of championships merchandise. Also, income from program advertising or sales shall not be included in the host institution's or sponsoring agency's financial report or percentage of net receipts if the program is produced and sold under contract between the NCAA and an outside agency.

31.4.2 Gross Receipts. Gross receipts shall be all revenues derived from the championship, including:

- (a) Sale of tickets. All tickets shall be accounted for at face value and shall become a part of gross receipts. Working passes may be provided to bona fide working personnel, including media representatives; and participation passes may be provided to student-athletes competing in the championship, as well as to their coaches, athletic trainers, managers and other members of the participating institution's official party as defined by the Association;
- (b) Net revenue from marketing items sold at the site through or by an outside agency under contract with the NCAA;
- (c) Program sales and advertising;
- (d) Radio, television and movie rights; and
- (e) Any other income derived from the operation of the championship.

31.4.2.1 Exclusions. Income from concessions and parking shall accrue to the host institution or sponsoring agency and is not included in gross receipts. Sales commissions received by a host institution for selling marketing items on behalf of an outside agency under contract with the NCAA shall accrue to the host institution.

31.4.2.2 Waiver. Any waiver of the policies for the gross receipts of championships shall be approved in advance by the Championships Committee.

31.4.3 Game Expenses. Game expenses are the actual costs directly related to the administration and conduct of the championship, including specifically the costs for tickets (printing, selling and collecting), sales taxes, ushers, game officials, police, buildings and grounds expenses, printing of related materials, motion pictures of the competition (if authorized by the Championships Committee), reasonable entertainment, expenses of selection

SPORT	MIN. NO. OF CONTESTS FOR SPONSORSHIP	MIN. NO. OF CONTESTS FOR SELECTIONS	MAX. NO. OF CONTESTS/DATES
Baseball	24	24	50 contests
Men's Basketball	22	22 overall; 18 in region	26 contests
Women's Basketball	22	22 overall; 18 in region	26 contests
Cross Country	5	4 - no double duals to count toward min.	7 dates
Field Hockey	10	10; 6 in region	18 contests
Football	8	10 (8 Division II)	11 contests
Men's Golf	6	7 (4 – spring); 12 rounds (6 – spring)	21 dates
Women's Golf	6	15 – 18 hole rounds (6 – spring); 12 of the 15 rounds must be 5 team tournaments.	21 dates
Men's Lacrosse	8	8	17 dates
Women's Lacrosse	8	10	17 dates
Women's Rowing	6	5 (3 in region – Spring)	20 dates
Men's Soccer	10	10 in region	18 contests
Women's Soccer	10	10 in region	18 contests
Softball	24	24	56 contests with no tournament exception
Swimming/Diving	8	None	16 dates
Tennis	10	10	25 dates
Track and Field – outdoor	4	4 with 14 participants – no double duals to count toward minimum.	18 dates total indoor and outdoor
Track and Field – indoor	4	3 with 10 participants - no double duals to count toward minimum.	18 dates total indoor and outdoor
Volleyball	9	15 Division II matches; 60% must be against Division II teams.	26 dates
Wrestling	12	None	16 dates

Men's Soccer

Pages 40-44

-Men's soccer teams have a tendency to play games outside of Division II.

-Most conferences leave room for games outside of the conference schedule.

Conference Games Scheduled				
Season Max: 18				
Region	Conference	2008	2009	2010
West	CCAA	16	16	16
Central	RMAC	14	14	14
Midwest	GLVC	12	14	14
East	NE-10	12	13	13
Midwest	GLIAC	8	8	12
West	PAC West	12	12	12
East	CACC	11	11	11
Southeast	C-Carolinas	10	10	11
West	GNW	8	8	10
Atlantic	PSAC	13	13	9
Atlantic	WVIAC	10	10	9
Southeast	SAC	8	8	9
South	SSC	8	8	8
South Central	Heartland	10	10	8
South Central	LSC	6	6	8
Southeast	PBC	6	8	8
East	ECC	8	7	7
South	GSC	8	7	7
Atlantic	CIAA	0	0	0
Central	NSIC	0	0	0
South	SIAC	0	0	0
South Central	MIAA	0	0	0

Women's Soccer

Pages 33-38

-High number of required conference games.

-Fewer out of Division games compared to Men's soccer, but still may be problematic because of higher conference game requirements.

Conference Games Scheduled				
Season Max: 18				
Region	Conference	2008	2009	2010
South Central	MIAA	16	16	16
West	CCAA	16	16	16
East	NE-10	14	15	15
Atlantic	PSAC	14	14	14
Central	RMAC	14	14	14
Midwest	GLIAC	14	14	14
Midwest	GLVC	12	14	14
West	GNW	12	12	14
Central	NSIC	13	13	13
Southeast	C-Carolinas	11	11	12
West	PAC West	12	12	12
East	CACC	11	12	12
South Central	LSC	10	10	11
South	GSC	9	9	10
Southeast	PBC	8	10	10
South Central	Heartland	12	12	10
Atlantic	WVIAC	10	10	9
Southeast	SAC	8	8	9
South	SSC	8	8	8
East	ECC	9	7	7
Atlantic	CIAA	0	0	0
South	SIAC	0	0	0

Men's Basketball

Pages 9-15

-High number of conference games required.

-Number of games against non-Division II schools may be problematic considering the high number of conference games.

Conference Games Scheduled				
Season Max: 26				
Region	Conference	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
South	SIAC	24	24	24
West	CCAA	22	22	22
South Central	MIAA	20	20	22
East	NE-10	22	22	22
Central	NSIC	20	20	22
Central	RMAC	22	22	22
Atlantic	WVIAC	20	22	22
East	ECC	18	21	21
South Central	LSC	19	19	20
Midwest	GLIAC	22	19	19
East	CACC	16	18	18
Atlantic	CIAA	18	18	18
Midwest	GLVC	18	18	18
West	GNW	16	16	18
West	PAC West	12	16	18
Southeast	PBC	20	18	18
Atlantic	PSAC	18	18	18
Southeast	SAC	16	16	18
South	SSC	18	18	18
Southeast	C-Carolinas	20	20	17
South Central	Heartland	16	16	12
South	GSC	10	(10/12)	(10/12)

Women's Basketball

Pages 17-23

-High number of conference games required.

-Number of games against non-Division II schools may be problematic considering the high number of conference games.

Conference Games Scheduled				
Season Max: 26				
Region	Conference	2008	2009	2010
South	SIAC	24	24	24
West	CCAA	22	22	22
South Central	MIAA	20	20	22
East	NE-10	22	22	22
Central	NSIC	20	20	22
Central	RMAC	22	22	22
Atlantic	WVIAC	20	22	22
East	ECC	18	21	21
South Central	LSC	20	20	21
East	CACC	17	19	19
Southeast	C-Carolinas	22	22	19
Midwest	GLIAC	22	19	19
Atlantic	CIAA	18	18	18
Midwest	GLVC	18	18	18
West	GNW	16	16	18
West	PAC West	12	16	18
Southeast	PBC	20	18	18
Atlantic	PSAC	18	18	18
Southeast	SAC	16	16	18
South	SSC	18	18	18
South	GSC	10	(10/12)	(10/12)
South Central	Heartland	14	14	10

Women's Volleyball

Pages 25-31

-Most regions and conferences have the opportunity to play Division II in-region non-conference games.

-Teams play a moderate number of out of Division games.

Conference Games Scheduled				
Season Max: 26				
Region	Conference	2008	2009	2010
West	CCAA	22	22	22
Atlantic	CIAA	16	18	22
South Central	MIAA	20	20	20
Central	NSIC	20	20	20
Central	RMAC	20	20	20
East	CACC	17	19	19
Midwest	GLIAC	16	16	19
Atlantic	PSAC	19	19	19
West	GNW	16	16	18
Southeast	SAC	16	16	18
South	SIAC	18	18	18
Southeast	C-Carolinas	20	20	16
West	PAC West	16	16	16
East	NE-10	14	15	15
Midwest	GLVC	18	14	14
South Central	LSC	13	13	14
Southeast	PBC	10	14	14
South	SSC	14	14	14
Atlantic	WVIAC	15	14	14
East	ECC	16	12	12
South Central	Heartland	14	14	12
South	GSC	12	10	10

Baseball

Pages 54-60

-The number of conference games scheduled and games played against non-Division II opponents.

-There were a few institutions with a high number of out of Division II games that played within a conference that required a high number of conference games.

Conference Games Scheduled				
Season Max: 50				
Region	Conference	2008	2009	2010
South Central	MIAA	40	40	44
West	CCAA	40	40	40
Central	RMAC	40	40	40
Midwest	GLIAC	35	35	36
Midwest	GLVC	24	32	36
South Central	LSC	44	44	36
West	GNW	32	32	32
Central	NSIC	32	32	32
West	PAC West	24	32	32
East	ECC	24	30	30
Atlantic	WVIAC	16	16	30
South Central	Heartland	49	49	30
Atlantic	CIAA	18	22	28
Southeast	C-Carolinas	24	24	27
Southeast	SAC	24	24	27
South	SSC	27	27	27
East	NE-10	30	26	26
Southeast	PBC	27	24	24
Atlantic	PSAC	24	24	24
South	SIAC	21	21	21
East	CACC	27	20	20
South	GSC	18	15	15

Softball

Pages 46-52

-The number of conference games scheduled and games played against non-Division II opponents.

-There were a few institutions with a high number of out of Division II games that played within a conference that required a high number of conference games.

Conference Games Scheduled				
Season Max: 56				
Region	Conference	2008	2009	2010
Central	RMAC	40	40	40
West	CCAA	36	36	36
Midwest	GLIAC	26	26	32
West	GNW	40	40	32
South	GSC	32	32	32
East	NE-10	28	30	30
East	ECC	18	28	28
West	PAC West	24	32	28
South	SSC	27	27	27
East	CACC	24	24	26
Midwest	GLVC	24	28	26
Central	NSIC	26	26	26
Atlantic	WVIAC	28	28	26
Southeast	C-Carolinas	18	18	22
South Central	MIAA	20	20	22
South Central	LSC	24	24	21
Southeast	PBC	18	20	20
Atlantic	PSAC	20	20	20
Southeast	SAC	16	16	18
South	SIAC	18	18	18
Atlantic	CIAA	22	22	16
South Central	Heartland	28	21	15

Men's Basketball 2010-2011

Atlantic Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
CIAA (18)	Fayetteville St.	29	4	1	0	3
	Livingstone	29	3	0	0	3
	Johnson C. Smith	28	2	1	0	1
	Winston-Salem	27	2	0	0	2
	Virginia St.	27	1	0	0	1
	Chowan	27	1	1	0	0
	Lincoln (PA)	27	1	1	0	0
	Elizabeth City St.	28	1	0	0	1
	St. Augustine's	27	0	0	0	0
	Virginia Union	24	0	0	0	0
	St. Paul's	26	0	0	0	0
	Bowie St.	29	0	0	0	0
	Shaw	32	0	0	0	0
Independent	Washington	28	9	2	0	7
	Salem Int'l	26	6	0	2	4
	Dist. Columbia	26	2	0	0	2
PSAC (18)	Bloomsburg	26	4	0	0	4
	Slippery Rock	32	4	0	1	3
	Clarion	26	4	0	1	3
	West Chester	26	2	0	2	0
	California (PA)	27	2	0	0	2
	Edinboro	28	2	0	1	1
	Shippensburg	26	1	0	0	1
	Mansfield	28	1	0	0	1
	East Stroudsburg	28	1	0	0	1
	Kutztown	27	1	0	1	0
	Gannon	26	1	0	0	1
	Indiana (PA)	32	1	0	1	0
	Mercyhurst	27	0	0	0	0
	Cheyney	28	0	0	0	0
	Millersville	25	0	0	0	0
	Lock Haven	25	0	0	0	0
WVIAC (22)	Bluefield St.	27	3	1	0	2
	Wheeling Jesuit	28	2	0	0	2
	Pitt.-Johnstown	28	2	0	0	2
	Fairmont St.	27	1	0	0	1
	West Va. Wesleyan	30	1	0	0	1
	Concord	27	1	0	0	1
	Davis & Elkins	27	1	0	0	1
	Glenville St.	26	1	1	0	0
	West Liberty	34	0	0	0	0
	West Virginia St.	30	0	0	0	0
	Alderson-Broadus	31	0	0	0	0
	Seton Hill	30	0	0	0	0
	Charleston (WV)	28	0	0	0	0
	Shepherd	29	0	0	0	0
	Ohio Valley	27	0	0	0	0

Men's Basketball 2010-2011

Central Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Northern Sun (22)	Northern St.	26	4	0	1	3
	Minn.-Crookston	26	4	0	2	2
	Augustana (SD)	27	4	0	0	4
	Minn. St. Moorhead	27	4	0	2	2
	Bemidji St.	26	3	0	2	1
	St. Cloud St.	29	2	0	2	0
	Southwest Minn.	26	2	1	1	0
	Wayne St. (NE)	27	2	0	0	2
	Concordia-St. Paul	27	2	0	1	1
	Minn. Duluth	26	2	0	2	0
	Winona St.	30	1	0	1	0
	Minn. St. Mankato	33	1	0	1	0
	Upper Iowa	26	1	0	0	1
	Mary	29	0	0	0	0
RMAC (22)	Colo. Christian	27	5	1	0	4
	Western N.M.	30	4	4	0	0
	Adams St.	29	4	0	0	4
	Regis (CO)	26	3	0	2	1
	N.M. Highlands	27	3	0	0	3
	Colorado St.-	26	3	0	1	2
	Colorado Mines	31	2	0	0	2
	Chadron St.	26	2	0	0	2
	Western St.	27	2	2	0	0
	UC-Colo. Springs	26	1	0	0	1
	Colorado Mesa	28	1	0	0	1
	Metro St.	30	1	0	0	1
	Neb.-Kearney	27	0	0	0	0
	Fort Lewis	32	0	0	0	0

East Region

CACC (18)	Nyack	26	2	0	0	2
	Wilmington (DE)	26	1	1	0	0
	Philadelphia U.	27	0	0	0	0
	Holy Family	27	0	0	0	0
	Chestnut Hill	28	0	0	0	0
	Concordia (NY)	26	0	0	0	0
	Caldwell	26	0	0	0	0
	Dominican (NY)	29	0	0	0	0
	Post	28	0	0	0	0
	USciences	25	0	0	0	0
	Bloomfield	33	0	0	0	0
	Felician	27	0	0	0	0
	Goldey-Beacom	30	0	0	0	0

Men's Basketball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
ECC (21)	Dowling	27	1	1	0	0
	Molloy	27	0	0	0	0
	C.W. Post	31	0	0	0	0
	NYIT	28	0	0	0	0
	Queens (NY)	28	0	0	0	0
	St. Thomas	26	0	0	0	0
	Bridgeport	28	0	0	0	0
	Mercy	26	0	0	0	0
Northeast-10 (22)	American Int'l	29	1	1	0	0
	Southern N.H.	26	1	0	1	0
	Saint Rose	31	0	0	0	0
	Pace	27	0	0	0	0
	Stonehill	30	0	0	0	0
	Assumption	29	0	0	0	0
	New Haven	26	0	0	0	0
	Bentley	32	0	0	0	0
	Saint Michael's	28	0	0	0	0
	Franklin Pierce	27	0	0	0	0
	Southern Conn. St.	27	0	0	0	0
	Le Moyne	27	0	0	0	0
	St. Anselm	28	0	0	0	0
	Mass.-Lowell	30	0	0	0	0
	Adelphi	31	0	0	0	0
	Merrimack	27	0	0	0	0

Midwest Region

GLIAC (19)	Ohio Dominican	26	6	1	0	5
	Lake Superior St.	27	5	0	3	2
	Northern Mich.	26	4	0	2	2
	Lake Erie	26	4	0	0	4
	Grand Valley St.	27	4	0	1	3
	Findlay	28	4	0	0	4
	Ashland	26	3	0	0	3
	Saginaw Valley	27	3	1	0	2
	Northwood (MI)	28	3	2	0	1
	Hillsdale	26	2	0	0	2
	Tiffin	26	2	0	0	2
	Ferris St.	32	2	1	1	0
	Wayne St. (MI)	30	1	0	0	1
	Michigan Tech	28	1	0	1	0
GLVC (18)	Maryville (MO)	26	7	1	1	5
	Rockhurst	27	6	1	2	3
	Southern Ind.	30	6	0	1	5
	Missouri S&T	25	6	0	3	3
	Indianapolis	28	5	0	1	4
	Drury	31	5	0	3	2
	Lewis	31	5	0	2	3
	Mo.-St. Louis	27	5	0	2	3

Men's Basketball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
GLVC (continued)	Ky. Wesleyan	29	4	0	1	3
	Quincy	27	4	0	1	3
	St. Joseph's (IN)	27	3	0	1	2
	Bellarmine	35	3	0	1	2
	Wis.-Parkside	27	3	0	1	2
	Ill.-Springfield	25	3	0	2	1
	Northern Ky.	30	3	0	2	1
	William Jewell	0	0	0	0	0

South Central Region

Heartland (N/A)	Dallas Baptist	32	8	0	2	6
	Okla. Panhandle	28	6	4	0	2
	Tex. A&M Int'l	30	5	1	0	4
	St. Edward's	26	5	2	1	2
	Tex. Permian Basin	28	4	0	1	3
	Ark. - Fort Smith	29	4	0	0	4
	Newman	27	4	0	0	4
	St. Mary's (TX)	27	4	0	1	3
Lone Star (20)	Cameron	29	6	1	0	5
	Midwestern St.	34	4	0	0	4
	Tarleton St.	30	3	0	0	3
	East Central	27	3	0	0	3
	Tex. A&M-	26	3	1	1	1
	Central Okla.	34	3	0	0	3
	Northeastern St.	26	3	1	0	2
	Tex. A&M-	27	2	0	1	1
	Eastern N.M.	27	2	0	0	2
	West Tex. A&M	30	2	0	0	2
	Southeastern Okla.	26	2	1	0	1
	Southwestern Okla.	29	2	0	0	2
	Abilene Christian	26	1	0	0	1
	Incarnate Word	26	1	0	0	1
	Angelo St.	26	0	0	0	0
MIAA (22)	Emporia St.	30	4	1	0	3
	Truman	26	3	1	0	2
	Central Mo.	29	3	0	1	2
	Mo. Southern St.	31	2	0	0	2
	Southwest Baptist	29	2	0	0	2
	Pittsburg St.	26	2	0	0	2
	Washburn	28	2	0	0	2
	Fort Hays St.	33	2	0	0	2
	Neb. Omaha	28	2	0	1	1
	Northwest Mo. St.	26	2	0	0	2
	Mo. Western St.	28	1	0	0	1
	Lincoln (MO)	26	0	0	0	0

Men's Basketball 2010-2011

South Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Gulf South (10/12)	West Ala.	26	7	1	1	5
	Valdosta St.	30	6	0	0	6
	Arkansas Tech	31	6	0	0	6
	West Ga.	27	6	0	0	6
	Ouachita Baptist	26	5	0	0	5
	Ark.-Monticello	27	5	2	0	3
	Southern Ark.	26	5	0	0	5
	Delta St.	28	5	0	0	5
	Henderson St.	26	5	0	0	5
	Christian Bros.	28	4	0	0	4
	North Ala.	29	4	1	0	3
	Harding	30	3	0	0	3
	West Fla.	26	3	1	0	2
	Ala.-Huntsville	34	2	0	0	2
SIAC (24)	Miles	27	2	0	0	2
	LeMoyne-Owen	29	2	1	1	0
	Stillman	32	2	1	0	1
	Morehouse	28	1	0	0	1
	Paine	28	1	0	0	1
	Albany St. (GA)	29	1	1	0	0
	Tuskegee	28	1	1	0	0
	Claflin	28	0	0	0	0
	Benedict	29	0	0	0	0
	Clark Atlanta	31	0	0	0	0
	Fort Valley St.	29	0	0	0	0
	Kentucky St.	28	0	0	0	0
	Lane	28	0	0	0	0
Sunshine State (18)	Saint Leo	28	4	0	0	4
	Tampa	29	4	0	1	3
	Rollins	32	3	0	0	3
	Nova Southeastern	27	3	0	0	3
	Eckerd	30	3	0	0	3
	Barry	27	3	1	0	2
	Florida Tech	31	3	1	0	2
	Fla. Southern	32	2	0	0	2
	Lynn	27	0	0	0	0

Southeast Region

Conference Carolinas (17)	King (TN)	34	17	1	1	15
	Erskine	26	3	1	0	2
	St. Andrews	27	3	0	0	3
	Coker	28	2	0	0	2
	Lees-McRae	26	2	0	0	2
	Belmont Abbey	28	1	0	0	1
	Queens (NC)	29	1	1	0	0
	Pfeiffer	27	0	0	0	0
	Limestone	30	0	0	0	0
	Barton	28	0	0	0	0
	Mount Olive	27	0	0	0	0

Men's Basketball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Peach Belt (18)	Clayton St.	29	6	0	0	6
	Ga. Southwestern	29	6	2	0	4
	Francis Marion	27	4	0	0	4
	Lander	26	4	1	0	3
	Columbus St.	26	4	0	0	4
	North Ga.	26	4	0	0	4
	UNC Pembroke	30	3	0	0	3
	Flagler	26	3	0	0	3
	Armstrong	26	3	0	0	3
	Montevallo	30	2	0	0	2
	Augusta St.	34	2	0	0	2
	S.C. Aiken	27	1	0	0	1
	Georgia College	26	1	0	0	1
South Atlantic (18)	Tusculum	30	4	1	0	3
	Lincoln Memorial	30	4	0	0	4
	Carson-Newman	27	4	0	1	3
	Anderson (SC)	33	2	1	0	1
	Brevard	27	2	0	0	2
	Newberry	27	1	0	0	1
	Lenoir-Rhyne	26	1	1	0	0
	Catawba	28	0	0	0	0
	Wingate	29	0	0	0	0
	Mars Hill	26	0	0	0	0

West Region

CCAA (22)	Cal St. Chico	27	5	0	2	3
	Cal St. Stanislaus	27	5	1	2	2
	Cal St. L.A.	28	5	0	2	3
	Cal Poly Pomona	28	4	0	2	2
	Humboldt St.	30	4	0	2	2
	San Fran. St.	27	4	2	2	0
	Cal St. Monterey	26	4	2	2	0
	Cal St. Dom. Hills	30	3	0	2	1
	Cal St. San B'dino	27	3	0	2	1
	UC San Diego	28	2	0	2	0
	Sonoma St.	26	2	0	2	0
	Cal St. East Bay	26	0	0	0	0

Men's Basketball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Great Northwest (18)	Alas. Anchorage	34	6	3	0	3
	Western Ore.	29	4	0	1	3
	Western Wash.	27	4	0	2	2
	Northwest	27	3	0	0	3
	Saint Martin's	29	2	0	1	1
	Central Wash.	30	2	0	0	2
	Alas. Fairbanks	25	2	0	0	2
	Mont. St. Billings	26	1	0	0	1
	Simon Fraser	24	1	0	0	1
	Seattle Pacific	30	1	0	1	0
Pacific West (18)	Chaminade	29	4	3	1	0
	Hawaii Pacific	28	4	1	2	1
	Academy of Art	26	4	0	1	3
	Hawaii Hilo	27	3	0	2	1
	Notre Dame de Namur	26	3	1	1	1
	BYU-Hawaii	31	2	1	0	1
	Grand Canyon	26	2	1	0	1
	Dixie St.	29	2	0	0	2

Women's Basketball 2010-2011

Atlantic Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
CIAA (18)	Winston-Salem	28	2	1	0	1
	St. Augustine's	30	1	0	0	1
	Virginia Union	26	1	0	1	0
	Elizabeth City St.	29	1	1	0	0
	Lincoln (PA)	27	1	1	0	0
	Chowan	28	0	0	0	0
	Virginia St.	28	0	0	0	0
	St. Paul's	26	0	0	0	0
	Bowie St.	28	0	0	0	0
	Johnson C. Smith	31	0	0	0	0
	Shaw	37	0	0	0	0
	Fayetteville St.	27	0	0	0	0
	Livingstone	26	0	0	0	0
Independent	Washington	27	10	0	2	8
	Salem Int'l	26	5	0	0	5
	Dist. Columbia	28	0	0	0	0
PSAC (18)	Mansfield	26	2	0	0	2
	Bloomsburg	28	2	0	0	2
	Lock Haven	25	1	0	0	1
	Indiana (PA)	27	1	0	1	0
	Mercyhurst	30	0	0	0	0
	West Chester	27	0	0	0	0
	Shippensburg	26	0	0	0	0
	Edinboro	30	0	0	0	0
	Clarion	26	0	0	0	0
	Gannon	26	0	0	0	0
	Millersville	29	0	0	0	0
	California (PA)	31	0	0	0	0
	Slippery Rock	26	0	0	0	0
	Kutztown	27	0	0	0	0
	East Stroudsburg	26	0	0	0	0
	Cheyney	26	0	0	0	0
WVIAC (22)	Glennville St.	33	1	1	0	0
	Concord	29	1	0	0	1
	West Virginia St.	29	1	1	0	0
	Bluefield St.	27	1	0	0	1
	Ohio Valley	27	1	0	0	1
	West Va. Wesleyan	28	0	0	0	0
	Shepherd	28	0	0	0	0
	Wheeling Jesuit	27	0	0	0	0
	Charleston (WV)	32	0	0	0	0
	West Liberty	32	0	0	0	0
	Alderson-Broaddus	27	0	0	0	0
	Davis & Elkins	29	0	0	0	0
	Pitt.-Johnstown	28	0	0	0	0
	Fairmont St.	27	0	0	0	0
	Seton Hill	29	0	0	0	0

Women's Basketball 2010-2011

Central Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Northern Sun (22)	St. Cloud St.	26	4	0	1	3
	Augustana (SD)	30	3	0	1	2
	Minn.-Crookston	27	3	0	1	2
	Bemidji St.	26	3	0	1	2
	Minn. St. Mankato	26	3	0	1	2
	Minn. St. Moorhead	27	2	0	0	2
	Mary	26	1	0	0	1
	Northern St.	30	1	0	1	0
	Winona St.	30	1	0	1	0
	Minn. Duluth	27	1	0	1	0
	Southwest Minn.	26	1	0	1	0
	Upper Iowa	26	0	0	0	0
	Concordia-St. Paul	30	0	0	0	0
	Wayne St. (NE)	30	0	0	0	0
RMAC (22)	Colo. Christian	29	2	1	0	1
	N.M. Highlands	30	2	0	0	2
	Adams St.	33	2	0	1	1
	Colorado Mesa	27	1	0	1	0
	Regis (CO)	26	1	0	0	1
	Neb.-Kearney	27	1	0	0	1
	Colorado St.-	27	1	0	1	0
	Western N.M.	26	1	1	0	0
	Western St.	27	1	0	0	1
	Metro St.	33	1	0	0	1
	Chadron St.	26	0	0	0	0
	Colorado Mines	27	0	0	0	0
	UC-Colo. Springs	26	0	0	0	0
	Fort Lewis	31	0	0	0	0

East Region

CACC (19)	Nyack	27	1	0	0	1
	Philadelphia U.	27	1	0	1	0
	Chestnut Hill	26	0	0	0	0
	Goldey-Beacom	30	0	0	0	0
	Wilmington (DE)	26	0	0	0	0
	Concordia (NY)	26	0	0	0	0
	Holy Family	29	0	0	0	0
	Caldwell	27	0	0	0	0
	Post	26	0	0	0	0
	Dominican (NY)	27	0	0	0	0
	USciences	27	0	0	0	0
	Felician	27	0	0	0	0
	Bloomfield	28	0	0	0	0
	Georgian Court	26	0	0	0	0

Women's Basketball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
ECC (21)	Queens (NY)	29	1	1	0	0
	Molloy	29	0	0	0	0
	St. Thomas Aquinas	29	0	0	0	0
	C.W. Post	30	0	0	0	0
	NYIT	26	0	0	0	0
	Dowling	29	0	0	0	0
	Bridgeport	31	0	0	0	0
	Mercy	26	0	0	0	0
Northeast-10 (22)	American Int'l	29	1	1	0	0
	Pace	33	0	0	0	0
	Stonehill	28	0	0	0	0
	Saint Rose	29	0	0	0	0
	Southern N.H.	28	0	0	0	0
	Assumption	30	0	0	0	0
	New Haven	26	0	0	0	0
	Bentley	33	0	0	0	0
	Saint Michael's	27	0	0	0	0
	Franklin Pierce	32	0	0	0	0
	Southern Conn. St.	27	0	0	0	0
	Le Moyne	26	0	0	0	0
	St. Anselm	27	0	0	0	0
	Mass.-Lowell	27	0	0	0	0
	Adelphi	26	0	0	0	0
	Merrimack	27	0	0	0	0

Midwest Region

GLIAC (19)	Ohio Dominican	26	5	1	0	4
	Lake Erie	25	4	1	0	3
	Hillsdale	27	2	0	0	2
	Findlay	27	2	0	0	2
	Michigan Tech	34	2	0	1	1
	Grand Valley St.	28	2	0	0	2
	Lake Superior St.	26	2	0	1	1
	Wayne St. (MI)	26	1	0	0	1
	Northwood (MI)	27	1	0	1	0
	Northern Mich.	26	1	0	1	0
	Ashland	29	1	0	0	1
	Saginaw Valley	26	0	0	0	0
	Ferris St.	26	0	0	0	0
	Tiffin	27	0	0	0	0
GLVC (18)	Maryville (MO)	26	7	1	3	3
	Rockhurst	26	6	1	2	3
	Mo.-St. Louis	27	5	0	2	3
	Ill.-Springfield	26	5	0	3	2
	Missouri S&T	28	5	0	4	1
	Wis.-Parkside	31	4	0	1	3
	Ky. Wesleyan	27	4	0	1	3
	Northern Ky.	28	3	0	1	2

Women's Basketball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
GLVC (continued)	Drury	30	3	0	2	1
	Indianapolis	30	3	0	1	2
	Quincy	30	3	0	1	2
	Lewis	31	2	0	1	1
	Bellarmine	27	2	0	1	1
	Southern Ind.	27	2	0	1	1
	St. Joseph's (IN)	27	1	0	1	0
	William Jewell	0	0	0	0	0

South Central Region

Heartland (N/A)	Tex. A&M Int'l	27	6	2	2	2
	Tex. Permian Basin	29	4	0	1	3
	Newman	27	4	0	0	4
	St. Edward's	28	4	1	1	2
	Ark. - Fort Smith	26	3	0	0	3
	Okla. Panhandle	26	3	0	0	3
	St. Mary's (TX)	27	0	0	0	0
Lone Star (21)	East Central	27	3	0	0	3
	Tex. A&M-Kingsville	26	2	1	0	1
	Cameron	28	1	0	0	1
	Southeastern Okla.	28	1	0	0	1
	Southwestern Okla.	26	1	0	0	1
	Tarleton St.	30	1	0	0	1
	Tex. A&M-Commerce	26	1	0	0	1
	Eastern N.M.	26	1	1	0	0
	Texas Woman's	33	1	0	0	1
	Northeastern St.	30	1	1	0	0
	Midwestern St.	26	1	0	0	1
	Incarnate Word	26	0	0	0	0
	Abilene Christian	27	0	0	0	0
	West Tex. A&M	28	0	0	0	0
	Angelo St.	27	0	0	0	0
	Central Okla.	32	0	0	0	0
MIAA (22)	Neb. Omaha	26	3	1	0	2
	Southwest Baptist	26	3	1	0	2
	Northwest Mo. St.	34	2	0	0	2
	Mo. Southern St.	27	2	0	0	2
	Central Mo.	29	2	0	0	2
	Emporia St.	29	1	1	0	0
	Truman	27	1	0	1	0
	Fort Hays St.	26	1	0	0	1
	Washburn	29	1	0	0	1
	Pittsburg St.	28	0	0	0	0
	Lincoln (MO)	26	0	0	0	0
	Mo. Western St.	27	0	0	0	0

Women's Basketball 2010-2011

South Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Gulf South (10/12)	Valdosta St.	27	6	1	0	5
	Arkansas Tech	33	5	0	0	5
	West Fla.	26	5	0	0	5
	West Ala.	27	4	0	0	4
	Henderson St.	26	4	1	0	3
	Christian Bros.	26	4	0	0	4
	Harding	28	4	0	0	4
	Ark.-Monticello	26	3	2	0	1
	North Ala.	28	3	0	0	3
	West Ga.	27	3	0	0	3
	Delta St.	32	3	0	0	3
	Ala.-Huntsville	26	2	0	0	2
	Ouachita Baptist	29	2	0	0	2
	Southern Ark.	24	1	0	0	1
SIAC (24)	Paine	27	3	0	0	3
	Miles	29	3	0	0	3
	Stillman	28	3	1	0	2
	Claflin	27	2	0	0	2
	LeMoyne-Owen	27	2	1	1	0
	Clark Atlanta	27	1	0	0	1
	Tuskegee	28	1	0	0	1
	Lane	26	0	0	0	0
	Benedict	28	0	0	0	0
	Fort Valley St.	32	0	0	0	0
	Albany St. (GA)	29	0	0	0	0
	Kentucky St.	28	0	0	0	0
Sunshine State (18)	Rollins	29	3	0	0	3
	Tampa	29	3	0	1	2
	Lynn	27	3	0	0	3
	Eckerd	28	1	0	0	1
	Florida Tech	33	1	0	0	1
	Saint Leo	27	1	1	0	0
	Barry	27	1	0	0	1
	Nova Southeastern	27	1	0	0	1
	Fla. Southern	31	0	0	0	0

Southeast Region

Conference Carolinas (19)	King (TN)	32	8	0	1	7
	Coker	26	3	2	0	1
	Lees-McRae	26	3	0	0	3
	Converse	27	2	2	0	0
	Erskine	27	2	2	0	0
	Pfeiffer	27	1	1	0	0
	St. Andrews	24	1	0	0	1
	Limestone	28	1	0	0	1
	Barton	31	0	0	0	0
	Queens (NC)	28	0	0	0	0
	Mount Olive	29	0	0	0	0
	Belmont Abbey	27	0	0	0	0

Women's Basketball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Peach Belt (18)	Clayton St.	29	6	0	0	6
	Ga. Southwestern	29	6	2	0	4
	Francis Marion	27	4	0	0	4
	Lander	26	4	1	0	3
	Columbus St.	26	4	0	0	4
	North Ga.	26	4	0	0	4
	UNC Pembroke	30	3	0	0	3
	Flagler	26	3	0	0	3
	Armstrong	26	3	0	0	3
	Montevallo	30	2	0	0	2
	Augusta St.	34	2	0	0	2
	S.C. Aiken	27	1	0	0	1
	Georgia College	26	1	0	0	1
	North Ga.	28	5	0	0	5
South Atlantic (18)	Armstrong	26	3	0	0	3
	Montevallo	27	3	0	1	2
	Augusta St.	26	3	1	0	2
	Ga. Southwestern	26	3	0	0	3
	Flagler	26	2	1	0	1
	Francis Marion	28	2	0	0	2
	S.C. Aiken	33	1	1	0	0
	Georgia College	29	1	0	0	1
	UNC Pembroke	27	1	1	0	0
	Columbus St.	27	1	0	0	1
	Lander	33	1	1	0	0
	Clayton St.	36	0	0	0	0

West Region

CCAA (22)	Cal St. San B'dino	29	4	0	2	2
	Cal St. Stanislaus	27	3	0	2	1
	Cal St. L.A.	26	3	0	2	1
	Cal Poly Pomona	33	3	1	2	0
	Humboldt St.	27	2	0	2	0
	Sonoma St.	27	2	0	2	0
	San Fran. St.	26	2	0	2	0
	Cal St. Dom. Hills	26	2	0	2	0
	UC San Diego	31	2	0	2	0
	Cal St. Chico	27	2	0	2	0
	Cal St. Monterey	31	2	0	2	0
	Cal St. East Bay	26	0	0	0	0

Women's Basketball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Great Northwest (18)	Saint Martin's	27	4	1	2	1
	Simon Fraser	24	3	0	0	3
	Western Ore.	27	2	1	0	1
	Western Wash.	30	2	0	1	1
	Alas. Anchorage	34	2	2	0	0
	Mont. St. Billings	28	1	0	0	1
	Northwest Nazarene	27	1	0	0	1
	Central Wash.	25	0	0	0	0
	Seattle Pacific	29	0	0	0	0
	Alas. Fairbanks	25	0	0	0	0
Pacific West (18)	Academy of Art	25	5	1	2	2
	BYU-Hawaii	25	2	2	0	0
	Dixie St.	28	2	1	0	1
	Hawaii Pacific	25	1	0	1	0
	Chaminade	23	1	0	1	0
	Grand Canyon	32	1	0	0	1
	Hawaii Hilo	24	1	0	1	0
	Notre Dame de Namur	25	0	0	0	0

