Summary of 2013 Division II Membership Census Results

Introduction

The first Division II Membership Census was conducted in the summer and early fall of 2013 to gather information about the operations of Division II athletics departments and solicit feedback from chancellors and presidents, athletics administrators, coaches, faculty and conference staff about a broad range of topical issues impacting the future of the division. With the 2012-15 Division II Strategic Plan nearing its midway point, the division’s leadership sought to gather an unprecedented amount of feedback from member institutions to inform the development of the next plan and provide committees information about the membership’s stance on issues related to their jurisdiction.

The results of the census were shared with governance committees from October 2013 through February 2014, including educational sessions at the 2014 NCAA Convention in January. Given the volume of information generated by the census, presentations were abridged to emphasize areas of particular importance to each audience. This report is intended to provide a broader summary of census results in all topics covered in the survey, including athletics department operations, Division II branding and positioning, national championships, student-athlete advisory committees, divisional governance processes and structure, diversity and inclusion, and conference and presidential involvement in institutional athletics programs.

Methodology

The 2013 Division II Membership Census was administered using the online survey system Qualtrics. Staff at 315 Division II institutions and 24 conferences, including 2012-13 active Division II member institutions (N=289) and those institutions in the membership process (N=26), were invited to participate via emails from the NCAA national office. The first email invitations were sent July 9, 2013. After several reminders during the summer, the survey closed September 14, 2013.

The census comprised four different surveys, each with slightly different banks of questions based on the position of the respondent: President/chancellor, athletics director, other athletics staff or faculty athletics representative (FAR), and conference commissioner or staff member. The emails to presidents and athletics directors included links to the survey that were unique to them and their titles; they were instructed not to forward the email to anyone else. Conference commissioners were sent a link to a version of the survey designed specifically for conferences and asked to forward it to other staff in their offices. Senior woman administrators at member institutions were sent a link to a survey designed for institutional athletics staff below the athletics director level and asked to forward the link to all other athletics staff, including coaches. FARs also received this institutional staff link, as did compliance coordinators and all other staff listed in the NCAA’s membership database.

The surveys were confidential but not anonymous. Survey respondents were required to identify their institution or conference to allow for further analysis by institutional characteristics and to evaluate the degree to which the responses were representative of Division II. The surveys included introductory language ensuring that response data would only be presented in aggregate to prevent the identification of individual respondents.

Response Data

At least one person at 306 of 315 institutions and all 24 conferences submitted a survey. Therefore, on an institutional/conference level, the responses are highly representative of the Division II membership in
terms of major characteristics such as proportion of historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs), public/private control, football sponsorship, geographic region, and undergraduate enrollment. While the presidents and athletics directors received links to surveys that identified their position, the surveys sent to institutional and conference staff asked respondents to select from a list the title that best matched their position; responses to this question and others allowed each respondent to be categorized by position within their institution or conference (e.g., compliance coordinator, trainer, coach, commissioner, etc.). A total of 2,022 individuals submitted survey responses. The response rate was considered strong for most key positions, including athletics director (81 percent), FAR (59 percent), president/chancellor (56 percent), compliance officer (46 percent) and commissioner (100 percent). In addition, the gender and race/ethnicity of the respondents in these positions very closely mirrored those of the respective positions in the membership. However, it should be noted that in all key position groups, the response rates from staff at HBCUs were approximately half the rate from non-HBCUs. Females were slightly overrepresented among athletics staff (non-athletics directors). The response rate among coaches is estimated to be about 5 percent, and coach respondents were more likely to be female and white than their population in the membership.

Structure of this Report

The narrative of this report will present key findings in each of the subject areas covered in the census. A comprehensive set of cross-tabulations and the survey instrument (institutional staff version) are included as appendices. Because the responses to most questions varied by position, most of the analyses will compare position groups, which include:

- President/chancellor
- Athletics director
- Compliance officer
- FAR
- Coach
- Other athletics staff
- Commissioner and/or conference staff

Experience in Athletics

Experience in Division II athletics, either at the institution or conference level, varies widely by position. Compliance staff and coaches tend to have much less Division II experience than those in other position groups; 50 percent of coaches and 45 percent of compliance officers reported working in Division II for five years or fewer. At the other end of the spectrum, FARs (44 percent) and athletics directors (39 percent) are most likely to have worked 16 or more years in Division II. The Division II tenure of presidents is the most evenly distributed; approximately one quarter have worked in the division for either one to five years, six to 10 years or 11 to 20 years.

