

**America East Conference
Athletics Directors
June 5-6, 2019**

AGENDA

Saratoga Hilton

May 5 – 2 to 5:30 p.m. | Alabama Room

May 6 – 1 to 5 p.m. | Broadway 4 Room

1. Welcome.
2. NCAA basketball update.
 - a. NCAA men's basketball update. (Dan Gavitt, 2:00-2:30 p.m.)
 - b. NCAA women's basketball update. (Meredith Cleaver, 2:30-3:00 p.m.)
 - c. Multi-team event discussion. (Supplement 1)
3. America East basketball.
 - a. Officiating report. (Supplement 2)
 - b. Playoffs.
 - 1) Attendance report. (Supplement 3)
 - 2) Playoffs facility – sites other than normal home facility. (Supplement 4)
 - c. Men's Basketball Working Group.
 - 1) Background – roadmap and discussion document. (Supplement 5a and 5b)
 - 2) Proposed strategic objectives. (Supplement 6)
 - 3) Priority concepts identified by working group. (Supplements 7a, 7b, 7c and 7d)
 - 4) Supporting analytics and data. (Supplement 8)
4. Executive Committee report. (Supplements – Distributed at meeting)
 - a. FY20 budget
 - b. Forecast.
 - c. Institutional obligations document.
 - d. Future areas of discussion.

5. ESPN report.
 - a. Two-year roadmap. (Supplement 9)
 - b. Production pilot.
6. General counsel meeting takeaways.
7. Preview select Administration Group items.
8. Other business.
9. Adjournment.

#####



SPORT: _____

QUALIFYING REGULAR-SEASON MULTIPLE-TEAM EVENT CONCEPTS

Model	Description	Anticipated Multiple-Team Event Legislative Criteria
Concept A: Elimination of fourth contest.	28 contests + one multiple-team event (not to exceed three contests); or 29 contests.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The event is sponsored by the NCAA, an active or affiliated member, or a member conference of the Association.• The event may not include more than three contests and concludes not later than 10 days after the first contest of the event.• Participation is limited, by conference, to one team per conference and, by institution, to not more than once in the same event in any four-year period.• All participating institutions must participate in same number of contests in the event.• Each institution participating in the multiple-team event must use the same maximum playing season contest limit (i.e., 28 contests + one multiple-team event).• The Oversight Committees will establish event certification criteria that will be administered by NCAA staff. Initial suggested components of the certification program include:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Event operator and institutional/conference sponsor must submit request for approval prior to event.• Standardized documentation required to be submitted, such as adherence to legislative criteria, officiating assignments, and health and safety. <p>Points to Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Eliminates current confusion surrounding fourth contest in qualifying regular-season multiple-team event.• Reduces difficulties institutions face in scheduling fourth contest.• Allows for one additional regular-season contest which may occur at any time during the season.

How Supportive are you of Concept A: Elimination of the Fourth Contest

____ Strongly Supportive
____ Somewhat Supportive
____ Not Supportive

Comments Related to Concept A:

Model	Description	Anticipated Multiple-Team Event Legislative Criteria
Concept B: Hybrid.	<p>28 contests + one multiple-team event (not to exceed three contests);</p> <p>29 contests + one multiple-team event (not to exceed two contests); or</p> <p>29 contests.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The event is sponsored by the NCAA, an active or affiliated member, or a member conference of the Association. For three game multiple-team events, the event may not include more than three contests and conclude not later than 10 days after the first contest of the event. For two game multiple-team events, the event may not include more than two contests and conclude not later than five days after the first contest of the event. Participation is limited, by conference, to one team per conference and, by institution, to not more than once in the same event in any four-year period. All participating institutions must participate in same number of contests in the event. Each institution participating in the multiple-team event must use the same maximum playing season contest limit (i.e., 28 contests + one multiple-team event; 29 contests + one multiple-team event.) The Oversight Committees will establish event certification criteria that will be administered by NCAA staff. Initial suggested components of the certification program include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Event operator and institutional/conference sponsor must submit request for approval prior to event. Standardized documentation required to be submitted, such as adherence to legislative criteria, officiating assignments, and health and safety. <p>Points to Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminates current confusion surrounding fourth contest in multiple-team event. Reduces difficulties institutions face in scheduling fourth contest. Allows for one or two additional regular-season contest(s) which may occur at any time during the season. Provides the opportunity to schedule 29 regular season contests if participating in a two-game multiple-team event.

How Supportive are you of Conference of Concept B: Hybrid

☐ Strongly Supportive
☐ Somewhat Supportive
☐ Not Supportive

Comments Related to Concept B:

Please Indicate Which of the Two MTE Concepts you Prefer:

Concept A: ☐ Prefer ☐ Acceptable ☐ Unacceptable

Concept B: ☐ Prefer ☐ Acceptable ☐ Unacceptable

Please Provide any Feedback Regarding your Preference:

For Two Game Multiple-Team Events, Should the Event be Required to be Bracketed (i.e., Four-Team, Two-Game Bracketed Event)?

☐ Yes – Comments: _____

☐ No – Comments: _____

☐ Don't know

For Three Game Multiple-Team Events, Should the Event be Required to be Bracketed (i.e., Eight-Team, Three-Game Bracketed Event), Round Robin Format (i.e., Four-Team, Three-Game Round Robin Event), or Neither Format?

☐ Bracketed Event – Comments: _____

☐ Round Robin Format – Comments: _____

☐ Neither – Comments: _____

2018-19 Men's and Women's Basketball Officiating Report

Background

America East completed its second season with the Collegiate Officiating Consortium (COC) for all men's basketball assignments and evaluation. The conference completed its first season with the newly hired Coordinator of Women's Basketball Officials.

Jim Haney was hired by the COC, in consultation with conference staff, as assistant director of men's basketball officials. Haney serves at the direction of the Consortium's Executive Director (currently the Big Ten Conference Associate Commissioner for Men's Basketball) in a variety of capacities while assigning officials and monitoring the daily, in-season officiating operations for America East.

Michael Schmidt was hired in July of 2018 as the America East Coordinator of Women's Basketball Officials. Schmidt is responsible for the identification, recruitment and education of high-quality officials; the assignment of all non-conference and conference home games; and oversight of all evaluations to ensure maximum accountability of officials and efficient dialogue with the coaches and the conference's women's basketball liaison.

Officiating Staff

Background checks are mandated for all officials and conducted by Verified Volunteers (Ft. Collins, CO). This program is part of the CCA/NCAA initiative for all DI conferences, and exclusive to DI basketball. Background checks include:

- Complete criminal history
- Federal and state civil court searches
- Motor vehicle record check
- Consumer credit check (collections, bankruptcy, tax liens, other delinquencies)

Postseason Tournament Selections

Men's Basketball

- America East had 13 men's basketball officials selected to the 2019 Division I NCAA Tournament.
 - These officials received 74 assignments for America East home games in 2018-19.
- NCAA Tournament officials were assigned to 47 percent of all America East men's basketball home games (56 of 119).
- Eight men's basketball officials worked NIT games. Sixteen worked CBI and/or CIT games.
- Thirteen of the 21 officials (62 percent) assigned to the America East Playoffs were selected to work NCAA Tournament games. Another three officials worked CBI and/or CIT games.

Women's Basketball

- America East had 28 women's basketball officials selected to the 2019 Division I NCAA Tournament.
 - These officials received 148 assignments for America East home games in 2018-19.
- 26 women's basketball officials worked WNIT games. Two worked WBI games.
- 20 of the 21 officials (95 percent) assigned to the America East Playoffs were selected to work NCAA Tournament games. The one other official worked a WNIT game.

NCAA Tournament Selections (Past five seasons):

	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
MBB	13	25	13	13	14
WBB	28	23	22	18	16

MBB Technical Foul Summary (Past 10 seasons)

Season	Players	Coaches	Total
2018-19	30	14	44
2017-18	25	6	31
2016-17	22	14	36
2015-16	21	6	27
2014-15	10	11	21
2013-14	33	11	44
2012-13	17	8	25
2011-12	29	11	40
2010-11	16	17	33
2009-10	26	11	37

MBB Technical Foul Summary by School (Past four seasons)

2018-2019	Players	Coaches	Total	2017-2018	Players	Coaches	Total
UAlbany	2	1	3	UAlbany	4	2	6
Binghamton	5	2	7	Binghamton	1	0	1
Hartford	7	2	9	Hartford	7	1	8
Maine	2	0	2	Maine	4	0	4
UMBC	4	0	4	UMBC	3	0	3
UML	3	4	7	UML	2	0	2
UNH	2	2	4	UNH	0	1	1
Stony Brook	4	1	5	Stony Brook	3	0	3
Vermont	1	2	3	Vermont	1	2	3
TOTAL	30	14	44	TOTAL	25	6	31
2016-2017	Players	Coaches	Total	2015-2016	Players	Coaches	Total
UAlbany	2	1	3	UAlbany	5	1	6
Binghamton	0	1	1	Binghamton	1	0	1
Hartford	3	4	7	Hartford	3	1	4
Maine	1	0	1	Maine	1	0	1
UMBC	3	2	5	UMBC	5	1	6
UML	4	1	5	UML	4	1	5
UNH	2	2	4	UNH	0	0	0
Stony Brook	4	2	6	Stony Brook	0	0	0
Vermont	2	2	4	Vermont	2	2	4
TOTAL	22	14	36	TOTAL	21	6	27