Volleyball 2010-2011

Atlantic Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
CIAA (22)	Livingstone	31	5	0	2	3
	Johnson C. Smith	28	3	0	0	3
	Lincoln (PA)	29	3	1	2	0
	St. Augustine's	34	2	1	0	1
	St. Paul's	23	1	0	1	0
	Virginia St.	29	1	0	1	0
	Elizabeth City St.	29	1	0	1	0
	Winston-Salem	28	1	0	0	1
	Virginia Union	28	0	0	0	0
	Shaw	18	0	0	0	0
	Fayetteville St.	24	0	0	0	0
	Chowan	35	0	0	0	0
	Bowie St.	31	0	0	0	0
PSAC (19)	Mercyhurst	31	3	0	0	3
	Cheyney	25	3	0	3	0
	Edinboro	36	2	0	0	2
	California (PA)	36	2	0	2	0
	Gannon	30	1	0	0	1
	Clarion	37	1	0	1	0
	Kutztown	32	1	0	1	0
	Millersville	36	0	0	0	0
	Slippery Rock	29	0	0	0	0
	Shippensburg	35	0	0	0	0
	West Chester	34	0	0	0	0
	East Stroudsburg	36	0	0	0	0
	Lock Haven	31	0	0	0	0
	Indiana (PA)	32	0	0	0	0
WVIAC (14)	Bluefield St.	30	9	0	1	8
	Davis & Elkins	36	8	0	4	4
	Concord	35	6	0	0	6
	Pitt.-Johnstown	25	5	0	3	2
	Charleston (WV)	29	4	0	1	3
	West Liberty	30	4	0	1	3
	West Va. Wesleyan	31	3	0	1	2
	Wheeling Jesuit	38	3	0	1	2
	Seton Hill	22	2	0	1	1
	Alderson-Broaddus	37	2	0	2	0
	Fairmont St.	30	1	0	0	1
	West Virginia St.	25	1	0	0	1
	Shepherd	31	1	0	0	1
	Ohio Valley	29	1	0	0	1
	Glenville St.	25	0	0	0	0

Volleyball 2010-2011

Central Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Northern Sun (20)	Bemidji St.	28	4	0	0	4
	Upper Iowa	29	1	0	0	1
	Northern St.	29	1	0	0	1
	Winona St.	28	0	0	0	0
	Concordia-St. Paul	36	0	0	0	0
	Minn.-Crookston	28	0	0	0	0
	Southwest Minn.	31	0	0	0	0
	Mary	30	0	0	0	0
	St. Cloud St.	28	0	0	0	0
	Minn. Duluth	29	0	0	0	0
	Wayne St. (NE)	30	0	0	0	0
	Minn. St. Mankato	28	0	0	0	0
	Augustana (SD)	29	0	0	0	0
	Minn. St. Moorhead	28	0	0	0	0
RMAC (20)	Colo. Christian	33	13	1	1	11
	Colorado St.-Pueblo	26	3	0	1	2
	N.M. Highlands	28	2	0	0	2
	Colorado Mesa	29	1	0	1	0
	Neb.-Kearney	36	1	0	0	1
	UC-Colo. Springs	29	1	0	1	0
	Metro St.	32	1	0	1	0
	Adams St.	26	1	0	1	0
	Colorado Mines	29	0	0	0	0
	Chadron St.	26	0	0	0	0
	Western N.M.	25	0	0	0	0
	Western St.	25	0	0	0	0
	Regis (CO)	29	0	0	0	0
	Fort Lewis	27	0	0	0	0

East Region

CACC (19)	Chestnut Hill	30	4	0	4	0
	Philadelphia U.	28	1	0	1	0
	Caldwell	32	0	0	0	0
	Goldey-Beacom	28	0	0	0	0
	Wilmington (DE)	34	0	0	0	0
	Concordia (NY)	24	0	0	0	0
	Holy Family	28	0	0	0	0
	Nyack	23	0	0	0	0
	Post	30	0	0	0	0
	Dominican (NY)	33	0	0	0	0
	USciences	23	0	0	0	0
	Felician	29	0	0	0	0
	Bloomfield	26	0	0	0	0
	Georgian Court	32	0	0	0	0

Volleyball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
ECC (12)	Bridgeport	30	0	0	0	0
	NYIT	32	0	0	0	0
	Molloy	32	0	0	0	0
	C.W. Post	33	0	0	0	0
	Queens (NY)	25	0	0	0	0
	Dowling	33	0	0	0	0
	Mercy	29	0	0	0	0
Northeast-10 (15)	Assumption	33	15	4	7	4
	Saint Michael's	27	11	0	11	0
	Bentley	31	4	0	0	4
	Southern N.H.	23	2	0	0	2
	American Int'l	33	1	0	0	1
	Le Moyne	26	1	0	0	1
	Pace	33	0	0	0	0
	Saint Rose	27	0	0	0	0
	Southern Conn. St.	29	0	0	0	0
	Stonehill	29	0	0	0	0
	Franklin Pierce	24	0	0	0	0
	New Haven	29	0	0	0	0
	St. Anselm	20	0	0	0	0
	Mass.-Lowell	27	0	0	0	0
	Adelphi	32	0	0	0	0
	Merrimack	26	0	0	0	0

Midwest Region

GLIAC (19)	Tiffin	30	4	0	0	4
	Ohio Dominican	27	4	0	1	3
	Lake Erie	30	2	0	0	2
	Findlay	28	1	0	0	1
	Saginaw Valley	26	1	0	0	1
	Michigan Tech	26	1	0	1	0
	Ashland	30	1	0	0	1
	Lake Superior St.	26	1	0	0	1
	Grand Valley St.	33	0	0	0	0
	Wayne St. (MI)	27	0	0	0	0
	Hillsdale	31	0	0	0	0
	Northwood (MI)	27	0	0	0	0
	Northern Mich.	29	0	0	0	0
	Ferris St.	28	0	0	0	0
GLVC (14)	Maryville (MO)	32	11	0	4	7
	Northern Ky.	34	7	0	2	5
	Wis.-Parksides	30	6	0	1	5
	Quincy	27	5	1	1	3
	Ill.-Springfield	30	5	1	2	2
	Ky. Wesleyan	27	5	0	1	4
	Indianapolis	36	5	0	1	4
	Drury	35	4	0	1	3

Volleyball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
GLVC (continued)	Rockhurst	32	4	0	1	3
	St. Joseph's (IN)	27	4	0	1	3
	Bellarmine	28	4	0	2	2
	Mo.-St. Louis	29	2	0	1	1
	Lewis	32	2	0	1	1
	Missouri S&T	27	2	0	1	1
	Southern Ind.	30	1	0	1	0
	William Jewell	0	0	0	0	0

South Central Region

Heartland (N/A)	St. Mary's (TX)	33	2	0	1	1
	Tex. Permian Basin	31	2	0	0	2
	Okla. Panhandle	31	2	0	0	2
	Tex. A&M Int'l	26	1	0	0	1
	St. Edward's	32	1	0	0	1
	Newman	30	0	0	0	0
	Ark. - Fort Smith	32	0	0	0	0
	Dallas Baptist	34	0	0	0	0
Lone Star (14)	Southwestern Okla.	31	5	0	1	4
	West Tex. A&M	36	3	0	0	3
	Midwestern St.	29	3	0	0	3
	Tarleton St.	33	2	1	0	1
	Cameron	27	2	0	0	2
	Tex. A&M-Kingsville	26	2	0	0	2
	Eastern N.M.	29	2	0	0	2
	Central Okla.	31	2	0	0	2
	Angelo St.	31	1	0	0	1
	Incarnate Word	24	1	0	0	1
	Southeastern Okla.	25	1	0	0	1
	East Central	31	0	0	0	0
	Texas Woman's	30	0	0	0	0
	Tex. A&M-Commerce	29	0	0	0	0
	Abilene Christian	33	0	0	0	0
MIAA (20)	Washburn	35	2	0	1	1
	Pittsburg St.	32	1	0	0	1
	Truman	33	1	0	0	1
	Mo. Western St.	29	1	0	0	1
	Fort Hays St.	32	0	0	0	0
	Mo. Southern St.	32	0	0	0	0
	Southwest Baptist	32	0	0	0	0
	Central Mo.	37	0	0	0	0
	Emporia St.	33	0	0	0	0
	Northwest Mo. St.	30	0	0	0	0
	Neb. Omaha	32	0	0	0	0

Volleyball 2010-2011

South Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Gulf South (10)	Ouachita Baptist	26	8	0	2	6
	West Ala.	31	6	0	2	4
	Southern Ark.	32	5	1	1	3
	Ark.-Monticello	30	5	3	1	1
	Arkansas Tech	36	5	0	0	5
	Christian Bros.	32	5	2	1	2
	West Ga.	31	4	0	2	2
	Ala.-Huntsville	35	4	0	1	3
	West Fla.	37	4	0	0	4
	Harding	29	3	0	1	2
	Henderson St.	28	3	2	0	1
	North Ala.	31	1	0	0	1
	Valdosta St.	32	0	0	0	0
SIAC (18)	Stillman	35	11	2	3	6
	Kentucky St.	37	9	0	0	9
	LeMoyne-Owen	28	8	3	2	3
	Paine	27	6	1	2	3
	Albany St. (GA)	33	6	3	0	3
	Fort Valley St.	23	5	0	2	3
	Clayton	21	5	2	0	3
	Lane	22	4	0	2	2
	Miles	24	3	0	0	3
	Clark Atlanta	22	3	3	0	0
	Tuskegee	22	1	0	0	1
	Benedict	24	0	0	0	0
Sunshine State (14)	Rollins	32	1	0	0	1
	Barry	23	0	0	0	0
	Saint Leo	29	0	0	0	0
	Eckerd	27	0	0	0	0
	Nova Southeastern	27	0	0	0	0
	Fla. Southern	30	0	0	0	0
	Tampa	35	0	0	0	0
	Florida Tech	31	0	0	0	0
	Lynn	31	0	0	0	0

Southeast Region

Conference Carolinas (16)	Pfeiffer	28	4	1	0	3
	Queens (NC)	30	3	1	0	2
	Limestone	30	3	1	0	2
	Coker	27	3	0	0	3
	Erskine	31	3	0	0	3
	Converse	27	2	1	0	1
	Mount Olive	30	2	0	0	2
	Lees-McRae	33	2	0	0	2
	Belmont Abbey	29	1	0	0	1
	St. Andrews	0	0	0	0	0
	Barton	31	0	0	0	0

Volleyball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Peach Belt (14)	Pfeiffer	28	4	1	0	3
	Queens (NC)	30	3	1	0	2
	Limestone	30	3	1	0	2
	Coker	27	3	0	0	3
	Erskine	31	3	0	0	3
	Converse	27	2	1	0	1
	Mount Olive	30	2	0	0	2
	Lees-McRae	33	2	0	0	2
	Belmont Abbey	29	1	0	0	1
	St. Andrews	0	0	0	0	0
	Barton	31	0	0	0	0
South Atlantic (18)	Brevard	29	6	2	0	4
	Mars Hill	25	4	0	0	4
	Newberry	31	2	1	0	1
	Carson-Newman	31	2	0	1	1
	Anderson (SC)	33	1	0	0	1
	Lenoir-Rhyne	27	1	0	0	1
	Wingate	33	0	0	0	0
	Tusculum	32	0	0	0	0
	Catawba	27	0	0	0	0
	Lincoln Memorial	31	0	0	0	0

West Region

CCAA (22)	Cal St. Dom. Hills	29	8	0	4	4
	Cal Poly Pomona	27	4	0	2	2
	Cal St. Chico	28	4	0	3	1
	Cal St. San B'dino	31	3	0	2	1
	Cal St. Stanislaus	27	3	0	2	1
	Cal St. L.A.	27	3	0	2	1
	Cal St. Monterey	25	3	0	2	1
	UC San Diego	28	2	0	2	0
	Sonoma St.	27	2	0	2	0
	Humboldt St.	26	2	0	2	0
	San Fran. St.	27	2	0	2	0
	Cal St. East Bay	27	0	0	0	0

Volleyball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Great Northwest (18)	Alas. Fairbanks	24	2	0	2	0
	Mont. St. Billings	28	2	0	0	2
	Northwest	24	2	0	0	2
	Central Wash.	23	1	0	0	1
	Western Ore.	23	1	0	1	0
	Saint Martin's	24	1	0	1	0
	Seattle Pacific	29	0	0	0	0
	Western Wash.	24	0	0	0	0
	Alas. Anchorage	27	0	0	0	0
Pacific West (16)	Academy of Art	27	4	0	0	4
	Notre Dame de Namur	23	3	0	1	2
	Grand Canyon	29	3	0	0	3
	Hawaii Pacific	24	1	1	0	0
	Dixie St.	24	1	0	0	1
	Hawaii Hilo	23	0	0	0	0
	Chaminade	23	0	0	0	0
	BYU-Hawaii	24	0	0	0	0

Women's Soccer 2010-2011

Atlantic Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Independent	Lincoln (PA)	15	4	0	3	1
	Salem Int'l	10	4	0	1	3
PSAC (14)	Edinboro	18	1	0	0	1
	Mercyhurst	18	1	0	0	1
	Gannon	18	1	1	0	0
	Clarion	17	0	0	0	0
	Lock Haven	17	0	0	0	0
	East Stroudsburg	18	0	0	0	0
	California (PA)	23	0	0	0	0
	Mansfield	16	0	0	0	0
	Shippensburg	19	0	0	0	0
	Millersville	18	0	0	0	0
	Slippery Rock	22	0	0	0	0
	Bloomsburg	21	0	0	0	0
	West Chester	23	0	0	0	0
	Indiana (PA)	18	0	0	0	0
	Kutztown	21	0	0	0	0
WVIAC (9)	Pitt.-Johnstown	16	4	0	1	3
	Alderson-Broaddus	21	4	1	2	1
	Seton Hill	19	4	0	0	4
	Charleston (WV)	18	4	0	0	4
	Ohio Valley	15	4	0	1	3
	Shepherd	16	2	0	0	2
	Wheeling Jesuit	20	1	0	1	0
	Concord	16	1	0	0	1
	West Va. Wesleyan	18	0	0	0	0
	Davis & Elkins	17	0	0	0	0

Central Region

Northern Sun (13)	Upper Iowa	18	4	0	2	2
	Wayne St. (NE)	18	4	0	1	3
	Northern St.	18	3	0	0	3
	Winona St.	23	3	0	0	3
	Mary	19	2	1	0	1
	Bemidji St.	19	2	0	0	2
	Southwest Minn. St.	16	2	0	0	2
	Minn.-Crookston	18	2	1	0	1
	Minn. St. Moorhead	17	2	0	0	2
	Minn. Duluth	20	1	0	0	1
	Concordia-St. Paul	17	1	0	1	0
	St. Cloud St.	19	1	0	0	1
	Minn. St. Mankato	20	0	0	0	0
	Augustana (SD)	19	0	0	0	0

Women's Soccer 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
RMAC (14)	Colo. Christian	21	4	0	0	4
	Metro St.	21	1	0	0	1
	Adams St.	18	1	0	0	1
	Regis (CO)	23	1	0	0	1
	UC-Colo. Springs	19	1	0	1	0
	Colorado St.-Pueblo	19	1	1	0	0
	Colorado Mines	21	0	0	0	0
	Neb.-Kearney	18	0	0	0	0
	Colorado Mesa	18	0	0	0	0
	N.M. Highlands	21	0	0	0	0
	Fort Lewis	23	0	0	0	0

East Region

CACC (12)	Goldey-Beacom	15	0	0	0	0
	Post	18	0	0	0	0
	Nyack	17	0	0	0	0
	Caldwell	18	0	0	0	0
	Bloomfield	17	0	0	0	0
	Chestnut Hill	20	0	0	0	0
	Holy Family	20	0	0	0	0
	Concordia (NY)	17	0	0	0	0
	Philadelphia U.	19	0	0	0	0
	Dominican (NY)	17	0	0	0	0
	Wilmington (DE)	20	0	0	0	0
	Felician	18	0	0	0	0
	Georgian Court	22	0	0	0	0
ECC (7)	St. Thomas Aquinas	16	0	0	0	0
	NYIT	18	0	0	0	0
	Molloy	17	0	0	0	0
	C.W. Post	20	0	0	0	0
	Queens (NY)	20	0	0	0	0
	Dowling	16	0	0	0	0
	Bridgeport	20	0	0	0	0
	Mercy	16	0	0	0	0

Women's Soccer 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Northeast-10 (15)	Saint Rose	25	2	0	0	2
	Franklin Pierce	21	1	0	0	1
	Pace	18	0	0	0	0
	Stonehill	18	0	0	0	0
	Southern N.H.	18	0	0	0	0
	Bentley	17	0	0	0	0
	New Haven	19	0	0	0	0
	Saint Michael's	17	0	0	0	0
	Assumption	17	0	0	0	0
	American Int'l	22	0	0	0	0
	Southern Conn. St.	17	0	0	0	0
	Le Moyne	17	0	0	0	0
	St. Anselm	16	0	0	0	0
	Mass.-Lowell	18	0	0	0	0
	Adelphi	17	0	0	0	0
	Merrimack	20	0	0	0	0

Midwest Region

GLIAC (14)	Northwood (MI)	18	2	0	1	1
	Findlay	19	2	1	0	1
	Ashland	17	1	0	0	1
	Northern Mich.	20	1	0	0	1
	Ohio Dominican	18	1	0	0	1
	Lake Erie	18	1	0	0	1
	Michigan Tech	17	1	0	0	1
	Tiffin	20	0	0	0	0
	Saginaw Valley	18	0	0	0	0
	Grand Valley St.	25	0	0	0	0
	Ferris St.	19	0	0	0	0
GLVC (14)	Southern Ind.	19	4	0	1	3
	Quincy	21	3	1	1	1
	Rockhurst	18	3	0	1	2
	Ky. Wesleyan	17	3	0	1	2
	Bellarmine	19	3	1	1	1
	Maryville (MO)	17	3	0	1	2
	Indianapolis	16	2	0	1	1
	Wis.-Parkside	21	2	0	2	0
	St. Joseph's (IN)	17	2	0	1	1
	Ill.-Springfield	16	2	0	1	1
	Northern Ky.	22	2	0	1	1
	Drury	20	1	0	1	0
	Mo.-St. Louis	16	1	0	1	0
	Lewis	16	1	0	1	0
	Missouri S&T	15	1	0	1	0
	William Jewell	0	0	0	0	0

Women's Soccer 2010-2011

South Central Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Heartland (N/A)	Tex. A&M Int'l	16	3	0	0	3
	St. Mary's (TX)	18	2	0	0	2
	Newman	18	2	0	0	2
	Tex. Permian Basin	18	1	0	1	0
	Dallas Baptist	18	1	0	1	0
	St. Edward's	21	0	0	0	0
Lone Star (11)	East Central	18	4	0	2	2
	Southwestern Okla.	18	3	0	0	3
	Eastern N.M.	18	3	0	0	3
	Central Okla.	20	2	0	0	2
	Midwestern St.	20	2	0	0	2
	Northeastern St.	18	1	0	0	1
	Incarnate Word	18	1	0	0	1
	Texas Woman's	18	0	0	0	0
	Abilene Christian	21	0	0	0	0
	West Tex. A&M	18	0	0	0	0
	Angelo St.	21	0	0	0	0
	Tex. A&M-	18	0	0	0	0
MIAA (16)	Truman	20	0	0	0	0
	Northwest Mo. St.	18	0	0	0	0
	Central Mo.	20	0	0	0	0
	Emporia St.	18	0	0	0	0
	Southwest Baptist	18	0	0	0	0
	Mo. Southern St.	18	0	0	0	0
	Washburn	18	0	0	0	0
	Mo. Western St.	18	0	0	0	0
	Neb. Omaha	18	0	0	0	0

South Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Gulf South (10)	Delta St.	18	10	1	0	9
	Ouachita Baptist	18	7	1	2	4
	Ala.-Huntsville	16	5	0	0	5
	Christian Bros.	16	5	0	1	4
	Harding	18	5	1	0	4
	North Ala.	21	4	0	0	4
	West Ga.	18	4	1	0	3
	West Fla.	21	4	0	1	3
Sunshine State (8)	Saint Leo	17	4	1	0	3
	Eckerd	18	4	0	0	4
	Nova Southeastern	16	3	0	0	3
	Florida Tech	22	3	1	0	2
	Barry	18	2	1	0	1
	Fla. Southern	19	2	1	0	1
	Tampa	23	1	0	0	1
	Rollins	17	1	0	0	1
	Lynn	14	1	1	0	0

Women's Soccer 2010-2011

Southeast Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Conference Carolinas (12)	Converse	18	5	2	0	3
	Lees-McRae	20	4	0	0	4
	Coker	17	3	1	0	2
	Mount Olive	19	3	1	0	2
	St. Andrews	19	3	1	1	1
	Pfeiffer	21	2	0	0	2
	Belmont Abbey	22	2	0	0	2
	Queens (NC)	18	1	0	0	1
	Erskine	18	1	0	0	1
	Barton	15	0	0	0	0
	Limestone	17	0	0	0	0
Peach Belt (10)	Ga. Southwestern	17	4	1	1	2
	Montevallo	19	1	0	0	1
	Clayton St.	18	1	0	0	1
	North Ga.	20	1	0	0	1
	Flagler	17	1	0	0	1
	Armstrong	20	1	0	0	1
	S.C. Aiken	18	0	0	0	0
	Columbus St.	22	0	0	0	0
	Lander	17	0	0	0	0
	UNC Pembroke	22	0	0	0	0
	Georgia College	17	0	0	0	0
South Atlantic (9)	Lincoln Memorial	17	4	0	0	4
	Mars Hill	18	2	0	0	2
	Brevard	17	2	0	0	2
	Tusculum	19	1	0	0	1
	Carson-Newman	18	1	0	0	1
	Anderson (SC)	18	1	1	0	0
	Wingate	19	0	0	0	0
	Catawba	18	0	0	0	0
	Newberry	19	0	0	0	0
	Lenoir-Rhyne	23	0	0	0	0

West Region

CCAA (16)	Cal St. Dom. Hills	18	5	0	2	3
	Cal St. San B'dino	18	4	0	2	2
	Cal St. Stanislaus	19	4	0	1	3
	Cal St. L.A.	20	4	0	2	2
	UC San Diego	25	3	0	2	1
	San Fran. St.	21	3	0	1	2
	Cal St. Chico	18	3	0	1	2
	Cal Poly Pomona	18	3	0	2	1
	Humboldt St.	18	2	0	1	1
	Sonoma St.	17	2	0	1	1
	Cal St. East Bay	19	1	0	0	1
	Cal St. Monterey	18	1	0	1	0

Women's Soccer 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Great Northwest (14)	Simon Fraser	19	5	0	0	5
	Northwest	18	3	0	1	2
	Western Ore.	18	2	1	0	1
	Mont. St. Billings	20	2	0	0	2
	Western Wash.	18	1	0	1	0
	Seattle Pacific	20	1	0	0	1
	Saint Martin's	18	1	0	1	0
	Central Wash.	18	0	0	0	0
Pacific West (12)	Academy of Art	18	3	0	1	2
	Hawaii Pacific	17	1	0	1	0
	Grand Canyon	17	1	0	0	1
	Hawaii Hilo	18	1	0	1	0
	Chaminade	16	1	0	1	0
	BYU-Hawaii	18	0	0	0	0
	Notre Dame de Namur	18	0	0	0	0
	Dixie St.	18	0	0	0	0
	Dominican (CA)	18	0	0	0	0

Men's Soccer 2010-2011

Atlantic Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Independent	Salem Int'l	16	8	0	5	3
	Washington	18	6	0	3	3
	Chowan	18	5	0	4	1
	Dist. Columbia	18	1	1	0	0
	Lincoln (PA)	11	1	0	1	0
PSAC (9)	Mercyhurst	19	2	0	0	2
	Slippery Rock	19	1	0	0	1
	Millersville	18	1	0	1	0
	East Stroudsburg	20	1	0	1	0
	Gannon	18	1	0	0	1
	California (PA)	18	0	0	0	0
	Shippensburg	21	0	0	0	0
	West Chester	17	0	0	0	0
	Bloomsburg	16	0	0	0	0
	Lock Haven	18	0	0	0	0
WVIAC (9)	Shepherd	18	12	6	0	6
	Concord	17	11	5	0	6
	Wheeling Jesuit	20	10	5	0	5
	Ohio Valley	17	10	4	0	6
	Pitt.-Johnstown	17	8	4	0	4
	Davis & Elkins	17	6	3	0	3
	Seton Hill	17	4	2	0	2
	Charleston (WV)	21	2	0	0	2
	Alderson-Broaddus	15	0	0	0	0
	West Va. Wesleyan	24	0	0	0	0

Central Region

Independent	Upper Iowa	17	11	0	4	7
	Mary	18	7	0	1	6
RMAC (14)	Colo. Christian	19	2	0	0	2
	Fort Lewis	20	1	1	0	0
	Regis (CO)	21	0	0	0	0
	Adams St.	17	0	0	0	0
	Metro St.	20	0	0	0	0
	Colorado Mesa	19	0	0	0	0
	UC-Colo. Springs	18	0	0	0	0
	Colorado Mines	21	0	0	0	0
	Colorado St.-Pueblo	19	0	0	0	0

Men's Soccer 2010-2011

East Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
CACC (11)	Nyack	20	2	0	0	2
	Philadelphia U.	20	0	0	0	0
	Goldey-Beacom	17	0	0	0	0
	Wilmington (DE)	19	0	0	0	0
	Chestnut Hill	19	0	0	0	0
	Caldwell	18	0	0	0	0
	Holy Family	19	0	0	0	0
	Concordia (NY)	15	0	0	0	0
	Post	19	0	0	0	0
	Dominican (NY)	21	0	0	0	0
	Bloomfield	21	0	0	0	0
	Felician	17	0	0	0	0
ECC (7)	Dowling	20	4	2	0	2
	Molloy	17	0	0	0	0
	C.W. Post	17	0	0	0	0
	NYIT	17	0	0	0	0
	Queens (NY)	18	0	0	0	0
	St. Thomas					
	Aquinas	18	0	0	0	0
	Bridgeport	19	0	0	0	0
	Mercy	17	0	0	0	0
Northeast-10 (13)	St. Anselm	18	4	2	0	2
	Mass.-Lowell	16	4	2	0	2
	Southern N.H.	20	2	1	0	1
	Saint Rose	18	2	1	0	1
	Saint Michael's	17	2	0	1	1
	Stonehill	17	2	1	0	1
	Le Moyne	19	0	0	0	0
	Assumption	14	0	0	0	0
	Southern Conn. St.	20	0	0	0	0
	New Haven	18	0	0	0	0
	Bentley	20	0	0	0	0
	Franklin Pierce	21	0	0	0	0
	American Int'l	18	0	0	0	0
	Merrimack	18	0	0	0	0

Men's Soccer 2010-2011

Midwest Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
GLIAC (12)	Saginaw Valley	18	4	0	0	4
	Northwood (MI)	18	4	0	1	3
	Lake Erie	18	3	0	1	2
	Ashland	21	3	1	0	2
	Findlay	17	2	1	0	1
	Ohio Dominican	20	2	0	1	1
	Tiffin	18	1	0	0	1
GLVC (14)	Ky. Wesleyan	18	5	1	1	3
	Wis.-Parkside	17	4	0	1	3
	Indianapolis	18	2	0	1	1
	Quincy	20	2	0	1	1
	Northern Ky.	25	2	0	1	1
	Ill.-Springfield	16	2	0	1	1
	Rockhurst	17	2	0	1	1
	St. Joseph's (IN)	17	2	0	1	1
	Bellarmino	17	2	0	1	1
	Maryville (MO)	17	2	0	1	1
	Drury	18	1	0	1	0
	Southern Ind.	17	1	0	1	0
	Lewis	17	1	0	1	0
	Mo.-St. Louis	17	1	0	1	0
	Missouri S&T	19	1	0	1	0
	William Jewell	0	0	0	0	0

South Central Region

Heartland (8)	Tex. Permian Basin	17	16	7	2	7
	St. Edward's	18	13	6	0	7
	St. Mary's (TX)	17	13	6	0	7
	Tex. A&M Int'l	18	11	5	0	6
	Newman	17	2	1	0	1
Lone Star (8)	Eastern N.M.	18	2	0	0	2
	West Tex. A&M	18	1	0	0	1
	Midwestern St.	22	1	0	0	1
	Incarnate Word	18	0	0	0	0
	Northeastern St.	18	0	0	0	0

South Region

Gulf South (7)	Delta St.	17	9	0	0	9
	Harding	16	7	1	1	5
	West Fla.	21	6	0	1	5
	Ouachita Baptist	17	6	0	1	5
	Ala.-Huntsville	17	6	0	0	6
	Christian Bros.	19	4	0	1	3

Men's Soccer 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Sunshine State (8)	Rollins	22	4	0	0	4
	Fla. Southern	15	3	0	0	3
	Saint Leo	15	3	0	0	3
	Eckerd	15	3	0	0	3
	Barry	18	3	0	0	3
	Nova Southeastern	16	2	0	0	2
	Tampa	22	2	0	0	2
	Lynn	16	2	0	0	2
	Florida Tech	18	1	0	0	1

Southeast Region

Conference Carolinas (11)	Erskine	19	4	0	0	4
	Coker	19	2	0	0	2
	Queens (NC)	17	2	0	0	2
	Belmont Abbey	19	2	0	0	2
	Lees-McRae	21	2	0	0	2
	Mount Olive	17	1	0	0	1
	Barton	18	1	0	1	0
	Pfeiffer	17	1	0	0	1
	St. Andrews	17	0	0	0	0
	Limestone	18	0	0	0	0
Peach Belt (8)	Montevallo	22	4	1	1	2
	Flagler	20	2	1	0	1
	Ga. Southwestern	15	2	0	0	2
	Clayton St.	23	1	0	0	1
	S.C. Aiken	15	0	0	0	0
	North Ga.	18	0	0	0	0
	UNC Pembroke	18	0	0	0	0
	Francis Marion	18	0	0	0	0
	Lander	19	0	0	0	0
South Atlantic (9)	Lincoln Memorial	17	3	0	0	3
	Brevard	19	3	2	0	1
	Mars Hill	20	1	0	0	1
	Tusculum	17	1	0	0	1
	Anderson (SC)	24	1	0	0	1
	Lenoir-Rhyne	18	1	0	0	1
	Wingate	19	0	0	0	0
	Catawba	19	0	0	0	0
	Carson-Newman	18	0	0	0	0
	Newberry	16	0	0	0	0

Men's Soccer 2010-2011

West Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
CCAA (16)	Cal St. Dom. Hills	21	4	0	2	2
	Cal St. L.A.	17	3	0	2	1
	Cal St. Stanislaus	18	2	0	1	1
	Cal St. San B'dino	20	2	0	2	0
	San Fran. St.	18	2	0	1	1
	Sonoma St.	21	2	0	1	1
	UC San Diego	18	2	0	2	0
	Cal Poly Pomona	18	2	0	2	0
	Cal St. Monterey Bay	17	2	1	1	0
	Cal St. Chico	22	1	0	1	0
	Humboldt St.	18	1	0	1	0
	Cal St. East Bay	21	1	0	0	1
Great Northwest (10)	Simon Fraser	21	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Seattle Pacific	18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Northwest Nazarene	16	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Saint Martin's	18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Western Wash.	18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Mont. St. Billings	18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pacific West (12)	Academy of Art	18	2	0	0	2
	Hawaii Pacific	18	1	0	1	0
	Hawaii Hilo	17	1	0	1	0
	Chaminade	16	1	0	1	0
	Notre Dame de Namur	18	1	0	1	0
	BYU-Hawaii	16	0	0	0	0
	Grand Canyon	20	0	0	0	0
	Dixie St.	18	0	0	0	0
	Dominican (CA)	18	0	0	0	0

Softball 2010-2011

Atlantic Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
CIAA (16)	Bowie St.	44	9	4	3	2
	Johnson C. Smith	39	6	0	0	6
	Livingstone	23	6	0	2	4
	Winston-Salem	42	4	3	1	0
	Virginia St.	36	4	0	2	2
	St. Augustine's	31	4	0	0	4
	Shaw	56	4	2	0	2
	Virginia Union	30	3	0	3	0
	St. Paul's	30	2	0	2	0
	Chowan	53	1	0	0	1
	Elizabeth City St.	24	0	0	0	0
	Fayetteville St.	42	0	0	0	0
	Lincoln (PA)	24	0	0	0	0
PSAC (20)	Gannon	40	9	3	3	3
	Indiana (PA)	46	4	2	0	2
	Lock Haven	40	2	1	1	0
	Millersville	38	2	0	2	0
	Mercyhurst	44	2	0	0	2
	Clarion	25	2	0	2	0
	Edinboro	29	1	1	0	0
	East Stroudsburg	35	1	1	0	0
	Shippensburg	43	1	1	0	0
	West Chester	53	1	0	1	0
	Bloomsburg	42	1	1	0	0
	Kutztown	57	1	1	0	0
	California (PA)	43	0	0	0	0
	Mansfield	28	0	0	0	0
	Slippery Rock	32	0	0	0	0
WVIAC (26)	West Virginia St.	47	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Wheeling Jesuit	41	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	West Va. Wesleyan	56	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	West Liberty	47	9	2	0	7
	Charleston (WV)	50	9	5	4	0
	Ohio Valley	38	8	2	6	0
	Fairmont St.	43	6	4	0	2
	Concord	42	5	3	0	2
	Davis & Elkins	40	3	2	0	1
	Alderson-Broaddus	47	3	2	0	1
	Bluefield St.	22	2	2	0	0
	Shepherd	47	2	2	0	0
	Seton Hill	41	2	0	0	2
	Glenville St.	41	0	0	0	0

Softball 2010-2011

Central Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Northern Sun (26)	Minn.-Crookston	38	9	0	5	4
	Minn. St. Moorhead	38	9	0	3	6
	Northern St.	43	6	1	4	1
	St. Cloud St.	51	6	0	4	2
	Augustana (SD)	61	5	2	2	1
	Mary	50	5	0	0	5
	Bemidji St.	32	4	0	3	1
	Wayne St. (NE)	54	3	1	2	0
	Concordia-St. Paul	52	3	0	3	0
	Minn. St. Mankato	70	2	0	0	2
	Minn. Duluth	50	2	0	1	1
	Upper Iowa	47	1	0	0	1
	Winona St.	50	1	1	0	0
	Southwest Minn. St.	48	0	0	0	0
RMAC (40)	Chadron St.	47	3	2	0	1
	Adams St.	57	3	2	0	1
	N.M. Highlands	53	2	1	0	1
	Regis (CO)	57	1	0	0	1
	Colorado Mesa	46	0	0	0	0
	Colorado Mines	60	0	0	0	0
	Neb.-Kearney	45	0	0	0	0
	Colorado St.-	47	0	0	0	0
	UC-Colo. Springs	50	0	0	0	0
	Western N.M.	58	0	0	0	0
	Metro St.	52	0	0	0	0
	Fort Lewis	41	0	0	0	0

East Region

CACC (26)	Bloomfield	46	5	0	1	4
	Goldey-Beacom	38	4	0	1	3
	Holy Family	42	1	0	0	1
	Nyack	43	1	0	1	0
	Concordia (NY)	39	0	0	0	0
	USciences	40	0	0	0	0
	Chestnut Hill	38	0	0	0	0
	Philadelphia U.	39	0	0	0	0
	Dominican (NY)	53	0	0	0	0
	Post	48	0	0	0	0
	Felician	44	0	0	0	0
	Caldwell	57	0	0	0	0
	Wilmington (DE)	50	0	0	0	0
	Georgian Court	56	0	0	0	0

Softball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
ECC (28)	Mercy	44	1	0	0	1
	C.W. Post	57	0	0	0	0
	Queens (NY)	47	0	0	0	0
	NYIT	39	0	0	0	0
	Dowling	50	0	0	0	0
	St. Thomas Aquinas	40	0	0	0	0
	Bridgeport	41	0	0	0	0
	Molloy	56	0	0	0	0
Northeast-10 (30)	Merrimack	54	5	0	0	5
	New Haven	53	4	2	1	1
	Mass.-Lowell	54	3	2	0	1
	Southern N.H.	45	2	1	1	0
	Assumption	44	2	0	1	1
	St. Anselm	43	1	0	0	1
	Saint Michael's	38	0	0	0	0
	Southern Conn. St.	55	0	0	0	0
	Bentley	40	0	0	0	0
	Saint Rose	38	0	0	0	0
	Adelphi	52	0	0	0	0
	Franklin Pierce	40	0	0	0	0
	Stonehill	46	0	0	0	0
	Le Moyne	40	0	0	0	0
	Pace	45	0	0	0	0
	American Int'l	44	0	0	0	0

Midwest Region

GLIAC (32)	Findlay	48	14	2	0	12
	Ohio Dominican	51	7	0	0	7
	Grand Valley St.	57	7	2	2	3
	Saginaw Valley	56	4	2	0	2
	Ashland	52	4	0	0	4
	Lake Superior St.	33	3	0	2	1
	Wayne St. (MI)	56	2	2	0	0
	Hillsdale	47	2	0	0	2
	Lake Erie	48	2	0	0	2
	Northwood (MI)	47	0	0	0	0
	Ferris St.	47	0	0	0	0
	Tiffin	53	0	0	0	0
GLVC (26)	Rockhurst	52	16	0	3	13
	St. Joseph's (IN)	45	11	0	2	9
	Ill.-Springfield	42	11	4	3	4
	Maryville (MO)	48	10	0	2	8
	Ky. Wesleyan	41	9	0	2	7
	Lewis	50	8	1	2	5
	Wis.-Parksides	44	8	2	2	4
	Indianapolis	51	6	0	4	2

Softball2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
GLVC (continued)	Bellarmine	44	6	0	2	4
	Mo.-St. Louis	51	6	0	4	2
	Quincy	52	5	0	2	3
	Southern Ind.	43	4	0	2	2
	Northern Ky.	46	2	0	0	2
	Drury	56	2	0	2	0
	Missouri S&T	42	2	0	2	0
	William Jewell	0	0	0	0	0