Presidents and conference staff are most likely to have worked at other Division II institutions or conferences; just under half of both groups have other experience within the division. By contrast, only 14 percent of FARs have worked elsewhere in Division II. While only 36 percent of athletics directors have
worked at another Division II institution, 73 percent have worked at other levels of athletics, such as Divisions I or III, a two-year college, or a member of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA). This is the same percentage as presidents and slightly higher than conference staff (68 percent). Again, FARs (32 percent) were the least likely to have worked at another level. Within each position, Division I was the other level at which the highest percentage of respondents had worked, followed by NAIA and Division III. About one-third of presidents and athletics directors reported working at an NAIA school, figures undoubtedly bolstered by the recent transition of NAIA schools to Division II. The two-year-college level was by far the least-reported non-Division II experience.

Three-quarters or more of all respondent groups were confident that they can describe the philosophical differences between Division II and the other NCAA membership divisions. Athletics directors (95 percent) were most likely to agree that they can describe the divisional differences; coaches (74 percent) were least likely. While tenure in Division II was related to the ability to describe the philosophical differences between the divisions, there is a stronger correlation with employment in other divisions.

### Athletics Department Operations

Despite anecdotal reports to the contrary, census responses reveal that very few (N=3) Division II athletics directors and compliance officers are not full-time employees of the athletics department. In addition, the vast majority of athletics directors (88 percent) and compliance officers (95 percent) report having no coaching duties. Among the remaining 12 percent of athletics directors with coaching responsibilities, approximately half spend less than one-quarter of their time coaching and the other half spend between one-quarter to one-half of their time coaching.

Ninety-five percent of athletics directors report to their president or chancellor in some fashion; 64 percent report directly to the president or chancellor, and another 31 percent report indirectly or via a “dotted line.” About a quarter of athletics directors report directly to the chief student affairs officer. Just less than 90 percent of compliance officers report directly to the athletics director, and 42 percent report indirectly to the president. In fact, compliance officers are the most likely to have multiple dotted-line reporting relationships (26 percent). They also sometimes report indirectly to the athletics director, legal counsel and/or FAR. Not surprisingly, the vast majority of FARs (86 percent) report directly to the president; another 5 percent report to the chief academic officer. Only about a quarter of FARs have a dotted-line reporting structure, and most of those lead to the athletics director.

Half of Division II athletics directors are part of their president’s senior leadership team, or “cabinet.” Those who report directly to their president are more than three times as likely (69 percent vs. 19 percent) to be part of the cabinet than those who report to someone else. Athletics directors are also more likely to serve on the leadership team at schools that sponsor football or with enrollments outside the top quartile.

The census queried athletics directors about the number of full-time staff, part-time staff, volunteers and graduate assistants or interns in their department – including coaches. Their responses indicate that the average Division II athletics department employs about 26 full-time staff, 11 part-time staff, seven graduate assistants or interns and five volunteers. As would be expected, full-time staffing levels are highly correlated with athletics budget. Schools that
sponsor football employ more full-time staff than non-football-playing institutions (mean 31 vs. 21), but part-time staff levels do not differ (mean 11). HBCUs employ fewer full-time staff than non-HBCUs (mean 17 vs. 26); public institutions employ more full-time staff (mean 28 vs. 24), but private schools rely more on part-time employees (9 vs. 13).

Athletics directors and commissioners were asked whether their institution or conference has a sufficient budget allocation for athletics. Two-thirds of commissioners and nearly 60 percent of athletics directors agree that their conference or school has allocated enough funds for athletics to operate effectively. Athletics directors at private schools are much more likely to agree than those at public institutions (69 percent vs. 45 percent); differences by HBCU status, football sponsorship, enrollment and level of championships participation were not significant. And, perhaps surprisingly, the size of the athletics budget is not related to agreement that the budget is sufficient.

The survey also asked athletics directors and commissioners whether their athletics department/conference has a written and documented strategic plan for athletics. While three-quarters of athletics directors reported that their school has a written and documented plan, 19 percent reported that it does not and 5 percent were unsure. All commissioners reported that their conference has a strategic plan document. Athletics directors (only) were also asked whether their gender-equity plan was specific to athletics, a part of the institution’s overall plan or included in the plan of another department, such as student affairs. Responses were roughly split between stand-alone and institution-wide. However, 5 percent of athletics directors reported that their department does not have a gender-equity plan at all.