WBB Technical Foul Summary (Past eight seasons)

Season	Players	Coaches	Total
2018-19	6	1	7
2017-18	7	11	18
2016-17	12	10	22
2015-16	5	10	15
2014-15	14	13	27
2013-14	9	5	14
2012-13	5	11	16
2011-12	5	9	14
2010-11	6	11	17

WBB Technical Foul Summary by School (Past four seasons)

2018-2019	Players	Coaches	Total	2017-2018	Players	Coaches	Total
Albany	1	0	1	Albany	1	3	4
Binghamton	0	1	1	Binghamton	0	0	0
Hartford	2	0	2	Hartford	1	1	2
Maine	0	0	0	Maine	1	0	1
UMBC	0	0	0	UMBC	0	1	1
UML	0	0	0	UML	1	0	1
UNH	0	0	0	UNH	2	0	2
Stony Brook	2	0	2	Stony Brook	0	0	0
Vermont	1	0	1	Vermont	1	6	7
TOTAL	6	1	7	TOTAL	7	11	18
2016-2017	Players	Coaches	Total	2015-2016	Players	Coaches	Total
Albany	2	0	2	Albany	1	0	1
Binghamton	1	0	1	Binghamton	1	0	1
Hartford	2	1	3	Hartford	1	1	2
Maine	1	0	1	Maine	0	0	0
UMBC	0	3	3	UMBC	0	5	5
UML	2	0	2	UML	1	1	2
UNH	0	0	0	UNH	1	1	2
Stony Brook	2	1	3	Stony Brook	0	1	1
Vermont	2	5	7	Vermont	0	1	1
TOTAL	12	10	22	TOTAL	5	10	15

**America East Geographical Peer Conferences
Men's and Women's Basketball Championship Attendance**

SUPPLEMENT 3

2019 Men's Basketball Championship			
Conference	Total	Games	Average
America East	18619	7	2660
Ivy League	7737	3	2579
CAA	15905	9	1767
MAAC	16748	10	1675
Patriot League	12884	9	1432
NEC	8633	7	1233

2019 Women's Basketball Championship			
Conference	Total	Games	Average
America East	8303	7	1186
MAAC	9782	10	978
Patriot League	5533	9	615
NEC	4123	7	589
CAA	2238	9	249
Ivy League	n/a	n/a	n/a

2018 Men's Basketball Championship			
Conference	Total	Games	Average
Ivy League	10983	3	3661
CAA	21941	9	2438
America East	17062	7	2437
Patriot League	16325	9	1814
NEC	11596	7	1657
MAAC	13690	10	1369

2018 Women's Basketball Championship			
Conference	Total	Games	Average
America East	9108	8	1139
MAAC	10576	10	1058
CAA	7662	9	851
Patriot League	5242	9	582
NEC	3166	7	452
Ivy League	n/a	n/a	n/a

2017 Men's Basketball Championship			
Conference	Total	Games	Average
Ivy League	8858	3	2953
America East	19723	7	2818
CAA	21247	9	2361
MAAC	22466	10	2247
NEC	13898	7	1985
Patriot League	13489	9	1499

2017 Women's Basketball Championship			
Conference	Total	Games	Average
CAA	9237	9	1026
MAAC	9435	10	944
America East	5915	7	845
Patriot League	6668	9	741
NEC	3243	7	463
Ivy League	n/a	n/a	n/a

2016 Men's Basketball Championship			
Conference	Total	Games	Average
America East	21281	7	3040
MAAC	21275	10	2128
CAA	16198	9	1800
Patriot League	14657	9	1629
NEC	9258	7	1323
Ivy League	no championship		

2016 Women's Basketball Championship			
Conference	Total	Games	Average
America East	7908	7	1130
MAAC	7555	10	756
Patriot League	4628	9	514
CAA	4079	9	453
NEC	3142	7	449
Ivy League	no championship		

2015 Men's Basketball Championship			
Conference	Total	Games	Average
America East	21292	7	3042
CAA	18754	9	2084
MAAC	18115	10	1812
Patriot League	14357	9	1595
NEC	6891	7	984
Ivy League	no championship		

2015 Women's Basketball Championship			
Conference	Total	Games	Average
MAAC	9302	10	930
NEC	6148	7	878
CAA	5475	9	608
America East	3792	7	542
Patriot League	4797	9	533
Ivy League	no championship		

**Sorted by average attendance*

**Sorted by average attendance*

**America East Men's and Women's Basketball Playoffs
Facility Policies and Requirements**

Background

The America East Men's and Women's Basketball Playoffs games are among the most visible events sponsored by the conference. The dates and times of the championship games are determined by ESPN with no flexibility to change without the risk of losing the linear television appearances.

As premier events for the conference, there are facility policies and requirements that must be met to accommodate ESPN, fans, and the participating teams, while ensuring the presentation of these events sufficiently represents the commitment we have to high-level, quality college basketball. Below is a summary of key policies and requirements.

Key Basketball Policies and Requirements

- 1. NCAA Men's and Women's Basketball playing rules (i.e., NCAA Basketball Rules and Interpretations), including but not limited to:**
 - a. NCAA Rule 1, Court and Equipment.
 - b. Ring testing (men's basketball only).

- 2. America East Men's and Women's Basketball policies (i.e., Basketball Policy Manual), including but not limited to:**
 - a. The use of Precision Timing.
 - b. The use of video replay technology.
 - c. The accessibility to spare backup backboard/rim/support and game/shot clocks.
 - d. The America East logo on the game floor.

- 3. America East Playoffs policies (i.e., Playoffs Handbook), including but not limited to:**
 - a. Financial guarantee.
 - 1) \$75,000 for the men's basketball championship game.
 - 2) \$25,000 for the women's basketball championship game.
 - b. A designated one-hour practice time on the game floor on the day of the quarterfinals and semifinals. The facility shall be available exclusively to the visiting team and America East personnel (i.e., closed practice).
 - c. Practice time of two hours on the game floor on the day prior to the championship game must be secured for the visiting team. The facility shall be available exclusively to the visiting team and America East personnel (i.e., closed practice).

4. ESPN Facility and Production Requirements, including but not limited to:

- a. Ability to accommodate ESPN3/ESPN+ school production for quarterfinals and semifinals.
- b. Ability to accommodate ESPN, ESPN2, or ESPU for the championship game.
 1. Ability to accommodate five cameras.
 - i. Two hard cameras, elevated and centered (platforms needed if no deck).
 - ii. One hard slash camera (platform needed if no deck).
 - iii. Two hand-held cameras under each basket with ease of movement beyond the six-foot restraining line.
 2. Horizontal light level of 100 footcandles to center main camera and 60 footcandles to end line cameras.
 3. Ability to accommodate a crew of up to 30 individuals.
 4. Ability to provide up to eight (8) hard telephone lines.
 5. Ability to accommodate park, power and security for television production truck 36 hours prior to game time.
 6. Ability to accommodate truck up to 54 feet in length and satellite truck up to 30 feet in length.
 7. Power requirements up to 200-amp/single phase/208 volts per truck.

Other Key America East Championship Requirements

1. Media

- a. Ability to host up to 20 media courtside with the ability to accommodate up to 30 additional media members in a conference-approved auxiliary area.
- b. Ability to accommodate up to five live radio broadcasts, including hard-wired Internet connections for each and either a dedicated hard phone line or ISDN line.
- c. Ability to provide complimentary wireless Internet and electrical for each media member, including those in any auxiliary media areas.
- d. Ability to provide up to 10 locations along the endline, outside the six-foot restraining line, for photographers.

2. Spirit Squads

- a. Ability to accommodate 30 band members (40 seats) from each team.
- b. Ability to accommodate 12 cheer/dance members from each team along the endlines.
- c. Ability to provide sufficient, secure storage for spirit squad members.

3. Tickets/Fan Experience

- a. Ability to provide reserved seating.
- b. Ability to provide sufficient ticketing services to accommodate walk-up sales.

Proposed Process to Request Alternative Facility for Playoffs Game(s)

The following process is outlined to address a situation in which an institution requests to use a site other than their normal home facility for a playoff game(s) in circumstances when their normal home facility is unavailable, for example, due to scheduling conflicts or facility renovations.

1. Institution submits notice to conference office by July 1 to request a facility other than its normal home facility. A facility shall be considered the normal home facility when the team plays a minimum of 70 percent of its games (conference and non-conference) at that site.
2. Conference staff will conduct a site visit and present an assessment of the facility to the requesting school within 30 days of the site visit.
3. The requesting school will have 30 days to address the conference staff's assessment.
4. A final assessment will be sent by the conference office to the Executive Committee for its review. The Executive Committee will determine if the facility is approved to host an America East Playoffs game(s).