South Central Region

Heartland (N/A)	Okla. Panhandle	50	7	0	0	7
	Tex. Permian Basin	45	3	0	0	3
	St. Mary's (TX)	57	1	0	0	1
	St. Edward's	55	1	0	0	1
	Newman	41	0	0	0	0
	Tex. A&M Int'l	61	0	0	0	0
Lone Star (21)	East Central	54	6	0	0	6
	Eastern N.M.	54	4	0	0	4
	Cameron	54	4	0	0	4
	West Tex. A&M	68	2	0	0	2
	Tarleton St.	48	2	0	0	2
	Incarnate Word	54	2	0	0	2
	Texas Woman's	56	1	1	0	0
	Central Okla.	48	0	0	0	0
	Southwestern Okla.	39	0	0	0	0
	Abilene Christian	55	0	0	0	0
	Tex. A&M-Kingsville	55	0	0	0	0
	Northeastern St.	46	0	0	0	0
	Angelo St.	59	0	0	0	0
	Southeastern Okla.	55	0	0	0	0
	Midwestern St.	68	0	0	0	0
MIAA (22)	Southwest Baptist	34	4	0	2	2
	Truman	48	3	0	2	1
	Central Mo.	54	2	0	2	0
	Fort Hays St.	52	0	0	0	0
	Pittsburg St.	48	0	0	0	0
	Northwest Mo. St.	44	0	0	0	0
	Mo. Southern St.	54	0	0	0	0
	Emporia St.	58	0	0	0	0
	Washburn	47	0	0	0	0
	Lincoln (MO)	46	0	0	0	0
	Neb. Omaha	58	0	0	0	0
	Mo. Western St.	55	0	0	0	0

Softball 2010-2011

South Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Gulf South (32)	Ark.-Monticello	62	11	2	2	7
	Christian Bros.	42	11	0	2	9
	Delta St.	52	9	2	1	6
	Valdosta St.	52	7	0	0	7
	West Fla.	43	7	0	0	7
	Ala.-Huntsville	55	7	1	1	5
	West Ga.	47	6	2	1	3
	Southern Ark.	53	5	0	0	5
	Ouachita Baptist	46	5	2	0	3
	Arkansas Tech	53	4	0	0	4
	West Ala.	57	4	0	0	4
	Henderson St.	54	3	0	0	3
	North Ala.	44	2	0	0	2
SIAC (18)	Stillman	43	21	8	0	13
	Clark Atlanta	47	13	4	2	7
	Miles	40	12	8	0	4
	LeMoyne-Owen	33	12	6	0	6
	Claflin	33	9	4	1	4
	Lane	32	8	4	0	4
	Benedict	40	6	4	0	2
	Paine	30	5	3	0	2
	Tuskegee	42	4	0	0	4
	Albany St. (GA)	55	4	2	0	2
	Fort Valley St.	42	3	1	0	2
	Kentucky St.	34	2	2	0	0
Sunshine State (27)	Eckerd	54	10	0	0	10
	Fla. Southern	46	10	0	0	10
	Florida Tech	50	5	1	0	4
	Saint Leo	54	2	0	0	2
	Tampa	48	2	0	0	2
	Barry	48	2	1	0	1
	Rollins	49	0	0	0	0
	Nova Southeastern	52	0	0	0	0
	Lynn	52	0	0	0	0

Southeast Region

Conference Carolinas (22)	Barton	46	12	1	9	2
	Limestone	55	5	2	0	3
	Coker	45	5	0	2	3
	Pfeiffer	50	4	0	0	4
	Lees-McRae	53	3	1	2	0
	St. Andrews	37	2	0	0	2
	Queens (NC)	39	2	2	0	0
	Erskine	42	2	0	0	2
	Belmont Abbey	44	1	1	0	0
	Mount Olive	50	0	0	0	0

Softball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Peach Belt (20)	Ga. Southwestern	50	10	0	2	8
	North Ga.	65	4	1	0	3
	Lander	43	4	2	0	2
	Georgia College	50	4	0	0	4
	Armstrong	45	4	0	0	4
	Columbus St.	53	2	0	0	2
	Flagler	60	2	0	0	2
	Augusta St.	55	1	0	1	0
	S.C. Aiken	44	0	0	0	0
	UNC Pembroke	45	0	0	0	0
	Francis Marion	46	0	0	0	0
South Atlantic (18)	Brevard	50	12	4	0	8
	Lincoln Memorial	53	6	0	0	6
	Mars Hill	49	6	0	0	6
	Anderson (SC)	43	6	2	2	2
	Newberry	45	2	2	0	0
	Tusculum	49	2	0	0	2
	Catawba	51	1	0	0	1
	Lenoir-Rhyne	55	1	0	0	1
	Wingate	46	0	0	0	0
	Carson-Newman	59	0	0	0	0

West Region

CCAA (36)	San Fran. St.	53	10	2	7	1
	Cal St. Stanislaus	51	9	1	7	1
	Humboldt St.	51	8	2	6	0
	Sonoma St.	60	8	2	5	1
	Cal St. Monterey Bay	51	7	2	5	0
	Cal St. Chico	50	7	0	6	1
	Cal St. San B'dino	59	7	0	5	2
	Cal St. Dom. Hills	52	6	0	6	0
	UC San Diego	58	6	1	5	0
	Cal St. East Bay	51	0	0	0	0

Softball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Great Northwest (32)	Simon Fraser	43	12	2	1	9
	Western Wash.	52	6	1	5	0
	Northwest Nazarene	47	5	1	2	2
	Saint Martin's	39	5	1	4	0
	Central Wash.	50	3	0	3	0
	Mont. St. Billings	48	2	0	2	0
	Western Ore.	46	1	0	0	1
Pacific West (28)	Academy of Art	49	13	0	2	11
	Notre Dame de	55	11	0	3	8
	Chaminade	50	10	0	3	7
	Dixie St.	47	10	6	0	4
	Hawaii Pacific	50	8	0	2	6
	BYU-Hawaii	38	6	0	2	4
	Grand Canyon	47	4	0	0	4
	Hawaii Hilo	42	3	0	1	2

Baseball 2010-2011

Atlantic Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
CIAA (28)	St. Augustine's	54	6	0	2	4
	Virginia St.	47	5	1	2	2
	Winston-Salem	56	5	0	3	2
	Lincoln (PA)	28	2	2	0	0
	Shaw	46	2	0	0	2
	St. Paul's	28	0	0	0	0
	Elizabeth City St.	42	0	0	0	0
	Chowan	50	0	0	0	0
PSAC (24)	Indiana (PA)	50	6	0	0	6
	Bloomsburg	44	5	0	0	5
	Mercyhurst	54	4	1	0	3
	Gannon	38	2	0	0	2
	Kutztown	39	2	0	1	1
	Shippensburg	51	1	1	0	0
	Lock Haven	39	1	0	0	1
	Millersville	56	0	0	0	0
	Clarion	37	0	0	0	0
	East Stroudsburg	47	0	0	0	0
	Slippery Rock	46	0	0	0	0
	West Chester	43	0	0	0	0
	Mansfield	39	0	0	0	0
	California (PA)	48	0	0	0	0
WVIAC (30)	Concord	53	3	0	0	3
	West Virginia St.	43	1	1	0	0
	Bluefield St.	38	1	0	0	1
	Ohio Valley	42	1	0	1	0
	West Va. Wesleyan	45	0	0	0	0
	Shepherd	37	0	0	0	0
	Wheeling Jesuit	44	0	0	0	0
	Fairmont St.	44	0	0	0	0
	West Liberty	50	0	0	0	0
	Alderson-Broadus	39	0	0	0	0
	Charleston (WV)	45	0	0	0	0
	Pitt.-Johnstown	47	0	0	0	0
	Davis & Elkins	47	0	0	0	0
	Seton Hill	48	0	0	0	0

Baseball 2010-2011

Central Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Northern Sun (32)	Winona St.	60	5	0	1	4
	Bemidji St.	47	4	1	0	3
	Concordia-St. Paul	34	2	0	2	0
	Minn. St. Mankato	52	2	1	1	0
	Minn. Duluth	46	1	1	0	0
	Northern St.	36	1	0	1	0
	St. Cloud St.	54	0	0	0	0
	Wayne St. (NE)	45	0	0	0	0
	Upper Iowa	50	0	0	0	0
	Mary	42	0	0	0	0
	Augustana (SD)	54	0	0	0	0
	Southwest Minn. St.	36	0	0	0	0
	Minn.-Crookston	39	0	0	0	0
RMAC (40)	Colo. Christian	53	10	0	0	10
	Colorado Mines	48	2	1	0	1
	N.M. Highlands	53	1	0	0	1
	Neb.-Kearney	57	1	1	0	0
	Metro St.	46	0	0	0	0
	Colorado Mesa	56	0	0	0	0
	Regis (CO)	49	0	0	0	0
	Colorado St.-Pueblo	53	0	0	0	0

East Region

CACC (20)	Wilmington (DE)	49	2	2	0	0
	Post	42	0	0	0	0
	Nyack	38	0	0	0	0
	Bloomfield	39	0	0	0	0
	Chestnut Hill	38	0	0	0	0
	Philadelphia U.	39	0	0	0	0
	Concordia (NY)	39	0	0	0	0
	Caldwell	41	0	0	0	0
	USciences	36	0	0	0	0
	Dominican (NY)	45	0	0	0	0
	Felician	46	0	0	0	0
ECC (30)	Bridgeport	45	0	0	0	0
	Queens (NY)	44	0	0	0	0
	Molloy	51	0	0	0	0
	C.W. Post	48	0	0	0	0
	St. Thomas	52	0	0	0	0
	Dowling	51	0	0	0	0
	Mercy	45	0	0	0	0

Baseball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Northeast-10 (26)	Pace	45	1	0	1	0
	Bentley	44	1	0	1	0
	American Int'l	42	1	1	0	0
	St. Anselm	45	1	1	0	0
	Franklin Pierce	54	0	0	0	0
	Saint Rose	45	0	0	0	0
	Assumption	48	0	0	0	0
	Southern N.H.	47	0	0	0	0
	Southern Conn. St.	55	0	0	0	0
	Stonehill	48	0	0	0	0
	New Haven	44	0	0	0	0
	Mass.-Lowell	51	0	0	0	0
	Adelphi	52	0	0	0	0
	Merrimack	42	0	0	0	0

Midwest Region

GLIAC (36)	Tiffin	48	6	1	0	5
	Findlay	47	4	2	0	2
	Saginaw Valley	49	3	0	2	1
	Ashland	51	3	1	0	2
	Northwood (MI)	41	2	0	0	2
	Hillsdale	46	2	0	0	2
	Ohio Dominican	46	2	0	0	2
	Lake Erie	47	2	1	0	1
	Wayne St. (MI)	56	1	1	0	0
	Grand Valley St.	57	0	0	0	0
GLVC (36)	Ill.-Springfield	43	9	5	4	0
	Quincy	55	8	0	4	4
	Mo.-St. Louis	44	8	1	5	2
	Rockhurst	49	8	3	4	1
	Bellarmine	52	7	0	3	4
	Missouri S&T	49	7	0	7	0
	Northern Ky.	57	5	1	0	4
	Lewis	42	4	0	2	2
	Drury	54	4	0	4	0
	Maryville (MO)	44	3	0	0	3
	Ky. Wesleyan	39	3	0	0	3
	Indianapolis	48	2	0	2	0
	Wis.-Parkside	43	2	0	2	0
	St. Joseph's (IN)	48	2	0	2	0
	Southern Ind.	56	1	1	0	0
	William Jewell	0	0	0	0	0

Baseball 2010-2011

South Central Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Heartland (N/A)	St. Mary's (TX)	57	6	0	0	6
	St. Edward's	51	3	1	1	1
	Tex. A&M Int'l	52	2	0	0	2
	Newman	50	2	0	0	2
	Tex. Permian Basin	52	1	0	0	1
	Okla. Panhandle	50	0	0	0	0
Lone Star (36)	Central Okla.	47	13	0	1	12
	West Tex. A&M	49	8	0	0	8
	Tex. A&M-Kingsville	48	6	0	0	6
	East Central	46	6	0	0	6
	Southwestern Okla.	51	5	0	0	5
	Cameron	49	5	0	0	5
	Eastern N.M.	44	5	0	0	5
	Southeastern Okla.	54	3	0	0	3
	Tarleton St.	50	3	0	1	2
	Abilene Christian	47	2	0	0	2
	Incarnate Word	55	2	0	0	2
	Northeastern St.	39	1	0	0	1
	Angelo St.	48	0	0	0	0
MIAA (44)	Pittsburg St.	49	3	0	0	3
	Lincoln (MO)	46	1	0	0	1
	Emporia St.	55	1	0	0	1
	Mo. Southern St.	50	1	0	0	1
	Northwest Mo. St.	50	0	0	0	0
	Southwest Baptist	47	0	0	0	0
	Fort Hays St.	51	0	0	0	0
	Washburn	50	0	0	0	0
	Truman	48	0	0	0	0
	Neb. Omaha	55	0	0	0	0
	Central Mo.	59	0	0	0	0
	Mo. Western St.	51	0	0	0	0

Baseball 2010-2011

South Region

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Gulf South (15)	Christian Bros.	44	19	0	2	17
	Harding	56	15	0	3	12
	Ala.-Huntsville	47	12	1	0	11
	Ark.-Monticello	43	9	1	0	8
	West Ga.	48	9	0	0	9
	Southern Ark.	52	8	1	0	7
	West Fla.	61	8	3	0	5
	North Ala.	51	8	0	0	8
	Arkansas Tech	51	6	0	1	5
	Delta St.	49	6	1	0	5
	Valdosta St.	49	5	2	0	3
	West Ala.	41	4	0	0	4
	Henderson St.	46	4	2	0	2
	Ouachita Baptist	47	2	1	0	1
SIAC (21)	Lane	31	12	0	0	12
	Miles	40	11	1	0	10
	Albany St. (GA)	49	10	0	0	10
	Claflin	45	8	1	0	7
	Tuskegee	35	7	3	0	4
	Clark Atlanta	32	6	4	0	2
	Paine	44	5	0	1	4
	Kentucky St.	38	5	0	2	3
	Morehouse	38	4	2	0	2
	LeMoyne-Owen	30	4	0	2	2
	Benedict	43	3	1	0	2
	Stillman	45	1	0	0	1
Sunshine State (27)	Eckerd	49	18	0	0	18
	Rollins	53	11	8	0	3
	Saint Leo	49	4	0	0	4
	Tampa	53	4	1	0	3
	Florida Tech	50	2	0	0	2
	Fla. Southern	47	2	0	0	2
	Lynn	49	2	1	0	1
	Barry	57	1	1	0	0
	Nova Southeastern	53	0	0	0	0

Southeast Region

Conference Carolinas (27)	King (TN)	53	20	0	0	20
	Belmont Abbey	46	7	3	0	4
	Erskine	52	6	4	0	2
	Limestone	52	3	0	0	3
	Mount Olive	57	2	0	2	0
	Coker	43	2	0	0	2
	Pfeiffer	49	1	0	0	1
	St. Andrews	44	0	0	0	0
	Barton	44	0	0	0	0

Baseball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Peach Belt (24)	Ga. Southwestern	48	4	0	0	4
	Montevallo	48	3	0	0	3
	Flagler	49	3	0	0	3
	S.C. Aiken	50	2	0	0	2
	North Ga.	54	2	0	1	1
	Columbus St.	51	2	0	0	2
	Georgia College	52	1	0	0	1
	Augusta St.	55	0	0	0	0
	Lander	53	0	0	0	0
	UNC Pembroke	56	0	0	0	0
	Francis Marion	57	0	0	0	0
	Armstrong	52	0	0	0	0
South Atlantic (27)	Lincoln Memorial	51	3	0	0	3
	Brevard	42	3	0	0	3
	Mars Hill	49	2	0	0	2
	Anderson (SC)	50	2	0	0	2
	Lenoir-Rhyne	47	2	0	0	2
	Carson-Newman	52	1	0	1	0
	Newberry	52	1	1	0	0
	Catawba	56	0	0	0	0
	Wingate	56	0	0	0	0
	Tusculum	51	0	0	0	0

West Region

CCAA (40)	Sonoma St.	59	12	0	4	8
	San Fran. St.	50	10	2	4	4
	Cal St. San B'dino	46	9	0	4	5
	Cal St. Monterey Bay	49	9	0	4	5
	Cal Poly Pomona	59	8	0	4	4
	Cal St. Stanislaus	47	7	0	6	1
	Cal St. Chico	50	6	0	6	0
	Cal St. L.A.	50	5	0	4	1
	UC San Diego	57	4	0	4	0
	Cal St. Dom. Hills	49	4	0	4	0
	Cal St. East Bay	50	3	0	0	3

Baseball 2010-2011

Conference (# of conference games)	Institution	Total Games	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non member Opp
Great Northwest (32)	Central Wash.	46	8	0	6	2
	Saint Martin's	47	5	0	5	0
	Mont. St. Billings	47	2	0	0	2
	Western Ore.	52	1	0	1	0
	Northwest	48	0	0	0	0
Pacific West (32)	Dixie St.	47	6	0	0	6
	Grand Canyon	47	6	0	3	3
	Academy of Art	49	5	0	0	5
	Hawaii Hilo	46	5	0	0	5
	Hawaii Pacific	47	4	0	0	4

Football 2010

Region	Conference	Institution	Total Games	In Region	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non-member opp
One	CIAA Conf games: 7	Bowie St.	10	9	1	1	0	0
		Chowan	10	9	1	1	0	0
		Elizabeth City St.	10	9	1	1	0	0
		Fayetteville St.	10	10	0	0	0	0
		Johnson C. Smith	10	9	0	0	0	0
		Lincoln (PA)	10	9	1	1	0	0
		Livingstone	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Shaw	12	10	1	1	0	0
		St. Augustine's	11	10	0	0	0	0
		St. Paul's	10	10	0	0	0	0
		Virginia St.	11	10	1	1	0	0
		Virginia Union	10	10	0	0	0	0
		Winston-Salem	10	9	1	1	0	0
	Northeast-10 Conf games: 8	American Int'l	10	9	1	1	0	0
		Assumption	11	9	2	2	0	0
		Bentley	9	7	1	1	0	0
		Merrimack	10	10	0	0	0	0
		New Haven	10	10	0	0	0	0
		Pace	9	9	0	0	0	0
		Southern Conn. St.	10	9	0	0	0	0
		St. Anselm	10	10	0	0	0	0
		Stonehill	10	9	1	0	1	0
	PSAC Conf games: 10	Bloomsburg	13	11	0	0	0	0
		C.W. Post	11	11	0	0	0	0
		California (PA)	12	11	0	0	0	0
		Cheyney	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Clarion	11	11	0	0	0	0
		East Stroudsburg	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Edinboro	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Gannon	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Indiana (PA)	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Kutztown	12	11	0	0	0	0
		Lock Haven	11	10	1	1	0	0
		Mercyhurst	13	11	0	0	0	0
		Millersville	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Shippensburg	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Slippery Rock	11	11	0	0	0	0
		West Chester	11	10	1	1	0	0
	WVIAC Conf games: 9	Charleston (WV)	11	10	0	0	0	0
		Concord	11	10	1	0	0	1
		Fairmont St.	11	10	0	0	0	0
		Glenville St.	11	9	0	0	0	0
		Seton Hill	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Shepherd	14	9	0	0	0	0
		West Liberty	10	9	0	0	0	0
		West Va. Wesleyan	11	11	0	0	0	0
		West Virginia St.	10	10	0	0	0	0

Football 2010

Region	Conference	Institution	Total Games	In Region	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non-member opp
Two	Gulf South Conf games: 9	Ark.-Monticello	11	9	1	1	0	0
		Arkansas Tech	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Delta St.	15	9	1	1	0	0
		Harding	10	10	0	0	0	0
		Henderson St.	11	10	0	0	0	0
		North Ala.	13	10	0	0	0	0
		Ouachita Baptist	10	8	1	0	0	1
		Southern Ark.	10	9	1	1	0	0
		Valdosta St.	11	10	0	0	0	0
		West Ala.	11	10	1	0	0	1
		West Ga.	10	9	1	0	0	1
	Independent	Lambuth	10	5	3	1	1	1
		North Greenville	10	5	5	1	1	3
		UNC Pembroke	10	9	1	0	0	1
	SIAC Conf games: 7	Albany St. (GA)	12	9	1	1	0	0
		Benedict	11	9	2	1	0	1
		Clark Atlanta	10	9	1	1	0	0
		Fort Valley St.	11	9	1	1	0	0
		Kentucky St.	11	10	1	1	0	0
		Lane	10	9	1	1	0	0
		Miles	11	10	1	0	0	1
		Morehouse	11	10	0	0	0	0
		Stillman	11	10	1	0	0	1
		Tuskegee	11	9	2	2	0	0
	South Atlantic Conf games: 7	Brevard	11	8	3	1	0	2
		Carson-Newman	11	8	1	0	0	1
		Catawba	10	10	0	0	0	0
		Lenoir-Rhyne	11	10	1	1	0	0
		Mars Hill	11	10	1	1	0	0
		Newberry	10	9	1	1	0	0
		Tusculum	11	7	1	1	0	0
		Wingate	12	10	0	0	0	0
Three	GLIAC Conf games: 10	Ashland	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Ferris St.	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Findlay	11	10	0	0	0	0
		Grand Valley St.	13	10	0	0	0	0
		Hillsdale	12	11	0	0	0	0
		Indianapolis	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Lake Erie	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Michigan Tech	10	10	0	0	0	0
		Northern Mich.	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Northwood (MI)	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Ohio Dominican	10	10	0	0	0	0
		Saginaw Valley	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Tiffin	11	10	1	0	0	1
		Wayne St. (MI)	11	11	0	0	0	0

Football 2010

Region	Conference	Institution	Total Games	In Region	Non DII Opp	DI Opp	DIII Opp	Non-member opp
	Independent	Black Hills St.	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Central St. (OH)	11	6	2	2	0	0
		Ky. Wesleyan	11	7	3	0	1	2
		Malone	10	0	9	0	1	8
		McKendree	12	0	9	0	0	9
		Minot St.	10	2	5	0	0	5
		Missouri S&T	11	7	5	1	2	2
		North Dakota	11	0	9	9	0	0
		Notre Dame (OH)	11	1	4	0	0	4
		Quincy	2	0	2	2	0	0
		Sioux Falls	14	0	12	0	1	11
		South Dakota	10	0	9	9	0	0
		South Dakota Mines	10	0	6	0	1	5
		St. Joseph's (IN)	10	6	2	2	0	0
		Urbana University	11	8	1	0	0	1
		Walsh	11	0	7	0	0	7
	Northern Sun Conf games: 10	Augustana (SD)	13	11	0	0	0	0
		Bemidji St.	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Concordia-St. Paul	12	11	0	0	0	0
		Mary	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Minn. Duluth	15	10	0	0	0	0
		Minn. St. Mankato	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Minn. St. Moorhead	11	10	0	0	0	0
		Minn.-Crookston	11	10	1	0	0	1
		Northern St.	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Southwest Minn. St.	11	11	0	0	0	0
		St. Cloud St.	13	11	0	0	0	0
		Upper Iowa	11	10	0	0	0	0
		Wayne St. (NE)	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Winona St.	11	10	0	0	0	0
	RMAC Conf games: 9	Adams St.	11	10	1	1	0	0
		Chadron St.	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Colorado Mesa	10	9	0	0	0	0
		Colorado Mines	12	10	1	0	0	1
		Colorado St.-Pueblo	11	10	1	0	0	1
		Fort Lewis	10	9	1	1	0	0
		N.M. Highlands	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Neb.-Kearney	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Western N.M.	11	10	2	1	1	0
		Western St.	11	10	1	1	0	0
Four	Great Northwest Conf games: 8	Central Wash.	11	8	2	1	0	1
		Dixie St.	10	9	1	1	0	0
		Humboldt St.	11	8	2	1	0	1
		Western Ore.	11	8	3	1	0	2
	Independent	Lincoln (MO)	11	7	3	1	0	2
		Lindenwood	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Okla. Panhandle	11	3	7	1	0	6
		Simon Fraser	10	8	2	0	0	2

Football 2010

	Lone Star Conf games: 10	Southwest Baptist	11	8	3	1	0	2
		Abilene Christian	12	11	0	0	0	0
		Angelo St.	10	10	0	0	0	0
		Central Okla.	11	11	0	0	0	0
		East Central	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Eastern N.M.	11	10	1	0	0	1
		Incarnate Word	11	10	0	0	0	0
		Midwestern St.	12	11	0	0	0	0
		Northeastern St.	11	10	0	0	0	0
		Southeastern Okla.	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Southwestern Okla.	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Tarleton St.	11	10	1	1	0	0
		Tex. A&M-Commerce	11	10	0	0	0	0
		Tex. A&M-Kingsville	12	11	0	0	0	0
		West Tex. A&M	12	10	0	0	0	0
	MIAA Conf games: 9	Central Mo.	14	10	1	1	0	0
		Emporia St.	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Fort Hays St.	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Mo. Southern St.	11	10	0	0	0	0
		Mo. Western St.	12	10	0	0	0	0
		Neb. Omaha	11	10	0	0	0	0
		Northwest Mo. St.	14	10	0	0	0	0
		Pittsburg St.	12	11	0	0	0	0
		Truman	11	11	0	0	0	0
		Washburn	12	11	0	0	0	0

Selection Criteria White Paper Membership Feedback

1. Is the scheduling of in-region/non-conference competition important?

We believe in the regionalization format and understand the importance of in-region non-conference games for ranking purposes.

Conference members have mixed feelings on this question. On the one hand, it is understood that regionalization is a basic tenet of Division II. It is also a practical thing for many of our schools with limited budgets. With the focus on the importance of playing games in region to help one's own team and their conference with possible selection to post season, schools with less resources to travel will be on a more level playing field when putting their schedules together. That is, ALL schools currently need to get in-region games to help with selection so even those with smaller travel budgets should be able to put together competitive schedules.

However, some issues impact the reality of this situation:

- The ECC is a presently a 9 member conference in a region with two larger conferences. One has 14 members (and looking to get larger) and one with 16. In some sports, the other conferences just have so few out of conference games to be played that scheduling is just not possible (more on that below). So even if criteria call for in-region non-conference contests, the reality with large vs. small conferences in the same region is this might not readily happen.
- Our conference now includes an institution, the University of the District of Columbia, that was formerly in another region as an independent. It will make more sense for them to play their out of conference game against schools closer to Washington DC. We are hopeful that another school that is in the membership process, Roberts Wesleyan, will join the ECC in the near future and they are in a location (Rochester, NY) far outside the that will make playing schools in contiguous states easier than in the East region. Our expansion was made necessary by institutions leaving the conference and the reality that 8 members was just not viable when the other conferences in the region were so big. We are not sure it makes sense for either of these schools to focus on finding real in-region games but instead they may need to choose to play those in their contiguous states for financial and travel reasons...but how does that help our conference or RAC committees looking to select for post season play? We are not sure the 'in region' model still works in this case.

The scheduling of in-region non-conference competition is important, however our league, Conference Carolinas with 12 members including a single gender institution in Converse College, will be moving to a full double round-robin scheduling format for basketball in 2012-13.

Member institutions will then play 22 women's conference games and 20 men's conference games each year, providing very limited opportunities to play non-conference competition and thus also in-region non-conference competition.

No.

Absolutely. SA's and coaches want to challenge themselves outside of their conference. Agreed that difficult to compare one conference vs. another if they don't play each other.

Yes, in-region/non-conference scheduling is important for comparison purposes between conferences.

We, of course, believe the opportunity and value of scheduling in-region/non-conference competition to be important and encourage it among member institutions. The struggle that remains is the definition of "in-region" for scheduling purposes. To facilitate the selection committee's desire for increased "in-region" competition, the Division needs to clarify the definition of "in-region"...is it "selection" region or the newer definition of contiguous states, etc. that has developed recently? It would seem that that issue needs clarified. We do not believe this is small vs. large geographic region issue, as it entirely depends on your location in proximity to non-conference institutions and likely your institutional budget.

Yes, if the contests are ones that make sense to play from a travel standpoint. Some of our regions stretch to an extent that it isn't viable to dictate that institutions travel 10 or more hours to compete when closer alternatives are available.

Yes for the sustainability and growth of Field Hockey.

Yes, in the sport of softball, we find that there is the ability for competition across conferences to appear from the early season tournaments.

While important, I do not think it should be a requirement. In requiring such, the action is then contrary to the principles of regionalization and the associated philosophies.

Yes, but to clarify, it's only important if those other games are D2 games.

Yes, the in-region/non-conference competition is very important. It provides measureable and outside competition for our programs.

This is absolutely very important. SA's and coaches want to challenge themselves outside of their conference. We agree that it is difficult to compare one conference vs. another if they don't play each other, but it does make comparisons easier. It is not worth increased costs if others don't also have to do it.

Yes, I believe it is crucial for DII as it helps lower travel costs and can promote regional rivalries. It also allows the school's fans and parents the greater ability to see their team and children play on the road. This helps the home team generate additional revenues as well as the local community.

Yes

Scheduling of in-region/non-conference competition is essential – more data to help make the best possible selection. Some schools have no data in this field.

I feel it is critically important to come up with a plan to encourage and require in-region/non-conference competition. As a member of the Div II Softball Committee, I find it frustrating with the many teams and conferences who have either no or very little out of conference play. It leaves a void or misrepresentation in that portion of the selection criteria. Encouraging increased out of conference in region competition would bring us closer to comparing "apples and apples".

Yes, in region games for a region using continuous states does not help us when they do not play them in the regional play. Should we mandate it must be a true "in region"? With staying within the Division II philosophy, yes it is important.

In region scheduling is important. Makes the committee's job easier.

We play a large % of our games in region and within Division II.

Yes it is important. Schools are not playing each other due to travel distances and time allotment within the schedule.

Yes. I am sure most regional softball chairs can agree that when you have 2 or more conferences in a region it is very difficult to determine the top 10 each week if in-region/non-conference competition doesn't take place. Also there is difficulty if 1 conference is more dominating then the rest.

Yes, it should be arranged with the coaches in each region to have a home and away schedule that rotates every year to secure home duals and create a healthy rival.

Non-conference in-region completion is hugely important to selecting the correct teams. The more games scheduled gives each RAC more head to head, common opponents and more comparison information.

The GLVC has embraced the concept of regionalization and recognizes the importance of in-region/non-conference competition. Our teams routinely compete against members of the GLIAC in various sports. Four years ago the both leagues came together to create the GLVC/GLIAC Crossover Volleyball Tournament to promote in-region competition and provide the Midwest Volleyball RAC with head-to-head results among all teams in the region.

Yes, if you are going to use regionalization as part of the criteria for the selection process to get to the regionals

Yes scheduling of in-region non-conference competition is important as it gives a basis for comparison.

Due to budgetary constraints and the vision of DII, in-region/non-conference is important.

It would depend on the sport and each sport's championship committee as to its process for selection. Not sure that it would be beneficial to generalize the scheduling of in-region/nonconference competition across all sports.

I think when you look at this question in a vacuum it's easy to say, well, of course, these contests are important, but we have to look at it on a much larger scale and decide what is the expense of mandating these competitions. In a perfect world the top teams in each region would compete each year but there are so many variables that the reality of this is improbable.

Yes, because it gives teams the best chance to make the NCAA tournament

Yes, but I think for some sports like women's lacrosse it's difficult with the limited amount of schools in certain regions to find enough in region games just to fill the schedule regardless whether it be in region or not, especially if we move to a 4 region model. I think it would be better for in-region/ non-conference competition if smaller number sports maintained a 2 region model until their teams hit a certain number of schools

Yes, under the current selection process for Women's Lacrosse, it is imperative that you schedule as many in-region/non-conference games as you can to improve your chances for selection for the small field in our sport. Due to the small field even team's with a 16-2 (.889) in-region and overall record despite a win over the #1 team in the region, have been left out of the NCAA Tournament in the past.

YES

I believe this is important, to an extent. There obviously needs to be some form of in-region/non-conference competition if RAC's and NAC's are to make informed comparisons between schools when it comes times for selecting/ranking teams for NCAA Post-season competition. However, some schools face certain obstacles (financial, geographical, willing opponents, mandated conference schedules, etc.) that can make in-region/non-conference competition difficult. Considering that, I believe that the entire body of work for a team is of greater importance than in-region/non-conference competition, but that the in-region/non-conference competition is not without value.

That being said, I also believe there are benefits to non-region competition as well. In a region such as the one I am in (Central), often times some of our schools would like to perhaps schedule

a trip to a more “exotic” locale (such as California or Florida) as an opportunity to be able to expose its student-athletes to different parts of the nation. However, this emphasis on in-region/non-conference competition reduces the likelihood that coaches will choose to make such educational trips as it hurts their chances to make the NCAA Post-season.

In region is important, but from experience it is getting increasingly difficult.

Yes, in-region non-conference is important, and I would go so far as to say it essential in order for RACs to determine who the best eight teams in the region are. Unfortunately, as conferences get bigger and the number of allowable contests decreases, there are fewer opportunities to play. Add to that the fact that the economy is terrible and budgets are tight, why would schools make the effort to play these types of games if they can schedule NAIA or DIII games at home for a fraction of the cost? So yes, it is very important, but the trend in DII is making this almost obsolete.

Yes

YES

From a global perspective, yes, in-region/non-conference competition provides institutions with opportunities to schedule DII opponents that should be geographically closer and thus save money and missed class time. This is the case within the East region. However, size of Conference is also a key component to the number of non-conference opponents available. While in-region play can contain costs, there is no question that the best way to build a schedule and contain costs is within your own Conference. Guaranteed home and away rotation, the ability to budget years ahead, etc. provide stability for a Conference. With 16 members, the Northeast-10 provides 85% of an institutions’ permissible games in the sport of basketball; 90% in football; 83% in women’s soccer. We are proud of the competitive conference we have in every sport the NCAA sponsors. As such, the in-region, non-Conference competitions are often scheduled to meet the NCAA requirements and given the relative compactness of the East Region, we do not typically have trouble filling the non-Conference opportunities with in-region contests against the other two leagues.

So, the in-region/non-conference approach is important in the sense that regional games save institutional money on travel and provides the RAC a frame of reference. However, we could support the notion that an institution should be able to complete their schedule with Division II opponents if necessary, regardless of selection region they reside in if an institution chooses. We feel a priority should be on Division II opponents and that there should be flexibility, especially for regions that have other out of region DII opponents that are closer in proximity than an in-region opponent.

The scheduling of in-region/non-conference competition is important in the sport of women’s volleyball. When trying to compare teams within a region, there isn’t always inter-conference

play to help compare two teams from separate conferences. This is partially due to the fact that, outside of their conference matches, teams can play an institution in a contiguous state and it will be counted as in-region. Many times those same opponents are not considered in-region for members of another conference within the same region because they are in a different state and cannot count that same state as contiguous. The volleyball coaches and the committee recognize that many institutions are playing the majority of their matches in-region; however, those in-region matches aren't always helping in comparing teams because two teams from one region do not have the same contiguous states.

2. Are scheduling difficulties limited to certain sports and regions?

- There are certain sports where our conference members do have difficulty in finding in region games against in region opponents: men's and women's soccer and men's and women's tennis. In some cases this is a matter of availability of games (as noted above – when other conferences are large and yours is smaller, there are just not that many games to go around) and in some cases it is a matter of strategic scheduling. If a strong team in a larger conference wishes to avoid a strong team in a smaller league, they can do so
- As one of our ADs commented: “In the East region The Northeast 10 has 14 men's soccer teams and 15 women's soccer teams. Therefore they really only need 5 and 4 more games in region. The ECC will have 10 teams playing soccer for both men and women and will therefore all be needing 9 more games. Since most soccer teams really only play 17 games it is going to be very difficult to find games in region, especially against regionally ranked teams. Basically the NE 10 could choose who to play. Our better ECC teams will have a harder time getting a game.

Since the women have an automatic bid they are guaranteed at least one rep in the event and we do not get others regionally ranked based on new criteria but the men with no automatic bid are at a greater disadvantage.

Strong consideration should be given to expanding automatic qualifiers in all sports including those like men's soccer and lacrosse. AQ's would solve many of the issues that arise with trying to get games in regions where there are larger conferences.

If the legislation passes that will support the numbers of members required to maintain a DII conference, then leagues of 10 or more members will have somewhat limited flexibility for non-conference, and thus non-conference in-region competition, for sports that they play a double round-robin schedule.

Yes, it is certainly much more difficult with certain sports and in certain regions.

For the East region it is not generally difficult to create a competitive schedule. However, there are times in certain sports that other conferences are not amiable to schedule.

I think so. Some regions clearly have more schools than others, fewer opportunities to join a conference due to low sport sponsorship. FH is a great example.

Some sport scheduling is easier than others. Regional (lacrosse/field hockey/football) sports struggle.

Generally, we would suggest that the scheduling difficulties lie in certain sports. However, we believe the scheduling difficulties also lie in the strength of the team trying to schedule. A historically strong program has a tendency to find it more difficult to schedule non-conference programs than perhaps a weaker team.

I certainly think that this issue varies wildly from sport-to-sport and in various parts of the country. As someone that has worked in differing areas, my perspective has been different in each job. I like ideas that allow flexibility for each region.

Helps the Independent schools which will help grow the sport.

From SA perspective you want to go outside your own region and challenge yourself and the life experience of the travel and exposure.

The challenge for softball with relation to the regular season schedule is that some teams “overschedule” knowing the spring weather may force them to “lose” games. While in the same token, if the weather issue does not come to fruition then some teams cancel contests later in the season knowing if they play they will play more games than is permitted. The national softball committee discussed this issue at the 2011 summer meetings and is looking at ways to alleviate the scheduling issue. However, it isn’t necessarily a difficulty to develop a schedule but to keep a firm schedule.

I have little perspective in which to comment on this subject.

Yes, especially here in the West. As stated in the paper, the conflicting forces of the increasing of conference size and the reduction of allowable contests has made the scheduling even more difficult as in some sports, there are certain out of conference/in-region opponents that everyone wants to play and there simply aren’t enough available dates.

I think there are different challenges in scheduling for different sports. All have scheduling challenges and more and more are non-conference related.

