AGENDA

The National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division III Strategic Planning and Finance Committee

Chancellors and Presidents Room
NCAA National Office
March 23, 2016
8 a.m. to 2 p.m. Eastern Time

1. Welcome and review roster. [Supplement No. 1] (Jay Lemons)

2. Report from the November 12, 2015 teleconference. [Supplement No. 2] (Lemons)

3. Division III Strategic Plan. [Supplement No. 3] (Louise McCleary)

4. 2016 Convention Proposal No. 1 – membership dues increase. [Supplement No. 4] (Lemons)

5. Division III Budget. (McCleary)
   a. Review 2015-16 budget-to-actual. [Supplement No. 5]
   b. Future Projections. [Supplement No. 6]

6. Division III Proposed Budget Initiatives. (Gerald Young/ McCleary)
   a. Championships February 2016 report. [Supplement No. 7]
   b. Championship Budget Priority Initiatives. [Supplement No. 8]
   c. Discuss Possible Updated Future Projections. [Supplement No 9]

7. Division III Initiatives – Budget Impact.
   a. Athletic Direct Report (ADR) Institute. [Supplement Nos. 10a and 10b] (Brit Katz)
   c. 2016 Women’s Basketball Joint Championship Budget. [Supplement No. 12] (Young)

8. Division III Conference Grant Program. (Jay Jones)
   a. Review and Approval of Updated Policies and Procedures. [Supplement No. 13]
b. Referrals Related to Conference Grant Spending. [Supplement No. 14]
c. Conference Grant Funding for Association of Independents [Supplement Nos. 15a, 15b and 15c]
d. Reaffirmation or Transition of SPFC Conference Grant Review Subcommittee Members.

   a. Sportsmanship and Game Environment. [Supplement No. 16] (Jones)
   b. Diversity and Inclusion. [Supplement No. 17] (McCleary)

   a. 2016 Legislation Voting Results. [Supplement No. 18] (Jeff Myers)
   b. Playing and Practice Seasons Review. [Supplement Nos. 19a and 19b] (Eric Hartung)
   c. NCAA Board of Governors Updates. (Dan Dutcher/Lemons)
      • Composition. [Supplement No. 20]
      • Resolution on diversity. [Supplement Nos. 21a and 21b]

11. Other business. (Lemons)

12. Future meetings – June 2016 teleconference call. (Lemons)
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ACTION ITEMS

1. Legislative Items.
   - None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.
   - Allow Funding for Presidents who Serve as Athletics Direct Reports (ADRs) - Division III Conference Grant Program – Tier One [Professional Development, Education and Communication].
     (1) **Recommendation.** Approve the request to allow Tier One spending on presidents and chancellors, who also serve as the athletics direct report, to attend the NCAA Convention.
     (2) **Effective Date.** Immediate.
     (3) **Rationale.** Currently, professional development funding under Tier One is only available for ADRs on an optional basis. The policy specifically notes “vice presidents” within the ADR section. Based on recent reductions in Association-wide funding for presidential attendance at Convention, the commissioners grant subcommittee requested expanding the funding to presidents and chancellors who also serve as ADRs. The committee noted that since some member institutions do not use a vice president as the ADR, this request would allow those institutions equal access to the Tier One funding.
     (4) **Budget Impact.** September 1, 2016.
     (5) **Student-Athlete Impact.** None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

1. Minutes of June 22, 2015, teleconference. The committee approved the report from its June 22, 2015, teleconference.

2. **Budget.** The committee reviewed the final 2014-15 budget-to-actual, and the 2015-16 budget expenses through November 5, 2015. The committee noted that the 2014-15 budget has an approximate $3.4M year-end surplus. The surplus is higher than the anticipated $2.1M from championship budget saving policy changes. Under-spending in nonchampionships initiatives and more than half a million dollars in Association-wide realized investment gain led to the higher surplus. Even with the surplus, the committee reinforced its support of the membership
dues increase proposal, noting that expenses average 6 to 7 percent annually while revenue is only increasing 2.5 percent annually. Additionally, the dues increase will allow for a restoration of championships per diem ($90 to $95); the reinstatement of a host per diem and increased access for the women’s swimming and diving championship. Currently, the division is forecasted to maintain a balanced budget through 2019-20.

3. **2014-15 Conference Grant Spending Summary.** The committee noted that during 2014-15, Division III distributed a total of $2,478,140 in Strategic Initiative Grant funds to 43 conferences and the Association of Division III Independents. The distribution amount per conference ranged from $44,000 to $86,000, with an average distribution of $56,320. The conference distribution amount is annually calculated with a formula that utilizes the number of member schools within each conference. No unused funds were returned to the NCAA from conference offices this year. Sixteen (16) conferences did not use the full amount of their allocated dollars and have properly presented a plan to rollover the unused amount to use with their 2015-16 grant allocations.