**America East Men's Basketball Working Group
-Roadmap-
September 24, 2018**

Members

- Mark Benson, Director of Athletics, UAlbany
- Tommy Dempsey, Head Men's Basketball Coach, Binghamton
- Mary Ellen Gillespie, Director of Athletics, Hartford
- Ryan Odom, Head Men's Basketball Coach, UMBC
- Shawn Heilbron, Director of Athletics, Stony Brook
- Jeff Schulman, Director of Athletics, Vermont

Staff Liaisons

Matt Bourque, Senior Associate Commissioner, Broadcast Media and Partnerships
Amy Huchthausen, Commissioner

Purpose

1. Identify desired outcomes and/or objectives for men's basketball.
2. Identify areas of potential improvement or modification for the Conference's men's basketball programs and/or conference operations.
3. Recommend a plan for improving or modifying the identified areas.

Key Tasks and Activities

1. Conduct 4-5 conference calls.
2. Compile comprehensive data and information across a variety of areas regarding men's basketball operations and support at the institutional and conference level.
3. Assess the data and information collected and focus on key areas of potential improvement or modification that align with the desired outcomes and objectives.
4. Solicit feedback from athletic directors, head coaches and other constituents, as appropriate.
5. Recommend a plan for potential improvement for the identified areas of importance for approval by the Athletics Director Council and Board of Presidents.

Timeline

1. Week of September 24.
 - a. Confirm working group committee members.
2. October 9-10.
 - a. Solicit input from Directors of Athletics.
 - b. Schedule conference calls.

3. February 2018.
 - a. Develop draft recommendation for AD review in February 2018.
 - b. Finalize recommendation for Administration Group vote no later than June 2018.

Resources/Data

1. Historical conference and school RPI rankings (example areas):
 - a. Overall.
 - b. Nonconference.
 - c. Strength of schedule.
 - d. Location of game.
 - e. Win/loss percentage.
2. Historical NCAA seeding and postseason bids.
3. Peer conference comparisons (e.g., RPI, SOS, NCAA and postseason opportunities).
4. Historical attendance (regular-season and postseason).
5. Historical ticket information (example areas):
 - a. Number of season tickets.
 - b. Price of season tickets, single-game tickets.
6. Historical television/streaming productions.
7. Local/regional media coverage (e.g., print, radio, TV).
8. Nonconference scheduling (example areas):
 - a. Philosophy.
 - b. Person primarily responsible.
 - c. Guarantee games.
9. Operational support (example areas):
 - a. Recruiting.
 - b. Head coach salary.
 - c. Assistant coach salary pool.
 - d. Number and positions of basketball staff.
 - e. Number and role of other support staff (e.g., academics, strength and conditioning, athletic training, nutrition, sports psychologist).
10. Facility information (example areas):
 - a. Capacity of game arena.
 - b. Practice facility.
 - c. Team locker room.
 - d. Video/LED signage.
11. Student-athlete experience (example areas):
 - a. Number of scholarships.
 - b. Number of student-athletes receiving SAF/SAOF.
 - c. Number of student-athletes receiving cost of attendance.
 - d. Transfer rates.
 - e. APR rates.
 - f. GSR rates.
 - g. Post-college professional playing opportunities.

**Men's Basketball Working Group
-Discussion Document-
November 20, 2018**

Background

During its June 2018 meeting, the America East Athletic Directors voted to establish a working group to examine men's basketball with the broad objective of intending to strengthen the league in this sport. The ADs acknowledge that each institution has varying priorities, objectives and resources across its athletics department, but all recognize that for the America East, the sport of men's basketball is the league's highest profile sport and provides the league and members the greatest opportunity for regional and national exposure and recognition.

It is understood that the challenges facing the America East are no different than those in other mid-major leagues and that lessons can be learned from efforts made by other leagues. It is understood that some of these challenges are perpetual challenges that have and/or will only increase in the future. It is also understood that the responsibility and authority for most decisions that impact any sport fall at the institutional level, rather than with the conference. A critical aspect of this is understanding and acknowledging the relational dynamics on each campus between a president, athletics director and head basketball coach, both in the interests – shared and competing – of each party along with the decision-making process and authority. Of course, this extends to the overall conference as well, as the conference may have both common and competing interests with any particular campus or its sub-parties on a given matter.

That said, it is possible for league decision-makers (i.e., athletics directors, presidents) to collaborate and reach consensus on decisions at the conference level that can drive campus decisions and the conference has made such decisions in the past. Specifically, over the past approximately 15 years, the conference has made several efforts to affect change in men's basketball, whether through scheduling standards, scholarship requirements, facility requirements, media (television) distribution, and postseason formats. Some of these efforts have had a positive impact on the league, while others have not and were reversed.

As the Working Group considers both the history, current state and future desired state of men's basketball for the America East, it will need to be comprehensive, realistic, proactive and innovative in its thinking in order to develop meaningful recommendations that can receive broad support and that can actually be implemented. Further, there must be mechanisms by which to measure progress at the campus and conference level on a regular basis, but also over a specified time horizon, understanding that change does not happen overnight.

Below lists a section of Key Initial Discussion Questions to prompt a high-level discussion during the Working Group's first call about objectives and outcomes. Additionally, five Categories of Focus are listed to guide the Working Group's discussion about potential areas to explore along with supporting data that may be useful. This is not an exhaustive list of categories nor data but is intended to be an initial working framework.

Key Initial Discussion Questions

1. What are the desired outcomes for America East men's basketball?
2. What are the areas of potential improvement for the Conference's men's basketball programs and/or the conference operations?
3. What data and information from the categories below are needed to focus on the key areas of potential improvement?

Categories of Focus

Performance

1. Historical conference and team RPI rankings (example areas):
 - a. Overall.
 - b. Nonconference.
 - c. Strength of schedule.
 - d. Location of game.
 - e. Win/loss percentage.
2. Historical NCAA seeding and other postseason bids (e.g., NIT, CBI, CIT).
3. Peer conference comparisons (e.g., RPI, SOS, NCAA and postseason opportunities).

Scheduling

1. Nonconference scheduling philosophy.
2. Person primarily responsible.
3. Guarantee games.
4. Impact on attendance, TV/media exposure.

Resources

1. Operational support (example areas):
 - a. Recruiting.
 - b. In-season travel (e.g., charter plane).
 - c. Technology and data information systems (e.g., ShotTracker, Keemotion).
 - d. Head coach salary.
 - e. Assistant coach salary pool.
 - f. Number and positions of basketball staff (e.g., director of operations, video staff, analytics).

- g. Number and role of other support staff (e.g., academics, strength and conditioning, athletic training, nutrition, sports psychologist).
- 2. Facility information (example areas):
 - a. Capacity of game arena.
 - b. Practice facility.
 - c. Team locker room.
 - d. Video/LED signage.

Student-Athlete Experience

- 1. Number of scholarships available.
- 2. Number of student-athletes receiving SAF/SAOF.
- 3. Number of student-athletes receiving cost of attendance.
- 4. Transfer rates.
- 5. APR rates.
- 6. GSR rates.
- 7. Post-college professional playing opportunities.

Media, Exposure and Fan Interest

- 1. Historical television/streaming productions.
- 2. Local/regional media coverage (e.g., print, radio, TV).
- 3. Historical attendance (regular-season and postseason).
- 4. Historical ticket information (example areas):
 - a. Number of season tickets.
 - b. Price of season tickets, single-game tickets.

America East Men's Basketball
Strategic Objectives and Roadmap
-DRAFT #4-

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION ONLY – NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

Strategic Objectives

1. Ensure programs are **committed to excellence** in men's basketball. It is the conference's highest profile sport and, importantly, is the program that presents the highest potential to generate exposure for an institution across the entire university.
2. Increase **exposure** and **promotion** of the conference's top teams, coaches and student-athletes locally, regionally and nationally.
3. Ensure programs have the necessary and appropriate **resources** to:
 - a. **Recruit, retain and graduate** student-athletes who can compete and perform on the court and in classroom.
 - b. **Attract and retain** coaches and staff who are measurably successful in recruiting, coaching and developing student-athletes.
 - c. **Invest** in technology and tools to stay current and relevant in a competitive and changing sport environment.
4. Increase the conference's aggregate performance in men's basketball to be in the Top 2 among **geographic** peers.
5. Consistently achieve an **NCAA** seed of 13 or better for our AQ team.
6. Consistently receive an **NIT** at-large bid at least once every three years (under current format).
7. **Geographic** Target Outcomes – RPI/NET/Quads.
 - a. At least two teams in the top 10% each year.
 - b. At least five teams in the Top 50% each year.
 - c. Zero teams in the bottom 10% each year.
8. **National** Target Outcomes – RPI/NET/Quads.
 - a. Establish "pod" structure, similar to the Horizon League.

**Men's Basketball Working Group
Priority Concepts for Discussion**

Group #1 – No Formal Vote Needed (Conference office to start doing)

Scheduling

- Conference office shall share preseason and postseason scheduling reports with ADs.
- Conference office shall create a checklist of questions and provide relevant data for institutions to consider in evaluating potential non-conference opponents.

Exposure

- Conference office to create a best practices document for securing linear TV appearances for non-conference games.

Group #2 – Discuss at Summer Meetings (MBB coaches, ADs, joint meeting)

Student-athlete support

- Require all institutions to pay for summer school.
- Require all institutions to provide cost of attendance.

Scheduling

- Establish a pod system for non-conference scheduling. (Supplement 3-a)
- Limit the number of non-Division I opponents.
- Mandate that schools identify the athletics director as the chief scheduling officer. (Supplement 3-b)
- Require annual meetings with the men's basketball chief scheduling officer and conference staff to discuss non-conference schedule development and assessment.