**Division II Identity and Positioning**

The Division II Strategic Positioning Platform was created in 2006 to provide the Division II membership with a common set of principles that help to define the division’s identity and key attributes. Census results indicate that the platform has resonated with staff at member institutions and conferences. When asked to rank the top five characteristics of Division II that are of most value to them, all position groups responding to the census selected the Strategic Positioning Platform as No. 1 most often. Also among the top five choices for most groups were championships participation opportunities, community engagement, the ease of burden initiative, the partial scholarship model and the regionalization philosophy. Eighty-five percent of compliance staff selected the ease of burden initiative among their top five characteristics. Conference staff were most likely to identify the conference grant program (65 percent) and enhancement fund distribution (50 percent).

While the Division II membership sees the value in the Strategic Positioning Platform, many would like to see a change in the way it is communicated. A high percentage of respondents felt that the platform has been communicated to the membership effectively, but about half as many agreed that external communication of the platform has been effective. So not surprisingly, about 60 percent of all position groups indicated that Division II should focus its future identity efforts externally.

A key part of Division II’s identity is its “Life in the Balance” positioning statement, and census results indicate that this statement also has firm support among the membership. The vast majority of respondents in all positions agreed that “Life in the Balance” is the right philosophy for athletics. Support was highest among presidents and chancellors (95 percent) and FARs (94 percent).
percent), and more than 80 percent of compliance staff, conference staff and athletics directors also agreed. Coaches (65 percent) were least likely to agree. Individuals at smaller schools were more likely to agree than those at large schools.

The “I Chose Division II” tagline has also become a key part of the division’s branding efforts, but census results reveal that it is time for a change. Only about one in five respondents favored continued use of “I Chose” as the primary mark for Division II. Presidents and FARs offered the most support (about 30 percent). Those who do not support retaining the tagline are evenly divided between repurposing “I Chose” and replacing it altogether. Dissatisfaction with ‘I Chose’ tends to increase with the enrollment at the respondent’s institution.

To enhance its branding and identity efforts, Division II has produced a series of resources, such as videos and public-service announcements (PSAs), the Strategic Positioning Platform, a strategic communications toolkit, a Strategic Plan and related scorecards, identity workshops and seminars, and a Facts and Figures document. At least two-thirds of all respondent groups except coaches said they were familiar with the videos and PSAs that have become a hallmark of Division II in the past several years. The Strategic Positioning Platform was the most familiar item for presidents and athletics directors. Conference staff, in particular, showed a high level of awareness of all these resources. It should be noted that 41 percent of coaches reported that they were unaware of any of these resources.

Sixty percent or more of most position groups agreed that ncaa.org does a good job of providing Division II resources to the membership. Compliance staff (77 percent) were most likely to say this is true. Respondents agreed less that ncaa.com – the website for regular-season and championships coverage – does a good job of covering Division II regular-season athletics. Conference staff showed the highest level of dissatisfaction with both the websites; only about 35 to 40 percent of conference staff agreed that either of these sites is effective. Among institutional staff, dissatisfaction with ncaa.com increased with the number of championships participants a school had over the previous four years.

Census respondents saw television coverage as a high priority for garnering exposure for Division II athletics. A very high proportion of all respondent groups (80 percent or more) agreed that the CBS Sports Network football/basketball regular-season package helped promote Division II, and even more said they would like to see more regular-season coverage of Division II, both on TV and streaming on the web. And many groups place TV coverage high on the list of priorities for the use of championships resources (see “Championships” section below). But if given the choice, coaches, sports information directors and conference staff would prefer to have all championships streamed live over having a few championships on TV.

As might be expected in this era of expanding use of social media, there was broad agreement among census respondents that social media are critical in getting the word out about Division II athletics. This sentiment was strongest among sports information directors and conference staff; 69 percent and 53 percent, respectively, strongly agreed that social media are important. It’s noteworthy that support for use of social media declines the longer an individual has worked in Division II, which is likely related to the age of the individual. Also, a high percentage of those who have worked 16 or more years in Division II are FARs, and they may not be as aware of the benefits of social media to athletics messaging.
Championships