Yes. Some regions clearly have more schools offering more programs than others. FH, Tennis and Men's soccer are great examples.

There can be if your school is willing to schedule games, but others schools in your close proximity/region are not willing to schedule those games. It can also be difficult if a conference is large and does not have space to schedule non-conference games.

Due to Peach Belt Conference scheduling regulations, our difficulties lie more in Time Constraints than anything else. Baseball is a good example, as we usually only have one (1) free weekend for non-conference play and mid-week contests aren't ideal or even feasible because the long travel to regional opponents would mean too much missed class time.

From the selections stand-point for women's soccer, in-region non-conference competition is VERY important. A minimal amount of IRNC competition by each team would suffice, 2-4 games.

Some regions have issues with scheduling regular season play in DII WSOC, especially the South and West regions – some institutions really will not play each other and it's a struggle. One game is affecting too large of one section of criteria in some regions.

Certain regions and conferences would have an increased difficulty in developing a regular season schedule. Geographical distances create greater travel time and expense in traveling for non-conference play. Weather is a factor especially in the Northeast and Northern states, limiting the number of good weather days available to schedule. And finally size of conference factors on the number of contests left available to play non-conference games. However we should not allow these to be an excuse for not implementing positive change. There are ways around some of these obstacles, (i.e. teams traveling south in the early season can and should try to coincide travel and schedule down south with other in region, non conference schools).

West region has difficulty getting games; California has limitations on playing out of the state.

Some regions have more options due to tournament dates (if they are consistent from year to year).

Not sure. I believe that each institution does what is affordable for them.

Yes, it depends on the coach and budget constraints of the schools.

The GLVC is currently comprised of 17 member institutions, 16 of which currently compete in the league's regular season schedule. Although we don't experience difficulties developing a regular season schedule for all of our sports we do face travel challenges inherent with claiming member schools in five Midwest states.

I think that it is a little of both

In our case there are difficulties in developing a regular season schedule to contain costs and limit missed class time and for the most part it affects all sports but basketball and volleyball seem to be able to work out better than the other sports in our conference/region.

Probably a little of both. Warmer weather conferences usually have an advantage in scheduling. Some regions have more schools within range.

I believe that this is extremely challenging for most institutions in the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference due to how spread out geographically the institutions are in both the conference and region, as well as the variety of sports offered within the conference.

The fact that I didn't know there were difficulties in developing regular season schedules leads me to believe it is certain sports and/or certain regions. I also believe there have been two important factors in recent past that has made it easier to fill schedules; 1) the broader definition of what counts as in-region play I discussed earlier and 2) conferences (either through expansion or simply changing their scheduling models) are playing more conference games. I would argue that most conferences are playing more conference games due to budgetary issues rather than simply trying to fill a schedule – the two items are certainly connected.

Yes there is difficulty because there are schools who sponsor lacrosse whose geography makes it difficult to schedule in region games.

I think they usually go hand in hand. I think usually sports like field hockey and women's lacrosse have a more difficult time scheduling game because of the number of schools that actually have programs. We have lower numbers, although we are growing. so making blanket statements or guidelines for all sports is a difficult thing to do without having certain sports suffer.

Yes, based more geographical location rather than what region a team plays in. In the sport of women's lacrosse, the number of teams are expanding so quickly that there are a lot of miles between the new schools in the west, midwest, and south.

Certain Sports within certain regions... for example FB and Men's Soccer

Due to the conference I belong to, I would like to reserve judgment on this question as in 2012-13, my league (the NSIC) is one that will be dealing with new conferences (MIAA, GAC), so all previous scheduling issues will effectively be moot. I will say that in our current arrangement (in a region with the RMAC), there has been a general sense of frustration from coaches in several different sports at my school that claim that RMAC teams are generally speaking more hesitant to travel to NSIC institutions due to financial considerations, and therefore our teams – who want to play those games – end up travelling more often than they think is fair. Again, this is only the perceptions offered by coaches at my institution; I have not studied this to see if it is accurate.

I believe there are different issues for different sports, mostly because of travel party size.

Yes, I think some regions struggle more than others. Obviously the geographically large regions have more travel costs for these types of contests.

Both

In our sport it is difficult because we have such a small window to get 18 games in, and our closest in region conference is on a different calendar than us. Forcing an 18th game may result in injury or cost them a game, which may hurt selection.

In general we benefit from the region we are in and the proximity and number of DII institutions in the region. Most of our institutions do not have tremendous difficulty in scheduling games out of Conference because in most sports they are not scheduling more than 3-6 non-Conference competitions; we would identify that we have more difficulty in scheduling home contests but that is driven by the regional success our Conference currently enjoys in many sports. Basketball has benefitted from early season tournaments that provide neutral court options and exempted games as incentives for non-Conference opponents. We believe that our difficulties, if any could be identified, are limited to football (neither of the other two conferences in our region sponsor the sport and the PSAC has an extra league game) and ice hockey. In football, we will be adding an extra in-league game to assist schools with DII scheduling. In recent years many had begun scheduling DIII opponents to fill their schedules and this does not assist anyone.

One suggestion from one committee member is to eliminate contiguous states.

- 3. Should a process similar to nullification be implemented if an institution did not schedule an “in-region/non-conference opponent”?**

Conference members are not interested in a system that penalizes but rather one that helps coaches and institutions focus on putting together a schedule that is viable according to that school's philosophy and financial situation, but also on what that provides their team members a competitive experience. The best teams in the region should play each other, as the schedule permits, because that is good for their team members. Those decisions should not only be based on qualifying for NCAA postseason. At present, this does not always happen.

it is significant that DII has now created the opportunity for an AQ in almost all sports because any team not able to develop an in-region non-conference schedule which affords it the opportunity to build a resume of success in those competitions does have the opportunity to win the right into post-season by winning a league championship.

No—absolutely not!

Absolutely. That goes against the principles of regionalization

Yes, but what if reason for not scheduling is budgetary? Funds from NCAA or conference to help with travel? Should it be penalty if 0, 1, 2.....games scheduled? i.e. where is the cutoff?

No, I do not think we should have a nullification process.

We would not suggest a “stick” approach to this process but rather a “carrot” approach in encouraging such scheduling. Budgetary restrictions, geography, institutional priorities and even historical programming and rivalries may weigh heavily on an institution's decisions to schedule. A bonus point system may be more appropriate.

I feel strongly that this should not occur. The burden will fall harder on schools that fall on the outer edges of regions.

Difficulties in developing a FH schedule limited to sports or regions? Limited to regions as the conference dictates the number of conference games. (South has 15 and North has 15 with one team playing 14)

I do support the nullification deduction and/or “bonus” type of methodology for consideration to either get a bonus for scheduling or a deduction for not doing so. I believe it will strengthen the selection analysis in the end yet provide teams an “incentive” for doing so.

No. Scheduling should be done at the discretion of the institution provided they meet the minimum requirements of number of contests.

Certainly something that could be looked at further.

I would strongly support some process that is a promotion to any out of conference competition.

Nullification would depend on the reasoning. Is it budgetary? Should it be penalty if 0, 1, 2.....games scheduled? i.e., where is the cutoff? Another idea versus nullification would be "bonus points."

I am not sure that I agree with a deduction, but there should be a plus to those institutions that do schedule any in-region/non conference competition.

No – you run the risk of penalizing coaches/programs who may not have much choice (due to scheduling regulations, etc.) in who/when they can schedule non-conference opponents.

The regions do vary in regards to the difficulty in scheduling, however, most of the difficulties we hear stem from their conference schedules and the decisions made about those. If the NCAA would set parameters for requiring non-conference contests then the conferences would be forced to alter their efforts and most of the difficulties would go away.

A nullification or penalty for not complying with increased in region, non conference play would force schools interested in advancing to comply. It would also encourage a more level playing field by making it difficult to squeeze out schools or conferences by other schools and conferences avoiding including them in their schedules.

Would not be fair to the SA's to implement such penalty structure.

Playing Division I elevates the pay of the golf game and is used as a recruiting tool. Tournaments are selected on dates available.

Unsure.

No because sometimes this is not up to the coach and it would punish the athlete.

Given the expansive geographic footprint of the Midwest Region membership the GLVC would not support the concept of nullification. It is not practical for our schools on the western and southern edge of the league to regularly travel to Michigan and Ohio for the sake of selection criteria or for the GLIAC schools to make a similar trip to the GLVC. It's a financial burden for the schools and not always conducive to promoting a positive student-athlete experience because of the length and duration of such bus trips.

Yes, those schools need to be penalize

To be consistent with my response in #1, yes a mathematical deduction should be implemented if an institution did not schedule any in region – non-conference competition.

I don't know the answer to that. It would be tough to penalize a school for not scheduling in-region/non-conference based on geography, budget, and weather.

No. Due to financial resources needed to travel long distances because of geographical location. Also, some larger conferences may be able to play a "full schedule" within their conference and shouldn't be penalized for not playing competitions outside of the conference.

I am adamantly opposed to any concept that would penalize a team for their non-conference schedule.

Yes

I think that depends on the sport and how the region is set up, like I previously said, if women's lacrosse sticks to a 2 region mode this would make sense, if we went to a 4 region model it would not.

No, as long as a team plays a minimum number of in-region games, however automatic qualifications (AQ's) should be allowed sooner than the current required 48-Team bracket size. The use of automatic qualifications encourages conferences to sponsor sports and gives institutions incentives to join and compete in a conference within a specific region. With the mandatory NCAA increases in conference sizes by 2017 & 2022, AQ's will encourage smaller conference to merge into larger ones.

YES

I support this idea as long as in-region/non-conference competition remains a primary selection criteria, and as long as in-region/non-conference competition remains an ideal of Division II.

I think it would be hard to penalize teams because you will not be able to tell who was really trying to schedule in region and who was not. Also, finances could play a roll.

I'm not sure I support a nullification process. This penalizes schools that may simply not be able to get games or simply cannot afford the cost to get these games. This certainly would increase the number of in-region non-conference games, but I'm not sure it is the right approach.

No

YES

As a Conference we strongly believe that there should be NO penalty for institutions that did not schedule in-region/non-Conference competition as long as the institution scheduled DII opponents, regardless of region and met all applicable NCAA requirements for scheduling. We do not believe that a punitive approach is the way to go and would instead support an incentive-approach in promoting the value of scheduling regional Division II opponents while also incentivizing schools to build DII schedules rather than scheduling DIII and NAIA opponents. We might consider that rather than non-DII games just not being part of the selection process, that it should be punitive in nature. As a division, we should care more about the fact that a school scheduled an entire DII schedule rather than from which region those schools came from. We would support weighted criteria on a sport by sport basis that rewarded in-region non-conference play but this would have to be examined on a sport-by-sport basis as there are differences in sports like field hockey, men's and women's lacrosse, where selections aren't via the "normal" eight region setup. We would rather have the RAC and the National Committee have to work harder to rank and select teams that may have fewer in-region opponents but at least used those opportunities to schedule in Division II than to have them be discussing teams that filled their schedules with non-DII opponents.

Another suggestion from a committee member is to allow all teams within one region to have the same set of in-region opponents. So contiguous states should be the same for all teams within a region.

4. Should sport committees' mandate a minimum on required 'in region/non-conference' contests?

The issues with finding games will be on a sport by sport basis and so there should not be a uniform rule like this. And, as noted above, in some sports and regions, conference size will dictate how many non-conference games are feasible. If a 16 team conference decides to play every other member in the regular season, can the NCAA dictate they leave open a certain number of games for non-conference?

I do not favor the addition of selection criteria which state a minimum of non-conference in-region competitions required for entry into post-season, or utilizes a weighted system to encourage scheduling of DII opponents v. non DII competition, or weights rankings based on the historical success of opponents.

No, absolutely not!

Yes, perhaps 2 or 3 contest.

Might be more cut and dry/black and white than the mathematical deduction. Easier for coaches to understand. The deduction might not be enough to encourage a really strong team to schedule non-conference games. Maybe a percentage of available games need to be non-conference because conferences are different sizes, and thus a different # of conference-mandated games.

Yes, it should be mandated, so conference comparisons can be made.

This may well be a sport-by-sport issue, however depending on conference size and availability of non-conference opponents may prohibit these options. Conference size is increasing in Division II, thus more mandated in-conference play is likely to occur. It is hard to mandate more out of conference play from the national body when to the contrary we just passed regulations increasing the minimum sizes of conferences.

Again, I would answer no. As a member of many different RAC's, it's certainly easier to have head-to-head competition. However, I think this is going too far on the association's part. Scheduling control should largely remain the province of conferences and schools.

Not interested in implementing a mathematical deduction for schools who did not implement an in-region, non-conference competition. The strength of schedule should work this out and this is not applicable for field hockey as we only have 2 regions.

No.

No. Scheduling should be done at the discretion of the institution.

No, I believe the schools need to make their schedules based on a variety of factors and because of geographical limitations, etc., it might not be possible.

I don't think there should be a mandate or at least punitive action to schedule, but some feel strongly about some incentive for scheduling should be in place.

The deduction might not be enough to encourage a really strong team to schedule non-conference games and because of conference sizes and locations of available non-conference opponents. Maybe a percentage of available games need to be non-conference because conferences are different sizes, and thus a different number of conference-mandated games.

There should not be a mandate of a certain amount of games, but the sports committee selection criteria should award those that schedule in-region/non-conference contests.

No – for same reasons stated above. Some schools may have more time and money than others to create flexibility in scheduling.

This would be ideal as it would force conferences to re-think what they are doing and would make this play easier to justify on campuses.

Sports committees should mandate at least 2 required in-region/non-conference games. 1 game is not enough to really compare and get enough data from. Side note: we would even consider taking it out of our ranking formula bc it's weighing too heavily for what we want them to be, but it's the only way of getting this data.

I would like to see a minimum number of games in region, out of conference as a requirement for post season eligibility. Ideally requiring schedule with cross conference teams in the same tier of the previous years conference order of finish. (i.e. a team finishing in the top half of their conference would be required to schedule a minimum number of games with non conference teams in region who also finished in the top half of their conference standings)

Some leagues do not have many opportunities.

Add criteria to say one tournament must be played against Division II competition or two dates of competition against Division II schools in your region out of conference.

No, I don't think that would help.

No- Our current regional qualifying system works.

The league's response would be predicated on whether the required in-region/non-conference contests must be played against GLIAC schools or schools located contiguous with the five states that comprise the GLVC. The league would be more receptive to mandating contests against GLIAC competition if funding were available to host more crossover events at a central site or to subsidize the expense for the road teams based on some type of mileage matrix.

Yes, but in may be a little different in each sport with the number of contest allowed by the NCAA and by the size of the Conference that you are in.

A weighted ranking system to encourage schedule against other DII institutions with bonus points for Top 25 teams is reasonable. However, there should also be bonus points for winning a game against a Division I opponent. Many DII institutions schedule a couple of games against DI competition and some win. Playing "up" against that type of competition brings tremendous recognition to our level of competition and we gain additional respect and our local and regional media cover those games. It can't be as

much of an incentive bonus as playing against at Top 25 DII team but it should have some form of point credit.

Yes

No, for reasons outlined on the previous page.

Currently there are minimum numbers of DII contests and in-region contests required for most sports, if not all. I believe these are good requirements and adequate numbers, I would not want to see a third criteria that specified in-region/non-conference. For example, in WBB a team must schedule 22 DII contests and 18 in-region contests to be eligible for post-season. 22 of the permissible 26 games must be against DII opponents (that is 85% of your schedule) and 18 must be in-region (70%). During the Life in the Balance initiative many sports had the number of permissible contests reduced which limits the number of non-conference opportunities – it would be very difficult to now put restrictions on teams of how to schedule those games as well.

Yes, this will force to schedule in region opponents

I think that may be difficult because of the different sizes of conferences. It's harder for those schools who may only have 2 games to schedule and need to travel in order to compete (especially with snow in the Northeast being a factor) So if the only games we can compete in are in the south region that makes it difficult

No, as long as a team plays a minimum number of in-region games, because a institution should be allowed to choose a schedule that is financially feasible. For example: a team in Northeast PA should be allowed to play a team in Southwest Connecticut because it is more financially feasible based on travel costs (Approx. 3 Hours) than the same team playing a school in Northeast Ohio (a conjoining state, thus in-region, however Approx. 7 hours away).*

*East Stroudsburg University to University of New Haven & East Stroudsburg University to Lake Erie College using MapQuest.

YES

Generally speaking, as long as in-region/non-conference competition remains a primary selection criteria, I like this concept. However, as I referenced earlier, I do have some concerns about schools that legitimately have issues being able to line up these games (financial, geographical, willing opponents, mandated conference schedules, etc.) that truly wish to line up these contests, but are unable to for whatever reason. Also, I can understand school's philosophical opposition to effectively be told "how to schedule" when that traditionally been an institutional decision. That being said, I think the pros outweigh the cons as the system currently stands.

Yes, but again I am not sure what that number should be. We play 16 region games just for conference.

Again, this is a cost issue. I support this over a nullification process.

Yes.

YES

We do not believe, as a Conference, that sports committees should mandate specific numbers of in-region/non-conference contests. This philosophy is contrary to the spirit in which Conferences strive to grow larger and provide more guaranteed in-Conference games. As a Conference with 16 members that also provides a large percentage of the games on each teams' schedule, our institutions, on a sport-by-sport basis, should be free to schedule the non-Conference DII opponents that they need. Perhaps by incentivizing those to be in-region contests, we would not then worry about establishing or mandating where those are. We are also in a region with 40 institutions. Not every school will have legitimate postseason aspirations and if the punitive nature of this is postseason eligibility, you will still have institutions that won't be appearing in postseason play and thus not subject to these penalties and will not assist in reaching the goal. Unless you could find a way to ensure that every DII institution will be mandated for the same number of games regardless of postseason potential, this approach can't work. And we don't feel that this will work for all regions of the country, especially in the West. The lack of in-region / non-conference games may make the RAC's job more difficult, but it doesn't make it impossible as long as schools are scheduling other DII institutions and not non-DII.

Based on the first bullet point, if an incentive program or a penalty system is implemented to require teams to play in-region/non-conference matches, it would only be beneficial in comparing teams if the requirement is that they play other conferences within their region (and not teams that are contiguous). Therefore, simply mandating a specific number of required in-region/non-conference contests would not help in solving the problem.

5. Should a weighted ranking system be developed to encourage scheduling DII institutions instead of those in other divisions or associations?

We feel the focus should be on playing DII opponents so a system that rewards that would be positive. Based on the issues noted above regarding budget limitations, location and program philosophy, schools should be permitted some latitude in how to develop a schedule. For example, if one school feels it is important for recruiting or development reasons, to take a trip from the East to Florida each year, as long as they are playing DII opponents, they should not be penalized for making that choice if they are meeting their conference obligations.

I do not favor an incentive plan, penalty structure, or additional legislation to require any level of non-conference in-region scheduling.

I love the idea of incenting teams to play in region and play more Division II games. I think a weighted system to encourage Division II play is an excellent idea. It has worked in baseball as most teams play almost their entire schedules against DII teams. I also like a weighted system so teams are encouraged to play the better teams. At one time there was a scale or point system for defeating a .750 team, a .500 team, or a .250 team. More points were rewarded for a road win and you were not punished for a road loss to a good team. Last year in men's basketball if you lost a road game to an opponent that was ranked it absolutely killed you in several categories. Conversely losing at home to a bad sub .500 team was actually the best loss that you could endure. They were not ranked. They were not above .500 and it was not on the road so in those three categories there was no damage done. Yet losing on the road to a ranked over .500 team beat you up in all of those categories. Long story short yes let's encourage schools to go play other good schools.

No, absolutely not!

Yes, only Division II institutions should be considered in the ranking process. For example, D I, D III, and NAIA should render 0 points.

I think playing D2 competition is essential. If you play other association/division, it should not count towards selection one way or the other. Is this way for FH. Is that the case for other sports?

Yes, we should do all we can to encourage DII competition.

Competition against Division II opponents is critical and essential. Anything that can be done to reduce non-Division II play should be considered. In 2010-11 our men's basketball teams played 20 non-Division II contests. It is hard to say that all 20 would have matched up with an in-region/non-conference opponent otherwise, but even if they had played against other Division II opponents, the chances increase for better comparisons and selection data.

I do support this strongly. When it all possible, we should be encouraging Division II competition. Schools are unfortunately playing NCCAA members or non-affiliated schools to pick up easy wins. I would also ask the folks in NCAA Statistics to consider changing what is considered a victory for their purposes. Contests versus schools that are not a part of a national sanctioning organization (NCAA, NAIA, NCCAA, USCAA) should not be counted as a contest period.

No. Again it is only a 2 region sport and don't believe it is applicable to us. Almost every game is considered in –region.

No, I'd be more in support of the nullification type methodology

No.

I'm not sure this is necessary when the system that had been in place for many years provided that. Contests against NAIA or D3 schools simply didn't count in any of the equations.

I strongly feel there should be some weighted but fair system to promote those who schedule out of conference competition in all sports.

We think playing D2 competition is essential. If you play other association/division, it should not count toward selection one way or the other. All non-division II competition should not count.

Yes

YES

Women's soccer has the weighted system and as a committee we discuss this as being a shame. We end of emphasizing play in 1-2 games rather than the other 16 games because we keep the INRC play in our selection criteria so that we have parity among institutions in different conferences. Two of 7 selection criteria points are for INRC games that represent 1 or 2 games on an 18 game schedule.

Yes, a weighted ranking system should be developed as part of the selection criteria to help encourage institutions to schedule II rather than in other divisions. Additionally, our committee felt that there should be a weighted system for those institutions have played ranked schools.

A weighted system to discourage scheduling non NCAA Division II opponents is necessary. Don't penalize, but let's not encourage or give credit for non Division II scheduling. Let's compare apples and apples as much as possible.

We should do all we can to encourage Division II play. We feel our criterion takes care of this situation. Plays into the notion the rich get richer.

Hard to determine if those schools would be entered into the tournament. This is taken care of in Golfstat calculations. Weight should be given to playing on the road.

Yes.

No, we need to be able to schedule other division for the health of the sport by limiting this option most programs would have less competition.

Many GLVC schools compete against and have established traditional rivalries with NAIA programs in close proximity to their communities. For some it's an opportunity to schedule more home contests and generate additional ticket revenue. In addition we have football programs that regularly schedule Division I games because of the financial guarantees that are provided. This is a major revenue source for some of our schools. While the GLVC would not support eliminating these NAIA and Division I contests entirely the league would be in favor of a weighted ranking system to encourage more Division II competition.

Yes

A weighted ranking system needs to be carefully constructed because teams at the top will be highly sought after for non-conference in region games and they'll fill their schedules. How do we help the programs who struggle or are middle of the pack and need the games but are not going to be the priority for those seeking these bonus points? I don't have an answer for that at this time but it's something we need to consider. Our division is larger than just those who qualify for championships.

Yes, don't we have that built in to softball already?

Encourage yes; however, other NCAA DII institutions may not be located within a close geographical area and options available that are fiscally possible. Often times NCAA DII schools have opportunities to receive game guarantees to play NCAA DI institutions in close proximity which can benefit them financially rather than a financial burden to travel long distances just to play within division.

Just as I am against a penalty system I am also against a reward system based on a non-conference schedule. There are many reasons to play outside the division or association and many are financial reasons. You can play DI games and get guarantee money that helps finance the rest of your season; you can play DIII or NAIA games because of your local you are surrounded by these schools and they are willing to come to your place and give you home games. These home games (since most non-conference games are played at the beginning of the season) can be used as avenues for Community Engagement and Game Environment initiatives. Again, with the minimum number of DII games already mandated and the maximum number of permissible contests legislated it doesn't leave many contests for institutions to make decisions that are in their best interests. I believe they should have the flexibility to schedule these as they choose.

Yes, I think DII should never schedule Division I or III and NAIA schools for a regular season contest because they are of no value. They should only schedule those institutions for scrimmages and in the non-championship segment.

Yes, I think that would help encourage schools to schedule games within our division

Yes, An in-region RPI and overall Division II RPI should be used in the selection process rather than in-region/overall record to encourage teams to compete against NCAA Division II opponents rather than other non-DII opponents.

YES- on a limited basis for sports that have limited number of contests versus say baseball with a large number.

It was my understanding that this was effectively being done at the current time as games against non-Division II institutions do not truly count as selection criteria. As such, I'm not sure how much more weighting can be done.

I think that is essentially what we are doing in basketball now. Penalizing for playing D-III or NAIA might not be fair again because of budgets and location.

This is similar to what MBB is doing this year, and I fully support this. This could be taken one step further where negative points are given for NAIA or DIII games. I see this as different than mandating games or a nullification process in that this is simply one of seven selection criteria, and an institution could choose to play home NAIA games knowing that they will suffer slightly in this selection criteria, but still have a chance to advance to regional play.

Being that in region play is what selections are based on, NO, not necessary.

YES

Yes. We believe there is value to scheduling DII opponents and that DIII and NAIA games do not provide the value in the postseason evaluation of teams. A weighted system that rewards DII play warrants more discussion. The non-DII games shouldn't just be under the "not considered" category. Perhaps it is time to consider an actual penalty for not completing your schedule with DII opponents. However we do believe that institutions should be allowed a DI game without being penalized.

The coaches and the committee did NOT support a penalty/nullification process for not scheduling in-region/non-conference. They are more in support of an incentive program. There was not much interest in a weighted ranking system either.

6. Should a weighted ranking system be developed as a part of the selection criteria to encourage institutions to schedule other Division II institutions that have historically been stronger in the sport (e.g., bonus points for playing a Top 25 team, bonus points for beating a Top 25 team on the road, etc.)?

Current performance and success should be what is weighed, not historic success. Moving back to systems that use a RPI or perhaps more importantly the “Quality Win Index” has been mentioned in our conference as an important tool for RACs to analyze and select for post season play. While this formula might not work in all sports, it does work well in sports like Basketball. There is no reason why different criteria can be used for different sports if it provides the necessary information.

On both 6 and 7: Perhaps this somewhat like going back in time, but there is a strong feeling by some in our conference that it may make more sense to establish a minimum number of in region games (would differ in each sport) that schools must play but leave room for schools to play quality out of region games if they wish. For example, leave room for schools to play 4 regular season, out of region games in the sport of basketball. If schools wish to travel and have the resources, they would not be penalized. Instead, using a QWI, they could be rewarded for playing strong teams on the road – win or lose. This would be good for DII sports and allow schools to make decisions themselves on how they want to use their funds. They may have decided that travel makes sense for recruiting, alumni reasons, student experience. In addition, as noted in our response, in some sports, our better programs are at times shut out by other higher level teams in our region – those opponents may choose not to play for fear they will lose regional rankings. If teams cannot find games in their own region, they should not be penalized for going out of region to find better quality contests. This plan may make the RAC job a little more difficult as they try to rank teams, but with a QWI or similar tool, they will also have more information that will help them.

It was noted that an example of a plan that seems to work is in DII Golf. A school in our region can play all in region contests and win most of those contests but achieve a low ranking or travel south to a stronger region and lose most of their matches but achieve a higher national ranking. In that case, the team is being rewarded for traveling to play better DII competition (no matter the region).

I have seen increasing efforts to schedule events which bring Barton’s teams and teams in our conference to sites for multiple-game competitions against non-conference in-region opponents and feel that programs desiring to maximize the ability for their schedule and results to impress a Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) will seek out such opportunities without additional incentives.

I have served for nine years on a variety of RACs and have found that the selection process typically includes a consideration of the proposed initiative in some manner, while at the same time adhering to the current stated criteria. For example, if a team has great success within its own league, does not attain an AQ, and has few non-conference in-region competitions, that team will be disadvantaged in paired consideration with a team that has a significantly higher number of non-conference in-region competitions and a level of success in those competitions.

I do not like the weighted system of any “Top 25” teams. These polls are subjective and most are voted on by coaches. If a coach is on the national poll committee, and is playing State University on Saturday, and knows that if they’re ranked in the top 25 it means more for their regional selection, then in my opinion, the temptation is too great to inflate the ranking. This happens all the time with all-conference selections. I think they currently do “bonus” points if the team has a record better than .500, and I think that is adequate for regional selection.

No

Yes, All of the examples should be factored into an institution's ranking. For example, Top 25 competition, on the road, etc.

If so, needs to be secondary criteria. “Historically strong” doesn’t necessarily mean team is strong in the current year. Some schools may have fewer opportunities to schedule those strong teams based on location/budget.

No, must be geographically doable. Also different criteria for different polls, etc.

We believe it is very hard to give any credit to past success in a current selection year when scheduling is done in advance. Valuing opponent’s current won-loss records through a weighted system would probably be the best answer rather than historical data. The old “quality win index” seemed to provide that analysis to selection committees, when records, site and division membership were included.

This goes against all premises of a fair ranking system. We rank year to year and past performance should be an indicator.

Yes as it rewards institutions for building a schedule of their own creation but does not mandate such.

Absolutely not. This assumes that the school will be strong going forward, but also assumes a team that historically isn’t strong is then conversely, weak. But if that team is undefeated, wouldn’t you expect to get bonus points for playing them? Plus, there would

be a rush to schedule those “historically strong” schools leaving some schools at a disadvantage for a variety of reasons, including geographical, financial, etc.

Yes, if you schedule more competitive schools and conferences, I would be very much in favor of some reward for such, of any sort.

If so, needs to be secondary criteria. “Historically strong” doesn’t necessarily mean team is strong in the current year. Some schools may have fewer opportunities to schedule those strong teams based on location/budget. This would be an interesting model to see although it seems complex.

Yes

YES – this would be good for those “stronger” teams as well, since some coaches may trend toward Not scheduling tough opponents if they don’t have to... especially if it is a long, non-conference road trip.

I do not feel that this is necessary.

Once ranked always ranked? Now that we only have 3 rankings, typically by the time we start our rankings, the top 10 schools are pretty well set – not to say they don’t flip flop, but we have a good idea. They should be rewarded for being ranked, and those schools who have made a tougher schedule and played them should also get rewarded. Good wins/bad losses can be accounted for.

Top 25 ranking is very subjective. We need to be careful of putting too much weight on Top 25 play, yet it does have value.

Plays into the notion the rich get richer. Hard to tell from year to year who are the stronger teams? Who determines who the Top 25 teams are?

Designated per sport. If goes to the conference, documentation must be provided to the National Office.

Yes.

NO.

Quantifying historical strength of programs by sport is an arbitrary process and would put RAC members in an untenable position if asked to justify their selections. The GLVC does not support awarding bonus points for playing a Top 25 team because these polls are not conducted with any NCAA oversight and the methodology for such selections are not transparent. The league does support rewarding teams for road victories based on the opponent’s overall record or regional ranking.

Yes this will help those schools that are strong get more in region games

Yes

Don't like the philosophy of this and it makes some institutions "in demand" for everyone to schedule and ultimately will leave out those that have to travel distances to play these "top teams" or "pay guarantees" to get on their schedule.

In terms of this question and the previous one, I truly believe that in this economy a weighted system (bonus system) only allows the rich to get richer as it could allow teams an opportunity to buy their way into post-season by spending more money on non-conference scheduling. Also, determining which teams warrant bonus points could turn into a logistical nightmare as Top 25 polls are coaches polls selected by a very few coaches nationwide – this would be open to suspect behavior if tied to post-season play. Also, many are scheduling at least two years out and it is very difficult to predict who the strong teams would be that far in advance. We are all one injury, one coaching change, etc. from not having the year we would have liked to.

Yes, especially if they are in region

Yes, I think that would benefit the teams that are newer programs and help those regions who are loaded with top 25 schools

Again, RPI will serve as a weighting system and teams that have wins over stronger teams will be considered for selection rather than teams with great records against sub-par competition.

YES

I like this concept, although the actual mechanics of this (for example, trying to figure out what a "historically" strong team entails) would need to be ironed out before I could give it my full endorsement. I can see a situation in which the "historically" strong teams, once determined, will tend to stay strong, and it might be difficult for new "historically" strong teams to emerge.

Again that could be giving more of an advantage to teams in certain locations for will larger budgets.

No. This is very hard to do. Last year in our region, the University of Mary was the third or fourth ranked team in the region at the end of the year. If this were implemented, I'm guessing RMAC schools would have tried to schedule UMary. This year, UMary is

below .500. I'm not sure there is a good enough system to weight the scheduling of Mary enough to where it offsets what will be lost in OWP and OOWP. I could be wrong here, but mathematically speaking, I can't figure out how this would add up to be a good thing - in some cases yes, but in back to back years like UMary is having, it seems to disrupt what we are trying to accomplish.

No.

Certainly if THAT is NOT being considered currently by selection committees

We do not believe the use of the words “historically been stronger” are relevant to this conversation at all. We should only care about the current season. As we all know, teams change and someone’s accomplishments from 2, 3 or 5 years ago should have no bearing on the process for scheduling this year’s games. We do believe there is merit in weighting selection criteria for rewarding road wins against teams above .500, etc. We do not want to see a system develop where the strong teams only play the strong teams and we feel that there is enough information to reward strength of schedule criteria through opponents win-loss and opponents’ opponents’ win-loss record. Also, until a system with national criteria for being ranked is developed, a reliance on Top 25 rankings is way too subjective to have a large place in selection criteria.

The most supported idea among coaches and the committee was to provide a stipend for conferences to have cross-over tournaments. The biggest concern with cross-over tournaments is travel costs for those institutions, so the stipend would need to be enough to cover at least some of the travel expenses incurred by the institutions. For women’s volleyball, the GLIAC and the GLVC hold a cross-over tournament the first weekend of every season, and it has been very effective for that region. They have some policies in place for that tournament that have helped make it successful, so the task force may want to reach out to someone in one of those conferences to get ideas if the implementation of an incentive program is possible. [Example – each team has to pay an entry fee and the amount of the entry fee depends on how far away each school is from the location of the tournament. Teams that are traveling farther have a lesser entry fee than those that are closer to the competition site.]

7. If the division supports an incentive plan, what parameters should be included in the incentive plan and who should oversee the funds received from the incentive plan?

If an incentive plan is approved, it should be administered through conferences and every conference should qualify for support, not just based on size. The problem with this concept is how much money can be steered to this plan? If the intent is to, for example, help cover the costs of using sites that reduce travel; or to cover the cost of neutral sites

that would allow for multi-team events in regions: or financial rewards for schools to travel to non-conference sites or to tournaments, a great deal of money will have to be dedicated to this concept...not just a few thousand per school.

Possibly the NCAA could assist in hosting (maybe get hotel rooms etc) centralized events to bring schools together. The conferences could host like the GLVC-GLIAC volleyball challenge. Could the NCAA can make more grant money available to assist in these type ventures?

Some NCAA Division II institutions are small and located in isolated and rural areas. These institutions are extremely underfunded compared to many NCAA Division II competitive peers. Some of these institutions are located in areas that are difficult to travel out of and get to institutions within the conference, let alone out of conference and in-region. The cost, logistics, missed class time, etc. is significant. Also, due to their location, the distance alone is not always the problem in getting other teams to travel in to play. Other institutions from other regions may be able to find a way to afford to travel to the neighboring region, but they may choose to play in the areas easily accessible. An example is that the RMAC schools located in the Denver-Metro area or on the Front Range of Colorado can easily get out and easily get teams in to play them. It is much more difficult to get a team to travel to Denver and then drive through the mountains on two lane highways over mountain passes and the continental divide, etc. another 4 to 5 hours.

Our current athletic department raises between 33% and 48% of our total athletic budget on an annual basis. This represents over \$1.3 Million (or more) per year and this still leaves us approximately 30% below the average of our competitive peers total budgets. Our sport programs raise approximately \$200,000 per year in sport specific fund-raisers just for travel funds just to meet their conference obligations and some minimal other competitions. Anything beyond that is usually paid for with significant game guarantees.

We are five hours from Denver International Airport on a two lane highway over mountain passes and the continental divide. We are located at over 7,700 feet in elevation (highest in the world). It is very costly and very difficult to get out of here to gain in-region, but out-of-conference competition and it is very difficult to get that competition to come to our campus.

The "incentive plan" will not likely be enough to help us enough to enable us to obtain this competition. It will likely help those institutions that already can afford to obtain that competition and the institutions that truly need the help won't be able to take advantage of it.

The “incentive plan” will not likely be enough to help us enough to enable us to obtain this competition. It will likely help those institutions that already can afford to obtain that competition and the institutions that truly need the help won’t be able to take advantage of it.

If an incentive system does go into place, then I think the conference office ought to administer it.

Conferences

Number of institutions in the conference and a minimum number of games against non-conference in-region games. The institutions would oversee the funds received.

Schools should oversee. Not all conference members should benefit if all members are not “putting in” the same “effort.” I would not support a monetary incentive. I would suggest using that money to help fund travel (as mentioned in response #3).

Don’t think there should be an incentive plan, so no answer here.

It’s hard to fathom an incentive plan that could be distributed fairly to institutions if money is involved, unless it’s a lot of money (i.e. several millions). Other incentives in the selection process are more important to consider. If a financial incentive is considered, it may be best to work through the conferences to help fund “in-region” tournaments and contests.

I don't think that the amount of dollars exist that would make this a viable option.

I believe the challenges related to the incentive plan and any thought to equal distribution by the conferences will not necessarily achieve the full goal. It seems for some conferences and/or regions, a financial incentive plan works geographically for them and with coordination from other conferences within their region. For others, the system does not seem to be in place either to the conferences fault or that of the geography the conferences are within. I also note from feedback through discussions I have been a part of or heard that the incentive plan may create some issues related to perception of disparity for implementation.

Funds should be not distributed as part of any scheduling whatsoever.

Absolutely not.

I would not be in favor of some financial compensation but lean specifically toward rewards in the ranking and selection process. It is difficult to rank/rate schools regionally much less nationally when a committee doesn’t ever see them play. An impossible task, but non-conference competition at least gives the committees some area of evaluation and

more credibility in an impossible task. We all want to get to the NCAA postseason and reward will make that an easier and more efficient task in selecting the best teams.