Technology

- Mandate that all institutions invest in an analytics product (e.g., Keemotion, ShotTracker, Noah Basketball) by the start of the 2021-22 season. (Supplement 3-c)
- Require that schools add a position (e.g., FT, PT, GA, volunteer) dedicated to analytics by the start of the 2021-22 season.

Group #3 – Do Nothing (hold, eliminate or refer elsewhere for now)

Postseason

- Re-visit the playoffs.

Scheduling

- Require that schools play a minimum number of home non-conference games against Division I opponents.

Technology

- Mandate that schools implement DVSPORT for use of official replay by start of 2020-21 season.

**AMERICA EAST MEN'S BASKETBALL
2018-19 NON-CONFERENCE SCHEDULE**

SUPPLEMENT 7-b

QUADRANT GROUPING

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION ONLY – NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

QUAD	NET	ALB	BIN	HART	Maine	UMBC	UML	UNH	SBU	UVM	Overall AE Record
Q1	1-30 H	1	1	3	2	2	0	1	0	3	0-13
	1-50 N										
	1-75 A										
Q2	31-75 H	1	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	1-10
	51-100 N										
	76-135 A										
Q3	76-160 H	2	1	2	4	1	4	3	4	7	11-17
	101-200 N										
	136-240 A										
Q4	161+ H	10	8	8	6	8	8	6	9	3	32-34
	201+ N										
	241+ A										
NET		271	325	183	335	226	257	345	156	71	
DI W-L Record		4-10	2-11	6-8	1-13	5-7	6-7	0-11	11-3	9-4	

Indicates number of non-conference games vs. each Quadrant as of Selection Sunday

POTENTIAL POD MODELS

QUAD	NET	Pod A	Pod B	Pod C
Q1	1-30 H	Minimum of ____	Minimum of ____	Maximum of ____
	1-50 N			
	1-75 A			
Q2	31-75 H	Minimum of ____	Minimum of ____	Maximum of ____
	51-100 N			
	76-135 A			
Q3	76-160 H	Minimum of ____	Minimum of ____	Maximum of ____
	101-200 N			
	136-240 A			
Q4	161+ H	Maximum of ____	Maximum of ____	Minimum of ____
	201+ N			
	241+ A			

**Horizon League
Men's Basketball Chief Scheduling Officer**

Evaluation

1. Engage in candid evaluation of your team's position for the upcoming year(s) with your coach.
2. Participate in an annual teleconference with the Horizon League office and RPI expert, Jim Sukup, from RPIRatings.com, to inform your scheduling strategy and designate your school's scheduling pod.
3. Vet potential nonconference opponents.

Oversight

1. Provide final oversight and approve of all non-League games before a contract is signed to ensure the overall schedule meets your school's scheduling pod guidelines.
2. Track for League reporting purposes any games that fall outside of your pod's scheduling guidelines.
3. Chief Scheduling Officer should have explanation available for any game(s) that fall outside of their guidelines.

NOV. 2018 CCA MTG



COLLEGIATE COMMISSIONERS ASSOCIATION

November 7, 2018

Men's Basketball Oversight Committee Competition Committee

- General support for the following rule change:
 - ☐ Extended 3-point line to FIBA distance.
 - ☐ Shot clock reset to 20 seconds after offensive rebound.
- Further discussion warranted for the following topics:
 - ☐ Widening of the lane.
 - ☐ Four-quarter format.
 - ☐ Use of technology (e.g., iPads, tablets) by coaches in bench area during competition.
 - ☐ Advancing the ball to the front court after a timeout in the last minute of a period.

Competition Committee

Joint Technology Working Group

➤ Current Rule.

- ☐ Women's rule currently allows for statistical purposes; men's does not allow.
- ☐ Both allow for tracking of health and safety purposes.

➤ Working Group findings:

- ☐ General interest in allowing more flexibility in bench area.
- ☐ Major concerns/challenges are:
 - ❖ Defining parameters for use in the bench area for coaching purposes.
 - ❖ Enforcing the parameters once established.
 - ❖ Cost may restrict some institutions from providing service in home venues.

Rules Committee Update

- Proposed Experimental Rules for the 2019 NIT.
 - ☐ Extended 3-point line. (Used in 2018)
 - ☐ Widened lane. (Used in 2018)
 - ☐ Shot clock reset to 20-seconds after offensive rebounds. (Used in 2018)
 - ☐ Four-quarter format. (Used in 2018)
 - ☐ Advancing the ball after a timeout in the last minute of the game. (New for 2019)
 - ☐ Use of technology (e.g., iPads, tablets) by coaches in bench area. (Potential for 2019)
- Regular Season Experimental Rules.
 - ☐ 2018 NABC Hall of Fame Classic presented by ShotTracker
 - ❖ Use of technology by coaches in bench area during competition.
 - ❖ Available for use by fans via phone app for fan engagement.

**Men's Basketball Working Group
Analytics and Data**

Background

The America East Men's Basketball Working Group was provided with historical conference and team NET/RPI rankings, historical NCAA seeding and other postseason bids (e.g., NIT, CBI, CIT), peer conference comparisons and other data and information throughout the process. That information has been consolidated into Supplement 4 with the following attachments:

- Attachment A – Peer Conference Comparison, a 5-year and 10-comparison of RPI, winning percentage, strength of schedule, NCAA bids and seed, other postseason bids, etc.
- Attachment B – Geographic Peers by NET, a list of the NET of each school on Selection Sunday from geographic peer conferences (America East, CAA, Ivy League, MAAC, NEC, Patriot League)
- Attachment C – Resumes of Select NCAA Teams, a list of high-achieving teams from peer conferences in 2019
- Attachment D – Non-conference and Conference NET/RPI, a 5-year comparison of non-conference and conference results for America East schools
- Attachment E – Sukup Report, a report provided by Jim Sukup, data analyst and creator of The RPI Report and ripratings.com, specific to America East schools
- Attachment F – Horizon League Pod Structure, the guidelines for the Horizon League's scheduling standards



ATTACHMENT A

AE Men's Basketball Working Group Meeting #2

December 17, 2018



1



Peer Conferences* Five-Year Postseason Summary

*Excludes Power 5, American, Atlantic 10, Big East, Missouri Valley, Mountain West, West Coast



2



Key NCAA Outcomes (2014-18)

- **Average NCAA seed = 14.3**
- **Number of NCAA at-large teams = 0**
Most recent at-large = Sun Belt, 2013 (Middle Tennessee St.)
- **Number of NCAA wins = 26 (5.2/year)**
- **Number of NCAA wins (excluding First Four) = 15 (3.0/year)**
Wins from 10 of 21 peer conferences (11 conferences have zero wins)
- **No teams advanced to Sweet 16**

*Excludes Power 5, American, Atlantic 10, Big East, Missouri Valley, Mountain West, West Coast

3



Non-First Four NCAA Wins (2014-18)

Conference	No. of Wins	Seeds
C-USA	3	13, 12, 14
Ivy League	2	12, 12
Southland	2	14, 12
Sun Belt	2	12, 14
America East	1	16
Atlantic Sun	1	14
Big West	1	13
Horizon	1	14
Mid-American	1	13
Summit	1	12
	Avg. Seed	13.1

Seed	Wins	Win %
12	6	30%
13	3	23%
14	5	36%
15	--	0%
16	1	6.25%

*Excludes Power 5, American, Atlantic 10, Big East, Missouri Valley, Mountain West, West Coast

4



Non-Group of 21 Conferences At-Large (2014-18)

Conference	No. of Teams	Comments
American	10	
Atlantic-10	13	5 in 2014, 2 in 2015-18
Missouri Valley	2	Both were Wichita St. (now in AAC)
Mountain West	4	
West Coast	3	
Total	32	

- 5 of the 32 at-large berths from these leagues were sent to the First Four (16%)
 - 5 of 20 First Four at-large spots = 25%
- 27 of the 32 at-large berths in the Round of 64 (84%)

5



Key NIT Outcomes (2014-18)

- Number of NIT at-large teams = 11

Conference	Number	Seeds
C-USA	5	4, 1, 6, 3, 3
Horizon	2	7, 5
Big West	1	6
Colonial	1	5
Ivy League	1	6
Mid-American	1	6
	Avg. Seed	4.7

*Excludes Power 5, American, Atlantic 10, Big East, Missouri Valley, Mountain West, West Coast

6



Peer Conferences* Five-Year Outcomes

*Excludes Power 5, American, Atlantic 10, Big East, Missouri Valley, Mountain West, West Coast

7



AE vs. 21 Peer Conferences (2014-18)

- Conference RPI = 13th best
- Win percentage = 8th best
- Non-conference SOS = T20th (last)
- Top RPI Team[^] = 7th (11 conferences higher)
- AQ Team[^] = 12th highest
- NCAA seed = 7th highest (11 conferences higher)
- NCAA wins = T3rd (Tied w/8 conferences, 3 have more)
- NIT teams = T6th (2 in 5 years)

*Excludes Power 5, American, Atlantic 10, Big East, Missouri Valley, Mountain West, West Coast
[^]RPI/AQ at time of NCAA selections

