



REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION II MEN'S AND WOMEN'S SWIMMING AND DIVING COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 7-8, 2016, ELECTRONIC VOTE

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative items.

- **Swimming selection model revision.**

- a. Recommendation. That the swimming selection model be revised as follows:

Effective the 2016-17 academic year:

Coaches may enter an individual student-athlete in a maximum of ~~5~~ 4 individual events to be considered for selections.

~~Either the fastest aggregate or the fastest actual relay time achieved by the individuals who swam the events in bona fide competition will be allowed for entering relays for entry/selection.~~ Relays will not be selected.

~~An uninvited relay alternate is a student athlete who has not qualified for the championships in any event (i.e., he or she is neither a member of a four person relay team identified and named on the submission of results that achieved the qualifying standard nor a swimmer who achieved a qualifying standard in an individual event). Any swimmer ... is eligible to swim relays as an uninvited relay alternate in invited and optional entry relay events, provided at least one of the institution's relay teams is officially invited to the championships. An institution with one or more selected student-athletes may bring uninvited relay-only swimmers to swim only in relays in which the institution has achieved a provisional standard ("B" cut).~~

~~An uninvited relay alternate (a competitor who was not a member of the four person relay team that achieved his or her institution's relay entry time) -only swimmer will not be considered part of the institution's official travel party. As such, reimbursement for travel and per diem, banquet tickets and participation awards will not be provided for those individuals.~~

However, the uninvited relay ~~alternate~~ only swimmer will receive a participant credential.

Effective the 2017-18 academic year:

~~Relay event qualifying standards ("A" cuts) are based on an average of the past three years of the 2nd place championship results. Relay event provisional standards ("B" cuts) are computed to be 5 percent slower than the qualifying standards ("A" cuts).~~

Relay event provisional standards ("B" cuts) will be based on the three-year average of the 12th fastest time for each event. (All regular-season and championship times will be considered).

- b. Effective date. Immediate, with new relay standards formula implementation delayed until 2017-18.
- c. Rationale. The current model selects individual event and relay-only qualifiers. Under this model, the participant cap generally is reached before the top 16 spots are filled for each individual event. The 16 spots, which are point-earning spots, currently can be filled with swimmers already selected in other events and whose times may be slower than those of the individual swimmers not selected. The proposed selection model will select student-athletes to individual events only. It then provides the opportunity for institutions with four or more selected student-athletes to swim in any of the relays.

The current model permits institutions with a selected relay to bring uninvited relay alternates at the cost of the institution. The uninvited relay alternates may swim in any relay event. The proposed model allows an institution that has one or more selected student-athletes (individual events) to bring additional student-athletes to the meet at the cost of the institution. These uninvited relay-only swimmers may swim only in relays for which the institution has achieved a provisional standard ("B" cut).

The Division II Men's and Women's Swimming and Diving Committee directed staff to survey the membership on the proposal. The proposed selection model received overwhelming response and support. (Attachments A and B)

- d. Estimated budget impact. None.
- e. Student-athlete impact. Selecting the fastest swimmers in each individual event will make the meet much more competitive and thus provide a positive championships experience for the student-athletes.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

- **None.**

Committee Chair: Roger Karns, Lewis University; Great Lakes Valley Conference
Staff Liaison: Marie Scovron, Championships and Alliances

Division II Men's and Women's Swimming and Diving Committee September 7-8, 2016, Electronic Vote
Attendees:
Roger Karns, Lewis University; Great Lakes Valley Conference.
Carlin Chesick, Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference.
Barbara Parker, University of West Florida, Gulf South Conference.
Nancye Rahn, King University; Conference Carolinas.
Patrick Snively, Fairmont State University; Mountain East Conference.
Absentees:
None.
Guests in Attendance:
None.
NCAA Staff Support in Attendance:
Marie Scovron, Championships and Alliances.
Other NCAA Staff Members in Attendance:
None.