Items ranked in the Top 5 championships priorities by majority of each respondent group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President/Chancellor</th>
<th>Athletics Director</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Conference Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase per diem (67%)</td>
<td>Increase per diem (83%)</td>
<td>TV exposure (68%)</td>
<td>TV exposure (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimburse local trans. (61%)</td>
<td>Reimburse local trans. (67%)</td>
<td>Increase per diem (63%)</td>
<td>Region #1 seed hosts (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region #1 seed hosts (57%)</td>
<td>Increase bracket sizes (56%)</td>
<td>Region #1 seed hosts (53%)</td>
<td>Increase per diem (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV exposure (57%)</td>
<td>Increase travel party (54%)</td>
<td>Increase bracket sizes (51%)</td>
<td>SA mementos (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA awards (50%)</td>
<td>TV exposure (54%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>SA awards (53%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Census participants were presented a list of 10 championships-related items and asked to rank the top five in terms of budgeting priority. Increasing per diem and TV exposure were selected in the top five by 50 percent or more of presidents, athletics directors, coaches and conference staff. Increasing per diem was the top choice among presidents and athletics directors, while TV exposure was most important to coaches and conference staff. Ensuring that the No. 1 seed in a region can host a championship contest ranked among the top five priorities for more than half of presidents, coaches and conference staff, and just less than half of athletics directors. Reimbursement for local transportation was the second-most important priority among presidents and athletics directors, but it failed to crack the top six among conference staff and coaches. Increasing squad sizes had the least support overall; it ranked no better than eighth among any position group.

In response to a separate question, most respondent groups expressed little interest in having the NCAA pay all championship travel expenses if the trade-off is a reduction in bracket sizes. Presidents were split on the idea, and fewer than a quarter of athletics directors, coaches and conference staff supported it.

Even though it has been the subject of some debate among Division II members for several years, the regionalization model for championships has moderate to strong support among key position groups. Eighty-five percent of presidents and 70 percent of athletics directors support regionalization, along with almost two-thirds of coaches and conference staff. Support for regionalization is strongest among respondents from schools in the northeastern states. But there is no significant relationship between support for regionalization and football sponsorship, HBCU status and athletics budget.
Predictably, there is broad agreement (more than 75 percent in all position groups) that regionalization causes institutions to schedule most regular-season contests with in-region opponents. But there is somewhat less certainty that it results in savings for schools’ travel budgets; while three-quarters of presidents and conference staff agree, only 53 percent of coaches and 60 percent of athletics directors do. Presidents (81 percent) and FARs (73 percent) enthusiastically agree that regionalization limits missed class time, but athletics directors (61 percent) and coaches (53 percent) seem less certain. Again, respondents from the Northeast are much more likely to see positive impacts of regionalization on budgets and class time.

Despite broad support for regionalization, support is mixed at best for the concept of allowing regions to select their own championships representatives. No more than half of any position group agreed that regions should have the autonomy to decide who represents them in a championship.

Census participants expressed varying levels of interest in Division II pursuing unique championship events such as combining similar sports across gender (e.g., Division II men’s and women’s soccer), combining the same sport across divisions (e.g., Divisions I, II and III women’s basketball) and holding additional festival-type events where multiple Division II championships are held in the same city at the same time. Combining similar Division II events captured the most support and holding additional festivals was least popular among athletics directors, coaches and conference staff. Presidents also strongly supported combining the championships of similar Division II sports, but only one-third supported multi-division events. In general, coaches were least likely to support the alternative championship concepts.

About 40 percent of athletics directors and conference staff, one-third of coaches, and a quarter of presidents and athletics staff reported attending a Division II championship festival. Those who had attended said that having multiple championships at one site was the most important feature of the festival. Per diem to stay the duration of the festival was ranked second, followed by the student-athletes’ community engagement activity. Coaches’ rankings of festival features were clustered closer together, indicating they may be better able to see the impact of the entire experience on their student-athletes.

While two-thirds of athletics directors agree that automatic qualification is the most important component of Division II championships, only about half of coaches and conference staff agree. Meanwhile, athletics directors and conference staff show a strong level of disagreement with the idea that automatic qualification is only appropriate for brackets of 48 or more. Somewhat surprisingly, 40 percent of coaches don’t have an opinion one way or the other. Presidents and chancellors have a high rate of neutrality on these questions, perhaps indicating that they do not fully understand the issue.