8



Five and 10-Year Team RPI vs. Geographic Peers

CAA, Ivy, MAAC, Patriot, NEC



9



High/Low Teams – Geographic Peers

5-Year	High Team	Low Team
CAA	W&M, 2	Drexel, 38
MAAC	Iona, 1	Marist, 55
Ivy	Yale, 4	Brown, 52
Patriot	Bucknell, 7	Lafayette, 49
AE	Vermont, 3	Maine, 58
NEC	MSM, 23	CCSU, 56

10-Year	High Team	Low Team
CAA	Northeastern, 5	Elon, 35
MAAC	Iona, 1	Marist, 56
Ivy	Harvard, 2	Dartmouth, 58
Patriot	Bucknell, 7	Colgate, 45
AE	Vermont, 3	Binghamton, 57
NEC	Robert Morris, 10	FDU, 55



10



America East vs. Geographic Peers

Rank	Team	5-Year
1	Vermont	3 rd
2	Albany	9 th
3	Stony Brook	10 th
4	UNH	33 rd
5	UMBC	43 rd
6	Hartford	44 th
7	UMass Lowell	53 rd
8	Binghamton	57 th
9	Maine	58 th

Rank	Team	10-Year
1	Vermont	3 rd
2	Stony Brook	9 th
3	Albany	16 th
4	UNH	41 st
5	Hartford	47 th
6	UMBC	51 st
7	UMass Lowell	53 rd
8	Maine	54 th
9	Binghamton	57 th

Geographic Peers: CAA, Ivy, MAAC, Patriot, NEC (58 teams)



11



Distribution of Teams – Geographic Peers

	Top 10%	Top 25%	Top 50%	Top 75%	Bottom 10%
	1-6	1-15	1-29	1-44	53-58
CAA	2	5	8	10	0
MAAC	1	3	7	9	1
Ivy	2	3	4	5	0
Patriot	0	1	4	8	0
AE	1	3	3	6	3
NEC	0	0	3	6	2

Note: Distribution is same for last 10 years and 5 years



12



**AMERICA EAST MEN'S BASKETBALL
GEOGRAPHIC PEERS BY NET (2018-19)
AS OF SELECTION SUNDAY**

ATTACHMENT B

	Rank	School	NET	Conf		Rank	School	NET	Conf	
	1	Vermont	71	AE		30	Quinnipiac	244	MAAC	
	2	Hofstra	76	CAA		31	LIU-Brooklyn	250	NEC	
	3	Northeastern	78	CAA		32	James Madison	252	CAA	
	4	Yale	86	Ivy		33	Siena	253	MAAC	
	5	Charleston	107	CAA		34	St. Francis Brooklyn	254	NEC	
10%	6	Penn	110	Ivy		35	Towson	255	CAA	
	7	Harvard	129	Ivy		36	UMass Lowell	257	AE	
	8	Colgate	132	Patriot		37	UNC Wilmington	263	CAA	
	9	Brown	145	Ivy		38	St. Francis (PA)	265	NEC	
	10	Bucknell	152	Patriot		39	Robert Morris	267	NEC	
	11	Stony Brook	156	AE		40	UAlbany	271	AE	
	12	Lehigh	159	Patriot		41	Elon	277	CAA	
	13	American	177	Patriot		42	Marist	278	MAAC	
	14	Princeton	180	Ivy		43	Navy	279	Patriot	
	15	Hartford	183	AE		44	Lafayette	280	Patriot	
	16	William & Mary	193	CAA		45	Loyola (MD)	281	Patriot	
	17	Cornell	195	Ivy		46	Canisius	282	MAAC	
	18	Columbia	196	Ivy		47	Monmouth	287	MAAC	
	19	Rider	201	MAAC		48	Fairfield	292	MAAC	
	20	Iona	202	MAAC		49	Wagner	300	NEC	
	21	Fairleigh Dickinson	203	NEC		50	Niagara	301	MAAC	
	22	Dartmouth	217	Ivy		51	CCSU	312	NEC	
	23	UMBC	226	AE		52	St. Peter's	317	MAAC	
	24	Boston U.	228	Patriot		53	Manhattan	318	MAAC	10%
	25	Holy Cross	232	Patriot		54	Mount St. Mary's	319	NEC	
	26	Drexel	233	CAA		55	Bryant	322	NEC	
	27	Delaware	238	CAA		56	Binghamton	325	AE	
	28	Army	239	Patriot		57	Maine	335	AE	
50%	29	Sacred Heart	241	NEC		58	New Hampshire	345	AE	

Geographic Target Outcomes

At least two teams in top 10%: Not met (Vermont, 1)

At least five teams in top 50%: Not met (Vermont, 1; Stony Brook, 11; Hartford, 15; UMBC, 23)

Zero teams in bottom 10%: Not met (Binghamton, 56; Maine, 57; New Hampshire, 58)

**Resume Comparison of Select Teams
As of Selection Sunday (3/17/19)**

Note: All totals include non-conference games only

America East	
0-13 vs. Quad 1 1-10 vs. Quad 2	Stage A: 0-8 / 0-2 Stage B: 0-1 / 1-1 Stage C: 0-4 / 0-7
NCAA 12 Seeds	
New Mexico St. (NET 40) – WAC AQ Quad 1: 0-1 Quad 2: 0-1 Quad 3: 2-1 Quad 4: 8-0	Murray St. (NET 44) – OVC AQ Quad 1: 0-2 Quad 2: 0-0 Quad 3: 2-0 Quad 4: 5-0
Liberty (NET 58) – ASUN AQ Quad 1: 0-0 Quad 2: 1-2 Quad 3: 3-1 Quad 4: 5-0	<i>Note: Oregon was the other 12 seed</i>
NCAA 11 Seed	NCAA 7 Seed
Belmont (NET 47) – OVC At-Large Quad 1: 1-1 Quad 2: 2-0 Quad 3: 2-1 Quad 4: 3-0	Wofford (NET 13) – SoCon AQ Quad 1: 0-4 Quad 2: 1-0 Quad 3: 1-0 Quad 4: 3-0
NIT At-Large	
Furman (NET 41) Quad 1: 1-1 Quad 2: 1-0 Quad 3: 0-0 Quad 4: 6-0	UNC Greensboro (NET 60) Quad 1: 0-2 Quad 2: 0-0 Quad 3: 3-0 Quad 4: 6-0

Non-conference vs. All Games NET/RPI Comparison

ATTACHMENT D

2018-19	Win Pct		Schedule Strength			NET		
School	NC	All	NC	All	+/-	Start*	All	+/-
Albany	28.6%	35.5%	288	284	4	254	271	-17
Binghamton	15.4%	25.8%	278	235	43	328	325	3
Hartford	42.9%	53.1%	84	200	-116	187	183	4
Maine	7.1%	12.9%	243	237	6	329	335	-6
UMBC	41.7%	58.1%	295	276	19	273	226	47
UMass Lowell	41.2%	43.3%	265	294	-29	201	257	-56
UNH	0.0%	11.1%	336	310	26	347	345	2
Stony Brook	78.6%	74.2%	112	267	-155	152	156	-4
Vermont	69.2%	81.3%	50	243	-193	118	71	47

2017-18	Win Pct		Schedule Strength			RPI		
School	NC	All	NC	All	+/-	Start*	All	+/-
Albany	78.6%	67.7%	283	299	-16	116	142	-26
Binghamton	53.8%	31.1%	340	324	16	249	320	-71
Hartford	46.2%	58.1%	303	277	26	270	198	72
Maine	7.7%	13.3%	329	260	69	342	338	4
UMBC	0.5%	67.7%	301	234	67	196	111	85
UMass Lowell	41.7%	39.7%	326	287	39	311	289	22
UNH	0.2%	27.6%	305	252	53	348	312	36
Stony Brook	30.8%	38.7%	85	125	-40	231	208	23
Vermont	64.3%	78.8%	82	189	-107	72	60	12

2016-17	Win Pct		Schedule Strength			RPI		
School	NC	All	NC	All	+/-	Start*	All	+/-
Albany	57.1%	60.6%	150	202	-52	142	129	13
Binghamton	50.0%	31.0%	234	281	-47	265	312	-47
Hartford	33.3%	28.1%	328	313	15	314	327	-13
Maine	21.4%	19.4%	313	207	106	281	323	-42
UMBC	63.6%	57.1%	139	248	-109	191	165	26
UMass Lowell	35.7%	33.3%	299	277	22	313	309	4
UNH	54.5%	58.6%	140	185	-45	178	127	51
Stony Brook	38.5%	58.1%	248	228	20	220	177	43
Vermont	64.3%	84.8%	84	181	-97	80	46	34

2015-16	Win Pct		Schedule Strength			RPI		
School	NC	All	NC	All	+/-	Start*	All	+/-
Albany	71.4%	74.2%	274	302	-28	94	107	-13
Binghamton	23.1%	26.7%	220	215	5	317	299	18
Hartford	28.6%	28.1%	287	225	62	332	292	40
Maine	30.8%	26.7%	315	289	26	309	314	-5
UMBC	26.7%	21.9%	348	317	31	328	339	-11
UMass Lowell	25.0%	35.7%	276	260	16	285	261	24
UNH	45.5%	58.6%	310	305	5	214	177	37
Stony Brook	63.6%	80.0%	44	194	-150	60	60	0
Vermont	50.0%	60.6%	148	177	-29	121	126	-5