Schools should oversee. Not all conference members should benefit if all members are not “putting in” the same “effort.” Money, if given, would need to be justified to help fund travel. Not really in favor of money, other incentives in the form of selection would be better.

Conferences

Where would these Funds come from?? For parameters, I would think simpler would be better... Perhaps just a flat rate \$\$ amount per contest, and consider addition compensation for trips outside a certain mileage radius from home.

The incentive program is good for institutions but it will not help unless everyone does it. And I feel that the ones who are already playing IRNC games will continue to and will utilize the grant while others will not.

If requiring or encouraging in region non conference play is an outcome, then an incentive plan would help assure it happening. Conference offices should be held responsible to support this objective. The conferences can jointly schedule and promote cross conference play via tournaments or rotating scheduling of some sort. In some cases financial assistance may be needed to help make it happen. I would support any move in this direction as soon as possible. Most schools have enough flexibility in their schedules to accommodate these changes.

Not sure there is not enough money to distribute appropriately.

Yes, incorporating the conference office will aid in the scheduling of centrally located events.

Conferences.

I would not support an incentive plan at this point. I would support a plan to provide funds to the region that has the highest number of place winners.

The GLVC has earmarked funds from the NCAA Division II Conference Grant Program to help subsidize the cost of the GLVC/GLIAC Crossover Volleyball Tournament for the past four years. The league has invested over \$32,000 in this event since its inception in 2008. The incentive plan is best administered through the conference office. Schools looking to schedule in-region/non-conference contests in various sports could apply for funding assistance from the league to help subsidize the cost of the trip if they travel or for expenses associated with hosting a home event.

Why would you need an incentive plan? If we had one then I think the Conference should oversee it

Each conference is unique and has its own challenges. I'd like to see any funds from incentive plans be handled by the conference office with the plan approved by AD's and ultimately Presidents. The NCAA body (championships committee) would have oversight on the conference offices to make sure they are utilizing the funds as stated in their plan.

I doubt this will be a viable alternative due to the economic situation conferences and member schools are already facing.

Incentives should cover travel expenses and the conference should oversee the funds received and distributed.

I'm all for an incentive plan IF it is not tied to mandated in-region/non-conference play. If mandated then there would have to be a HUGE pot of money to assist teams in being able to schedule appropriately and I'm not sure there is that much money. On the other hand, an incentive plan to ENCOURAGE (not mandate) play would be great as I believe most institutions really do want to play these games. Conference offices should be utilized and each conference should be given the autonomy to decide how best to use the funds. But, and I know you aren't asking for this information, if there is extra money then I believe there are better ways to spend it than on non-conference games, which are usually played very early in the season. Why not use this money to enhance the actual championship experience for the participants. One way to do this would be to travel officials to other regions (send the West officials to the South Central tournament and vice versa).

There should be a set number of non-conference region games you have to play and if you play more than that amount you qualify for incentive. Conference offices should oversee funds.

I think specific schools should receive money from these incentive programs to go to the specific sports budget

Conferences... With the mandatory NCAA increases in conference sizes by 2017 & 2022, it will encourage smaller conference to merge into larger ones, thus creating incentives to play in a conference.

Conferences for distribution purposes only

I am not sold on the financial incentive plan as it might be difficult for the funds to actually go for their intended goal (encouraging more in-region/non-conference play). However, if there is a financial assistance fund, I believe the money should go directly to the schools rather than conferences, with it being weighted more heavily for programs that will need to travel to play these types of games.

Not sure, I have been at my school for a long time and during my time it always seems like the rich get richer. I am afraid that if you put incentives in that the schools with the biggest budgets will be the one reaping the rewards.

I think an incentive plan should benefit schools and not conferences. There should be a way for schools to apply (to the NCAA, perhaps Championships Committee) for financial assistance to play these types of contests. The thing that is making this difficult is travel and costs. If money goes to conferences, why would schools be motivated to do this?

At my school, we are on the edge of our conference geographically, so it costs me a lot less to go play RMAC schools than the rest of my league. That should be taken into consideration and I should not receive the same support from something like this as Duluth, for example, because they are another 500 miles away than I am. I just don't see how involving the conference offices would help.

The schools admin

We are not comfortable with the notion of an incentive plan. The values placed on scheduling for postseason aspirations should be enough. This incentive plan would be difficult to manage and nearly impossible to make the financial incentives large enough to have a true impact. It will cost tens of thousands of dollars in each sport in each region to create cross-conference tournaments. We feel that an incentive plan based on dollars is not needed and that the NCAA should look to incentivize the teams in its selection criteria.

It would be possible to schedule cross-over tournaments for most schools, but it would probably be their one weekend away from conference matches. Some schools in larger conferences may have a harder time scheduling additional matches/tournaments that are in-region/non-conference, but hopefully the additional week of play for DII women's volleyball that was recently approved would help with that.

8. Should conferences or institutions sponsor centrally located events to meet any new selection criteria requirements or to encourage in-region/non-conference competition?

This is a good idea but funding will be necessary to make it work. Again, if a uniform plan to require in region play is put into place, the amount of funds needed to apply to all sports will be significant.

I support the concept of regional qualification. Having regions represented at the national level regardless of whether the number one team on one region is weaker than the number 3 team in another region is a concept I think is appropriate for Division II for many reasons. However, I am strongly opposed to mandating regional competition! No matter what we do, it will be difficult to rank teams. There will always be flaws in the ranking system. Whether a team played outside their conference and in their region or not there will likely be one or more common opponents to compare. Even if that is not the case, this will always be an inexact science. What we gain (if any) by making this a bit more of an exact science will be far less than the true total “cost” of this mandate.

Also, the people that are complaining will still be the ones complaining about the ranking system, etc. anyway.

Is it ideal? Yes. But, not at this cost.

I think this concept is even more difficult in the Rocky Mountain West than anywhere geographically. This is even more exacerbated in certain sports, such as football.

I also don't think there should be any penalty for a Division II team to play a Division I team or a FCS Football institution. Our programs highly depend on playing schools like that to make net profit. This money is desperately needed to help defray the costs of competing just in the conference. If we could not play those institutions for game guarantees or if we were penalized by playing them, it would have significant adverse effect on our programs.

I think the idea of the conference scheduling centrally located events has some potential and I am willing to explore that will incentive money used for teams that would travel to that central location from further than 100 miles or something like that.

Possibly.

Yes, conference challenges between 2 or more conferences would assist in satisfying new selection criteria.

I would agree with this concept. Similar to a conference challenge tournament that we have discussed with PSAC and NE-10 for basketball. Centrally located might be tough, so alternating between the two conferences might be better.

Yes, this should be encouraged , if in-region/non-conference competitions are mandated.

This concept is worth pursuing and could be funded from monies being considered for an incentive plan. \$40-\$50,000 in each region to be used by the conferences to develop these kinds of events in a few sports may be very helpful in the selection processes. Perhaps regional funding could be based on the number of “TEAM” automatic qualifying sports exist in a given region.

This should be encouraged, but not required. There's also some fairness issues involved if centrally-located institutions or conferences always get to host games and outlying schools are always playing on the road.

In general, financially offsetting cost through the conference offices for tournaments run.

Yes, if this can be done for a sport – it should be done. However, within softball several conferences and/or regions already do this in early season tournaments.

If they felt so inclined but at their expense.

Happens all the time already in softball and volleyball. Not necessary to add since it's already happening.

Yes, we should do anything to promote in region/non conference competition.

This concept has merit. This is similar to a conference challenge tournament that has been discussed with PSAC and NE-10 for basketball. Centrally located might be tough, so alternating between the conferences might be better. This item is worth pursuing.

This is a good concept, but I would not support it being implemented on a mandatory level. Schools/conferences should be encouraged to host these type of events if the host institution/venue is able to do so.

Yes – great idea. If regional conferences work together on something like this it would take some of the uncertainty out of trying to find in-region/non-conference competition.

If possible, yes!

Encouraged but not mandated.

Depends on the money given, make it effective immediately if enough money is available.

Conferences – with an incentive plan conferences could use the funds received to set-up weekend pods to encourage centrally located event/tournaments. My conference in particular has already discussed the possibility of an event/tournament.

The RMAC already completes this with our conference and regional championship on the same date.

Ideally yes however there are challenges inherent with establishing these competition dates because of recent “Life in the Balance” legislative changes that have reduced the number of regular season contests in many sports.

By centrally located events, I’m assuming this would mean things like regional non-conference tournaments as competition? I think that would help especially those schools getting difficulty finding DII in-region schools to play against. Either conferences or institutions can sponsor. Some institutions are already doing some form of this.

By centrally located events, I’m assuming this would mean things like regional non-conference tournaments as competition? I think that would help especially those schools getting difficulty finding DII in-region schools to play against. Either conferences or institutions can sponsor. Some institutions are already doing some form of this.

I think this would be similar to crossover tournaments that take place.

Yes, if there is incentive plans in place for those that travel.

Again, I don’t believe this should be tied to new selection criteria – I am opposed to that. It would be next to impossible to have enough of these events to take care of the requirements for all schools. But, to encourage these competitions, of course. I believe there is a movement to do that already and the basketball exemption given to the maximum number of contests (Conference Challenge Event) has been the greatest incentive to that movement. This exemption is currently allowed once every three years – we might want to look at changing this to once every other year. Other sports should certainly consider this exemption.

Yes, this would help those schools who are required to travel farther to get in region games

I think that conferences should sponsor these events. It would be beneficial for out of season competition if we could do that as well

Yes, only if it is financially feasible to host such an event.

YES

Yes. I think that conferences across the nation need to do more to coordinate with fellow conferences to aid their respective memberships that might need scheduling assistance.

I think the conference crossover tournaments are great, I would like to see schools be able to do it more frequently instead of the current exemption.

Not sure.

Yes, use your incentives here

If it helps meet the criteria yes, but limit the distance and amount per year

The Northeast-10 is generally supportive of this concept but believe it is a sport-by-sport issue that would be difficult to mandate. There is no question that centrally-located events would be helpful and have the ability lower costs but with so many teams in our region and travel not being excessive, it would be difficult to provide enough opportunities to have this be worthwhile. One basketball event with four teams from two of the three conferences would help only 8 of 40 teams in the region so is this a worthwhile expenditure? If the goal is to grow a sport or interest in a sport, this might be worthwhile, but if it is to provide non-conference scheduling, you'd have to have many of these events in each sport. We do believe there could be value but this can't be a pillar on which changes to non-conference scheduling is built.

If we provided an incentive for cross-over tournaments, it would help out with the conferences that are participating, but it wouldn't necessarily solve the problem for every conference in the region. For example, the CCAA and the PWC may be inclined to have a cross-over tournament with each other but still may not include the GNAC schools because the majority of schools in the GNAC are widely dispersed. The result would be better information to compare teams from the CCAA and PWC, but it wouldn't help out in comparing GNAC schools to teams in other conferences.

Cross-over tournaments obviously wouldn't help when comparing independent teams.

9. When should any proposed changes be implemented?

Implementation should not occur before two or three years.

Never.

Implementation of changes may take some time for scheduling purposes and the details associated with creating schedules may force the adoption of these changes to 2014 or 2015.

As part of the review or after determination of how to approach the issues is made, could NCAA look back a year or two and see how institutions would have been affected by the new rules? For each sport, see if any teams would have NOT been selected if the new rules had been in place? This might help in determining what rules to enact and/or when to enact them. Also, maybe 2013-14 is a phase-in year. NCAA could distribute information on how the new rules would have affected teams in that year, allowing coaches/administrators to plan for the rules to be enacted in 2014-15.

Minimum 2 years from approval for scheduling purposes.

At best, Division II is likely looking at 2014-15 on any major unified scheduling and criteria selection shift. Perhaps looking back a year or two in each sport could facilitate a quicker review for some sports. The likely timeframe from decision to implementation is two years.

I support at least one year of notice for any change to allow schools/conferences to make adjustments to their schedules in an orderly manner.

Changes would need to be at least 2 years out.

If using the nullification type of methodology or other type of weighting system, the process to communicate to membership would need to be thorough. First, a system would need to be developed, tested/piloted and then an education related to the system would need to occur in the membership. I would recommend no earlier than three years for implementation.

Depends on what we are trying to accomplish in doing so, but I do not believe there is, nor should be, a great sense of urgency. We already select teams, organize competitive and exciting tournaments and crown champions annually and I do not believe we should further define how schedules are built and who plays whom. That is called professional sports.

No sooner than one year out, so if something was approved this spring, it would take effect no earlier than 2013-14.

We should implement as soon as possible.

As part of the review or after determination of how to approach the issues is made, could NCAA look back a year or two and see how institutions would have been affected by the new rules? For each sport, see if any teams would have NOT been selected if the new

rules had been in place? This might help in determining what rules to enact and/or when to enact them. Also, maybe 2013-14 is a phase-in year. NCAA could distribute information on how the new rules would have affected teams in that year, allowing coaches/administrators to plan for the rules to be enacted in 2014-15. At the minimum at least two years out to accommodate home/away scheduling agreements.

There should be at least a year of education on this before it is actually implemented. For example, educate the Division during the 2013-2014 year and then have it implemented for the 2014-2015 year, starting with the Fall Sports.

No earlier than August 1, 2013. Might be a good idea to decide what criteria you truly want to examine and focus on (as far as collecting data) first, and then use 2012-2013 for analysis and save any legislative action for a January 2014 vote and August 2014 implementation. At least then you wouldn't be rushing in to change something that might not need changing.

ASAP! Giving institutions notice is a concern but people can adjust. The membership is ready for a change to occur in this area.

At least two years.

Year in advance.

Two years out.

From the time of approval of any new system it should not be implemented until a whole calendar year has passed. Thus giving institutions a chance to schedule appropriately.

As the Division II membership continues to grow and current conferences are asked to take in these new members the opportunities to schedule in-region/non-conference contests will be reduced. Clarification is needed to determine if contests against GLIAC opponents will be of greater value in the selection criteria than in-region contests against programs from contiguous states that compete in conferences outside of the Midwest Region. We understand the membership and travel challenges facing the regions in the Western part of the country and would not be opposed if the NCAA Championships Committee piloted a program to establish different parameters for selection criteria by region. Institutions and conferences must be given a minimum of three years notice for any changes to the selection criteria.

In the year 2014-2015

A 2 year implementation date from time of approval should be sufficient time to get these changes in place. Those members who are well funded and organized with successful programs probably have a good part of their non-conference schedule completed 2 years out.

It would probably be best to look at 2014.

After all institutions, conferences, and regions have had an opportunity to provide feedback and build an incentive plan to accommodate cost containment concerns.

How about 2050? Seriously, I hope it is evident that I hope there are no proposed changes, but if there are I believe the bare minimum needs to be 2 years due to long-term scheduling contracts and agreements institutions could have in place.

2013 -14

I think at this point many coaches are scheduling for their 2013 season already. I think it would be best if we implemented these new changes for 2014 season, however, implementing these new changes to coincide with the new 8 team bracket would also make sense.

As early as Fall 2013 but no later than 2017...

ASAP- allowing exceptions for signed contracts.

As soon as reasonably possible.

They need to be implemented prior to season scheduling, which for me in basketball is between April and May.

If there are changes that Championships and the membership think are good for selection, those changes should be implemented immediately. We found this to be true in men's basketball when we proposed changes to the criteria. The coaches association was in full support of an immediate change and did not see any benefit in waiting. I agree with them. If it's good, let's do it right now.

2013-14

2-4 years out

If changes to selection criteria are implemented, teams must be given at least 18-24 months to adjust scheduling approaches. Also, as noted, mandating changes that will affect the way Conferences schedule their regular seasons will be substantially harder to put in place in the short term. We, however, do not believe that major changes are

necessary and in fact would counter that providing flexibility for certain regions is more important than enacting a one-size fits all model that will not be productive in other regions based on their size. Broadening the footprint of the contiguous state approach to pull in more potential opponents for schools will help the institutions and may allow Conferences to continue to develop a number of Conference games that they see as appropriate in each sport.

10. General comments .

In general, I feel the stated criteria currently used by our RACs permit valid selection decisions.

Regarding the strategic changes in the proposed conference membership requirements and how this plays out on this white paper discussion---it hurts football in the Rocky Mountain West. While I ideally think requiring an institution to have a conference accept them for membership prior to being admitted into the Division II is a good idea so that one does not end up in the difficult situation that South Dakota School of Mines and Technology finds themselves in right now. On the other hand, there are many conferences that will not allow them to come in right now as they are a travel and cost burden. Therefore, it could restrict growth of institutions and certain sports in areas where we desperately need more density.

We, at the University of North Alabama, are finding it difficult in certain sports to schedule D2 opponents. For example in the sport of football, we currently have 9 games scheduled for 2012 (only 8 D2 games). While there are a few D2 football teams that share the same open dates with us, they do not want to play. The excuses range from needing a home game, to waiting for a DI guarantee money game, to UNA is too good, and so on.

I do believe there are certain geographic regions and conferences who may share our same concern (Lone Star and the Rocky Mountain Conferences). Whatever the solution, I hope the penalty structure for declining DII games is significant enough to ensure those with open dates to schedule in-region competition.

We are, unfortunately at this writing, a transitioning institution that is in year 2 of the process without a conference. Additionally, we are an institution in a very geographically challenged area of the country. Putting those two factors together has made the transition extremely difficult as it relates to scheduling contests for team sports and finding a conference. Both conferences that are in close proximity (and believe me nothing is really close) to us have large numbers of teams within the conference and therefore have very few non-conference games available. The 3-4 non-conference games are all at the beginning of the season and thus we are being forced (if we want to play D-II competition) to play close to 70% of our regular contests in the first 2-3 weeks of a season... which is basically impossible. In addition some of our nearest opponents in mileage that we have been able to play are now being moved to another region and thus we are being asked to travel 200-400 more miles than usual to play our new regional members. It just doesn't seem like

the championships committee understands the distances that teams in regionally challenged areas of the country must encounter to play contests. Being an independent was not our plan when we opted to move from NAIA to NCAA D-II, and it seems like the championships and memberships committee are continually throwing up new hurdles for geographically challenged institutions to try to navigate. There are potentially several current NAIA schools within geographically challenged areas that would strongly consider the move to D-II but with the new standards for gaining admission and with the D-II conferences that do have some members already within those geographically challenged areas being at 14 or 16 members, there is no place for them to go. This new legislation significantly hurts geographically challenged areas and then ultimately makes it impossible to find contests. I understand this legislation was designed to limit the growth in D-II but unfortunately in some geographic areas of the country it has stopped it completely and made it extremely difficult for those already involved in transitioning to survive.

Scheduling of non-conference in-region contests is extremely important for selection committees. It has been my experience that some institutions have been able to manipulate their rankings by intentionally scheduling out of region contests so head to head comparisons with other non-conference in region teams becomes impossible. I might support a nullification process that penalizes an institution for not playing non-conference in-region contests. I would be more likely to support a weighted ranking system to encourage DII schools to schedule other DII institutions rather than other association or division institutions. I would be less likely to support bonus points for teams that schedule “top 25” teams because whose top 25 do you use- coaches polls are not necessarily accurate. Also in my experience sometimes those “top 25” teams don’t always play out in the next scheduling cycle, so if you are scheduling a top 25 team one year to play the next year they may not in fact be a quality top 25 team.

I like the conference challenge events as a way to promote in-region contests. Perhaps an incentive program built into that concept would be helpful.

Citing issues that affect our conference and region:

We have a 12 member conference-22 conference games so our out of conference schedule is limited-sometimes we have to select schools that are closer-CIAA schools vs SE region schools-the travel in our region for other conference schools would not be as adversely affected as Barton and Mt Olive because of their location. So they have an advantage of in region contest

The idea of a cross conference tournament before your conference starts would help if some way you could have 4 schools at one location playing 2 games then switch locations to the other conference the next year-some teams did something like this this year but there was not opportunity for all schools to participate.

It would be hard to give bonus points to teams playing top 25 teams because every school may not have the same opportunity-in our region we have a lot of state supported institutions that get a

lot more funding than Conference Carolinas plus have either 1.5 or 3 more scholarships than we do before we even get started

I would not have a problem with mandating a specific number of required/nonconference contests in order to be eligible for post season play-then the school could make the decision whether they wanted to be considered or not-it would be on them if they played schools from other divisions

I love the idea of more in-region, non-conference competition. We play enough Conference games as it is, it's always nice to see where we stack up against in-region teams so everyone knows what to expect come tournament time. Nullifying POINTLESS games out of region, against D3 schools or NAIA schools needs to be in place ASAP! Penalize teams for not playing these close, rivalry type games. Only issue that may come into effect, is coaches will want to play more games for a regular season. Don't expand the season in terms of weeks/months, just let them play more games in the same time frame of a season.

As I can only speak to this matter in regards to Women's Golf, I do not feel that there are specific difficulties in scheduling in-region, non-conference tournaments in OUR (south) region.

Currently, women's golf has a minimum requirement of 25% for competition in-region/non-conference tournaments. This, I feel, in the south region is an easy achievement. In regards to the minimum requirement for post-season play, I agree. This requirement would be beneficial for the RAC when determining those eligible for post-season play. I believe that in women's golf, there is a ranking system in place through GolfStat so there would be no need for an additional ranking system.

The PSAC would offer three priorities that the Championships Committee should keep in mind in future deliberations on this issue.

- A). Consider budgetary restrictions on institutions when contemplating mandating play that would increase travel costs and missed class time.
- B). Increase the emphasis on encouraging/rewarding Division II-only competition
- C). Remember, the Division is increasing in size by institutional membership, not necessarily conferences. As conferences grow, in-conference play will increase. Developing selection criteria contrary to how growth is occurring is counterproductive to the direction the Division is clearly moving.

A not-so-simple example from our league would be a men's soccer program from our league located in the suburbs of Philadelphia. After scheduling their 9 PSAC mandated contests, 9 non-conference opportunities remain. That institution could fill its remaining 9 non-conference contests entirely with Division II opponents all within a 100-mile radius of campus, but not play another non-conference opponent from the Atlantic Region because there are none closer within the 100 miles. The institution has a) scheduled only DII opponents, which is good, b) considered its institutions budget limitations, which is good, c) because of the travel distances, likely kept missed class time to a minimum, which is good, but d) didn't help the Atlantic Region selection process by playing other soccer teams from within the Atlantic region, arguably that is bad. I

would hate to have to explain to that university's president why he had to pay more money and have his student's miss more classes in order to help a committee of six people make their jobs easier. And thus, the complexity of this issue.....

While I understand the regionalization concept of Division 2 and how this affects the RAC selection, I do think it is very difficult for some sports based on region to find out of conference games. The sport is going to be different based on region so a set penalty structure may adversely affect a particular region.

For example: In the East region The Northeast 10 has 14 men's soccer teams and 15 women's soccer teams. Therefore they really only need 5 and 4 more games in region. The ECC will have 10 teams playing soccer for both men and women and will therefore all be needing 9 more games. Since most soccer teams really only play 17 games this is going to be very difficult to find games in region, especially against regionally ranked teams. Basically the NE 10 could choose who to play. Our better ECC teams will have a harder time getting a game.

Since the women have an automatic bid we are guaranteed at least one rep in the event we do not get others regionally ranked based on new criteria but the men with no automatic bid are at a greater disadvantage. Just a thought.

Having sat on three different RAC committees (baseball, men's soccer, women's basketball) I would like to provide some feedback in regards to the discussion regarding selection criteria.

There has been a change in philosophy from some schools where the goal is to get as many wins as possible, rather than get as many wins against quality opponents as possible. Teams have become "afraid" to play a strong opponent fearing a loss, so instead, they take the easy win over a lesser opponent. In the past, the RAC would look at categories such as strength of schedule, opponents record and opponents opponents record to be able to better judge both subjectively and objectively the relative strengths of each team, and those schools that played the tougher schedule would earn higher credit for playing those schools, even if they lost. I believe that system has worked well in the past.

Here are my thoughts if we are collecting info from a WBB HEAD COACH:

- If region games will be more important there needs to be a recognition for how hard it is for teams currently like Clayton State and Lander to find region teams to play us. Being one of the strongest teams in the strongest league in your region limits the number of teams willing to play you. Very few if any Carolinas Conference Schools will play us. Two months ago I called every member institution in that league and offered a guarantee for a home game, or a home and home series. I received one phone call back.
- With increased conference scheduling, and limited non-conference scheduling does a school get punished if they take their team on a non-region trip/tournament? We try every 3 or 4 years to take our team to Washington D.C. for a Christmas tournament (two non-region games). It is a

very rewarding experience for everyone and something we would like to continue to do. Is there any consideration to being able to exempt non-region tournaments from time to time? Currently, several available at the D-I level...not many exempt options for D-II coaches.

As DIV II Conferences Grow and the number of NON-Conference Opportunities shrink what incentives can be utilized to REWARD IN-REGION Play:

MBB Coach

1. Create EXEMPT GAMES that are IN-REGION so we can play more than 26
2. Can we Create a Mid-season weekend across the country where ONLY IN-REGION NON Conference Competition dates can take place. Similar to BRACKET BUSTER in late FEB with DIV I
3. If leagues go from 8 teams and 14 conf games to 12 teams and 22 conf games how do you get those 4 non conf games to become region games in Basketball?

We believe that scheduling in-region/non-conference games are important. The problem for us as I assume the same for many other conferences is the distance of the region we have been placed in. The GAC as of the 2012-13 season will be competing in the Central Region. This region includes the Northern Sun conference. We neither have the budget or the ability to schedule schools that far away. The MIAA is also in the Central region which would be a better option geographically, but with the size of that conference (15) makes it extremely difficult to schedule. With all their conference games that they need to cover they do not have many needs for non-conference games. This is especially true with football and basketball. This puts our conference in a very difficult situation. If we are only allowed to play within our region then we would have to bypass the MIAA and go North. This is something that just isn't feasible for many of our schools. If we were in the South Central as we are currently, then it would not be an issue to play the in region competition which would support what the committee is recommending.

Along those lines, the LSC and the RMAC are in a situation that would struggle with this recommendation. The new alignment has them in a region with the Heartland. As we all know there are only 1 (soon to be 2) football playing schools in the Heartland. That makes the LSC and the RMAC with one option for scheduling football games. This will be difficult for just about everyone, but the two schools that come to mind that would have it the worst would be Kingsville and Western CO. They both would have a very difficult time finding games. In Basketball and other sports the LSC will dominate without ever leaving their state. This will make scheduling for all the remaining sports next to impossible for the RMAC.

I think that you could do some of the recommendations that have been presented if there was a better geographical situation with in the regions. It would be very difficult to put in regulations, stipulations, mathematical deductions, weighted ranking system, incentive

plans,... or anything else without another look at the regional alignments. This may mean attempting to increase membership in certain areas to help the realignment by growing some areas to help them not be so spread out.

Finally this Recommendation mentioned that this review is aimed at helping schools manage their regular season travel budget and limit missed class time. I believe that this recommendation the way it is written will do the opposite for many institutions. Conference Carolinas is supportive of the current regional concept recognizing that conference scheduling and play is a priority and that as conferences grow larger intra-regional play becomes more problematic. Division II members should be encouraged to play non-conference contests against in-region opponents. However requiring play, rewarding play beyond the current regional system and penalizing for play outside the region is not appropriate. Other considerations (missed classes, travel distances and financial considerations) also have an importance in the scheduling determination process.

Those of us who serve on regional advisory committees (RACs) recognize the advantage of greater comparative opportunities. The frustration of small data does occur. However we believe the current process offers opportunity for members to separate themselves through wise scheduling of out of conference regional opponents. The additions we were asked to review are overly intrusive and often are available in the current structure. We support the concept of flexibility for conferences and individual members to schedule regular season competition.

Finally, there is recognition that a small number of Division II members have difficulty completing schedules. We would support incentives to assist them if provided in a way that did not include policies or provisions that effect a regional or national population. We prefer a situation specific approach rather than implementing policies that are more general in nature.

We believe that scheduling in-region/non-conference games are important. The problem for us as I assume the same for many other conferences is the distance of the region we have been placed in. The GAC as of the 2012-13 season will be competing in the Central Region. This region includes the Northern Sun conference. We neither have the budget or the ability to schedule schools that far away. The MIAA is also in the Central region which would be a better option geographically, but with the size of that conference (15) makes it extremely difficult to schedule. With all their conference games that they need to cover they do not have many needs for non-conference games. This is especially true with football and basketball. This puts our conference in a very difficult situation. If we are only allowed to play within our region then we would have to bypass the MIAA and go North. This is something that just isn't feasible for many of our schools. If we were in the South Central as we are currently, then it would not be an issue to play the in region competition which would support what the committee is recommending.

Along those lines, the LSC and the RMAC are in a situation that would struggle with this recommendation. The new alignment has them in a region with the Heartland. As we all know there are only 1 (soon to be 2) football playing schools in the Heartland. That makes the LSC and the RMAC with one option for scheduling football games. This will be difficult for just about everyone, but the two schools that come to mind that would have it the worst would be Kingsville and Western CO. They both would have a very difficult time finding games. In Basketball and other sports the LSC will dominate without ever leaving their state. This will make scheduling for all the remaining sports next to impossible for the RMAC.

I think that you could do some of the recommendations that have been presented if there was a better geographical situation with in the regions. It would be very difficult to put in regulations, stipulations, mathematical deductions, weighted ranking system, incentive plans,... or anything else without another look at the regional alignments. This may mean attempting to increase membership in certain areas to help the realignment by growing some areas to help them not be so spread out.

Finally this Recommendation mentioned that this review is aimed at helping schools manage their regular season travel budget and limit missed class time. I believe that this recommendation the way it is written will do the opposite for many institutions.

Some additional thoughts: Not to match the men's, but ending up with a microscope of two games; too much weight on such a small sample size. Have no way to make people play across conferences. Realize it's an additional cost, but is a championships issue overall—only in there to cross compare to make better selection.

My thoughts:

- Being in Florida, we have a very, very strong conference and the regionalization program has made it much more difficult for us to get in region out of conference games as teams can look at neighboring states for games which are easier.
- Last season, the only way a GSC team got into the NCAA tourney was because of the AQ
- We have had so much trouble getting games that the SSC has now gone to an 8 plus 4 format so we have 12 games against conference opponents
- I don't know how we can have an incentive program as the 8 regions and the conferences within the regions are all different and have different numbers of conference games
- I would recommend mandating that the out of conference in region games HAVE to be within the region, ie. SSC plays GSC teams only and having 2 games per team as a mandate in order to be eligible for the post season.
- There are a number of D2 schools who are not interested in making the NCAA play offs so they are not worrying about the conference or NCAA mandates to make the post season

Please receive this information with a large grain of salt, understanding that my experience with the NCAA is still very limited since we are just seven months into year one candidacy for DII membership.

In trying to put together NCAA-compliant DII schedules for 2012-13 we have found that local nonconference DII schools, all within a two-hour drive of our campus, are reluctant to play us, and instead would rather travel north six to nine hours to play other schools in our conference that would appear to not be as strong and threatening for victories.

Azusa Pacific is a seven-time NAIA Directors' Cup champion and 18 of our 19 sports were nationally-ranked last year, perhaps explaining why local nonconference DII schools would rather travel far to pick up in-region games than play us.

If reducing missed class time and travel costs remain top priorities for the association, we at Azusa Pacific would favor some form of incentive plan in which teams are rewarded (or at least not penalized as much) for playing nationally-ranked teams. It would hopefully be incentive enough for schools to remain local to pick up nonconference games and not travel great lengths in the region to pick up "easier" wins.

I think that we should look at raising the total number of Division II games “most” of the sports need to play. Basketball plays 85% of its games versus DII and 82% of those DII games needs to be in-region and they seem to have the least amount of complaints about selection related to in-region games, etc. I think we need to start with playing more DII games, which hopefully leads to more in-region, but at least we should be playing DII opponents.

I am not in favor of bonus or penalty for playing Top 25 – this changes from year to year and can be too much of a variable.

I think it is imperative conference commissioners work together to create tournaments, neutral site games and other cross-over events within the region.

Another consideration should be the abolishment of the contiguous state rule for certain regions. Allowing teams to count contiguous states as in- region games actually hinders regionalization in the South Region, and reduces the number of true head to head regional games. Gulf South teams use weaker “contiguous state” teams to get to their required number of regional games, thus avoiding true regional play. The intent of the rule is to make scheduling easier, however it makes it more difficult for the Sunshine State Conference teams.

Would it be possible to have criteria established for one region such as the South Region? With 15 teams in the South, this could be solved with regional cross scheduling. Institutions wishing to be considered for the NCAA tournament could be required to enter into cross scheduling between conferences rather than have a certain number of regional matches.

Schools should not be permitted to play a conference school and count it as an out of conference game.

I have been advised by both my RAC and my AD that it would be wise to voice my concerns regarding the “White Paper” and the possible changes that could occur for NCAA selections for men’s soccer in the coming seasons. After reviewing the White Paper and also my own time on the men’s national soccer committee (2003-2006, National Chair 2006), I have found it very difficult from our committee experience to express quality solutions to the championships committee without them being turned down without much concern. Whether or not there was, I can assure you, the feeling was from our group and my own individual feeling, that the ideas were not really considered.

Examples that were most pressing were the very first Fall Championship in 2006 (hosted in Pensacola, FL) and also the regionalization model both for playoff selection as well as for scheduling.

In the 2006 Championship model, the big team sports, such as Volleyball and Soccer (both men’s and women’s), were forced to shut down their seasons 2+ weeks early to finish the championship because it was based on the cross country and field hockey issues and their schedules. I know this to be true as it was specifically shared to our committee in our meeting in New Orleans during the February meeting, 2005. Our national chair at that time suggested that it was “like taking a size 11 foot and stuffing it into a size 9 shoe.” The season for 2006 was still shortened by a week to accommodate the other sport’s seasons. To date, Men’s and Women’s Soccer still has the shortest league season among big sports teams in college sports and it is significantly smaller than golf and tennis which are “team/individual” sports. It’s very disappointing.

Having shared this, these are the main points that need to be referenced in the difficulties and inconsistencies with our sports seasons and championships selections.

1. Representation of Regions:

The playoff selection model is a bit different – speaking that D2 wants all 8 regions represented. We suggested each year at our committee meeting that the regions at least put together a seeding system among the sub-regions. This way, at least all regions are represented AND you CAN have the best talent make their way to the finals.

The Division II regionalization philosophy provides access to national championships from every region of the country. Regionalization does not guarantee that the best eight programs in the country will compete for a national championship, but does guarantee that the different regions of the country will be represented at the championships by each region's best team. (WHITE PAPER)

- Since the “championships” don’t include all 8 teams at the finals, it would be silly to try to use this statement to apply to our finals. Instead, it applies to the “championships” in general. This means that getting teams into the championships is more important than who wins the championship.
- This being the case, regions should play out a seeding of #1, 4, 5, 8 at one site and #2, 3, 6, 7 at another. Regions can still have their 1-4 but it may help put them into categories of more competent playoff format.
- The winners would play in the quarter finals
- This would help bring regions back to 4 teams per region vs. 2 in one, 6 in another etc.

- In 2011, cost-wise, 3 California schools traveled to Washington State to play in the 1st and 2nd rounds of playoffs. If in the South, the team from Tennessee had not “tied” in their conference final, 3 Florida schools would have traveled to Tennessee. Cost effectiveness will still apply

2. Competition vs. regional opponents (Scheduling)

In addition, regionalization encourages a member school to compete against opponents within its region, instead of seeking contests against opponents outside the geographical region. This scheduling review is aimed at helping schools manage their regular-season travel budgets and limit missed class time for Division II student-athletes. (WHITE PAPER)

- Issues with travel still applies
 - In S. Florida, the scheduling issues have become harder because of the region we’ve been scheduled with. Though the two strongest conferences are the CCAA and the SSC (this is historically based in terms of representation in the final four the past 30+ years), schools will not come south to play citing everything from “cost” to “too tough of competition”
- The SSC and the GSC and the SIAC were placed together. There are no teams in the SIAC basically giving our region a “dummy” conference with no option for competition/travel
- The GSC has continually been the perpetrator in not taking road trips to play games. They will take home games against SSC teams, but will not regularly travel to face them on the road. If they do travel, it will rarely include true South Florida teams.
- The competition factor to get these teams also goes up. Therefore, these scenarios play out quite regularly:
 - Avoidance: schools will not schedule stronger opponents and will use the contiguous state model.
 - With Florida, there are no options of contiguous states south of Georgia & Alabama, so I am certain the travel costs are far higher to the SSC institutions than to schools in the SAC, PBC, GSC.
 - With schools avoiding play to the S. Florida area or perhaps Florida all-together, with the few schools that are in the Georgia/Alabama area, seeking play in S. Carolina, N. Carolina etc becomes more difficult as those schools may not want to return leaving the main option of travel to get games, but no returns. Not very equitable.

3. Conferences (Scheduling)

At the 2012 NCAA Convention, the Division II membership will vote on a package of legislative proposals designed to manage the strategic growth of the division. As a part of this legislative package, conferences will be required to have 8 active member institutions by 2017 and 10 active member institutions by 2022. Additionally, any new conference that is formed following August 1, 2013, will be required to have 10 members. The intent is to encourage the stabilization of conferences and requiring conferences to grow meets the desired outcome.

When the Division II Membership Committee was developing these concepts for the Division II membership's consideration, the Membership Committee noted that larger conferences will inevitably include more conference contests during the regular season and the potential for fewer in-region/non-conference contests. As a result, there is potential for increased scheduling issues for smaller conferences. Therefore, the Membership Committee recommended the creation of an incentive program to encourage conferences to schedule in-region/non-conference competition.(WHITE PAPER)

- With the bigger conferences, more schools will play the same opponent 2-3 times a year (including conference playoffs. Add to that, a possible 4th turn by NCAA playoffs
- Schedules become stagnant and though “easier” to schedule in one respect, it becomes more difficult getting non-conference opponents. The issues with regionalization will still apply and hiding from schools will become more common. As in conference opponents increase, out of conference opponents decrease and this is for both the large and the small conferences.