Governance and Legislation

The level of understanding of the Division II governance structure, such as committee oversight areas and reporting lines, varies significantly by position. More than 80 percent of athletics directors, FARs and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Strongly agree' or 'agree' they understand the governance structure</th>
<th>80+ %</th>
<th>AD, FAR, Conference Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>President/Chancellor, Assoc./Asst. AD, Compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59%</td>
<td>SID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 50%</td>
<td>Coach, Medical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
conference staff agreed that they understand the structure, along with about three-quarters of presidents and compliance staff. However, about half of sports information directors and even fewer coaches reported understanding how the division governs itself. For three key players in the governance process – presidents, athletics directors and FARs – the level of agreement is significantly related to years worked in Division II. Those groups that are most familiar with the NCAA governance structure – presidents, athletics directors, FARs, conference staff and compliance staff – also appear to have a firm grasp on the committee nomination and election procedures. Eighty percent of athletics directors agree that they understand the procedures, as well as about two-thirds of the other groups.

Two-thirds or more of the people in the positions most familiar with the governance structure agree that it accomplishes the division’s goals and business. But they are not as likely to agree (54 to 70 percent) that the governance structure is diverse in terms of ethnicity and gender; in particular, fewer than half of minority respondents agree (there are no differences by gender).

Census respondents sent mixed messages about communication from the governance staff and NCAA national office. Two-thirds or more of respondents in positions that have regular communication with the national office about legislative or governance matters agreed that they do so effectively. Yet agreement that there is an appropriate amount of communication before and after meetings was lukewarm – from 47 percent of conference staff to 66 percent of FARs. Nevertheless, two-thirds or more of all groups most involved in the governance process agree that they know where to locate information on the work of the Division II governance structure. In addition, there is broad agreement among all involved groups that the educational resources provided by the Division II staff (Q&A document, etc.) help in understanding legislative proposals. Indeed, groups involved in the legislative process strongly agree that they have little trouble understanding the intent of legislative proposals (lowest agreement was 73 percent among presidents and chancellors).

There is little support for changing major provisions of the Division II legislative process. Across most of the groups that are most involved in the process (i.e., presidents, athletics directors, compliance staff, FARs and conference staff), there was broad agreement that the following are appropriate:

- The timeline for submission of membership-sponsored proposals (65 to 81 percent agreement);
- The requirement of two active member conferences or 15 active member institutions for sponsoring proposals (75 to 88 percent);
- The one-school, one-vote model for approving proposals (90 percent or more); and
- The business session as the forum for voting (61 to 78 percent)

Respondents were less certain that the number of Convention proposals is appropriate. About three-quarters of athletics directors, FARs and compliance staff agreed with this, along with less than 60 percent of presidents and conference staff.
NCAA Convention

More than 90 percent of athletics directors and about three-quarters of presidents, FARs, compliance staff and conference staff reported that they have attended an NCAA Convention. Most groups overwhelmingly agree (84 percent or more) that attending a Convention is a good use of their time. The exception is presidents and chancellors; less than three-quarters agree, though that number rises to 85 percent among those who report attending most or all Conventions.

It’s not surprising, then, that among key institutional staff who have attended an NCAA Convention, there is a great deal of satisfaction with most aspects of the Convention. Approximately 65 to 85 percent of presidents, athletics directors, FARs, compliance staff and conference staff agree that the Convention should continue to be held in January, that the length of the Convention is appropriate and that the education sessions are valuable. Moving the business session to a day other than Saturday appealed to more than half of only one group – compliance officers – though about 40 percent of most groups were neutral on this issue.

Chancellors and Presidents Summits are held periodically either in conjunction with the Convention or as a separate meeting to address the key issues of Division II and to help determine its future direction. The summits are open only to chief executives, though the topics of discussion are more widely distributed. Not surprisingly, summits get the highest ratings from presidents; 79 percent agree that they accomplish their goal. About 60 to 70 percent of athletics directors, FARs and compliance staff also agree, but only half of conference staff believe the summits fulfill their stated purpose.

Diversity and Inclusion

Census respondents were nearly unanimous in their belief that athletics adds diversity to their campus. Ninety-five percent or more of each position group said this is “true” or “somewhat true” (top two points on a four-point scale), and three-quarters of all respondents chose the top point on this scale. Minority respondents were twice as likely as whites to say it is “somewhat untrue” or “untrue” that athletics adds diversity.

Respondents were similarly in agreement that their institution and their athletics department foster a culture of diversity and inclusion. More than 90 percent of each position group said this is “true” or “somewhat true.” While there were no differences between minority and white respondents, men saw more truth in the statement than women; the percentage of males responding that it is “true” that their athletics department or institution fosters diversity and inclusion was six points higher than the percentage of females.