2014-15	Win Pct		Schedule Strength			RPI		
School	NC	All	NC	All	+/-	Start*	All	+/-
Albany	46.2%	75.0%	195	286	-91	231	99	132
Binghamton	0.0%	16.7%	163	230	-67	340	332	8
Hartford	50.0%	44.8%	167	276	-109	189	245	-56
Maine	7.7%	10.0%	146	215	-69	314	339	-25
UMBC	15.4%	13.3%	282	310	-28	334	346	-12
UMass Lowell	41.7%	39.3%	222	298	-76	162	265	-103
UNH	45.5%	58.6%	290	321	-31	241	193	48
Stony Brook	53.8%	65.6%	80	241	-161	74	107	-33
Vermont	33.3%	56.7%	225	301	-76	265	204	61

NC = Non-conference games as of Selection Sunday

All = Non-conference + conference games as of Selection Sunday

Start* = Start of conference season

Evaluation of America East Men's Basketball Non-Conference Scheduling and Proposed Recommendations

Prepared by Jim Sukup, Collegiate Basketball News

Starting Parameters

This discussion of the America East (AE) men's basketball program over the past five seasons, from 2014 through 2018, will begin with some preliminary guidelines. We are concerned here only with games against Division I opponents, and games against non-Division I schools are ignored, unless they are specifically mentioned. Only games through the end of the regular season, including conference tournament games but excluding all post-Selection Sunday games, are included herein. Post-season tournament participation is excluded because it has no bearing on the selection or seeding of the NCAA or other post-season tournaments. Lastly, only the past five seasons are considered, from the 2013-14 through the 2017-18 seasons. While data for more than two decades prior to 2014 exists, the conference has had the same stable membership for this five-year period, which standardizes data analysis and comparisons for all member schools. The terms "rankings" and "ratings" used herein are generally interchangeable.

Winning Percentages

We begin with the winning percentages of AE teams from 2014 - 2018. The three tables below show: 1) All regular-season games wins and losses and winning percentages, including conference tournament game results; 2) Non-conference games only wins and losses and winning percentages; 3) Conference games only wins and losses and winning percentages; and 4) Sorted AE average standings by year.

America East Final Regular Season All Games Won-Lost Records and Percentages
*Won AE conference tournament

Team	2014			2015			2016			2017			2018		
	W	L	Pct	W	L	Pct	W	L	Pct	W	L	Pct	W	L	Pct
Albany	*18	14	.563	*24	8	.750	23	8	.742	20	13	.606	21	10	.677
Binghamton	7	23	.233	5	25	.167	8	22	.267	9	20	.310	9	20	.310
Hartford	17	16	.515	13	16	.448	9	23	.281	9	23	.281	18	13	.581
Maine	5	23	.179	3	27	.100	8	22	.267	6	25	.194	4	26	.133
New Hampshire	5	24	.172	17	12	.586	17	12	.586	17	12	.586	8	21	.276
Stony Brook	22	10	.688	21	11	.656	*24	6	.800	18	13	.581	12	19	.387
UMass Lowell	9	18	.333	11	17	.393	10	18	.357	10	20	.333	11	18	.379
UMBC	8	21	.276	4	26	.133	7	25	.219	16	12	.571	*21	10	.677
Vermont	20	10	.667	17	13	.567	20	13	.606	*28	5	.848	26	7	.788

America East Final Regular Season Non-Conference Won-Lost Records and Percentages

Team	2014			2015			2016			2017			2018		
	W	L	Pct	W	L	Pct	W	L	Pct	W	L	Pct	W	L	Pct
Albany	*6	7	.462	*6	7	.462	10	4	.714	8	6	.571	11	3	.786
Binghamton	3	10	.231	0	13	.000	3	10	.231	6	6	.500	7	6	.538
Hartford	6	9	.400	6	6	.500	4	10	.286	5	10	.333	6	7	.462
Maine	1	10	.091	1	12	.077	4	9	.308	3	11	.214	1	12	.077
New Hampshire	1	11	.083	5	6	.455	5	6	.455	6	5	.545	2	10	.167
Stony Brook	7	6	.538	7	6	.538	*7	4	.636	5	8	.385	4	9	.308
UMass Lowell	1	10	.091	5	7	.417	3	9	.250	5	9	.357	5	7	.417
UMBC	3	9	.250	2	11	.154	4	11	.267	7	4	.636	*6	6	.500
Vermont	4	8	.333	4	8	.333	7	7	.500	*9	5	.643	9	5	.643

America East Final Regular Season Conference Games only Won-Lost Records and Percentages

Team	2014			2015			2016			2017			2018		
	W	L	Pct	W	L	Pct	W	L	Pct	W	L	Pct	W	L	Pct
Albany	*9	7	.563	*15	1	.938	13	3	.813	10	6	.625	10	6	.625
Binghamton	4	12	.250	5	11	.313	5	11	.313	3	13	.188	2	14	.125
Hartford	10	6	.625	7	9	.438	4	12	.250	4	12	.250	11	5	.688
Maine	4	12	.250	2	14	.125	4	12	.250	3	13	.188	3	13	.188
New Hampshire	4	12	.250	11	5	.688	11	5	.688	10	6	.625	6	10	.375
Stony Brook	13	3	.813	12	4	.750	*14	2	.875	12	4	.750	7	9	.438
UMass Lowell	8	8	.500	6	10	.375	7	9	.438	5	11	.313	6	10	.375
UMBC	5	11	.313	2	14	.125	3	13	.188	9	7	.563	*12	4	.750
Vermont	15	1	.938	12	4	.750	11	5	.688	*16	0	1.000	15	1	.938

Sorted America East Standings, Position by Year

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Avg
Vermont	1	2	3	*1	1	1.6
Stony Brook	2	2	*1	2	5	2.4
Albany	*4	*1	2	3	4	2.8
New Hampshire	7	4	3	3	6	4.6
Hartford	3	5	7	7	3	5.0
UMass Lowell	5	6	5	6	6	5.6
UMBC	6	8	9	5	*2	6.0
Binghamton	7	7	6	8	9	7.4
Maine	7	8	7	8	8	7.6

The main takeaway from these tables is that over the past five seasons, all but one AE school that had a winning (above .500) non-conference record also had a winning conference record. In three of these five years, the regular-season conference champion won the conference tournament, the second place team won the tournament once (2018), and the fourth-place team won the tournament once (2014). Success during the non-conference schedule for all AE teams is a very good indicator of success in both the conference regular season and conference tournament. Although Albany had 6-7 non-conference records in 2014 and 2015, only one team in 2014 and two teams in 2015 had better non-conference winning percentages than they did, and Albany ended up with winning conference records both years. It is clear that winning non-conference games for AE teams is very important when it comes to being successful in the conference portion of the season.

RPI Rankings

RPI rankings for the AE conference and AE teams for the past five seasons are listed below. The first table compares the RPI regular season rankings (left) with the Kenpom full season rankings (right). (Kenpom rankings for the regular seasons shown were not available.) The reason for comparing the RPI with the Kenpom rankings is to show, in general, that Kenpom's average team rankings over that same five year period were generally similar to the RPI rankings, although there are some variations, which can be expected due to different ranking systems used and the difference between the regular season and full season rankings. The second table shows AE regular season non-conference ratings for the past five seasons. It can be said, in general, that the men's basketball committee has not paid a great deal of attention to the non-conference RPI rankings in the past (as opposed to non-conference schedule strength, which is very important and will be discussed below).

Final Regular Season Team and Conference RPI and Kenpom Full Season Rank List

	RPI	RPI	RPI	RPI	RPI	RPI	KP	KP	KP	KP	KP	KP
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Avg	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Avg
America East	29	29	23	21	23	25	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Albany	185	99	107	129	142	132	181	131	121	129	151	143
Binghamton	325	332	299	312	320	318	333	322	325	314	297	318
Hartford	234	245	292	327	198	259	234	284	324	334	215	278
Maine	330	339	314	323	338	329	339	345	336	337	332	338
New Hampshire	340	193	177	127	312	230	328	189	235	182	278	242
Stony Brook	165	107	60	177	208	143	169	130	94	213	223	166
UMass Lowell	283	265	261	309	289	281	322	303	315	295	287	304
UMBC	327	346	339	165	111	258	323	343	334	201	166	273
Vermont	101	204	126	46	60	107	75	123	151	63	76	98

Final Regular Season Non-Conference RPI Rank List

	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC
NC RPI	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Avg
America East	29	29	28	23	27	27
Albany	156	163	92	150	78	128
Binghamton	298	336	302	234	254	285
Hartford	224	165	310	328	261	258
Maine	309	321	321	313	350	323
New Hampshire	342	223	214	140	344	253
Stony Brook	189	69	28	248	219	151
UMass Lowell	321	164	290	299	313	277
UMBC	322	335	340	139	210	269
Vermont	108	260	116	84	35	121

AE's average all games RPI over the past five seasons is 25 out of 32 conferences. Three (3) AE schools had average RPI's in the 100's (Vermont, 107; Albany, 132; Stony Brook, 143), four (4) averaged in the 200's (New Hampshire, 230; UMBC, 258; Hartford, 259; UMass Lowell, 281), and two in the 300's (Binghamton, 318; Maine, 329).

