ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative items.
   - None.

2. Nonlegislative items.
   - Seeding for finals.
     a. Recommendation. That once regional selections are finalized, the committee use the divisional selection criteria to rank the eight No. 1 regional teams to determine the regional matchups at the finals site.
     b. Effective date. 2016 championship.
     c. Rationale. The committee believes that seeding the eight No. 1 ranked teams will provide the opportunity for the best teams to advance in the championship. Without seeding, top teams often meet before the championship game. Seeding immediately after selections will allow for those teams that have performed well over the entire season to be placed on opposite sides of the bracket, thus creating a “truer” bracket and building excitement as teams advance or are eliminated, similar to Division I. The committee will use current selection criteria, along with a national Rating Percentage Index, to evaluate teams and seed them one through eight when selecting the 64 teams to the championship.
     d. Estimated budget impact. None.
     e. Student-athlete impact. Top teams could be placed on opposite sides of the bracket, which would provide the best chance for them to meet in the championship game.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Review meeting schedule. The committee reviewed the meeting schedule and made no adjustments.

2. Review/approval of 2015 annual meeting report. The committee approved the 2015 annual meeting report as submitted.
3. NCAA updates.

a. **Regionalization review.** NCAA representatives informed the committee that the Division II regionalization policies will be reviewed. The committee asked for a close review of the contiguous state component, as it appears the implementation has been skewed by conference realignments.

b. **Seeding finals.** The representatives shared that the Division II Championships Committee will determine a timeline to review requests for seeding of finals competition. Approving such requests would prompt policy changes rather than legislative changes, so implementation could be effective with 2016 fall championships.

c. **Publication of selections data.** The representatives shared that in February, the Championships Committee will review the practice of publishing rankings data, as well as including the publication of selections data after selections have been announced.

d. **Playing and practice season in festival years.** The committee asked staff to craft a proposal that would allow for adjusting the playing and practice season for women’s volleyball in festival years in order to avoid losing a week of competition.

4. **Review of Championships Committee actions.** The committee reviewed actions the Championships Committee took at its meetings and teleconferences for the past calendar year.


a. **Bracket.** The committee reviewed the final bracket and crafted a proposal to seed the eight No. 1 teams after selections. (See Nonlegislative Item.)

b. **Evaluations/reports.** The committee noted the need to reinforce host requirements related to securing qualified individuals to work as scorer, libero tracker and announcer.

c. **Regional sites.**

   (1) **Seating capacity.** The committee noted that some potential host facilities had limited seating capacity. In an effort to avoid a host having to turn away spectators, the committee wants to implement minimum seating requirements for regionals, based on the host institutions’ largest crowds of the season and the anticipated postseason crowd. The committee directed staff to include this requirement in the bid specifications and to potentially ask an institution’s conference commissioner to confirm the seating capacity necessary for a regional championship.
(2) **Film of regional opponents.** The committee noted that some coaches had difficulty finding film of regional opponents.

(3) **Web streaming.** The committee directed staff to determine if there would be a cost in requiring regional hosts to web stream all matches. The committee also asked staff to discuss with the official NCAA equipment provider whether balls could be broken in before they are shipped to regional and final sites.

(4) **Award ceremonies.** The committee determined the format worked well and made no changes. The members suggested having hosts provide team administrators with a copy of the protocol or post it in the locker room.

(5) **Practice times.** The committee indicated that since the match times are now prescribed, the host operations manual should also include the practice times and orders based on team competition schedules.

d. **Finals.**

(1) **Facility setup.** The committee noted the facility was of championship caliber.

   (a) **Meeting space.** The administrative meeting space was well organized, yet so large that it may have been hard for all participants to hear the presenters, even with the public announcement system.

   (b) **Hospitality.** The committee recommended future hosts share proposed menus and hours of operation with staff. The committee suggested the host provide a separate space for volunteer hospitality, space permitting.

   (c) **Officials meeting area.** The committee noted the host determined a good plan and suggested continuing to request that hosts escort officials and secure locker rooms.

   (d) **Press conference room.** The committee indicated the press conferences should be open to credentialed individuals only. The members noted that the pre-championship press conferences require a larger room so that entire teams may sit in the audience, facility space permitting.

The committee also noted the need for the host to prepare match-relevant questions as the tournament continues. The members suggested that the host designate a point person to coordinate with the committee members assigned to attend and monitor the press conferences. There also may be a need for a door monitor to control access throughout the tournament.
(e) **Competition venue.** The committee indicated the venue was of a high caliber and a good fit for the championship.

(2) **Administrative meeting.** The committee noted the need to review the agenda with host before the administrative meeting.

(3) **Practices.** The committee indicated that once the match times are determined, the practice times should also be finalized based on team competition schedules.

(4) **Press conferences/interviews.** The committee noted the participants were well prepared for the press conferences. However, the Webstream commentators need to attend the practice day to conduct coach interviews, rather than asking coaches for time during warm-up right before competition.

(5) **Web streaming of matches and press conferences.** The committee noted there were many glitches in this year’s stream, including sound outages and incorrect or incomplete graphics.

(6) **Committee responsibilities.** The committee liked how the championship assignments were divided.

(7) **Award ceremonies.** The committee was pleased with this year’s adjustment that allowed each national committee member to present the awards to their respective region’s participants. The committee directed staff to investigate whether a change may be made in the trophies from “Regional Champion” to “National Quarterfinalist,” “National Semifinalist” and “National Runner-Up.”

(8) **Attendance.** The committee noted the attendance was good even though the host did not advance as one of the final eight teams in the championship.

(9) **Follow-up teleconference with host.** The committee chair and staff liaison will conduct a teleconference with the host to share feedback and suggestions for future championships.