Division II Swimming Selection Model Survey Results

Executive Summary – September 6, 2016

Head Coaches Surveyed: 103

Head Coaches Responding: 81

Response Rate: 79%

Question #1: Setting Provisional Standards

Option	N	Pct.
“B” cuts at 5 percent slower than the “A” standards	23	29%
“B” cuts based on the average 12th place over 3 years	55	71%

Question #2: Number of Individual Events

Option	N	Pct.
Permitting coaches to enter student-athletes in up to 5 individual events	21	26%
Permitting coaches to enter student-athletes in up to 4 individual events	59	74%

Question #3: Individual/Relay Selection

Option	N	Pct.
Selecting two rows of individual events, then one row of relay events and continuing the process until the participant cap is reached	16	20%
Selecting rows of individuals only, continuing the process until the participant cap is reached	64	80%

Question #4: Relay Alternates

Option	N	Pct.
Allowing an institution to bring uninvited relay alternates provided at least one of the institution’s relay teams is officially invited to the championships	10	12%
Allowing an institution with 4 or more selected swimmers to bring uninvited relay alternates to participate in relays in which they have achieved the “B” cut; and allowing institutions with 1-3 selected swimmers to bring uninvited relay alternates to participate only in relays in which they have achieved a “B” cut	70	88%



Division II Swimming and Diving Selection Model Survey Results

September 13, 2016

Background

- ▶ Survey administered entirely online via Qualtrics
- ▶ Email invitation to complete survey sent to 103 Division II swimming/diving head coaches on August 29
 - ▶ 101 institutions (2 had multiple head coaches)
- ▶ Deadline: September 2
 - ▶ Reminder to non-submitters on September 1

Responses

- ▶ 81 valid responses
 - ▶ 3 responded but did not answer any questions
- ▶ Response rate of 79% is unusually high for sport-related survey
- ▶ Responses can be considered representative of DII institutions that sponsor swimming

SWIMMING QUESTIONS



Setting Provisional Standards

Option	N	Pct.
“B” cuts at five percent slower than the “A” standards	23	29%
“B” cuts based on the average 12 th place over three years	55	71%

Number of Individual Events

Option	N	Pct.
Permitting coaches to enter student-athletes in up to 5 individual events	21	26%
Permitting coaches to enter student-athletes in up to 4 individual events	59	74%



Individual/Relay Selection

Option	N	Pct.
Selecting two rows of individual events, then one row of relay events and continuing the process until the participant cap is reached	16	20%
Selecting rows of individuals only, continuing the process until the participant cap is reached	64	80%

Relay Alternates

Option	N	Pct.
Allowing an institution to bring uninvited relay alternates provided at least one of the institution's relay teams is officially invited to the championships	10	12%
Allowing an institution with 4 or more selected swimmers to bring uninvited relay alternates to participate in relays in which they have achieved the "B" cut; and allowing institutions with 1-3 selected swimmers to bring uninvited relay alternates to participate only in relays in which they have achieved a "B" cut	70	88%

DIVING QUESTIONS

Notes on Diving Questions

- ▶ After completing swimming questions, respondents were asked whether their institution had diving participants
- ▶ 35 respondents (43%) indicated that they had divers and were presented with diving-related questions
 - ▶ 2 respondents only answered questions related to women's diving
 - ▶ 1 respondent only answered one question, and only for men's 1-meter

Degree of Difficulty – Prequalification Meet

Are you in favor of increasing the degree of difficulty required to qualify to compete in the prequalification meet?

Men's Events				Women's Events					
	Yes		No			Yes		No	
1-Meter	15	47%	17	53%	1-Meter	22	65%	12	35%
3-Meter	13	41%	19	59%	3-Meter	22	65%	12	35%

Prequalification Score

Are you in favor of increasing the score required to qualify to compete in the prequalification meet?

Men's Events					Women's Events				
	Yes		No			Yes		No	
1-Meter	11	33%	22	67%	1-Meter	16	47%	18	53%
3-Meter	10	31%	22	69%	3-Meter	11	32%	23	68%

Degree of Difficulty – Prequalification & Championships

Are you in favor of increasing the degree of difficulty required in the prequalification and the championships meets?

Men's Events				Women's Events					
	Yes		No			Yes		No	
1-Meter	12	37%	20	63%	1-Meter	17	50%	17	50%
3-Meter	11	34%	21	66%	3-Meter	17	50%	17	50%

THANK YOU

Contact info: Gregg Summers



gsummers@ncaa.org



317-917-6521





[NCAA.org/research](https://www.ncaa.org/research)



@NCAAResearch

NCAA is a trademark of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. All other licenses or trademarks are property of their respective holders.



Research