It is obvious that all AE teams, along with every team in the country, wants to increase their rankings no matter which computer ranking system is used (RPI , NET, Kempom, Sagarin, BPI, etc.). The goal for AE schools is to do so through savvy non-conference scheduling.

Schedule Strength Rankings

Three schedule strength (or strength of schedule, if you prefer) tables are shown below. The first is the all games schedule strength list for AE schools over the past five regular seasons and average, the second is the non-conference schedule strength list for the past five regular seasons and average, and the last is the difference between the non-conference and all games schedule strength list and average.

Final Regular Season all Games Schedule Strength Rank List

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Avg
America East	28	28	25	23	23	25
Albany	273	286	302	202	299	272
Binghamton	305	230	215	281	324	271
Hartford	314	276	225	313	277	281
Maine	243	215	289	207	260	243
New Hampshire	311	321	305	185	252	275
Stony Brook	332	241	194	228	125	224
UMass Lowell	267	298	260	277	287	278
UMBC	324	310	317	248	234	287
Vermont	210	301	177	181	189	212
	Team Average					260

Final Regular Season Non-Conference Schedule Strength Rank List

	NC 2014	NC 2015	NC 2016	NC 2017	NC 2018	Avg
America East	23	23	32	23	32	27
Albany	176	195	274	150	283	216
Binghamton	239	163	220	234	340	239
Hartford	245	167	287	328	303	266
Maine	100	146	315	313	329	241
New Hampshire	290	290	310	140	305	267
Stony Brook	276	80	44	248	85	147
UMass Lowell	134	222	276	299	326	251
UMBC	275	282	348	139	301	269
Vermont	16	225	148	84	82	111
			Team Average			223

Difference Between Final Regular Season Non-Conference Schedule Strength Rank and Final Regular Season all Games Schedule Strength

	Diff 2014	Diff 2015	Diff 2016	Diff 2017	Diff 2018	Avg
America East	-5	-5	7	0	9	1
Albany	-97	-91	-28	-52	-16	-57
Binghamton	-66	-67	5	-47	16	-32
Hartford	-69	-109	62	15	26	-15
Maine	-143	-69	26	106	69	-2
New Hampshire	-21	-31	5	-45	53	-8
Stony Brook	-56	-161	-150	20	-40	-77
UMass Lowell	-133	-76	16	22	39	-26
UMBC	-49	-28	31	-109	67	-18
Vermont	-194	-76	-29	-97	-107	-101
			Team Average			-37

There are several important pieces of data to note in these tables, some being much more important than others. In the first table, the average all games non-conference schedule strength for the AE Conference was 25, with values ranging from 23 to 28. For individual teams on a yearly basis, in only six instances was the team schedule strength better than 200, the best being 125. In 13 instances those values were below (worse than) 300. Individual team five-year schedule strength averages ranged from 212 to 287, with a mean team average of 260.

Examining the second table, the final regular season non-conference schedule strength (NCSS) rank list, shows the AE Conference with a 5-year average non-conference schedule strength of 27 among 32 conferences, with a range from 23 to 32 during the five-year period. However, non-conference schedule strength ranks for individual teams on a yearly basis generally show better values than the all games schedule strength. In six cases the NCSS for individual teams is above (better than) 100, and in 11 cases the NCSS for teams is between 100 and 200.

The last table shows the difference between the first two tables, that is, the difference between the NCSS list and the all games schedule strength list. The first thing to notice is that there is a plethora of negative signs in this table, and the five-year average for individual schools shows that there is a negative sign in front of every one of those averages. For the individual teams, there are a total of 29 instances where AE teams ended up with a worse all games schedule strength than a NCSS. The mean team average NCSS is 223, a difference of 37 places compared to the all games schedule strength list of 260.

This difference is quite apparent. What does it mean? It suggests that throughout AE conference play, the all games schedule strength for all AE teams is trending down (ie., gets worse), meaning that conference competition is not as strong as non-conference competition. Schedule strength is a function of opponents' wins and losses (ie., opponents' winning percentage), so when AE teams begin playing each other, the competition generally is not as tough, resulting in decreased all games schedule strengths for most AE teams. Taking a look at AE schools' non-conference winning

percentages over the past five seasons, 1 team had a winning percentage of .500 or better in 2014, it was 2 teams in 2015, 3 teams in 2016, 5 teams in 2017, and 4 teams in 2018. That is a total of 15 teams that had winning percentages of .500 or better, out of 45 opportunities to do so. The bottom line is that the better **all** AE teams do in non-conference games, the better it is for all AE teams' all games schedule strengths, which in turn produces better overall computer ratings for all AE teams.

Percentages of Home, Road, and Neutral games

The table below might be considered unconventional, but it is possibly the most important one in this report. For each of the past five years, this table lists home, road, and neutral won-lost non-conference records for combined AE teams, along with the percentage of locations (home, road, neutral) where those games were played, along with the winning percentage at that location. For example, in 2018, AE teams had a record of 28-14 (66.7%) against non-conference opponents at home, but only 36.2% of the 116 total non-conference games were home games for AE teams. For road (away) games in 2018, AE teams had a 18-42 (30.0%) record, and 51.7% of their 116 non-conference games were road games. Finally, the 5-9 (35.7%) record on neutral courts, for a total of just 14 games, was 12.1% of the total number of non-conference games played by combined AE teams.

**America East Pct. of Regular-Season NC Home, Road, Neutral Games
and Winning Percentage of Those Games**

	Home W-L	Pct Home Games	Pct Home Games Won	Road W-L	Pct Road Games	Pct Road Games Won	Neut W-L	Pct Neut. Games	Pct Neut. Games Won
2014	15-22	33.0	40.5	14-53	59.8	20.9	3-5	7.1	37.5
2015	18-18	32.1	50.0	17-54	63.4	23.9	1-4	4.5	20.0
2016	25-16	35.0	61.0	21-52	62.4	28.8	1-2	2.6	33.3
2017	25-17	35.6	59.5	23-43	55.9	34.9	6-4	8.5	60.0
2018	28-14	36.2	66.7	18-42	51.7	30.0	5-9	12.1	35.7
Average		34.4	55.5		58.6	27.7		7.0	37.3

It is very important to look at the 5-year average percentages of combined AE home, road, and neutral non-conference games. Over the past 5 seasons, AE teams in non-conference play have averaged 34.4% home games, 58.6% road games, and 7.0% neutral games. Over that same 5 season period, non-conference average winning percentages for home games was 55.5%, it was 27.7% for road games, and 37.3% for neutral games. The percentage of home games won ranged from 40.5% (15-22 in 2014) to 66.7% (28-14 in 2018) and averaged 55.5%; road non-conference winning percentages ranged 20.9% (14-53 in 2014) to 34.9% (23-43 in 2017) and averaged 27.7%; and neutral non-conference winning percentages ranged from 20.0% (1-4 in 2015) to 60.0% (6-4 in 2017) and averaged 37.3% for the 5 year period.

These data lead to the conclusion that the preference for scheduling non-conference opponents is as follows: 1) The highest priority is to schedule as many home games as possible; 2) The second priority is to schedule as many neutral games as possible; and 3) The remainder of the schedule should be filled with as few road (away) games as possible.

Over the past three years there seems to be a very slight uptick in the combined efforts of AE teams to schedule games according to this strategy. The percentage of home, road, and neutral non-conference games scheduled by AE teams were at a 5-year "best" in all three game venues, with a high of 36.2% games at home, a low of 51.7 games on the road, and a high of 12.1% for games on neutral courts. It remains to be seen if this is a trend or simply a blip that will revert back to the average after the 2018 season.

Scheduling Strategies

Post-season tournament participation is obviously important to all AE teams because regular season play (including the conference tournament) has its rewards in either becoming an automatic qualifier to the NCAA or NIT tournaments or being invited to one of the other two post-season tournaments. Over the past five seasons, four different AE teams have participated in the NCAA tournament, one in the NIT, two in the College Basketball Invitational, and four in the CollegeInsider.com tournament.

A *self-evaluation* of AE teams might place them into three different groups, or “Tiers.” Note that there is no need to divide AE teams into three neat groups of three teams each. Each Tier might have no teams or just a single team, and likewise there is no limit to how many teams might fall into a single Tier. They can be defined as follows, noting that there is a bit of wiggle room in each category.

* **Tier A teams** would have NCAA tournament at-large potential with a projected final, regular-season NET ranking, or a ranking from one of the other well-known computer ratings, in the top 75. This has been the case for three AE teams over the past five seasons.

* **Tier B teams** are not NCAA tournament at-large contenders, with likely projected average computer rankings in the 76 to 250 range. They may finish somewhat better or worse than .500 overall.

* **Tier C teams** are those that are in the rebuilding process, will have a losing overall record, with an average computer ranking below 250.

The most recent single year, or three or five-year computer ranking averages, could be used for the three Tiers to project AE team finishes. However, the most recent year may be the most important, as players that are returning or are not returning can play a very important role in the projected outcomes given the three Tiers as described above.