Presidents and chancellors got high marks from their athletics staff for their leadership in the area of diversity and inclusion. Two-thirds or more of each position group said it is “true” (top point on scale) that their president shows leadership and promotes engagement around diversity and inclusion, including 87 percent of athletics directors. Again, there were no significant differences between majority and minority respondents, but 7 percent more men than women said this is “true.”

Census respondents were asked to indicate their level of support for programs conducted by the NCAA and Division II institutions and conferences that promote inclusion for individuals who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or questioning (LGBTQ), disabled, or from another country. In most respondent
groups, programs promoting inclusion for the disabled got the most support (77 to 87 percent “supportive” or “very supportive”), with slightly lower levels of support for programs geared toward international (72 to 81 percent) and LGBTQ (57 to 70 percent) individuals.

While two-thirds of athletics directors reported that their institution has designated a senior-level administrator for diversity and inclusion for the entire campus, nearly one-quarter said that a diversity officer has not been identified. Another 11 percent were unsure.

**Student-Athlete Advisory Committees**

According to responses from athletics directors and assistant/associate athletics directors, the vast majority of campus student-athlete advisory committees (SAACs) meet at least once a month – 86 percent meet monthly, and 4 percent meet weekly. The remaining 10 percent are evenly split between meeting once per semester and on an as-needed basis.

All respondent groups have a favorable impression of their campus SAAC. Ninety percent or more of each respondent group said it is “true” or “somewhat true” that their SAAC is organized, while about 80 percent or more said their SAAC is productive and recognized. Coaches were most likely to say these statements are “true” (the highest point on a four-point scale). At least two-thirds of each group said their SAAC is more engaged in non-athletic campus events than other student-athletes, and that their school relies on SAAC members to communicate with other student-athletes.

**Conference Involvement**

Institutional respondents were asked to evaluate their conference’s level of involvement in several key areas, and overall the conferences were rated very highly by those who have the most contact with conference staff. At least 80 percent of presidents, athletics directors, compliance staff and FARs indicated that their conferences were “involved” or “very involved” in monitoring Division II issues, managing the Conference Grant Program and providing timely governance information to member schools. Reviews were only slightly less enthusiastic (74 percent or greater) for conferences’ role in encouraging involvement in the governance process, educating members on legislative proposals and requesting feedback on the work of governance bodies. Conferences received the lowest marks for their efforts to promote professional development for staff at member schools and promoting diversity and inclusion on member campuses, though more than half of each respondent group still felt that their conference was “involved” or “very involved” in these issues (56 to 76 percent). In general, FARs and athletics directors perceived conference involvement to be slightly higher than presidents and compliance officers.

**Presidential Involvement**

A set of questions unique to presidents and chancellors was designed to gauge the level of presidential involvement in athletics-related issues at the campus, conference and division level. Slightly more than half of presidents meet with their director of athletics on a weekly basis, and another 29 percent meet monthly. Meetings with FARs are less frequent, with 35 percent of presidents meeting with their FAR monthly and 38 percent meeting quarterly. The frequency of meetings with student-athletes as a group is more evenly distributed: Roughly the same proportion (20 to 25 percent) meets with student-athletes either quarterly, biannually or annually, and another 15 percent meet monthly. Presidential attendance at campus athletic events is high,
with more than two-thirds attending most or all events, and the remainder attending at least some contests. Presidents are also engaged at the conference level: More than half reported attending all in-person conference meetings, and another third attend most of them.

NCAA Convention attendance on the part of presidents and chancellors is much more varied. While about one-third report attending all Conventions, one-quarter attend most, another quarter attend some and the remainder (19 percent) do not attend any Conventions. The frequency of Convention attendance was directly related to how much a president values the programming at the annual NCAA meeting. Almost 90 percent of chief executives who reported attending all NCAA Conventions agreed that they value the programming offered for presidents and chancellors; in contrast, just under 60 percent of those who attended some Conventions value the presidential programming.

All position groups were asked to evaluate the level of presidential involvement in setting Division II athletics policy. The two position groups that do the bulk of their work outside athletics – presidents and FARs – were least likely to say that presidents are too involved. More than 90 percent of both position groups said that presidents and chancellors have either too little or just the right amount of involvement in athletics. But even among other institutional and conference staff, at least two-thirds said the level of presidential involvement is just right.

Conclusion

This report is intended to provide a broad summary of census results in all topics covered in the survey. The results will inform the division as it works to develop its next strategic plan and provide committees information about the membership’s stance on issues related to their jurisdiction.