4. Strength of Schedule

- Should the division implement a process similar to nullification that would include a mathematical deduction at the time of selections if an institution did not schedule any in-region/non-conference competition?
 - Should sports committees' selection criteria mandate a specific number of required in-region/non-conference contest(s) in order to be eligible for the post-season?
 - Should a weighted ranking system be developed as a part of the selection criteria to encourage institutions to schedule other Division II institutions rather than institutions in other associations or other divisions?
 - Should a weighted ranking system be developed as a part of the selection criteria to encourage institutions to schedule other Division II institutions that have historically been stronger in the sport (e.g., bonus points for playing a Top 25 team, bonus points for beating a Top 25 team on the road, etc.)?
- From the White Paper questions and thoughts at the end, these 4, but not limited to these 4 questions need to be addressed. A strength of schedule model needs to be revisited. There needs to be benefits from having to head out on the road and yet, even a tougher standard should be where. As in, “in region, non-contiguous state” competition. This would have schools face the fact that they must play opponents in their region more often.
I am in support of the contiguous state rule, but I struggle with the lack of competition by schools who find it easier not to travel and still get rewarded for a playoff opportunity.

In theory, the regionalization model is a good one. For effectiveness and equality which it hoped to accomplish, it has reduced schools still to the “haves and the have nots”. That is, schools with money still must spend it and schools that don't, won't.

Division II is about “choosing Division II”. “I CHOSE Division II”. Why do we choose it? Because it offers opportunity. Opportunity to still compete and study where at a Division III school, this may not be possible without an athletic scholarship. If by choosing Division II, it must still be available to those student-athletes and their coaches to have the very best opportunities to enjoy that competition that Division III and I also invite. Seedings, travel, different competition, different challenges all are represented in those two divisions. Division II can still keep its regionalization model and yet, still have a very healthy development for the “CHOOSER” of Division II athletics.

There are many other statements that could be made including the “incentive plan” and there are schools and areas that probably are very deserving of that financial assistance (Florida for example and also including the Western states that do not have accessibility to schools via driving as well).

For now, I hope that these thoughts and solutions can assist in some real growth and improvement for Division II soccer.

I would be in favor some type of legislation that requires a certain number of in region-non conference games in order to receive a bid to regional/national tournaments. Maybe 2 or 3 contests. Our volleyball coach said Volleyball currently has that rule in place and it has increased regional play. They do crossover games involving all teams in two conferences. In tennis there are several teams that are notorious for refusing to play any in region opponents other than in their conference.

Some interesting stuff there, but I don't think it pertains to wrestling as much due to the spread out nature of our teams, though that is and has been more of a factor with our region (Two, which used to be the Midwest) than the others. For instance, in Region Two it's not feasible for Central Oklahoma to schedule a dual against Limestone or Ashland, but it is against Newman. Or Fort Hays State and Nebraska-Kearney, though those two will be in our region next year. I think for the most part our teams schedule within their region as much as they can, but obviously the teams grouped closer together can do that easier.

In our region, the seeding meeting has always been a little tough because a lot of the teams haven't wrestled each other, thus making it hard to compare results. But, like I always say, in wrestling the end result is always decided on the mat!

Just to throw my two cents in, I think the one thing making scheduling more difficult is the growth of conferences. In the MIAA, for instance, we will play 10 conference football games (and that was suppose to be 11 until UNO dropped). That obviously doesn't allow for any games against other teams within the region. And when you have a 14- and 15- and 16-team conferences, that translates into a lot of games in every other sport, which again makes trying to get other in-region games difficult. I don't think you can mandate a specific number of required in-region contests simply because of the difficult many schools would face around the country getting those games scheduled.

And I also don't think a weighted schedule system would work in relation to getting bonus points for scheduling ranked teams. The ranking systems used in most Division II sports are too political and inaccurate for that to really work. For instance, in women's soccer the coaches rank the top 25 teams but

the top eight always consists of the number one teams from each region, with the next eight the second-place teams, etc. You see how flawed that is?

While I agree with the overall concept of scheduling in-region/non-conference games, I'm not on board with the following:

- Mathematical deductions
- Specific number of required games
- Weighted ranking system
- Bonus points

Specifically relative to tennis, we have regions with conferences that do not have their conference matches in the same season. For example, in the East Region, two conferences (ECC and CACC) have their championship segment in the Fall, while the Northeast 10 has their championship segment in the Spring. Cross over play is virtually impossible. Unless all conferences play the same segment, it would be difficult to mandate required number of games, and penalizing a school because of a Conference decision would be hard to swallow. Even if centrally located events were to be scheduled, teams from one conference could technically be in the non-traditional segment and potentially not be at full strength.

This concept of scheduling in-region/non-conference games can and does apply to most sports, since that is what we normally do anyway. I just think it will be difficult to mandate this for men's and women's tennis.

I think a certain percentage of each team's games in a sport needs to be non-conference in-region. Using soccer for example, I would use a 20% of games scheduled need to be non-conference in-region. Since the minimum number of games you have to play is 16 to be eligible for NCAA championships, a team would have to play 3 non-conference in-region games. If they scheduled 18 it would be 4. I would let each sport committee set the percentage they think appropriate.

I do not think any type of new weighted system or nullification process needs to be implemented. I just believe non-conference in-region strength of schedule and non-conference in-region won/loss record needs to be emphasized in the current selection system. Either by giving it added weight in the primary selection criteria, priority in secondary, or do both. If this is done, coaches will soon realize how important this is for scheduling to improve their chances for selection.

The liaison to the NCAA national committee for each sport has to be good at giving committees instruction in how to drill down into the numbers. When I was first on the national soccer committee, I thought Troy Arthur was a pain in the rear end. However, after I was on the committee for a year I saw how important he was in getting all the RAC's to really look at the criteria and get to the heart of the selection criteria. Good liaisons make committees examine

home vs. away results and won-loss record vs. strength of schedule. I credit Troy with making each region chair ensure that their RAC thoroughly examined and justified their selections, and this is the main reason that when I was national chair we received not one call about an institution being upset over their seeding or not being selected.

From the time of approval of any new system it should not be implemented until a whole calendar year has passed. Thus giving institutions a chance to schedule appropriately.

I have several problems with the new balloting procedure. By balloting secretly this allows committee members to form secret alliances, and also for a person to place a team lower in the ballot process to improve their team or another team they favor. People need to be able to stand up and be accountable. If the thinking is they are being influenced on the call and will not speak their mind, I believe they will be influenced more easily if they know their vote is recorded privately. I also firmly believe a person needs to be removed from the RAC selection committee by second to last call if his/her school is under consideration. I have seen firsthand how by not doing this the discussion has changed or been influenced. I saw how a member of a RAC actively promoted a school until it came between choosing that school and a school that was in consideration that had a representative on the RAC, and the discussion then changed drastically. Not being removed created a huge conflict of interest.

The Gulf South Conference Directors of Athletics, SWAs and FARs conducted our annual winter meeting with our Board (CEOs) on January 27, 2012 in Birmingham, AL. The group discussed the "white paper" and the scheduling issues raised therein, and also reviewed the critical point we've reached in the South Region (South Super-Region for football) regarding in-region, non-conference scheduling. As the Commissioner, I've been asked to forward the following items to your attention:

1) We have reached a true crisis point in D2 Football in the South "Super-Region" and in men's soccer and basketball in the South Region.

There are also concerns in baseball. Part of the reason for the crisis is that there simply are not enough teams in the Region to accommodate all of the in-region, non-conference games that are needed; however, the major issue is that the South Atlantic Conference (SAC) and Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (SIAC) schools rarely are willing to play our teams, even when they have the same date. As a particularly galling example, it was pointed out that a member of the National Committee has a football team with the same open date as North Alabama.

The UNA Director of Athletics approached that individual at the NCAA Convention, proposing that their teams play, and was bluntly turned down. There is an endless list of in-region, non-conference open dates that match up, but the other schools simply will not play our teams.

It is important to understand that the GSC is down to five NCAA Active Members sponsoring football. We have incorporated what will be a Second-Year Candidacy School (Shorter) into our 2012 schedule, so we technically have six "in-region counters." We have relief coming in 2013, when Florida Tech joins us

as a football-only member, and in 2014 when Shorter University becomes an active member. We also hope that West Florida starts football for 2014 or 2015, and that the University of New Orleans stays the D-II course and also adds football, as promised. However, it is also possible that some of these things might not happen or would be slowed, and we could also lose schools to D-1 at any time, so there is always uncertainty.

Desperate straits lead to desperate steps, so we entered into a scheduling agreement with the Lone Star Conference for 2012 and 2013, in which each of our schools plays one of theirs at home and away. Please consider what this means: schools like Valdosta State and West Georgia are traveling to places like Angelo and Kingsville, TX, and vice-versa.

The LSC has the same problem we do: in-region opponents with open dates won't play, and the lack of open dates further exacerbates the situation.

The other key point is the mathematical side: each GSC school has five league games for 2012. This means that we need 36 games (6 schools x 6 games). If each of our schools could at least get one game against an SAC school and one versus an SIAC each year, it would help, but still not fill our need for nine games against D-II opponents.

The SAC plays a seven-game league schedule and has a scheduling agreement with North Greenville, so their schools could only provide a maximum of 24 games (8 SAC schools x 3 non-league playing slots). However, most of them prefer to play an in-region independent, UNC-Pembroke, because of geographics (which is understandable), so that potential is reduced to about 18-20 games.

The SIAC plays an eight-game league schedule, so its schools could theoretically provide 36 games; however, its schools prefer to play SWAC schools for guarantees and CIAA schools for tradition.

The issue in men's soccer is a bit different because geographics and a lack of teams play a role. There is interest in playing, but the cost of travel from places like Memphis (TN) and Cleveland (MS) to Florida are prohibitive. The Commissioner of the Sunshine Conference and I have worked out a formula for getting more matches for both conferences, but we need help with costs.

As for basketball, the main issue continues to be a combination of travel costs to get to/from Florida, coupled with the refusal of some of the Florida schools to play any road games outside their league, to the challenges of getting the SIAC schools to play our schools (financial considerations, traditional rivalries with SWAC and CIAA schools, closer Peach Belt Conference schools, etc. all play a role).

2) The problem is acute. As much as we all wish that a "carrot rather than a stick" approach would work, the history shows it does not. The question is: what might be done to create incentives to play in-region, non-conference games, and what penalties should be put in place for those who refuse to play?

a) Adopt a policy that if a school refuses to play an in-region opponent on a common open date, that school will not be allowed to host any post-season games.

b) A policy that penalizes such schools by reducing their strength of schedule by a factor equal to the strength of schedule the opponent it declined to play records for that season (sort of a "nullification" process administered at the end of the season)

- c) Funding from the NCAA that would be provided to help with travel costs when two in-region non-conference opponents agree to play and present the signed contracts as proof.
- d) A requirement that to qualify for post-season play, a school must play 10% of its permissible schedule versus in-region, non-conference opponents (in other words, in football, at least two games).

We hope these suggestions are helpful. We do not believe that mere incentives will solve the problem because the guarantees that some schools receive for playing D-Is, combined with the traditional rivalries they entail, are greater than any payment the NCAA could afford to make on a regular basis. Either schools are committed to being D-2, and prove that commitment by playing, or they should be left out of the D-2 post-season picture.

After speaking to some of our coaches at GCU, they strongly feel that scheduling of in-region/non-conference competition is extremely important. A coach feels that they want to play in-region matches during the season because it gives them a look at teams that they could meet later in the championship rounds. The schools are also looked at closer when they have defeated a ranked team or even tried to play teams in the region. This may be the only way to get to a championship is through regional play, especially if you don't have an automatic bid from the conference.

Should a weighted ranking system be developed as a part of the selection criteria to encourage institutions to schedule other Division II institutions? Right now I think in tennis we have a weighted ranking system in the ITA. Our tennis coach expressed how nice it would be if the NCAA had their own weighted ranking system. I don't know why this has never happened but it only makes sense when we are members of the NCAA and they are our governing body.

Flaw in Regionalization for West Region: while Regionalization may, in theory, encourage institutions to compete against teams out of their own conference, in practice it is not the case in the west.

Current west region conference sizes and institution locations:

- California Collegiate Athletics Association: 12
 - **All located in California**
- Great Northwest Athletic Conference: 9 active (1 in candidacy process)
 - Alaska: 2, Idaho: 1, Montana: 1, Oregon: 1, Washington: 4, B.C.: 1
- Pac-West: 9 active (4 in candidacy process)
 - Arizona: 1, **California: 7**, Hawaii: 4, Utah: 1

Institutional breakdown by state:

- Alaska: 2
- Arizona: 1
- B.C.: 1
- *California: 19*
- Hawaii: 4
- Idaho: 1

- Montana: 1
- Oregon: 1
- Utah: 1
- Washington: 4

Total: 35 institutions in west region and 54% of those institutions located in the state of California.

Ideas to consider:

1. The CCAA should be its own region.
2. There should be stronger criteria implemented in order to force cross conference play. Current Championship Selection Criteria for many sports does not allow for cross conference competition in the west. Examples:

- In women's soccer, there is no out of conference requirement and some CCAA teams are choosing to not play any out of conference games.
- In men's soccer, teams may have a maximum of 18 contests. 12 of those must be DII contests and only one must be out of conference. The CCAA gets 16 in conference contests. They are then able to drive to two Pac-West California schools or offer to play an outlier Pac-West or GNAC but only at their home. This leaves Pac-West and GNAC to schedule contiguous states/conferences such as the RMAC.

However, once the four schools awaiting active DII membership in the Pac-West are official, the Pac-West will have little need to travel and play GNAC schools.

Soccer selection committees (men's more so than women's) has had difficulty in assessing which teams truly merit post-season selection due to lack of cross over and issues within the criteria numbers. A discrepancy exists when the GNAC must play 8 out of conference games and the CCAA only needs to play two.

- Similar scheduling issues have begun in men's and women's basketball and volleyball.
 - Schools are forced to fill gaps with NAIA and DIII contests. This is not acceptable because it hurts selection criteria numbers. Institutions scheduling all DII schedules are hurt by fellow conference members who can't or won't schedule all DII contests.
 - If the current model remains, there should be a penalty for playing NAIA and DIII games during the championship season. Those games, along with "Money Games" from DI can be played in the pre-season.
3. Sports should be looked at individually rather than generically (ex. men's soccer v. women's soccer) due to sponsorship numbers.
 4. Incentive plan for conference scheduling alliances.

5. Annual scheduling could be done by region instead of by conference with a rotation of games amongst all conferences so cross conference play is guaranteed to occur. All conferences within a region could combine and split off to divisions and annual schedules would be created within each division and rotate over time.
6. Selection criteria should include extra benefit for road wins.
7. Transparency of selection process needs improvement. Making computer selection numbers public would be helpful.
8. Assured consistency of how selection criteria are being applied nationally. This requires greater NCAA liaison oversight of RAC committees.
9. Assess championship access by ratios of teams per region. Is this a better allocation of post season invitations?

If regional play is to be important I would like to see the NCAA require home/home contracts with a time frame to complete of no more than 14 months.

The following is feedback from the Athletic Administration at Black Hills State University, a year two candidacy member to NCAA DII and member of the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference starting fall 2012.

The Division II philosophy statement indicates that a Division II member “believes in scheduling the majority of its athletics competition with other members of Division II, insofar as regional qualification, geographic location and traditional scheduling patterns permit.” It is the geographic location of Black Hills State University to other regional institutions that makes scheduling of in-region/non-conference contests a major concern.

Black Hills State University is the newest member of the 14 school Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference. Geographically, we are located in the Northern Black Hills in the state of South Dakota. Our furthest travel for a conference contest is Western New Mexico which is 1,145 miles. The travel distance to our closest in-region/nonconference competition is Eastern New Mexico University which is 919 miles.

This is in great contrast to all fourteen schools that make up the NCAA DII Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference (NCAA DII schools not located in our geographic region) which are closer in their geographical location to our school than even our closest in-region/nonconference opponent. It would be fiscally challenging and have a negative effect on cost containment for BHSU to consider scheduling in-region/nonconference competitions with institutions that are much further away geographically than other institutions that are not in our region. Another factor for us to consider is the life in balance initiatives and the missed class time for student-athletes at BHSU if we were mandated to travel and play in-region/non-conference opponents.

As stated in the Division II White Paper, the Division II Membership Committee has developed proposals for strategic growth to increase conference members. As conferences grow in the number of institutions and the sports provided, less opportunity for in-region/nonconference competitions will exist. Those that do exist will look to schedule in-region/nonconference competitions with schools that are closest in geographical location, leaving those institutions such as BHSU (as a geographical outlier) with little to no options for in-region contests without having to travel great distances or having to pay game guarantees to traveling institutions.

I realize that the Management Council is supportive of the concept to create an incentive plan, but feel that the cost to reimburse institutions for travel in regions that are spread out over numerous states and distances may be very expensive.

Due to our location and financial resources, BHSU would not favor mandating in-region/nonconference scheduling or a penalty structure to encourage cross competition among conferences in the same region.

Please note that DII men's soccer has a scheduling requirement of one in-region, out of conference contest to eligible for an at-large selection.

Comments:

- Issue differs by region, some have no issue finding and scheduling IROC contests.
- Some institutions hide behind budgetary excuses to “duck” opponents.
- Even when schools offer to travel some still find it hard to schedule IROC.
- Central/South Central regions have difficulty scheduling IROC contests due to geographic issues.
- Is there value in two criteria (W/L % and SOS) for a minimal number of games? (Create RPI for this category?)
- Due to conference schedules the men's soccer committee faces the challenge of evaluating one IROC contest for some schools and up to six or seven for others. Who gets the nod in a comparison of schools that are 1-0 vs. 5-1??

Ideas:

- The committee discussed keeping the scheduling requirement of one contest but removing it from selection criteria. It would deemphasize the “column” but still generate valuable results for the committee. Common opponents, head to head, etc.
- Allow schools to play maximum of 20 contests if two are IROC. The maximum number of contest went from 20 to 18 in phase #1 of Life in the Balance.
- Similar to above, make IROC contest exempted contests with some type of cap.
- More cooperation among conferences; conference agreements.
- Mandate 1-3 contests to be eligible for an at-large selection. Many schools do not aspire to post season so they could opt out and not play them.
- Mandate different numbers of contest by regions.

Division II baseball does not have a scheduling requirement for IROC contests but does evaluate results versus team outside the conference that are 0.500 or above. This would included those in-region as well as out of region. This criteria was created to help account for contests played on spring trips but only rewards for quality opponents.

Of those schools under consideration on selection day (top 8 per region) the average number of contests that met the criteria above for those school s was 6-7 contests with a range of 2 to 13. Due to the large number of permissible contests (50) the issue is not as big in baseball. As expected, the number of out of conference contests was lower in the central, south central and west regions.

A comment made in the narrative of the White Paper was that “DII sports committees sometimes have a difficult time ranking and selecting teams for national championships because there are few opportunities to compare schools across conferences.” Having served on several RAC’s over the past decade and now finishing my final year on the WBB National Committee I believe that most sports have adequate criteria and careful analysis of each does allow a comparison of teams that may not have played each other or common opponents. If certain sports are having a difficult time maybe they need to reevaluate their current criteria and revamp it. Also, I think it’s worth pointing out that simply requiring non-conference in-region play wouldn’t always make selections easier – it would be dependent on teams playing each other or common opponents and that’s not a guarantee with a minimum of 3 conferences per region.

Currently the definition of what counts as in-region play during the regular season does encompass areas outside of the “technical” post-season region. For example, you can count other institutions in your same state that due to conference affiliation are in a different region, you can count institutions in contiguous states as in-region, etc. This liberal definition of “in-region” games has certainly helped schools fill non-conference schedules while remaining within budgets, maintaining natural rivalries, etc. I would be very concerned if this interpretation went away if changes to selection criteria were made that required non-conference in-region play.

I think the questions are far reaching and open ended. I hope they are direct enough to get answers to some sport specific questions For example in football with a limited number of games and larger conferences, there are conferences that are moving towards a schedule comprised of conference games. What are the implications of this on non-conference in region play. Same thing with the sport of wrestling, do regionalization regulations help or hinder access to championships and are there a set of exceptions to some of the rules. For example within a sport that has less the X number participating can allowances be made to minimize travel costs?

I believe that encouraging teams to play non-conference, in-region competition has merit and would be very beneficial for RACs and the National Committee to fairly and accurately evaluate and select teams for the NCAA playoffs. Ideally, each region hosting a mid-season conference crossover event would be great. However, the biggest concern would be the geographic disparity in regions which would make this much more difficult and a tremendous financial burden on the

West and Central Regions. Comparatively, the proximity of conferences and teams in the other 6 regions makes this much easier to do.

So, although I like the idea of encouraging teams to do this, I don't believe at this time requiring it or even rewarding it (with bonus points, etc.) is a good idea until there is a solution as to how best accommodate the West and Central to allow them to have the opportunity as well. Currently, teams on the extreme exteriors of the West and Central would have to travel waaaaay too far to play these matches and it would be unfair to penalize them for not being able to do so (especially since centrally located teams in those regions could play those matches much more easily thus gaining an advantage or getting a reward based on location alone)

Ultimately, the issue in evaluating regions is that we do not have enough non-conf. in-region play (comparing teams from the NSIC and the RMAC has been tough due to limited intra-conference play). Some of this is due to geography, budget issues and perhaps because there is no incentive to do so. However, I think the biggest culprit is that teams can use the additional principles of regionalization or the contiguous states rule to play non-conf. in-region matches that count as in-region but ultimately do not help the RACs in their evaluations because those teams are not true in-region opponents (ex - Minnesota Mankato playing Grand Valley State doesn't help the RAC in evaluations because GVSU is not a Central Region team and may not play any other Central Region team that year so the RAC doesn't really know the quality of that win or loss in comparison to the other wins and losses in the region. Even if GVSU is ranked in the Midwest Region, it doesn't truly correlate to how they would compare in the Central Region).

Unfortunately, I understand why we have these rules and do not have a great solution as to what we do instead although I have proposed expanding what teams are considered in-region so that if a team counts as in-region for 1 team in the region, it counts for all (ex - currently GVSU is in-region for MN schools from the Central due to MI counting as a contiguous state...my proposal would be that therefore, GVSU counts as in-region for ANY team in the Central Region). This doesn't solve the problem but it removes the chance that playing Team A counts as in-region for one team in a region but not another.

Please feel free to contact me if you want more clarity in my thoughts on this issue. I like what is trying to be done but as of now, I am not convinced that anything can be done fairly under the current regionalization model.

I'll share my thoughts of the questions posed in the White Paper below, but generally speaking, I support the Division II Philosophy (Bylaw 20.10) where it states at Division II member, "believes in scheduling the majority of its athletics competition with other members of Division II, insofar as regional qualification, geographical location and traditional conference scheduling patterns permit."

To me the key component of that phrase is "majority of its athletics competition with other members of Division II" as that emphasizes the need for D-II schools to play other D-II schools. That being said, while it references regional qualification (and by inferring in-region/non-

conference play), that philosophy statement seems to me to press the need for intra-Division II play above and beyond everything else, regardless of the region of the opponent.

Long term, my greater concern about the emphasis of in-region/non-conference play concerns the new legislation pertaining to conference sizes, and even the number of conferences D-II will acknowledge. With these new rules, Division II is heading in the direction of "Super Conferences" featuring 16 members...or even more. Because conferences are going to try to schedule as many games as possible within the confines of its own league (for fairness' sake as well as automatically allowing its membership to meet Division II scheduling minimums), there are going to be less and less opportunities for in-region/non-conference games to be played, and yet there remains an implied demand that member schools will need to play these contests to be considered for NCAA post-season competition. In fact, there will almost be a *greater* emphasis on these games based upon current selection criteria, which to me seems to run counter to the concept that every game on the schedule should be weighted the same.

To summarize, I understand and appreciate the desire to have in-region/non-conference competition. However, I personally believe that competition against any Division II opposition should be the main focus, and that increasing sizes of conferences will make in-region/non-conference scheduling opportunities more difficult to line up in the future, thereby creating a perverse emphasis on those games in terms of NCAA post-season opportunities.

For what it's worth, if the regionalization model is going to continue, then absolutely scheduling in region contests is important. I do however feel that consideration should be given for out of region contests as I know most coaches on our staff here at MWSU are under the assumption that an out of region contest basically is weighted like an NAIA or D1 contest with no value which I think is wrong.

The flip side of that argument which is absolutely a golf issue, historically good teams tend to play in more of the national events versus some regional events which 9 times of 10 doesn't matter because that team in the end is going to make the regional, but in that one year that it may be close, the argument comes from a lot of the coaches that said team is "dodging" the regional head-to-head's which we wouldn't want to encourage either.

I would say for our regions in the Central/South Central/Midwest I think the only sport that has a serious regular season scheduling issue is the sport of football. On one side in a lot of cases teams are only looking for one game which wouldn't seem like a huge issue, but depending on the strength of your team, that game costs you out of pocket tremendously which at D2 most of us can't afford or no one simply wants to play you to begin with.

I am still learning about all this stuff obviously but I like the current set up we have in golf that requires us to play a set number of competitions against our region. I think in golf we play enough outside of our conference that it probably isn't an issue, so from our stand point I don't think there needs to be a mandate of outside conference play. Honestly, I don't think we need any major changes to golf at this time other

than the regional selection changes we have discussed. I am sorry I don't have much to offer at this time but I don't think this applies to us too much at this time.

Regarding softball, in region play is very important! Playing on the west coast, almost all teams play in region non conference games. I also believe that the athletic directors in our conference, the GNAC, will only fund competition that is "in region". Because of the economic situation, the trips to play in a different part of the country are no longer supported by the athletic administration.

Football is limited on the west coast, so they must travel a great distance to schedule D2 competition.

It is not fair to implement a fine program to a school that does not schedule non conference in region games. If a team does not schedule non conference in region games then they don't plan on being competitive. Also, it may be due to lack of funds.

Even the schools in Hawaii manage to play 7-10 non conference in region games.

We used to have a weighted ranking system of strength of schedule, those teams who could travel and afford to play the maximum allotted games were the most competitive. The field is even now without the weighted 50% of rankings being strength of schedule. All coaches know, to be ranked you must play outside your conference and in region. Programs are now budgeted that way. No incentive plan.

With the current ranking system in softball, teams are rewarded by playing tough in region competition. It is part of the current criteria when you look at who has played who. Conferences are moving towards cross overs with other conferences in their region. People get it!

We believe that it is a time to reevaluate the importance of in-region non-Conference play as being prioritized over geographical location and Conference scheduling. As the division evolves and Conferences will inevitably grow larger given the recent legislation, we as a Division should be providing our member institutions the opportunity to meet the applicable scheduling minimums in each sport they sponsor and doing so in a way that fits their institution and at the same time reflects the Division's priorities. The White Paper states that the "Division II Championships Committee has been charged with reviewing selection criteria to determine methods that would encourage Division II member schools to schedule in-region/nonconference competition and to discourage schools from scheduling contests that will not aid the sports committees in the selection of teams for the national championships." We actually think that the Championships Committee should have as its priority to develop policies that allow for institutions to fill their schedules with Division II games, prioritizing in-region play within that schedule, but allowing them to provide student-athletes the ability to engage in a full schedule in a fiscally responsible manner. It should not be the Championships greatest priority to aid in the RAC's work. The greatest priority lies in assisting institutions to maintain sports sponsorship and intercollegiate athletics opportunities. It is also apparent to us that a one-size fits all approach will not work for each region or each sport.

For DII cross country, indoor track and field, and outdoor track and field, there is not a concern about in-region/non-conference competition. Due to the nature of these sports and the qualifying methods for each of the championships, the number of in-region/non-conference competitions does not affect how teams or individuals are selected.

For **DII Wrestling**, I don't believe that the concept of scheduling in-region/nonconference competition is much of an issue at all. Because the qualifiers to the DII Wrestling Championships are determined solely on the results from each of the four Super Regional tournaments, the regular season scheduling for the sport bears no impact on the championship field. In addition, the sport's membership is spread out across the country (very sparsely in some areas); as a result, some institutions would be negatively impacted by any implementation of in-region/nonconference competition mandates simply because of their relative proximity to other potential opponents within the region.

However, I do believe that the issue is much more relevant for **DII Men's and Women's Tennis**, as the selection criteria takes into account the results from in-region/nonconference matches. During my year with the sport, I have heard committee members speak on numerous occasions to the fact that certain teams within their region are well-known for avoiding in-region/nonconference matches, out of fear that it may ultimately impact their selection/seeding. My take is that conference sponsorship of centrally located events may be the best way to push in-region/nonconference contests, as institutions would be more likely to follow a conference lead rather than branching out on their own to do something new/out-of-the-ordinary. With that said, tennis does have certain regions (e.g.: East) that have conferences sponsoring the traditional and non-traditional championship seasons during different semesters, so any changes implemented across the board would need to take this into account, as well.

The women's volleyball committee recently voted to amend their selection criteria (subject to the approval of the DII Champs Committee), and one of the criteria they want to implement is 'Results versus ranked teams in any region'. This would eliminate the issue (for this particular criteria) of contiguous states resulting in institutions being counted as in-region for some schools in the region and not for others. While that doesn't encourage in-region/non-conference matches, it does result in both teams within one region being able to count a result versus a ranked team in another region, instead of just the team that is contiguous to the state with the ranked team.

NCAA DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE
TIMELINES FOR SPORT COMMITTEE REQUESTS

Timelines for Sport Committees Recommendations.

In reviewing the recommendations that came forth to the Division II Championships Committee, the NCAA staff began the task of developing a working timeline for sport committee recommendations and providing estimated timelines for action to be approved. The Championships Committee has provided below guidelines for governing sport committees to identify when requests can be made and the timeline for implementation.

Recommendations	Championships Committee Review Date	Date of Implementation
Automatic qualifiers	May/June Championships Committee Meeting	September 1
Bracket expansion	September prior to budget cycle (2014, 2017, 2020, 2023)	September 2015, 2018, 2021, 2024
Budget requests	September prior to budget cycle (2014, 2017, 2020, 2023)	September 2015, 2018, 2021, 2024
Committee chair	August Teleconference	September 1
Date formulas	May 2012, May 2024	Immediate upon approval
Field size adjustments	September prior to budget cycle (2014, 2017, 2020, 2023)	September 2015, 2018, 2021, 2024
Selection criteria	September Championships Committee Meeting	Two - three years following approval
Site selection	TBD	TBD
Travel party/bench size adjustments	September prior to budget cycle (2014, 2017, 2020, 2023)	September 2015, 2018, 2021, 2024

Committee Chair: *Erin Lind, Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference (NSIC)*
Staff Liaisons: *Roberta Page, Championship and Alliances*
 Amy Reis, Championship and Alliances

DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIP CREDENTIAL TYPES

ACTION ITEMS.

- **Division II Championship Credential Types.**
 - a. Recommendation. That all Division II Championships provide only the following credential types:
 - All-Access
 - Bench
 - Event Management
 - Host/LOC
 - Media
 - Medical
 - NCAA
 - NCAA Committee
 - Official
 - Participant
 - Photo
 - Security
 - Sports Information
 - Team Personnel
 - Television
 - VIP
 - Volunteer
 - b. Effective Date. Immediate.
 - c. Rationale. The ability to streamline the credential types at Division II Championships will provide consistency for those participating in the events. Clarity about what passes are available and parameters as to what those passes mean by sport will be provided in pre-championship manuals.
 - d. Estimated Budget Impact. None.
 - e. Student-Athlete Impact. None.

Committee Chair: Erin Lind, Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference (NSIC)
Staff Liaisons: Roberta Page, Championships and Alliances
Amy Reis, Championships and Alliances

			CHAMPIONSHIP INFO												
Sport	Div	Gen	2012-13 Date	2013-14 Date	2014-15 Date	2015-16 Date	2016-17 Date	2017-18 Date	2018-19 Date	2019-20 Date	2020-21 Date	2021-22 Date	2022-23 Date	2023-24 Date	
Baseball	DII	M	Reg: May 16-19 Finals: May 25-June 1	Reg: May 15-18 Finals: May 24-31	Reg: May 14-17 Finals: May 23-30	Reg: May 19-22 Finals: May 28-June 4	Reg: May 18-21 Finals: May 27-June 3	Reg: May 17-20 Finals: May 26-June 2	Reg: May 16-19 Finals: May 25-June 1	Reg: May 14-17 Finals: May 23-30	Reg: May 13-16 Finals: May 22-29	Reg: May 19-22 Finals: May 28-June 4	Reg: May 18-21 Finals: May 27-June 3	Reg: May 16-19 Finals: May 25-June 1	
Basketball	DII	M	Reg: Mar. 16, 17 & 19 E8: Mar. 27, 28 & 30	Reg: Mar. 15, 16 & 18 E8: Mar. 26, 27 & 29	Reg: Mar. 14, 15 & 17 E8: Mar. 25, 26 & 28	Reg: March 12, 13 & 15 E8: March 23, 24 & 26	Reg: March 11, 12 & 14 E8: March 22, 23 & 25	Reg: March 17, 18 & 20 E8: March 28, 29 & 31	Reg: March 16, 17 & 19 E8: March 27, 28 & 30	Reg: March 14, 15 & 17 E8: March 25, 26 & 28	Reg: March 13, 14 & 16 E8: March 24, 25 & 27	Reg: March 12, 13 & 15 E8: March 23, 24 & 26	Reg: March 11, 12 & 14 E8: March 22, 23 & 25	Reg: March 16, 17 & 19 E8: March 27, 28 & 30	
Basketball	DII	W	Reg: Mar. 15, 16 & 18 E8: Mar. 26, 27 & 29	Reg: Mar. 14, 15 & 17 E8: Mar. 25, 26 & 28	Reg: Mar. 13, 14 & 16 E8: Mar. 24, 25 & 27	Reg: Mar. 11, 12 & 14 E8: Mar. 22, 23 & 25	Reg: Mar. 10, 11 & 13 E8: Mar. 21, 22 & 24	Reg: Mar. 16, 17 & 19 E8: Mar. 27, 28 & 30	Reg: Mar. 15, 16 & 18 E8: Mar. 26, 27 & 29	Reg: Mar. 13, 14 & 16 E8: Mar. 24, 25 & 27	Reg: Mar. 12, 13 & 15 E8: Mar. 23, 24 & 26	Reg: Mar. 11, 12 & 14 E8: Mar. 22, 23 & 25	Reg: Mar. 10, 11 & 13 E8: Mar. 21, 22 & 24	Reg: Mar. 15, 16 & 18 E8: Mar. 26, 27 & 29	
Cross Country	DII	M/W	Reg: Nov. 3 or 4 Finals: Nov. 17	Reg: Nov. 9 or 10 Finals: Nov. 23	Reg: Nov. 22 Finals: Dec. 6	Reg: Nov. 7 Finals: Nov. 21	Reg: Nov. 5 Finals: Nov. 19	Reg: Nov. 4 Finals: Nov. 18	Reg: Nov. 17 Finals: Dec. 1	Reg: Nov. 9 Finals: Nov. 23	Reg: Nov. 7 Finals: Nov. 21	Reg: Nov. 6 Finals: Nov. 20	Reg: Nov. 19 Finals: Dec. 3	Reg: Nov. 4 Finals: Nov. 18	
Field Hockey	DII	W	1st/2nd: Nov. 3 Finals: Nov. 9 & 11	1st/2nd: Nov. 16 Finals: Nov. 22 & 24	1st/2nd: Nov.29 Finals: Dec. 4 & 6	1st/2nd: Nov. 7 Finals: Nov. 13 & 15	1st/2nd: Nov. 5 Finals: Nov. 11 & 13	1st/2nd: Nov. 4 Finals: Nov. 10 & 12	1st/2nd: Nov. 24 Finals: Nov. 29 & Dec. 1	1st/2nd: Nov. 9 Finals: Nov. 15 & 17	1st/2nd: Nov. 7 Finals: Nov. 13 & 15	1st/2nd: Nov. 6 Finals: Nov. 12 & 14	1st/2nd: Nov. 26 Finals: Dec. 1 & 3	1st/2nd: Nov. 4 Finals: Nov. 10 & 12	
Football	DII	M	Nov. 17 Nov. 24 Dec. 1 Dec. 8 or 9 Finals: Dec. 15	1st: Nov. 23 2nd: Nov. 30 QF: Dec. 7 Semi: Dec. 14 or 15 Finals: Dec. 21	1st: Nov. 22 2nd: Nov. 29 QF: Dec. 6 Semi: Dec. 13 or 14 Finals: Dec. 20	1st: Nov. 21 2nd: Nov. 28 QF: Dec. 5 Semi: Dec. 12 or 13 Finals: Dec. 19	1st: Nov. 19 2nd: Nov. 26 QF: Dec. 3 Semi: Dec. 10 or 11 Finals: Dec. 17	1st: Nov. 18 2nd: Nov. 25 QF: Dec. 2 Semi: Dec. 9 or 10 Finals: Dec. 16	1st: Nov. 17 2nd: Nov. 24 QF: Dec. 1 Semi: Dec. 8 or 9 Finals: Dec. 15	1st: Nov. 23 2nd: Nov. 30 QF: Dec. 7 Semi: Dec. 14 or 15 Finals: Dec. 21	1st: Nov. 21 2nd: Nov. 28 QF: Dec. 5 Semi: Dec. 12 or 13 Finals: Dec. 19	1st: Nov. 20 2nd: Nov. 27 QF: Dec. 4 Semi: Dec. 11 or 12 Finals: Dec. 18	1st: Nov. 19 2nd: Nov. 26 QF: Dec. 3 Semi: Dec. 10 or 11 Finals: Dec. 17	1st: Nov. 18 2nd: Nov. 25 QF: Dec. 2 Semi: Dec. 9 or 10 Finals: Dec. 16	
Golf	DII	M	Super Reg: May 6-8 Finals: May 20-24	Super Reg: May 5-7 Finals: May 19-23	Super Reg: May 4-6 Finals: May 18-22	Super Reg: May 2-4 Finals: May 16-20	Super Reg: May 8-10 Finals: May 22-26	Super Reg: May 7-9 Finals: May 21-25	Super Reg: May 6-8 Finals: May 20-24	Super Reg: April 27-29 Finals: May 11-15	Super Reg: May 3-5 Finals: May 17-21	Super Reg: May 2-4 Finals: May 16-20	Super Reg: May 8-10 Finals: May 22-26	Super Reg: April 29-May 1 Finals: May 13-18	
Golf	DII	W	Super Reg: May 5-7 Finals: May 15-18	Super Reg: May 4-6 Finals: May 14-17	Super Reg: May 3-5 Finals: May 13-16	Super Reg: May 8-10 Finals: May 18-21	Super Reg: May 7-9 Finals: May 17-20	Super Reg: May 6-8 Finals: May 16-19	Super Reg: May 5-7 Finals: May 15-18	Super Reg: May 3-5 Finals: May 13-16	Super Reg: May 2-4 Finals: May 12-15	Super Reg: May 1-3 Finals: May 11-14	Super Reg: May 7-9 Finals: May 17-20	Super Reg: May 5-7 Finals: May 15-18	
Lacrosse	DII	M	Semi: May 18 or 19 Finals: May 26	First Round: May 10-11 Semi: May 17-18 Finals: May 25 Baltimore, Maryland	First Round: May 9-10 Semi: May 16 or 17 Finals: May 24	First Round: May 14-15 Semi: May 21-22 Finals: May 29	First Round: May 13-14 Semi: May 20-21 Finals: May 28	First Round: May 12-13 Semi: May 19-20 Finals: May 27	First Round: May 11-12 Semi: May 18-19 Finals: May 26	First Round: May 9-10 Semi: May 16-17 Finals: May 24	First Round: May 15-16 Semi: May 22-23 Finals: May 30	First Round: May 14-15 Semi: May 21-22 Finals: May 29	First Round: May 13-14 Semi: May 20-21 Finals: May 28	First Round: May 11-12 Semi: May 18-19 Finals: May 26	
Lacrosse	DII	W	1st: May 11 Finals: May 18-19	1st: May 10 Finals: May 17-18	1st: May 9 Finals: May 16-17	1st: May 14 Finals: May 19 & 21	1st: May 13 Finals: May 20-21	1st: May 12 Finals: May 19-20	1st: May 11 Finals: May 18-19	1st: May 9 Finals: May 14 & 16	1st: May 15 Finals: May 22-23	1st: May 14 Finals: May 21-22	1st: May 13 Finals: May 20-21	1st: May 11 Finals: May 16 & 18	
Rowing	DII	W	May 31-Jun. 2	May 30-Jun. 1	May 29-31	May 27-29	May 26-28	May 25-27	May 31-June 2	May 29-31	May 28-30	May 27-29	May 26-28	May 31 - June 2	