It is imperative that *all* AE teams make a concerted effort to play more home and neutral games and fewer road games. Historically, **men’s home teams** over the last 10 seasons in Division I have won 73% of their non-conference games, 61% of their conference games, and 66% of all games. **More home games equals a better winning percentage.** If acquiring more home games is impractical or impossible, then additional non-conference games at neutral sites should be strongly sought out. A “challenge” series with a similar nearby conference would give AE teams a home game against like peers every other year. Remember, non-Division I games do not count in upgrading the number of home games.

Some thoughts about non-Division I (NDI) games are in order regarding non-conference scheduling. **CBN** understands that some AE schools schedule NDI games for several reasons, among them being the need to have an adequate number of home games before conference play begins, and to boost a team’s overall winning percentage. (Over the last 4 seasons, Division I teams have won 97.6%, 98.2%, 97.7%, and 98.6% of their games against non-Division I competition.) Financial concerns may also play a role. Playing one or more NDI games puts more importance on every other counting Division I non-conference game, as well as all conference games, that are played during the season. It deprives teams from playing one or more games against legitimate counting Division I NET competition, thus diluting the overall schedule. In short, **CBN** does not condone playing NDI games unless it is absolutely necessary.

Scheduling recommendations for AE teams are as follows on a Tier-by-Tier basis, noting that teams in each Tier should play as many home and neutral games as possible and as few road games as possible.

Tier A

* Tier A teams should play an aggressive non-conference schedule and play at least 3 non-conference games against top 50 computer opponents.

* Tier A teams should not play more than 3 non-conference games against teams below 200 in the computer rankings, and none below 300 if possible, and avoid teams with winning percentages below 20%.

* Tier A teams **should not play any** non-Division I opponents to take advantage of playing games against counting Division I competition.

Tier B

Tier B teams should play at least 2 non-conference games against top 50 opponents in the computer ratings based on the potential for post-season consideration.

Tier B teams should limit their non-conference schedule to 4 games against teams ranked below 200 in the computer ratings, avoid opponents with ratings of 300 or worse, and avoid teams with winning percentages below 20% if possible.

Tier B teams **should not play more than one game** against non-Division I opponents to take advantage of playing games against counting Division I opponents.

Tier C

Tier C teams should concentrate on **winning games**.

Tier C teams should maximize wins by scheduling “like” opponents, but also avoid teams with very poor winning percentages (below 20%) if possible. However, **winning games** against Division I opponents takes priority above all else.

Tier C teams should not play more than 2 games against non-Division I opponents.

A general rule of thumb is that *a team’s average non-conference schedule should be no worse than its projected potential for Tier A and B teams*. They should strive to have an average non-conference schedule against similar teams *at least* to their projected ability.

It must be noted that scheduling non-conference games according to the above guidelines does pose several challenges. Non-conference games are usually scheduled well into the future. It is likely that many or most AE schools currently have a majority of their non-conference schedule already set for the 2019-2020 season, and also may have some games or events scheduled beyond that. Any non-conference scheduling strategy can be thought of as an experiment during its first year, and it may take up to two or three years to conclude that its goals were met.

Final Thoughts on Scheduling

Any scheduling parameters must include **all schools** to buy into that scheduling strategy. If a few schools do not follow along, it will likely hurt some AE schools, especially those at the top of the conference standings. Non-conference wins by teams in the lower half of the conference are as important, if not more important, as those in the top half.

Unfortunately, the formulas for the NET or any other computer rating system, except for the RPI, are unknown. The RPI formula was known precisely. Although we have not yet been able to analyze a final, regular season NET rating system and compare it with how teams are actually selected at-large and seeded for the NCAA tournament, the NET will be the NCAA's means of sorting teams into quadrants for good wins and bad losses. As such, mixing past RPI rankings with NET rankings for averages may or may not be useful. **CBN** is reluctant to recommend combining NET-based rankings with past RPI rankings to produce scheduling parameters for teams in Tiers A, B, and C. However, since the NCAA used RPI rankings previously and uses NET rankings currently, that is the best that is available at this time.

When non-conference scheduling strategies are considered, it boils down to the fact that teams must **win games** to be successful. Other than having good coaching and good players, the best way to win games is to schedule as many home games against Division I non-conference competition as possible. Last season the "Power 5" plus Big East conferences played a total of 69 true road (away) non-conference games, an average of 1.1 road games per team. That is the main reason they all have such good records going into conference play, even though they may not have especially good teams, or played demanding schedules. They win lots of home games against non-conference competition which in many cases is simply mediocre.

CBN has always been a proponent of spending plenty of time crafting non-conference schedules. "Plenty of time" means spending twice as much time as most teams are spending right now putting together non-conference schedules. Answer the following questions when sizing up a team for non-conference consideration: How many starters are returning for the year in question? How many players did they lose? What is their non-conference home court winning percentage if playing at their place? What is their non-conference road winning percentage if playing at your place? What have their winning percentages been over the past 1, 3, and 5 seasons? How do their non-conference winning percentages compare to their overall winning percentages recently? Have they had recent coaching changes where a new coaching style may be hard on the team?

The above questions can go on and on, as might be surmised. However, if each AE school can snag just one more non-conference win as a result of smart, time-consuming scheduling, the results can be truly amazing. If each AE team won one more non-conference game, to the worst team in the RPI that they lost to in 2018, studies similar to conferences such as the AE have shown that the AE Conference RPI might have increased by 8 to 10 places, and that two-thirds of the teams in the conference might have gained 30 to 40 places each in the RPI, which shows the power of winning non-conference games.

**Horizon League
Men's Basketball Pod Structure**

Pod 1 – Team with NCAA or NIT aspirations.

1. At least 8 games against Division I opponents with a 3-year average RPI of 1-200.
2. No more than 3 games against Division I opponents with a 3-year average RPI of 201+.

Pod 2 – Competitive team (.500 or better) with CBI/CIT aspirations.

1. At least 4 games against Division I opponents with a 3-year average RPI of 1-200.
2. No more than 5 games against Division I opponents with a 3-year average RPI of 201+.

Pod 3 – Team in transition.

1. No more than 4 games against Division I opponents with a 3-year average RPI of 1-200.
2. At least 4 games against Division I opponents with a 3-year average RPI of 201+.

Goal for all schools (regardless of pod) to play 55% home/neutral games by 2020-21 and at least 60% home/neutral games by 2021-22.

**America East Conference
ESPN School Productions
Two-Year Roadmap
2019-20 and 2020-21**

Staff Liaison

- Matt Bourque, Senior Associate Commissioner, Broadcast Media & Partnerships
- Sean Tainsh, Associate Commissioner, Content Strategy

Background

The conference and its members continue to invest in the production of live content for ESPN3 and ESPN+. Entering its fourth year of partnership with ESPN in 2019-20, the conference plans for sustained growth both in the quality of production and the number of events produced over the next two years. The minimum number of events the conference is required to produce for ESPN will increase to 300 (minimum 115 men's basketball games) for the 2020-21 season.

Objectives

- 1) Develop, implement and monitor conference-wide standards of production for all sports with an emphasis on Men's and Women's Basketball.**
 - a. Host the annual meeting for school production staffs, ESPN College Production Coordinators, and conference staff at which time the group will receive the present year ESPN School Productions Broadcast Manual and other relevant ESPN and conference documents.
 - b. Create an evaluation form in consultation with school production staffs and use to hold the conference and schools accountable to production standards and expectations.
 - c. Provide school production staffs with completed evaluation form and feedback for the first three productions of each sport for each school, and as needed for additional productions.
 - d. Provide overall evaluation and feedback to a designated administrator with oversight of the video production staffs at each school on a regular basis.
- 2) Increase efficiencies in communication between conference staff, school productions staffs and ESPN.**
 - a. Conduct bi-weekly conference calls for school production staffs with ESPN College Production Coordinators and conference staff.
 - b. Schedule a minimum of two ESPN College Production Coordinators visits to each school annually.

- c. Conduct one-on-one call, videoconference or in-person meeting for school production staffs and conference staff, as needed.
- d. Provide awareness of ESPN-offered educational services (e.g., webinars, manuals).
- e. Maintain a conference hub with updated ESPN, conference and school information.
- f. Share best practices within the nine school video production staffs.

3) Expand the existing schedule of productions.

- a. Utilize existing production systems, added America East revenue distribution, and continued advancement of the school production staffs to increase the number of events produced at each institution in each of the next two years.
- b. Establish framework to hold institutions accountable for satisfying minimum production requirements.
- c. Partner with ESPN to create pilot programs with emerging technology companies (e.g., Pixellot, AutomaticTV) to create a more efficient workflow for school production staffs.
- d. Require a minimum of 35 productions in America East-sponsored sports for each school by the 2020-21 season and work with each institution in 2019-20 to develop a plan to meet this requirement.

Measuring Progress

In 2019-20, the conference will measure progress towards achieving objectives by:

- 1) Creating an evaluation system with the school production staffs.
- 2) Evaluating game productions and providing written reports with the school production staffs.
- 3) Soliciting feedback from the video production staffs on the effectiveness of conference communications and services (e.g., weekly calls, conference hub).
- 4) Launching the pilot program between ESPN and select schools using emerging technologies.
- 5) Sharing production data and evaluations with Athletic Directors and other select administrators.

Membership Involvement

The conference will utilize certain constituency groups in order to meet these objectives. Additional involvement will include but is not limited to:

- 1) School video production staff.
- 2) School administrator with oversight of ESPN3/ESPN+ productions.