6. **Officials.** The committee discussed the following during a teleconference with the national coordinator of officials:

   a. **Review of 2015 regional and national officials.** The committee discussed the geographic disparity in how ball handling errors are called. The committee also noted the need to prohibit line judges from working two consecutive matches each day.
b. **Evaluation forms.** The committee reviewed coaches’ and crew chief evaluations of regional and national officials. The committee discussed whether to set up an annual regional rotation of officials selected to nationals, but preferred selecting the best officials, regardless of regional representation.

c. **Selection of 2016 championship officials.** The committee discussed and approved to maintain the timeline and criteria for the selection of officials.

7. **Rankings/selections.**

a. **Review of 2015 selections and selection show.** The committee felt selections went well. The committee noted that before the implementation of the score reporting system, a committee member contacted institutions before the selection show to let them know they were selected to avoid non-selected teams having watch parties. The committee directed staff to determine if this exercise of discretion is still permissible.

b. **Time of selections teleconference.** The committee feels the timing of the selections teleconference is challenging because of the late finish of some conference championships and the time needed to conduct regional advisory committee teleconferences. In addition, multiple time zones and the need to review other regions’ data to prepare for the national call complicate finding a better time. The committee recommends conference championships start earlier but understands this cannot be mandated.

c. **Rankings.**

(1) **Regional advisory committees.**

(a) **Rosters/replacements.** The committee reviewed the regional advisory committee rosters and will discuss committee service with potential regional representatives.

(b) **Regional advisory committee training.** The committee was somewhat disappointed with the delay in receiving the training materials. The committee directed staff to investigate the production of audio/visual training materials to use in an operator moderated webinar with all regional advisory committee members.

(2) **Number and dates of ranking calls.** The committee noted the number and dates of ranking calls are appropriate but that the time may need to change for 2016 depending on new committee member availability.
(3) **Score reporting system.** The committee indicated the system is a useful tool.

(4) **Publishing the data.** The committee recommends the selections data be published the day after the selections are announced.

d. **Selection requirements/criteria.** The committee noted increased comfort and understanding of the new criteria. The committee spent time preparing a unified approach to reviewing the common opponents criterion.

e. **Automatic qualification.** The committee will review and approve automatic qualifiers once conferences submit their application forms.

8. **Planning for 2016 championship and beyond.**

   a. **Regional video exchange.** The committee revised the language detailing specifics of the mandatory video exchange before regionals. Within 24 hours of the selections announcement, all participants must make available complete video of their final match before regionals to all other participants in their regional tournament. The video must be shot in a manner similar to that required by NCAA championship hosts, as detailed in the host operations manual. Failure to meet the requirements may subject the institution to committee review and sanction for failure to adhere to administrative policies and procedures.

   b. **Net system.** The committee indicated concern with the existing net system at the 2016 championship site and asked staff to determine if another system can be used.

   c. **2016-17 calendar/timeline.** The committee reviewed and moved the national committee ranking calls to 11 a.m. Eastern time.

   d. **Regional hosts.**

      (1) **Bid timeline.** The committee believes the timeline is appropriate.

      (2) **Regionals facility evaluation form.** The committee reviewed the form and included a question related to the competition facility seating capacity.

   e. **Finals.**

      (1) **Predetermined regional rotation versus seeding.** (See Action Item No. 2.)

      (2) **Competing at Division I Women’s Volleyball Championship site.** The committee asked staff to speak with the Division I championships manager about a combined
championship. The committee noted this would have to be coordinated when reviewing host bids for the next bid cycle.

(3) 2018-21 bid timeline. The committee reviewed the timeline.

9. Manual revisions. The committee reviewed and asked staff to revise areas in the committee operations, host operations, pre-championship, participant and site representative manuals.

10. Review of agendas. The committee reviewed and directed staff to make changes to the championship agendas.

11. National committee.

   a. Committee openings and timeline. The committee reviewed the roster and discussed potential new committee members.

   b. New committee orientation. The committee agreed to continue the new committee orientation teleconference.

   c. Committee chair recommendation. The committee recommended extending the current chair’s term for the 2016-17 academic year.


13. Championships Committee meeting/teleconference schedule. The committee reviewed the schedule and noted the timing of recommendations for seeding of championship participants.

14. Rules update. The playing rules representative reviewed the rules proposals and noted the upcoming comment period. The committee was concerned about using the Challenge Review System for the 2016 championship because it is still unclear how many institutions will use the system and thus help coaches become familiar with it during the regular season.

15. Future dates and sites.

   a. Future championships. The committee reviewed the dates and sites for 2016 and 2017 championships.

   b. 2017 annual meeting. The committee agreed to hold the next annual meeting Jan. 25-26.

16. Other business. The committee discussed possible requests for the Division II Foundation for the Future funds.
Committee Chair: Michelle Caddigan, Wingate University; South Atlantic Conference
Staff Liaison: Marie Scovron, Championships and Alliances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Megan Bratkovich, Caldwell University; Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Bouyer, California State University, Dominguez Hills; California Collegiate Athletic Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Caddigan, Wingate University; South Atlantic Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Hendricks, Metropolitan State University of Denver; Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Kreiger, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania; Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference (by teleconference).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy McManus, Northwestern Oklahoma State University; Great American Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Walters, Cedarville University; Great Midwest Athletic Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Wolter, University of West Florida; Gulf South Conference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absentees:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guests in Attendance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joan Powell, National Coordinator of Officials (by teleconference).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCAA Staff Liaisons in Attendance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerstin Hunter, Championships and Alliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Scovron, Championships and Alliances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other NCAA Staff Members in Attendance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roberta Page, Championships and Alliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Seewald, Championships and Alliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Simons, Championships and Alliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Willett, Academic and Membership Affairs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>