			CHAMPIONSHIP INFO												
Sport	Div	Gen	2012-13 Date	2013-14 Date	2014-15 Date	2015-16 Date	2016-17 Date	2017-18 Date	2018-19 Date	2019-20 Date	2020-21 Date	2021-22 Date	2022-23 Date	2023-24 Date	
Soccer	DII	M	1st: Nov. 8 or 9 2nd: Nov. 10 or 11 3rd: Nov. 15 or 16 QF: Nov. 17 or 18 Semifinals: Nov. 29 Finals: Dec. 1	1st: Nov. 14 or 15 2nd: Nov. 16 or 17 3rd: Nov. 21 or 22 QF: Nov. 23 or 24 Semifinals: Dec. 5 Finals: Dec. 7	1st: Nov. 13 or 14 2nd: Nov. 15 or 16 3rd: Nov. 20 or 21 QF: Nov. 22 or 23 Semifinals: Dec. 4 Finals: Dec. 6	1st: Nov. 12 or 13 2nd: Nov. 14 or 15 3rd: Nov. 19 or 20 QF: Nov. 21 or 22 Semifinals: Dec. 3 Finals: Dec. 5	1st: Nov. 10 or 11 2nd: Nov. 12 or 13 3rd: Nov. 17 or 18 QF: Nov. 19 or 20 Semifinals: Dec. 1 Finals: Dec. 3	1st: Nov. 9 or 10 2nd: Nov. 11 or 12 3rd: Nov. 16 or 17 QF: Nov. 18 or 19 Semifinals: Nov. 30 Finals: Dec. 2	1st: Nov. 8 or 9 2nd: Nov. 10 or 11 3rd: Nov. 15 or 16 QF: Nov. 17 or 18 Semifinals: Nov. 29 Finals: Dec. 1	1st: Nov. 14 or 15 2nd: Nov. 16 or 17 3rd: Nov. 21 or 22 QF: Nov. 23 or 24 Semifinals: Dec. 5 Finals: Dec. 7	1st: Nov. 12 or 13 2nd: Nov. 14 or 15 3rd: Nov. 19 or 20 QF: Nov. 21 or 22 Semifinals: Dec. 3 Finals: Dec. 5	1st: Nov. 11 or 12 2nd: Nov. 13 or 14 3rd: Nov. 18 or 19 QF: Nov. 20 or 21 Semifinals: Dec. 2 Finals: Dec. 4	1st: Nov. 10 or 11 2nd: Nov. 12 or 13 3rd: Nov. 17 or 18 QF: Nov. 19 or 20 Semifinals: Dec. 1 Finals: Dec. 3	1st: Nov. 9 or 10 2nd: Nov. 11 or 12 3rd: Nov. 16 or 17 QF: Nov. 18 or 19 Semifinals: Nov. 30 Finals: Dec. 2	
Soccer	DII	W	1st/2nd: Nov. 9 & 11 3rd/QF: Nov. 16 & 18 Semifinals: Nov. 29 Finals: Dec. 1	1st/2nd: Nov. 15 & 17 3rd/QF: Nov. 22 & 24 Semifinals: Dec. 5 Finals: Dec. 7	1st/2nd: Nov. 14 & 16 3rd/QF: Nov. 21 & 23 Semifinals: Dec. 4 Finals: Dec. 6	1st: Nov. 13 2nd: Nov. 15 3rd: Nov. 19 or 20 QF: Nov. 21 or 22 Semifinals: Dec. 3 Finals: Dec. 5	1st: Nov. 11 2nd: Nov. 13 3rd: Nov. 17 or 18 QF: Nov. 19 or 20 Semifinals: Dec. 1 Finals: Dec. 3	1st: Nov. 10 2nd: Nov. 12 3rd: Nov. 16 or 17 QF: Nov. 18 or 19 Semifinals: Nov. 30 Finals: Dec. 2	1st: Nov. 9 2nd: Nov. 11 3rd: Nov. 15 or 16 QF: Nov. 17 or 18 Semifinals: Nov. 29 Finals: Dec. 1	1st: Nov. 15 2nd: Nov. 17 3rd: Nov. 21 or 22 QF: Nov. 23 or 24 Semifinals: Dec. 5 Finals: Dec. 7	1st: Nov. 13 2nd: Nov. 15 3rd: Nov. 19 or 20 QF: Nov. 21 or 22 Semifinals: Dec. 3 Finals: Dec. 5	1st: Nov. 12 2nd: Nov. 14 3rd: Nov. 18 or 19 QF: Nov. 20 or 21 Semifinals: Dec. 2 Finals: Dec. 4	1st: Nov. 11 2nd: Nov. 13 3rd: Nov. 17 or 18 QF: Nov. 19 or 20 Semifinals: Dec. 1 Finals: Dec. 3	1st: Nov. 10 2nd: Nov. 12 3rd: Nov. 16 or 17 QF: Nov. 18 or 19 Semifinals: Nov. 30 Finals: Dec. 2	
Softball	DII	W	Reg: May 9 - 12 Super Reg: May 17-18 Finals: May 23-27	Reg: May 8-11 Super Reg: May 16-17 Finals: May 22-26	Reg: May 7-10 Super Reg: May 15-16 Finals: May 21-25	Reg: May 5-8 Super Reg: May 13-14 Finals: May 17-21	Reg: May 11-14 Super Reg: May 19-20 Finals: May 25-29	Reg: May 10-13 Super Reg: May 18-19 Finals: May 24-28	Reg: May 9-12 Super Reg: May 17-18 Finals: May 23-27	Reg: April 30-May 3 Super Reg: May 8-9 Finals: May 12-16	Reg: May 6-9 Super Reg: May 14-15 Finals: May 20-24	Reg: May 12-15 Super Reg: May 20-21 Finals: May 26-30	Reg: May 11-14 Super Reg: May 19-20 Finals: May 25-29	Reg: May 2-5 Super Reg: May 10-11 Finals: May 14-18	
Swim&Dive	DII	M/W	Mar. 6-9	Mar. 12-15	Mar. 11-14	Mar. 9-12	Mar. 8-11	Mar. 14-17	Mar. 13-16	Mar. 11-14	Mar 10-13	Mar 9-12	Mar 8-11	Mar. 13-16	
Tennis	DII	M/W	1st/2nd: Apr. 27-30 Finals: May 8-11	1st/2nd: May 3-6 Finals: May 14-17	1st/2nd: May 2-5 Finals: May 13-16	1st/2nd: May 7-10 Finals: May 18-21	1st/2nd: April 29-May 2 Finals: May 10-13	1st/2nd: April 28-May 1 Finals: May 9-12	1st/2nd: Apirl 27-30 Finals: May 8-11	1st/2nd: May 2-5 Finals: May 13-16	1st/2nd: May 1-4 Finals: May 12-15	1st/2nd: April 30-May 3 Finals: May 11-14	1st/2nd: April 29-May 2 Finals: May 10-13	1st/2nd: May 4-7 Finals: May 15-18	
Track & Field (In)	DII	M/W	Mar. 8-9	Mar. 14-15	Mar. 13-14	Mar. 11-12	Mar. 10-11	Mar. 9-10	Mar. 8-9	Mar. 13-14	Mar. 12-13	Mar. 11-12	Mar. 10-11	Mar. 8-9	
Track & Field (Out)	DII	M/W	May 23-25	May 22-24	May 21-23	May 26-28	May 25-27	May 24-26	May 23-25	May 21-23	May 27-29	May 26-28	May 25-27	May 23-25	
Volleyball	DII	W	Reg: Nov. 29-Dec. 1 or Nov. 30-Dec. 2 Finals: Dec. 6-8	Reg: Dec. 5-7 or Dec. 6-8 Finals: Dec. 12-14	Reg: Nov. 20-22 or Nov. 21-23 Finals: Dec. 4-6	Reg: Dec. 3-5 or Dec. 4-6 Finals: Dec. 10-12	Reg: Dec. 1-3 or Dec. 2-4 Finals: Dec. 8-10	Reg: Nov. 30-Dec. 2 or Dec. 1- 3 Finals: Dec. 7-9	Reg: Nov. 15-17 or Nov. 16-18 Finals: Nov. 29-Dec. 1	Reg: Dec. 5-7 or Dec. 6-8 Finals: Dec. 12-14	Reg: Dec. 3-5 or Dec. 4-6 Finals: Dec. 10-12	Reg: Dec. 2-4 or Dec. 3-5 Finals: Dec. 9-11	Reg: Nov. 17-19 or Nov. 18-20 Finals: Dec. 1-3	Reg: Nov. 30-Dec. 2 or Dec. 1-3 Finals: Dec. 7-9	
Wrestling	DII	M	Reg: Feb 23-25 Finals: Mar. 8-9	Reg: Feb. 22-24 Finals: Mar. 6-8	Reg: Feb. 27 - March 2 Finals: March 13-14	Reg: Feb. 26-29 Finals: March 11-12	Reg: Feb. 24-27 Finals: March 10-11	Reg: Feb. 23-26 Finals: March 9-10	Reg: Feb. 22-25 Finals: March 9-9	Reg: Feb. 28 - March 2 Finals: March 13-14	Reg: Feb. 26 - March 1 Finals: March 12-13	Reg: Feb. 25-28 Finals: March 11-12	Reg: Feb. 24-27 Finals: March 10-11	Reg: Feb. 23-26 Finals: March 8-9	

**REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE**

ACTION ITEMS.

- **Regional Advisory Committees (RAC) Call Schedule.**
 - a. Recommendation. That the RACs and national governing sports committees be permitted the following call schedule for all Division II team sports: one (1) practice call, three (3) ranking calls and one (1) selection call.
 - b. Effective Date. Immediate.
 - c. Rationale. The consistent call schedule across all team sports allows for more continuity in the Division to conduct the work of the RACs and national governing sports committees. Additionally, the call schedule provides clarity to membership related to the ranking and selection process.
 - d. Estimated Budget Impact. None.
 - e. Student-Athlete Impact. None.

Committee Chair: Erin Lind, Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference (NSIC)
Staff Liaisons: Roberta Page, Championships and Alliances
Amy Reis, Championships and Alliances

**REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE**

ACTION ITEMS.

- **Regional Advisory Committees (RAC) Balloting System.**

- a. Recommendation. That the Regional Advisory Committees use available online technology to vote for teams during all RAC calls for the sports of men's and women's basketball in winter 2012 as well as baseball, softball, men's and women's lacrosse, men's and women's golf and men's and women's tennis in spring 2012.

Further, baseball and softball would publish rankings, determined through the voting process, by the regional advisory committees (rather than the national committee) on a pilot program for spring 2012 (see attachments A and B).

- b. Effective Date. Immediate.

- c. Rationale.

- An NCAA taskforce was charged with evaluating the use of technology in the ranking and selection of teams for all divisions to improve efficiency and consistency during the selection process. The taskforce believes that a revised balloting and ranking process will provide for:
 - greater visibility and accountability for regional advisory committees;
 - greater efficiency during RAC and national committee calls;
 - confidentiality and decreased pressure/influence on RAC members during the voting process; and,
 - greater emphasis on RAC member participating in the ranking process and strengthening the role of the regional chair as a liaison between the sport committee and the RAC.

The task force believes that a pilot program in the spring of 2012 for baseball and softball will provide valuable feedback on the process to the other sport committees with potential full implementation in Division II in all sports for the 2012-13 academic year.

- d. Estimated Budget Impact. None.

- e. Student-Athlete Impact. None.

Committee Chair: Erin Lind, Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference (NSIC)
Staff Liaison: Roberta Page, Championships and Alliances
Amy Reis, Championships and Alliances

Winter & Spring 2012 Regional Advisory Committee Balloting Process Men's and Women's Basketball, Lacrosse, Golf and Tennis

1. NCAA statistics group processes weekly data. Any corrections/updates should be forwarded to the designated statistics staff member for the respective sport.
2. Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) calls are conducted weekly in each region. Voting is no longer conducted during the call (i.e., RAC members discuss strengths and weaknesses of all teams under consideration, compare teams in the online score reporting system and discuss how teams should be ranked, but are not required to come to consensus on regional ranking prior to end of call).
3. Upon completion of RAC calls, RAC members vote via online ballot by an established deadline (e.g., 5 p.m. Eastern time following the RAC calls). RAC members will receive an online link to a web page with an alphabetical list of all teams in the region on the left side of the page and a blank ballot with the same number of spaces as the number of teams to be included in the ranking (e.g., if eight teams are ranked in a respective region, RAC members from that region will vote for a total of eight teams) on the right side of the page. RAC members will be able to click and drag the names of the teams on the ballot to adjust their rank. A vote is cast by clicking on "Submit."
4. RAC members may vote for their own teams. This is consistent with the Division II policy of RAC members voting on the final regional ranking (including when the ranking includes teams of RAC members) forwarded to the national committee in previous years.
5. RAC chairs will email the championship point person regarding which RAC members did not participate on their respective call. RAC members who are not able to participate on the RAC call that week are not permitted to vote but may forward feedback to the regional chair prior to the call to share with the RAC.
6. The championship point person will review the votes for each region. The system will automatically tally the votes based on a sliding scale point system (e.g., for a region ranking eight teams, a team will receive eight points for each first-place vote, seven points for each second-place vote, etc.). Based on the votes, the championship point person will be able to assist the regional chairs in identifying key discussion points and team comparisons for RAC calls.
7. The championship point person will enter each regional ranking in the online score reporting system. Submission of the ranking will generate an automated email to the national committee, and the RAC members will continue to have read-only access to the system to view the ranking.
8. The national committee will review each regional ranking, compare teams as appropriate and provide feedback to the RAC, via the respective sport committee member serving as the RAC chair, to ensure consistency across all regions in the application of the selection criteria.
9. The RAC rankings, with adjustments as deemed appropriate by the national committee, will be published the final three weeks of the season but not on the day of selections. Non-voting conferences will be identified on the published rankings.

Spring 2012 Regional Advisory Committee Balloting Process Baseball and Softball

1. NCAA statistics group processes weekly data. Any corrections/updates should be forwarded to the designated statistics staff member for the respective sport.
2. Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) calls are conducted weekly in each region. Voting is no longer conducted during the call (i.e., RAC members discuss strengths and weaknesses of all teams under consideration, compare teams in the online score reporting system and discuss how teams should be ranked, but are not required to come to consensus on regional ranking prior to end of call).
3. Upon completion of RAC calls, RAC members vote via online ballot by an established deadline (e.g., 5 p.m. Eastern time following the RAC calls). RAC members will receive an online link to a web page with an alphabetical list of all teams in the region on the left side of the page and a blank ballot with the same number of spaces as the number of teams to be included in the ranking (e.g., if eight teams are ranked in a respective region, RAC members from that region will vote for a total of eight teams) on the right side of the page. RAC members will be able to click and drag the names of the teams on the ballot to adjust their rank. A vote is cast by clicking on "Submit."
4. RAC members may vote for their own teams. This is consistent with the Division II policy of RAC members voting on the final regional ranking (including when the ranking includes teams of RAC members) forwarded to the national committee in previous years.
5. RAC chairs will email the championship point person regarding which RAC members did not participate on their respective call. RAC members who are not able to participate on the RAC call that week are not permitted to vote but may forward feedback to the regional chair prior to the call to share with the RAC.
6. The championship point person will review the votes for each region. The system will automatically tally the votes based on a sliding scale point system (e.g., for a region ranking eight teams, a team will receive eight points for each first-place vote, seven points for each second-place vote, etc.). Based on the votes, the championship point person will be able to assist the regional chairs in identifying key discussion points and team comparisons for RAC calls.
7. The championship point person will enter each regional ranking in the online score reporting system. Submission of the ranking will generate an automated email to the national committee, and the RAC members will continue to have read-only access to the system to view the ranking.
8. The national committee will review each regional ranking, compare teams as appropriate and provide feedback to the RAC, via the respective sport committee member serving as the RAC chair, to ensure consistency across all regions in the application of the selection criteria.
9. The RAC rankings, without changes by the national committee, will be published the final three weeks of the season but not on the day of selections. Non-voting conferences will be identified on the published rankings.
10. All tied teams will be included in the published rankings (e.g., if two teams are tied for the final spot in a region, both will count as ranked teams in subsequent weeks).

Supplement No. 28

**Information concerning this agenda
item will be available after the
Division II Management Council
meeting in July.**

Division II Championships Committee
Automatic Qualifications

1. Baseball.

- a. Recommendation. That the following conferences receive automatic qualification for the 2013 NCAA Division II Baseball Championship: California Collegiate Athletic Association; 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; Heartland Conference; Lone Star Conference; Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association; Northeast-10 Conference; Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference; Peach Belt Conference; Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference; Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference; South Atlantic Conference; Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Sunshine State Conference; and West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.
- b. Rationale. This reflects all eligible conferences.
- c. Estimated Budget Impact. None.
- d. Student-Athlete Impact. None.

2. Men's Basketball Championship.

- a. Recommendation. That the following 22 conferences be approved for automatic qualification for the 2013 championship: California Collegiate Athletic Association; Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference; Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association; Conference Carolinas; East Coast Conference; Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Great Lakes Valley Conference; Great Northwest Athletic Conference; Gulf South Conference; Heartland 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.
- b. Rationale. This reflects all eligible conferences.
- c. Estimated Budget Impact. None.
- d. Student-Athlete Impact. None.

3. Women's Basketball Championship.

- a. Recommendation. That the following conferences receive automatic qualification for the 2013 NCAA Division II Women's Basketball Championship: California Collegiate Athletic Association; Central Athletic Collegiate Conference; Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association; Conference Carolinas; East Coast Conference; Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Great Lakes Valley Conference; Great Northwest Athletic Conference; Gulf South Conference; Heartland 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 West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.
- b. Rationale. This reflects all eligible conferences.
- c. Estimated Budget Impact. None.
- d. Student-Athlete Impact. None.

4. Men's Golf Championship.

- a. Recommendation. That the following conferences receive automatic qualification for the 2013 NCAA Division II Men's Golf Championship: California Collegiate Athletic Association, Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference, Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association, Conference Carolinas, Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, Great Lakes Valley Conference, Gulf South Conference, Heartland 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, Sunshine State Conference, and West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.
- b. Rationale. Each conference meets the defined criteria for automatic qualification.
- c. Estimated Budget Impact. None.
- d. Student-Athlete Impact. None.

5. Women's Soccer Championship.

- a. Recommendation. That the following conferences receive automatic qualification for the 2012 NCAA Division II Women's Soccer Championship: California Collegiate Athletic Association; Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference; Conference Carolinas; East Coast Conference; Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Great Lakes Valley Conference; Great Northwest Athletic Conference; Gulf South Conference; Heartland Conference; Lone Star Conference; Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic 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; Sunshine State Conference; and West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.
- b. Rationale. This reflects all eligible conferences.
- c. Estimated Budget Impact. None.
- d. Student-Athlete Impact. None.

6. Softball Championship.

- a. Recommendation. That the following conferences receive automatic qualification for the 2013 NCAA Division II Softball Championship: California Collegiate Athletic Association; Central Atlantic Collegiate; Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association; Conference Carolinas; East Coast Conference; Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Great Lakes Valley Conference; Great Northwest Athletic; Gulf South Conference; Heartland Conference; Lone Star Conference; Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association; Northeast-10 Conference; Northern Sun Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Pacific West Conference; Peach Belt Conference; Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference; Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference; South Atlantic Conference; Southern Intercollegiate Athletic; Sunshine State Conference and West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.
- b. Rationale. Each conference meets the defined criteria for automatic qualification
- c. Estimated Budget Impact. None.
- d. Student-Athlete Impact. None.

7. Men's Tennis Championship.

- a. Recommendation. That the following conferences receive automatic qualification for the 2013 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; Heartland 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 West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.
- b. Rationale. This reflects all eligible conferences.
- c. Estimated Budget Impact. None.
- d. Student-Athlete Impact. None.

8. Women's Tennis Championship.

- a. Recommendation. That the following conferences receive automatic qualification for the 2013 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 West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.
- b. Rationale. This reflects all eligible conferences.
- c. Estimated Budget Impact. None.
- d. Student-Athlete Impact. None.

9. Women's Volleyball Championship.

- a. Recommendation. That the following conferences receive automatic qualification to the 2012 NCAA Division II Women's Volleyball Championship: California Collegiate Athletic Association, Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference, Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association, Conference Carolinas, East Coast Conference, Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, Great Lakes Valley Conference, Great Northwest Athletic Conference, Gulf South Conference, Heartland 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 West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.
- b. Rationale. This reflects all eligible conferences.
- c. Budget Impact. None.
- d. Student-Athlete Impact. None.

Committee Chair: Erin Lind, Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference (NSIC)
Staff Liaisons: Roberta Page, Championships and Alliances
Amy Reis, Championships and Alliances

**REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION II MEN'S BASKETBALL COMMITTEE
April 16-18, 2012 Annual Meeting**

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

a. 2013 Championship Format.

- (1) Recommendation. That the format for the 2013 Division II Men's Elite Eight be conducted with four semifinal games on Thursday and two semifinal games on Saturday afternoon with the two advancing teams moving on to Atlanta, Georgia with the championship game to be conducted on Sunday afternoon of the Division I Men's Final Four weekend as part of the 75th anniversary of men's college basketball.
- (2) Effective Date. 2013 championship only.
- (3) Rationale. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee would still conduct regionals and the Elite 8 within the current date formula, however, the championship game would be played a week later at the Division I Men's Final Four. The committee has discussed this format with the National Association of Basketball Coaches and the body was very supportive of the proposed format for the 2013 championship.
- (4) Budget Impact. None.
- (5) Student-Athlete Impact. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee believes the student-athlete experience for the Elite 8 will be very similar to years past and that the experience for the two teams that advance to Atlanta will be outstanding. The student-athletes will have the opportunity to be introduced in front of 70,000 fans at the semifinals of the Men's Final Four the night preceding their championship which will provide for a terrific experience.

b. Requirement for Number of In-region Games.

- (1) Recommendation. That the number of in-region games required to be eligible for an at-large selection to the championship be increased from 16 to 18.
- (2) Effective Date. 2012-13 season.

- (3) Rationale. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee believes there are very few teams currently that do not meet this threshold and further it will bring men's basketball in line with what women's basketball currently requires.
- (4) Budget Impact. None.
- (5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

c. Selection Criteria.

- (1) Recommendation. That a minimum number of games (12 for the practice ranking, 14 for the 1st ranking, 16 for the 2nd ranking and 18 for the 3rd ranking) against Division II competition be played in order to be included in the Performance Indicator criteria.
- (2) Effective Date. 2012-13 season.
- (3) Rationale. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee believes that requiring a minimum number of games to be played against Division II competition in order for those games to count in the Performance Indicator will allow for better evaluations of teams during the selection process. The performance indicator provides a point value for wins or losses at home, away or neutral sites and when only a small sample size is used the data is less reliable. Currently, teams are getting the same point value for a win or a loss no matter if the opposing team has played the maximum number of games vs. Division II opponents or just a few games against Division II opponents. By requiring a minimum number of games against Division II competition, it will be a better indicator of a team's success over a minimum number of games rather than just a few games against Division II opponents.
- (4) Budget Impact. None.
- (5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

d. Appointment of Committee Chair.

- (1) Recommendation. That Eric Schoh be appointed as chair of the Division II Men's Basketball Committee.
- (2) Effective Date. September 2012.
- (3) Rationale. Mr. Schoh has been a member of the men's basketball committee for two years and has served his role very well. He has prior experience of serving

on the Regional Advisory Committee for four years and this experience will serve him well as the chair of the men's basketball committee.

(4) Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **2011 Annual Meeting Minutes.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee reviewed the 2011 meeting minutes and approved without any modifications.
2. **2012 Championship Committee Actions.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee members reviewed the action and information items from 2011.
3. **2012-13 Men's Basketball Automatic Qualifications.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee approved the conferences meeting automatic qualification for the 2012-13 academic year. The approved conferences will be submitted in one supplement for all Division II Championships at the May 2012 NCAA Division II Championships Committee meeting.
4. **National Association of Basketball Coaches Meeting.** Mr. Donnie Wagner provided an update from the NABC meeting in New Orleans. The coaches in attendance were overwhelming in favor of the 75th Anniversary concept and conducting the national championship game in Atlanta in 2013. Mr. Jim Johnson provided the coaches an overview of how selections went for the 2012 season and the Regional Advisory Committee balloting that took place for the first time this year.
5. **Governance Update.** Mike Racy joined the meeting to provide an update on governance issues related to men's basketball including initial eligibility standards.
6. **Review of the 2012 Championship.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee reviewed the 2012 championship held in Highland Heights, Kentucky with Western Washington University winning the national championship. Overall, the Division II Men's Basketball Committee was very pleased with championship and expressed a great deal of thanks to Northern Kentucky University. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee thought the venue was outstanding and that each of the hotels did a great

job and overall provided a very good student-athlete experience. The banquet was assisted with the nice weather and overall it was a great place for the event. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee thought the guest speaker was outstanding and had a good message for the student-athletes. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee reviewed the schedule of events and will move the coaches meeting to following the banquet as has been the case prior to this year. The Reese's All-Star game was well received as was the Youth Clinic on Friday night by fans in the local community.

7. **Review of 2012 Regionals.** All regionals were run very well with good attendance numbers at most regional sites. We continue to have some challenges with hotels mostly due to the distance from the venues. There are some security concern with fans rushing the court at the conclusion of the games that needs to be addressed at the pre-tournament meetings. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee will also require that all games at a regional site be webcasted by the host institution and should include live stats as well.
8. **Officiating.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee believed the process for evaluating and moving on officials worked very well again this year with assistance from John Adams. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee will continue to work with John to secure neutral evaluators at regional sites. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee wants to confirm that all officials should be available for the pre-tournament meeting as well as each day of competition. Coordinators should understand this requirement and should only be forwarding names on of officials that meet this requirement.
9. **Ranking Calls.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee thought the three ranking calls went very well this year. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee liked the RAC balloting procedures that were new this year. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee would like to see RAC balloting continue but believe the national committee should have the ability to change the rankings from how the RAC voted if criteria indicates a change should be made.
10. **Discussion of 2013 Championship.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee had discussions regarding the NABC All-Star game and Youth Clinic if the national championship game is part of the 75th anniversary of men's college basketball. The committee sees value with the All-Star game at the Final Four but believes that decision rests with the NABC. The committee is still planning on having a Youth Clinic at the Elite Eight and if the All-Star game participants are not present, the Division II Men's Basketball Committee will ask the four semifinal teams to take part in the Youth Clinic as part of their community outreach.

11. **Seeding of Championship.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee discussed possibly seeding the regions going into the championship and the challenges that exist in doing so. No formal action was taken on the concept.
12. **Selection Date.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee is concerned about the lateness of conference games competing on Sunday and the challenges it represents to the committee. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee will continue to evaluate whether to move selections to Sunday evening/Monday morning with a selection show webcast for Monday afternoon.
13. **Television/Webcast.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee reviewed the ratings for the broadcast this year and noted the ratings have been very similar to the past few years. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee talked with Mr. Ken Mack on the 2013 championship and he is looking into having the quarterfinals and semifinals broadcast on CBS College Sports Network.
14. **Regionalization/Sports Sponsorship List.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee reviewed the changes that will take effect next year with the new regionalization model.
15. **National Committee.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee discussed the make-up of the committee going forward and how to assist new committee members with an understanding of the selection criteria and score reporting system.
16. **Future Elite Eight Pairings.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee reviewed the pairings for future Elite Eight's going forward. The committee noted that the host region should be slotted into the evening session on the first day of competition and consideration should be given to the affects of time zone changes for competing teams.
17. **Call with Lennie Acuff.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee had a call with Lennie Acuff from the NABC to review issues from the meeting and provide feedback on any of the items discussed by the Division II Men's Basketball Committee.
18. **Discussion with Stephanie Quigg Smith.** Stephanie Quigg Smith joined the Division II Men's Basketball Committee to review items related to legislation, academic

requirements, as well as other questions from the Division II Men's Basketball Committee.

- 19. Strength of Schedule Calculations.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee discussed how the calculations are currently done (average of the percentages) and believe that a calculation using raw data is a better measure to minimize the skewing of the data when a small number of games are played against Division II competition. The Division II Women's Basketball Committee is supportive of calculating the OWP in the same manner.
- 20. Meeting with the Women's Basketball Committee.** The Division II Men's and Women's Basketball Committee's met briefly to discuss issues common to the two championships. The Division II Men's and Women's Basketball Committee's discussed a combined Men's and Women's Elite Eight for 2014 and 2015 and the logistics around holding both championships at the same site. Division II Men's and Women's Basketball Committee's are both supportive of the concept and will look to explore hosting the two events at the same site as early as the 2014 championship.
- 21. Review of 2012 Tournament Host Manual.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee reviewed the current tournament host manual and recommended changes for the 2012-13 season.
- 22. Review Committee Operations Manual.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee reviewed the current committee operations manual and recommended changes for the 2012-13 season.
- 23. Recognition of Outgoing Member.** The Division II Men's Basketball Committee acknowledged Jeff Ligney, Mark Peeler and Jim Johnson for their service on the committee over the past several years.

Committee Chair: Jim Johnson, Pittsburg State University

Staff Liaison: Donnie Wagner, Championships and Alliances

April 16-18, 2012	
ATTENDEES	ABSENTEES

Joe Clinton, Dominican College	Jim Johnson, Pittsburg State University
Kevin Hatcher, California State University, San Bernadino	Ken Tyler, West Virginia Wesleyan College
Jeff Ligney, Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	
Mark Peeler, Erskine College	
Tom Ryan, Eckerd College	
Eric Schoh, Wayne State College (Nebraska)	
Other Participants Lennie Acuff (University of Alabama-Huntsville), Ken Mack (CBS), Stephanie Quigg Smith (NCAA staff), Mike Racy (NCAA staff), Donnie Wagner (NCAA staff)	

**REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION II WOMEN'S BASKETBALL COMMITTEE
April 16 - 18, 2012 Annual Meeting**

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

a. Appointment of Committee Chair.

- (1) Recommendation. That Kathy Anderson be appointed as chair of the Division II Women's Basketball Committee.
- (2) Effective Date. September 2012.
- (3) Rationale. Ms. Anderson has been a member of the Division II Women's Basketball Committee for three years and has served her role very well. She has prior experience of serving on the Division II Women's Basketball Regional Advisory Committee and was the chair of the Division II Women's Softball Committee. This experience will serve her well as the chair of the women's basketball committee.
- (4) Budget Impact. None.
- (5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

- 1. 2011 Annual Meeting Minutes.** The Division II Women's Basketball Committee reviewed the 2011 meeting minutes and approved without any modifications.
- 2. 2011 Championship Committee Actions.** The Division II Women's Basketball Committee reviewed the action and information items from 2011 Championships Committee meetings. Each item applicable to Division II Women's Basketball was reviewed and discussed. The joint championship with Division I and III was discussed and supported by members of the committee.
- 3. WBCA Division II recap/report.** The Division II Women's Basketball Committee reviewed the report given at the WBCA Convention. The Division II conference captains

recommended a mock selection next year during their Division II session to be used as an educational session.

Many coaches were unaware of the RAC balloting system that was implemented for the 2011-12 season. Coaches that used the system were supportive of the system and would support full implementation of the system moving forward.

4. **2012 Division II Women's Basketball Championship.** The Division II Women's Basketball Committee reviewed the 2012 Women's Basketball Championship held in San Antonio, Texas. Shaw University won the national championship with a victory over Ashland University. The Women's Basketball Committee would like to continue with the 11:00 am EST selection call.

The selection show was good although done very quickly. The Women's Basketball Committee would like more information on the schools selected on the show.

The Women's Basketball Committee was very pleased with all the information sent out from the National Office surrounding the championship. Discussion took place concerning breaking out the information over a few days in an attempt not to inundate the coaches with information.

The Women's Basketball Committee reviewed all regional tournaments. All regional tournaments were run smoothly with no major issues.

CBS timing sheets need to be consistent beginning with regionals through the national championship.

A few suggestions will be forwarded to San Antonio Sports for next year including:

- All session tickets. Next year, session tickets (4) will be sold rather than an all session ticket.
- St. Mary's should be covered on the scoreboard to show home and away.
- Traffic needs to be monitored in the hallways during competition.
- The moderator will be encouraged to generate questions during the press conferences to ensure everyone is involved with the conference.
- San Antonio Sports will secure a new location for the banquet and have the emcee talk about each team in attendance. Lauren Packer-Webster will help write the scripts for 2013.

Lauren Packer-Webster did a great job as the Media Coordinator for the Championship. Two National Committee members will assist with compiling the All-Tournament selection to ensure timely notification to scorer's table.

The Women's Basketball Committee discussed the key areas for committee assignments at the Championship: Bands/cheerleaders, press conferences, officials, awards, scorer's table, video exchange, security/rover and chair responsibilities.

The schedule of events was reviewed and no changes were made. The SID reception was positively received and will be continued next year.

One misconduct will be issued to one institution for failure to wear numbered practice gear for open practices.

5. **Officials.** The Division II Women's Basketball Committee reviewed the procedure used for official assignors. Although there were a few minor issues, the Division II Women's Basketball Committee would like to maintain the same procedure for 2013.
6. **Regional and national ranking calls.** The Women's Basketball Committee would like to see the number of ranking calls increased to four although understand consistency and would support three if directed to do so. The budget and host bid deadlines should be pushed back at least one week to accommodate the lateness in the season of ranking teams. The Women's Basketball Committee expressed concerns about the full implementation of the balloting system when the RAC's are comprised of all coaches. The Women's Basketball Committee would like to continue to use the current system where the national committee can change the RAC rankings.
7. **2013 Championship San Antonio.** The Division II Women's Basketball Committee will implement the buddy system for new committee members for the 2013 season.
8. **Sponsorship list.** The Division II Women's Basketball Committee reviewed the current sponsorship list and confirmed all schools listed.
9. **Score Reporting System.** The Division II Women's Basketball Committee expressed gratitude to the statistics department for their work during the 2011-12 season. One suggestion was to transfer all information the Monday after Convention.

10. **Review of host operations manual.** The Division II Women's Basketball Committee reviewed the current host operations manual and recommended changes for the 2012-13 season.
11. **Review pre-championships manual.** The Division II Women's Basketball Committee reviewed the current pre-championship manual and recommended changes for the 2012-13 season.
12. **Review committee operations manual.** The Division II Women's Basketball Committee reviewed the committee operations manual and recommended changes for the 2012-13 season.
13. **Pairings at 2013 Elite Eight.** The Division II Women's Basketball Committee reviewed the pairings for the 2013 Elite Eight.
14. **Strength of Schedule Calculations.** The Division II Women's Basketball Committee discussed how the calculations are currently done (average of the percentages) and believe that a calculation using raw data is a better measure to minimize the skewing of the data when a small number of games are played against Division II competition. The men's basketball committee is supportive of calculating the OWP in the same manner.
15. **Meeting with the Men's Basketball Committee.** The Division II Men's and Women's Basketball Committee's met briefly to discuss issues common to the two championships. The Division II Men's and Women's Basketball Committee's discussed a combined Men's and Women's Elite Eight for 2014 and 2015 and the logistics around holding both championships at the same site. The Division II Men's and Women's Basketball Committee's are both supportive of the concept and will look to explore hosting the two events at the same site as early as the 2014 championship.
16. **Facility Specifications review.** Signage at venues needs to be covered during regional events. Communication needs to take place with the Commissioners and D2ADA.
17. **Recognition of outgoing member.** The Women's Basketball Committee acknowledged Sandee Mott and Joan Lehoullier for their service on the committee over the past several years.

- 18. Other Business.** Terri Steeb-Grouau and Jennifer Fraser joined the meeting to discuss the status of Division II and initiatives within the Division.

Committee Chair: Sandee Mott, Metro State College of Denver
Staff Liaison: Roberta Page, Championships and Alliances

ANNUAL MEETING January 24 - 26, 2012

<u>ATTENDEES</u>	<u>ABSENTEES</u>
Dede Allen, University of Alaska Anchorage	Wendy Saintsing, Barton College
Kathy Anderson, University of Central Missouri	
Greg Bamberger, Kutztown University	
Kiley Hill, Valdosta State University	
Joan Lehoullier, University of Massachusetts at Lowell	
David Marsh, Northwood University	
Sandee Mott, Metro State College of Denver (<i>chair</i>)	

<u>OTHER PARTICIPANTS:</u>

Terri Steeb-Gronau (<i>NCAA staff</i>), Jennifer Fraser (<i>NCAA staff</i>) and Erin Lind (<i>via teleconference</i>)(<i>NSIC</i>), Roberta Page (<i>NCAA staff</i>)
--

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION II FOOTBALL COMMITTEE
February 28-29, 2012 Annual Meeting

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- **Selection Criteria.**

- a. Recommendation. That in-region Division II won/loss results be removed from the selection criteria.
- b. Effective Date. 2012 Championship.
- c. Rationale. Currently, the selection criteria consists of both in-region Division II won/loss results as well as overall Division II won/loss results. The Division II Football Committee believes that overall Division II won/loss results is a better measure to utilize with so few football games being played. With more and more conferences moving towards closed conference scheduling, it is more difficult for those teams with open dates to find teams to play within their region. Utilizing only the overall Division II won/loss results should help those institutions that may have difficulty in scheduling in-region non-conference games by opening up more playing options for those teams that may be geographically isolated from in-region opponents.
- d. Budget Impact. There could be a budget impact for the institutions as those with open dates may look to compete against teams outside their region but the costs should not be significant.
- e. Student-Athlete Impact. None

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

- 1. 2011 Annual Meeting Minutes.** The Division II Football Committee reviewed the 2011 meeting minutes and approved without any modifications.
- 2. 2012 Championship Committee Actions.** The Division II Football Committee members reviewed the action and information items from 2011.

3. **2012 American Football Coaches Convention.** Mr. Frank Condino reviewed the issues from the Division II football coaches in attendance at the coaches convention in January.
4. **Football Rankings.** The Division II Football Committee reviewed how rankings were done over the year and discussed the RAC balloting that is being done on a pilot basis for winter and spring sports. Appreciation was expressed for the statistics staff at the NCAA for their work with the score reporting system.
5. **2012 Division II Football Championship.** The Division II Football Committee reviewed the 2011 Football Championship held in Florence, Alabama. Pittsburg State won the national championship defeating Wayne State (MI). The Champions Walk was very successful with a number of fans in attendance which will require additional security measures should it continue with a large number of fans. The Division II Football Committee is concerned about the second hotel used for one of the teams and particularly as it relates to catering. The Local Organizing Committee is aware and will continue to look at ways to feed the student-athletes at the hotel. The Division II Football Committee expressed concern on the opening press conference and the need to look for a larger space to hold the press conference. The committee would like to ensure the safety of the losing team from fans that may rush the field following the completion of the game. A larger buffer is needed for the podium in which to award the championship trophy to the winning team following the championship. The Division II Football Committee reviewed the trends of the television ratings over the past years and what impact the starting times may have on the rating. It was noted that the ratings have gone down since the championship took place a week later. The Division II Football Committee is considering requiring all conferences to use GameTape Exchange or something similar for all games during the playoffs so that all games are available within hours after selections.
6. **Arbiter Sports/Officiating.** The Division II Football Committee is supportive of requiring officials to be registered in Arbiter and to have passed the rules test in order to be eligible to officiate during the championship effective with the 2012 championship.
7. **Officials.** The Division II Football Committee liked having neutral evaluators either evaluate in person or via videotape for each game of the playoffs and providing recommendations to the Division II Football Committee for advancement. Instant replay worked very well at the semifinals and finals site. It was noted that all conferences except the Northeast 10 and the GLIAC had officials work in the playoffs.

8. **Football Start Date – 2013 and 2014.** Jennifer Fraser and Amanda Conklin joined the meeting to discuss options relative to the starting date for football in 2013 and 2014. In those two years (and subsequently 2019 as well), the first date of competition is after the Labor Day holiday when football traditionally starts. The Division II Football Committee is concerned with the lateness of the championship game taking place just days prior to Christmas and the impact that will have on team travel, fan travel as well as costs for the student-athletes to return home following their return from the football championship. There is also concern about those teams in the colder climates having to practice outside during the playoffs with the championship really a week later with the calendar changing in those two years. The Division II Football Committee realizes that commissioners will need to be supportive of the move because of the short time line and that communication will need to occur between the Division II Football Committee and the commissioners in the near future.
9. **Regional Alignment.** The Division II Football Committee talked about the impact of the new regionalization model that will be in place in 2012 for football. It was noted that the Great Lakes Valley Conference will be eligible for earned access beginning in 2012.
10. **ADA Football Task Force.** The Division II Football Committee reviewed the concerns from the task force and are hopeful the change in selection criteria will address some of the issues brought forward.
11. **Future Bracket Expansion.** The Division II Football Committee will be discussing future bracket expansion over the coming years as the ratios for football are lower than a majority of other sports. Should bracket expansion occur, the Division II Football Committee would be open to providing automatic qualification for those conferences that sponsor the sport of football.
12. **Squad Size.** The Division II Football Committee is evaluating the current squad size of 54 and whether to recommend to increase the squad size without increasing the travel party (70). The Division II Football Committee will survey conference offices as to their squad size for visiting teams with a possible recommendation coming forward at a later date.
13. **Regional advisory committees.** The Division II Football Committee reviewed the RAC assignments and the new procedure with the Conference Commissioners.

14. **2011-12 committee timeline.** The Division II Football Committee reviewed the current timeline and made changes for the 2012-13 season.
15. **Review of 2011 championship handbook.** The Division II Football Committee reviewed the current championship handbook and recommended changes for the 2012-13 season.
16. **Discussion with JR Smith.** JR. Smith, Division II Championships Committee liaison to the Division II Football Committee, joined the call to review the issues brought forward by the Division II Football Committee.
17. **Review of 2011 tournament host manual.** The Division II Football Committee reviewed the current tournament host manual and recommended changes for the 2012-13 season.
18. **Review committee operations manual.** The Division II Football Committee reviewed the current committee operations manual and recommended changes for the 2012-13 season.
19. **Recognition of outgoing member.** The Division II Football Committee acknowledged Shawn Jones and Bob Maskill for their service on the committee over the past several years.
20. **Other Business.** Terri Steeb-Gronau joined the meeting to discuss the status of Division II and initiatives within the Division.

Committee Chair: Frank Condino, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Staff Liaison: Donnie Wagner, Championships and Alliances

February 28-29, 2012	
ATTENDEES	ABSENTEES
Frank Condino, Indiana University of Pennsylvania	Ruben Perez, Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference
Brad Edwards, Newberry College	
Shawn Jones, University of Central Missouri	

Bill Maskill, Midwestern State University	
Bob Nielson, University of Minnesota Duluth	
Brad Smith, Chadron State College	
Waverly Tillar, Elizabeth City State University	
Other Participants Amanda Conklin (NCAA staff), Jennifer Fraser (NCAA staff), JR Smith (Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference), Donnie Wagner (NCAA staff), Terri Steeb-Gronau (NCAA staff)	

**REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION II WOMEN'S LACROSSE COMMITTEE**

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

- 1. Seton Hill University Sponsorship.** The Division II Women's Lacrosse Committee determined that Seton Hill University was an associate member of the East Coast Conference (ECC) for the 2011-12 season. This determination required moving Seton Hill to the North region, which was updated in the Online Score Reporting system. While the move aligns Seton Hill to the North region, it was previously approved to align with the South region at the February 2012 Division II Championships Committee meeting. Please see attachment A for the updated sponsorship list.

For the 2012-13 year, Seton Hill will no longer be an associate member of the ECC. At this time, NCAA staff is unsure as to Seton Hill's conference affiliation for the 2012-13 academic year.

- 2. Future Joint Championship.** At the February 2012 meeting, Division III Championships Committee approved a date formula change for Division III women's lacrosse (effective August 1, 2013) that will move the championship date to Memorial Day weekend. Because the 2014 Division II women's lacrosse's championship will be one week before the Division III championship, both Division II and III Women's Lacrosse Committees have decided that the 2013 championship will be the last joint championship year. The Division II Women's Lacrosse Committee has determined that it would be impractical to change its date formula to match Division III. Neither Division II or Division III Women's Lacrosse Committee, however, has ruled out returning to a joint championship format in the future.

Committee Chair: Michelle Gober, Kutztown University of Pennsylvania
Staff Liaison: Michelle Forkner; Championships and Alliances

May. 22, 2012

**NCAA Schools Sponsoring
Division II Women's Lacrosse
2011-12**

""ATTACHMENT
""SUPPLEMENT NO. 33
FKEj co ruEgo o '27B4"
Page 1 of 2

NORTH REGION

<i>School</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>State</i>
Adelphi University	Garden City	NY
American International College	Springfield	MA
Assumption College	Worcester	MA
Bentley University	Waltham	MA
University of Bridgeport	Bridgeport	CT
Bryant University	Smithfield	RI
C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University	Brookville	NY
Chestnut Hill College	Philadelphia	PA
Dominican College (New York)	Orangeburg	NY
Dowling College	Oakdale	NY
Franklin Pierce University	Rindge	NH
Georgian Court University	Lakewood	NJ
Holy Family University	Philadelphia	PA
Lake Erie College	Painesville	OH
Le Moyne College	Syracuse	NY
Mercy College	Dobbs Ferry	NY
Merrimack College	North Andover	MA
Molloy College	Rockville Centre	NY
University of New Haven	West Haven	CT
Notre Dame College (Ohio)	Cleveland	OH
Philadelphia University	Philadelphia	PA
Post University	Waterbury	CT
Queens College (New York)	Flushing	NY
Seton Hill University	Greensburg	PA
Southern Connecticut State University	New Haven	CT
Southern New Hampshire University	Manchester	NH
Saint Anselm College	Manchester	NH
Saint Michael's College	Colchester	VT
St. Thomas Aquinas College	Sparkill	NY
Stonehill College	Easton	MA
Tiffin University	Tiffin	OH
Urbana University	Urbana	OH
Wilmington University (Delaware)	New Castle	DE

Count: 33

SOUTH REGION

<i>School</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>State</i>
Adams State College	Alamosa	CO
Belmont Abbey College	Belmont	NC

**NCAA Schools Sponsoring
Division II Women's Lacrosse
2011-12**

SOUTH REGION

<i>School</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>State</i>
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	Bloomsburg	PA
Catawba College	Salisbury	NC
Colorado Mesa University	Grand Junction	CO
Converse College	Spartanburg	SC
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	East Stroudsburg	PA
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania	Edinboro	PA
Erskine College	Due West	SC
Florida Southern College	Lakeland	FL
Fort Lewis College	Durango	CO
Gannon University	Erie	PA
Grand Valley State University	Allendale	MI
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	Indiana	PA
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	Kutztown	PA
Lees-McRae College	Banner Elk	NC
Lenoir-Rhyne University	Hickory	NC
Limestone College	Gaffney	SC
Lindenwood University	St. Charles	MO
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania	Lock Haven	PA
Mercyhurst University	Erie	PA
Millersville University of Pennsylvania	Millersville	PA
Newberry College	Newberry	SC
Pfeiffer University	Misenheimer	NC
Presbyterian College	Clinton	SC
Queens University of Charlotte	Charlotte	NC
Regis University (Colorado)	Denver	CO
Rollins College	Winter Park	FL
Shepherd University	Shepherdstown	WV
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	Shippensburg	PA
Shorter University	Rome	GA
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania	Slippery Rock	PA
Saint Leo University	Saint Leo	FL
West Chester University of Pennsylvania	West Chester	PA
West Virginia Wesleyan College	Buckhannon	WV
Wheeling Jesuit University	Wheeling	WV

Count: 36

Total: 69

**REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION II MEN'S SOCCER COMMITTEE
JANUARY 25-26, 2012 ANNUAL MEETING**

ACTION ITEM.

1. Legislative Items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

1. Appointment of Committee Chair.

- Recommendation. That Dennis Helsel, vice president/director of athletics, Chowan University, be named as chair, replacing Dr. Gary Gray, Montana State University Billings.
- Effective Date. September 1, 2012.
- Rationale. Mr. Helsel has been a member of the men's soccer committee for three years and has shown great leadership.
- Estimated Budget Impact. None.
- Student-Athlete Impact. None.

2. Squad Size.

- Recommendation. That effective with the 2012 championship, the squad size be increased from 22 to 24 student-athletes, while keeping the travel party of 28 unchanged.
- Effective Date. September 1, 2012.
- Rationale. The number of student-athletes currently being carried by institutions exceeds the current squad size of 22. The average squad size across Division II men's soccer teams in 2010 was 38.2 which was an increase of 4.1 from 2003.
- Estimated Budget Impact. None.
- Student-Athlete Impact. This increase will provide additional participation opportunities for student-athletes.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Meeting Minutes.** The Division II Men's Soccer Committee reviewed and approved the 2011 meeting minutes.
2. **NCAA Division II Championships Committee Actions.** The Division II Men's Soccer Committee reviewed the Championship Committee actions.
3. **National Soccer Coaches Association of America (NSCAA) Update.** The Division II Men's Soccer Committee reviewed the NSCAA handout that was distributed at the Division II session. Staff provided an update on topics discussed by the coaches in attendance.
4. **Soccer Rules Review.** The Division II Men's Soccer Committee reviewed the playing rules timeline that was provided by the playing rules staff.
5. **Review of 2011 Championship.** The Division II Men's Soccer Committee reviewed the 2011 championship in Pensacola, Florida, and asked staff to make recommendations to the 2012 host.
 - a. The Division II Men's Soccer Committee asked staff to explore options with the 2012 host to engage the youth market in and around the Augusta, Georgia, area to include a youth tournament and clinic.
 - b. The Division II Men's Soccer Committee revised the priority for setting game order along with the women's soccer committee. The priority would be established as follows: (1) local team; (2) gender order with the men playing first and (3) consideration for team traveling from the West Coast.
 - c. The Division II Men's Soccer Committee asked staff to ensure future hosts adequately estimate the amount of food consumed at banquet by student-athletes.
 - d. The Division II Men's Soccer Committee commended the University of West Florida for the community service project at a local food pantry.

6. **Financial Report.** The 2011 financial information was not available at the time of the meeting.
7. **Misconduct.** The committee issued misconduct to two student-athletes for actions during the 2011 championship.
8. **Future Championship Sites.** The Division II Men's Soccer Committee discussed the 2012 and 2013 championships hosted by the Peach Belt Conference in Columbia County, Georgia. The Division II Men's Soccer Committee requested that staff keep them informed during the planning process.
9. **Sponsorship Analysis.** The Division II Men's Soccer Committee discussed the current sponsorship levels and discussed the regional access ratios across the nation.
10. **Review Selection Criteria.** The Division II Men's Soccer Committee discussed its desire to modify the "Once ranked, always ranked" criteria but elected to table the request pending the outcome of the Division II Championship Committee white paper review.
11. **Bracket Format.** The Division II Men's Soccer Committee discussed various options for a realigned bracket.
12. **Officials.** The Division II Men's Soccer Committee discussed the assigning process and the performance of all officials during the postseason.
13. **Review of National and Regional Advisory Committee Structures.** The Division II Men's Soccer Committee reviewed the regional and national committee structures.
14. **Review of the Division II Men's Soccer Committee Policies and Procedures Manual.** The Division II Men's Soccer Committee reviewed the policies and procedures manual and requested that staff make all appropriate changes.

15. **2012 Committee Calendar.** The Division II Men's Soccer Committee reviewed the 2012 committee calendar.
16. **Pre-Championship Manual Review.** The Division II Men's Soccer Committee reviewed the pre-championship manual and requested that staff make all appropriate changes.
17. **Host Operations Manual Review.** The Division II Men's Soccer Committee reviewed the host operations manual and requested that staff make all appropriate changes.
18. **2013 Annual Meeting.** The Division II Men's Soccer Committee decided to continue the joint meeting format with the women's soccer committee in 2013. The meeting dates were moved earlier in the calendar to coincide with the National Soccer Coaches Association of America Convention also held in Indianapolis in January 2013.

Committee Chair: Gary Gray, Montana State University Billings
Staff Liaison: Russ Yurk, Championships and Alliances

January 25-26, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Eric Alsop, Limestone College	
Gary Gray, Montana State University Billings	
Dennis Helsel, Chowan University	
Tom Lang, Southern Connecticut State University	
Tyler Madsen, Truman State University	
Hugh Seyfarth, Florida Southern College	
Charles Shub, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs	
Other Participants Russ Yurk, NCAA	

**REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION II WOMEN'S SOCCER COMMITTEE
JANUARY 24-25, 2012 ANNUAL MEETING**

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

1. Confirmation of Committee Chair.

- a. Recommendation. That Nick Cowell, Head Women's Soccer Coach at St. Edward's University, to replace Bridget Berube, associate athletics director at Northern Michigan University, as chair of the committee.
- b. Effective Date. September 1, 2012.
- c. Rationale. Mr. Cowell exemplified great leadership on the women's soccer committee during his first year. Previously, Nick served on the women's soccer Regional Advisory Committee for two years, along with serving as the NSCAA ranking chair and being named South Central Coach of the Year in 2009.
- d. Estimated Budget Impact. None.
- e. Student-Athlete Impact. None.

2. Selection Criteria.

- a. Recommendation. The committee recommends the following modifications to the selection criteria effective with the 2012-13 season.

When selecting teams, the Division II Women's Soccer Committee will evaluate the following criteria (not in priority order):

- In-region Division II won-lost record;
- Strength-of-schedule (average opponents' winning percentage);
- Head-to-head competition;
- Results versus common opponents;
- Results versus ranked teams;
- **Once ranked, always ranked;**
- Results versus Division II opponents outside of conference; and

- Strength-of-schedule versus Division II opponents outside of conference (opponents' average winning and opponent's opponents' average winning percentage).
- b. Effective Date. 2012-13 season.
- c. Rationale. The Division II Women's Soccer Committee revised the selection criteria to avoid the shift of teams up and down in the rankings week after week due to the inconsistencies of teams going in and out of the rankings. The above changes will provide a smoother ranking system and leave room for the human element. Due to ranking calls starting later in the year, there is less volatility in the regional top 10.
- d. Estimated Budget Impact. None.
- e. Student-Athlete Impact. None.

1. Squad Size/Bench Limit.

- f. Recommendation. That effective with the 2012 championship, the squad size be increased from 22 to 24 student-athletes, while keeping the travel party of 28 unchanged.
- g. Effective Date. 2012-13 season.
- h. Rationale. The number of student-athletes currently being carried by institutions exceeds the current squad size of 22. The average squad size across Division II soccer teams in 2010-11 was 24.8.
- i. Estimated Budget Impact. None.
- j. Student-Athlete Impact. The increase in squad size will provide additional participation opportunities for student-athletes.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **2011 Annual Meeting Minutes.** The Division II Women's Soccer Committee reviewed the 2011 meeting minutes and approved without any modifications.
2. **2011 Championships Committee Actions.** The Division II Women's Soccer Committee reviewed and discussed each item applicable to Division II Women's Soccer.

3. **National Soccer Coaches Association of America (NSCAA) update.** 2012 NSCAA meeting took place in Kansas City, Missouri. The women's soccer committee reviewed the NSCAA handout that was distributed at the Division II session. Staff provided an update on topics discussed by coaches in attendance.
4. **Soccer Rules Review.** The Division II Women's Soccer Committee reviewed the playing rules timeline that was provided by the playing rules staff.
5. **Review of 2011 Championship.** The Division II Women's Soccer Committee reviewed the 2012 Soccer Championships held in Pensacola, Florida. Saint Rose won the national championship with a victory over Grand Valley State University.

The student-athletes, coaches and Division II Women's Soccer Committee commended the community service event with MANNA Food Pantry. The Division II Women's Soccer Committee and staff felt it was highly successful and added a personal touch to the championships. Additionally, the banquet, hotel and overall championships experience was complimented by all parties involved.

The Division II Women's Soccer Committee acknowledged a few areas of concern and asked staff to make recommendations to the 2012 host; including:

- a. Explore options to engage the youth market, including area youth tournaments and clinics in Augusta, Georgia;
 - b. Set game priority with the Division II Men's Soccer Committee. The priority would be established as follows: (1) local team; (2) gender order with the men playing first and (3) consideration for team traveling from the West coast;
 - c. The Division II Women's Soccer Committee asked staff to ensure future hosts adequately estimate the amount of food consumed at the banquet by student-athletes;
 - d. The Division II Women's Soccer Committee expressed dissatisfaction with the official ball provided by Wilson and asked that the NCAA explore other options;
 - e. The Division II Women's Soccer Committee would like to see a better evaluation system created for preliminary rounds of the championship, in order to receive more feedback to enhance future championships.
6. **Financial Report and Attendance.** The 2011 financial information was not available at the time of the meeting and will be discussed at a later date.
 7. **Future Championships.** The Division II Women's Soccer Committee discussed the 2012 and 2013 championships hosted by the Peach Belt Conference in Columbia County, Georgia. The Division II Women's Soccer Committee requested that staff keep them informed during

the planning process and work closely with their grounds crew to make sure the field is in the most optimal conditions prior to championships.

8. **Review of Selection Criteria.** The Division II Women's Soccer Committee decided to modify the selection criteria by proposing "Once ranked, always ranked" to the Division II Championships Committee. Terri Steeb reminded the Division II Women's Soccer Committee to continue to request feedback from the Division II membership related to the "Selection Criteria White Paper."
9. **Review of Score Reporting System.** Appreciation was expressed for the statistics staff at the NCAA for their work with the score reporting system. Some concerns were raised, however, with the date that statistics are being made available for the RAC and national committee members.
10. **Review of Officials.** The Division II Women's Soccer Committee reviewed the assigning process and the performance of all officials during post season.
11. **Division II Women's Soccer Committee Acknowledgement.** The Division II Women's Soccer Committee acknowledged Atlantic Region representative, **Gary Kagiavas**, Head Women's Soccer Coach at Edinboro University of Pennsylvania and East Region representative and **Sue Zawacki**, associate director of athletics at the University of New Haven, for their service on the committee over the past several years.
12. **Review of Committee Policies and Procedures Manual.** The Division II Women's Soccer Committee reviewed the current Division II Women's Soccer Committee operations manual and recommended changes for the 2012-13 season.
13. **Review of 2011 Pre-Championships Manual.** The Division II Women's Soccer Committee reviewed the current championship handbook and recommended changes for the 2012-13 season.
14. **Review of 2011 tournament host manual.** The Division II Women's Soccer Committee reviewed the current tournament host manual and recommended changes for the 2012-13 season.

- 15. Future Meetings.** The Division II Women's Soccer Committee reviewed their upcoming meeting schedule and noted that due to the Soccer Coaches Convention in Indianapolis, the next annual meeting is set for January 15 and 16, 2013.

Committee Chair: Bridgett Berebe, Northern Michigan University
Staff Liaisons: Ashley Dunigan, Championships and Alliances
Heidi Wurster, Championships and Alliances

Annual Meeting January 24-25, 2012

<u>ATTENDEES</u>	<u>ABSENTEES</u>
Patrick Britz, South Atlantic Conferece	N/A
Bridget Berube, Northern Michigan (<i>chair</i>)	
Travis Connell, Western Washington University	
Nick Cowell, St. Edwards University	
Shane Drahota, Minnesota State University, Mankato	
Gary Kagiavas, Edinboro University	
Susan Zawacki, University of New Haven	
Ashley Dunigan, NCAA Staff	
Heidi Wurster, NCAA Staff	

<u>OTHER PARTICIPANTS</u>

Jen Fraser (<i>NCAA Staff</i>) Terri Steeb-Gronau (<i>NCAA Staff</i>)
--

**REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION II SOFTBALL COMMITTEE
April 18, 2012 Teleconference**

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

- 1. 2012-13 Automatic Qualifications.** The Division II Softball Committee approved the 2012-13 conference automatic qualifications. The information will be forwarded for action by the NCAA staff liaison at the May 2012 Championships Committee meeting in a singular supplement for all Division II automatic qualifications approval.
- 2. Barrel-Compression Testing (BCT) / Bat-Testing.** The Division II Softball Committee approved to complete barrel-compression testing at the first day of competition at the 2012 NCAA Softball Championship final site (Louisville, KY). If any new bats are added by a team, the NCAA Playing Rules Staff will conduct the BCT on that equipment.

Committee Chair: Pam Knox, Western Oregon University

Staff Liaison: Amy Reis, Championships and Alliances

April 18, 2012 Teleconference	
ATTENDEES	ABSENTEES
Pam Knox, Western Oregon	
Brian DeMasters, Queen's College (New York)	
Joan McDermott, Metropolitan State College of Denver	
Danielle Penner, Barry University	
Keri Becker, Grand Valley State University	
Beth Watson, Cameron University	
Kristen Decker, Mansfield University of Pennsylvania	
Jimmy Martin, Limestone College	
Other Participants: Amy Reis (NCAA Staff) and Carla Laster (NCAA Staff)	

DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIP COMMITTEE (CC)
MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES FORMULA CHART
As of 10/28/2011

DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS MEETINGS FORMULA

Eight Weeks Prior to CC	Request agenda items from NCAA staff.
Seven Weeks Prior to CC	Agenda items from NCAA staff are due to committee liaisons.
Six Weeks Prior to CC	Prep meeting with Championship Point Person on proposed agenda items and draft supplements with committee liaisons.
Five Weeks Prior to CC	Final meeting supplements are due to committee liaisons.
Four Weeks/One Month Prior to CC	Prep meeting with Division II Championships and Alliances team with committee liaisons. Prep meeting with Division II Governance and AMA staff.
Two Weeks Prior to CC	Meeting materials posted in the Division II Championships Committee Collaboration zone. <i>(NCAA committee liaisons to highlight items for Championships Committee members to share with membership prior to the meeting.)</i>
One Week Prior to CC	Prep teleconference with Division II Championships Committee chair, Chair/Vice Chair of Management Council, Division II SAAC representative with NCAA committee liaisons.
DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE MEETINGS held in February, May/June and September (three times annually).	
One Week Following CC	Any follow-up requested materials from Division II Championships Committee members are posted by NCAA committee liaisons on the Division II Championships Committee Collaboration zone.
One Week Following CC	Division II NCAA committee liaisons meet with the NCAA Public and Media Relations staff.
No Less Than Four Weeks/One Month Following CC	Final Championships Committee report and supplements forwarded to Division II Management Council (MC).
DIVISION II MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETINGS held in January, April, July and October (four times annually).	
One Day Following MC	Final Division II Management Council actions on the Division II Championships Committee report are forwarded to the Division II Championships Committee, Championship Point Person, Division II Championships and Alliances team, CCA and D2ADA (pending committee nominations are excluded and forwarded to the Division II President's Council).
One/Two Weeks Following MC	Follow-up/recap meeting with Division II Championships & Alliances team with committee liaisons.
DIVISION II PRESIDENTS COUNCIL MEETINGS held in January, April, August and October (four times annually).	

DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE TELECONFERENCES FORMULA

Two Weeks Prior to CC Teleconference	Request agenda items from NCAA staff to be due by end of week.
One Week Prior to CC Teleconference	Final meeting supplements are due to committee liaisons.
One Week Prior to CC Teleconference	Meeting materials posted in the Division II Championships Committee Collaboration zone. <i>(NCAA committee liaisons to highlight items for Championships Committee members to share with membership prior to meeting.)</i>
Week of CC Teleconference	Prep teleconference with Division II Championships Committee chair, Chair/Vice Chair of Management Council, Division II SAAC representative with NCAA committee liaisons.
DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIP COMMITTEE TELECONFERENCES are held the first Thursday of the following months: January, March, April, May, July, August, October, November and December (nine times annually). Teleconferences may be cancelled at any time if there are no agenda items. The time of each teleconference is from 2 - 3 p.m. Eastern time.	
One Week Following CC Teleconference	Final Championships Committee teleconference report and supplements forwarded to Division II Management Council (MC).

DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIP COMMITTEE (CC)
MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES FORMULA CHART
As of 10/28/2011

DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE MEETING MAY 30 & 31, 2012	
<i>* Note: Due to 2012 NCAA National Championships Festival in the Spring, deadlines reflected are earlier than meeting formula.</i>	
March 28, 2012	Request agenda items from NCAA staff.
April 4, 2012	Agenda items from NCAA staff are due to committee liaisons.
April 11, 2012	Prep meeting with Championship Point Person on proposed agenda items and draft supplements with committee liaisons.
April 16, 2012	Final meeting supplements are due to committee liaisons.
April 25, 2012	Prep meeting with Division II Championships & Alliances team with committee liaisons.
	Prep meeting with Division II Governance and AMA staff.
May 9, 2012	Meeting materials posted in the Division II Championships Committee Collaboration zone. (NCAA committee liaisons to highlight items for Championships Committee members to share with membership prior to meeting.)
May 23, 2012	Prep teleconference with Division II Championships Committee chair, Chair/Vice Chair of Management Council, Division II SAAC representative with NCAA committee liaisons.
MAY 30 & 31, 2012 -- DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE MEETING (INDIANAPOLIS)	
June 1 - 8, 2012	Any follow-up requested materials from Division II Championships Committee members are posted by NCAA committee liaisons on the Division II Championships Committee Collaboration zone.
June 8, 2012	Division II NCAA committee liaisons meet with the NCAA Public and Media Relations staff.
June 30, 2012	Final Championships Committee report and supplements forwarded to Division II Management Council (MC).
July 23-24, 2012 -- DIVISION II MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING (INDIANAPOLIS)	
July 25, 2012	Final Division II Management Council actions on the Division II Championships Committee report are forwarded to the Division II Championships Committee, Championship Point Person, Division II Championships and Alliances team, CCA and D2ADA (pending committee nominations are excluded and forwarded to the Division II President's Council).
July 30 - August 6, 2012	Follow-up/recap meeting with Division II Championships & Alliances team with committee liaisons.
AUGUST 2, 2012 -- DIVISION II PRESIDENTS COUNCIL MEETING (INDIANAPOLIS)	

DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIP COMMITTEE (CC)
MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES FORMULA CHART
As of 10/28/2011

DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE/JOINT SPORT COMMITTEE CHAIRS MEETING
SEPTEMBER 10-12, 2012

July 16, 2012	Request agenda items from NCAA staff.
July 23, 2012	Agenda items from NCAA staff are due to committee liaisons.
July 30, 2012	Prep meeting with Championship Point Person on proposed agenda items and draft supplements with committee liaisons.
August 6, 2012	Final meeting supplements are due to committee liaisons.
August 13, 2012	Prep meeting with Division II Championships & Alliances team with committee liaisons. Prep meeting with Division II Governance and AMA staff.
August 27, 2012	Meeting materials posted in the Division II Championships Committee Collaboration zone. <i>(NCAA committee liaisons to highlight items for Championships Committee members to share with membership prior to meeting.)</i>
September 4, 2012	Prep teleconference with Division II Championships Committee chair, Chair/Vice Chair of Management Council, Division II SAAC representative with NCAA committee liaisons.
SEPTEMBER 10 - 12, 2012 -- DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE MEETING (INDIANAPOLIS)	
September 12 - 19, 2012	Any follow-up requested materials from Division II Championships Committee members are posted by NCAA committee liaisons on the Division II Championships Committee Collaboration zone.
September 19, 2012	Division II NCAA committee liaisons meet with the NCAA Public and Media Relations staff.
October 12, 2012	Final Championships Committee report and supplements forwarded to Division II Management Council (MC).
October 15 & 16, 2012 -- DIVISION II MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING (INDIANAPOLIS)	
October 17, 2012	Final Division II Management Council actions on the Division II Championships Committee report are forwarded to the Division II Championships Committee, Championship Point Person, Division II Championships and Alliances team, CCA and D2ADA (pending committee nominations are excluded and forwarded to the Division II President's Council).
October 17 - 31, 2012	Follow-up/recap meeting with Division II Championships & Alliances team with committee liaisons.
October 30, 2012 -- DIVISION II PRESIDENTS COUNCIL MEETING (INDIANAPOLIS)	

2013 DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE MEETINGS

February 11 - 12, 2013

May 29 - 30, 2013

September 9 - 11, 2013

DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE TELECONFERENCES

** Note: Please note the calls are scheduled the first Thursday of each month from 2-3 p.m. Eastern time. With the exception of July, that month the meeting takes place the second Thursday of the month due to where the Fourth of July holiday falls during the 2012 and 2013 years.*

2012		2013
July 12, 2012		January 3, 2012
August 2, 2012		March 7, 2013
October 4, 2012		April 4, 2013
November 1, 2012		May 2, 2013
December 6, 2012		July 11, 2013
		August 1, 2013
		October 3, 2013
		November 7, 2013
		December 5, 2013

Handout No. 1
DII Champs Comm 05/12

Sport	2009-10 Cost	# Trips	Cost/Trip	2011-12 Cost	# Trips	Cost/Trip	% Change
DII FB	\$ 202,000	31	\$ 6,516	\$ 72,579	20	\$ 3,629	-44%
DII MBB	\$ 237,000	71	\$ 3,338	\$ 206,934	56	\$ 3,695	11%
DII MSO	\$ 92,000	26	\$ 3,538	\$ 97,029	27	\$ 3,594	2%
DII WBB	\$ 171,000	50	\$ 3,420	\$ 210,956	57	\$ 3,701	8%
DII WFH	\$ 10,000	3	\$ 3,333	\$ 15,968	5	\$ 3,194	-4%
DII WSO	\$ 150,000	44	\$ 3,409	\$ 152,173	44	\$ 3,458	1%
DII WVB	\$ 191,000	57	\$ 3,351	\$ 190,736	52	\$ 3,668	9%
	\$ 1,053,000	282	\$ 3,734	\$ 946,375	261	\$ 3,626	-3%

Division II	Winter 2012 Exceptional Above Avg Average	Fall 2011 Exceptional Above Avg Average
Courteousness	100%	87%
Accuracy of booking	97%	81%
Responsiveness	97%	77%
Ability to resolve issues	97%	80%
Ease in Contacting	100%	77%
TTC answers questions	100%	82%
Ability to accommodate entire schedule	97%	85%
Online systems	94%	79%
Overall Average	98%	81%

Expansion of the NCAA Division II Championships Committee

Background.

The Division II Conference Commissioners Association has discussed the current composition and representation on the NCAA Division II Championships Committee. Currently, the Division II Championships Committee consists of 12 representatives, including two representatives from the Division II Management Council and one representative from the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC). Additionally, the Division II Nominating Committee ensures regional representation (eight championships regions) on the committee by soliciting and nominating individuals to fill vacancies from particular regions.

The Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference (PSAC) recently submitted a membership-sponsored proposal for the 2013 NCAA Convention that would modify the composition of the Championships Committee. The proposal requires at least one additional conference to sign on as a co-sponsor before it is included on the agenda for the Division II Business Session; however, the proposal includes the following provisions:

- One representative from each of the Division II multisport voting conferences (currently 23).
- One representative representing the Division II independent member institutions.
- One representative representing the Division II SAAC.
- Two at-large representatives to enhance diversity of representation.
- Vice-chair of the Management Council (ex-officio, nonvoting).
- Representatives (other than faculty athletics representatives) shall have sport committee or regional advisory committee experience.
- Each conference is required to develop a slate of nominees that will be considered in making appointments to the committee. The slate shall include a director of athletics, senior woman administrator and a faculty athletics representative. The slate may also include a conference administrator. The Championships Committee will select individuals to fill vacancies on the committee, subject to ratification by the Management Council.

Costs.

It costs the NCAA approximately \$4,000 per representative, per year to serve on the Championships Committee. The cost for operating the governance structure in all three divisions is paid for using NCAA Association-wide dollars and is not paid for directly from the Division II budget. This funding structure was established as a part of federation in 1997. Additionally, the funding is overseen by the NCAA Executive Committee.

Current costs = \$48,000 per year.

Estimated costs per PSAC Proposal = \$112,000 (represents a \$64,000 increase) per year.

\$1,344,000 total through 2023-24 (\$768,000 increase).