The committee reviewed several requests from the Division III Commissioners Grant subcommittee and took the following actions:

a. **Referred back to the subcommittee a request to allow Tier One spending on operational expenses for Conference Rules Seminars.** Currently, Tier One funding in the area of compliance is limited to travel dollars provided to individuals within a conference to attend Regional or Conference Rules Seminars. Any grant funding for conferences to conduct the NCAA approved Conference Rules Seminars must be drawn from Tier Three funds. The commissioners subcommittee’s request contended that it is reasonable to allow conferences to use Tier One funds to cover other expenses associated with conducting the Conference Rules Seminars (e.g., meals, materials, registration, facility rental, etc.). During the committee’s discussion, it noted that this modification would be more appropriate if the change to Tier One would only be applicable to conferences hosting a Conference Rules Seminar, as well as determining a reasonable maximum funding amount that would be allowed for this purpose. The committee also noted concerns that the request didn’t protect Tier One funding for institutional member travel to the event.

b. **Denied a request to change the faculty athletics representative (FAR) to an optional requirement in Tier One of the conference grant program.** Currently, Tier One has an annual requirement to spend professional development dollars for FARs. The requested modification would have shifted the FAR requirement to an optional allowance under Tier One. The commissioners subcommittee noted that some conferences are struggling to find FARs willing or able to use the professional development dollars. In addition, it was noted that some institutions rotate their FAR designation every year or two, making it difficult and impractical to provide these professional-development dollars. The committee expressed concern that, if approved, FARs would no longer be allocated funds for professional development. Further the committee noted the division’s commitment to maintaining a high level of FAR engagement and professional development opportunities.
c. Denied a request to remove the parenthetical phrase “that handles conference finances directly” from the examples of appropriate third-party reviewers in the Third Party Review form. Currently, within the examples of appropriate third-party reviewers, an institutional member’s business office is listed with the parenthetical notation that the reviewing business office “does not handle conference finances directly.” The commissioners subcommittee’s request noted that there are several layers of administrative review required before cutting a grant check. In addition, the subcommittee noted that these arrangements have back-end checks and balances to avoid improprieties. For this reason, the subcommittee contended that the parenthetical phrasing creates an unnecessary burden to find a reviewer. To avoid fiscal impropriety, the committee noted the importance to maintain the requirement that business offices conducting the third party review cannot directly handle conference finances as noted in the parenthetical notation on the Third Party Review form. The committee further noted that there are several options beyond an institutional business office that can permissibly complete the Third Party Review form.

d. Denied the recommendation to empower the staff to assign a contractor to ascertain how grant funding was used by the Association of Division III Independents in 2014-15 and to outline appropriate Tier One and Tier Two spending allowances for 2015-16. The Association of Division III Independents is unique in that it does not have a typical conference arrangement, or a full-time commissioner. The reporting in years past had been performed by a consultant chosen by the independent institutions. Following the 2014-15 academic year, the Association of Independents failed to submit its Conference Grant Impact Form or provide any details regarding the use of the $44,088 that was distributed to its seven member institutions. In addition, the association did not submit its third-party review form by the October 15 deadline. NCAA staff attempts, via email and telephone, to contact the contractor have gone unanswered. As a result, the 2015-16 Conference Grant funds for the Association of Division III Independents have been held by the NCAA staff and not distributed to those institutions. Due to the unique situation, the staff requested that they be able to secure a contractor to submit last year’s impact and third party forms and oversee this year’s grant spending. However, the committee instead instructed the staff to inform the Association of Division III Independents that grant dollars would continue to be withheld until it submits a report for previous usage and a plan for future use. The committee noted that by withholding the conference grant, it may provide motivation for the independent institutions to hire a new contractor to manage the conference grant dollars.

4. **Athletics Direct Report Institute.** The committee reviewed the agenda for the inaugural Athletics Direct Report Institute during the 2016 NCAA Convention. Staff noted that 90 applications were received for 43 available spots.

5. **Championships Committee Report.** The committee received an overview from the September 14-15, 2015, Championships Committee report noting that there may be several action items, with a financial impact, for the March 2016 committee meeting.
6. **2016 Women’s Basketball Joint Championship.** The committee reviewed a championships budget for the 2016 Women’s basketball joint championship, noting the division has allocated $200,000 for this joint championship.

7. **Division III Initiatives.** Due to time constraints, the committee did not receive an update on the following initiatives.

   a. **Division III Identity Initiative.** The Division III Purchasing Website continues to be managed by Source One Digital. For the 2015-16 year, Division III allocated $500 to each institution, conference, and single sport conference.

   b. **360 Proof.** As 360 Proof has moved into the maintenance phase, the budget has been decreased for 2015-16 to $200,000. The last planned development project for the program is the integration of the updated NIAAA Recommended Strategies Tool. This tool will provide updates to training and other program materials, design costs and web updates.

   c. **Ethnic Minority Students to 2016 Convention.** Division III and the Office of Inclusion partnered on a pilot program to provide up to $1,860 each for 43 Division III ethnic minority students with a strong interest in athletics administration to attend the NCAA Convention and related Division III programming. In addition to the scheduled Division III programming, there will be a welcome and debrief meeting. The goal is to build a Division III pipeline in an effort to ultimately diversify the division.

   d. **Graduation Rate Report.** Staff noted that 146 institutions participated in the voluntary graduation rate reporting. To date, over 200 institutions, representing almost 50% of the membership, have participated in the program over the past six years.

   e. **Diversity and Inclusion Working Group.** The Diversity and Inclusion Working Group will have a presentation at the 2016 NCAA Convention. The working group highlighted existing diversity and inclusion programs and the importance of engaging presidents and ADRs.

   f. **Sportsmanship and Game Environment Working Group.** The working group discussed the development of a certification program to improve fan civility. In addition it discussed areas where it will need to begin securing assistance in order to create such a program. These areas include experts in online teaching technology, experts in fan behavior and experts in service-based training related to bystander intervention or conflict-resolution. The working group believes that a module-based online learning approach would be the most practical way to develop a successful program. The working group will update the membership on its progress with a presentation at the NCAA Convention.
8. **Hot Topics.** Due to time constraints, the committee did not receive an update on the following hot topics.

   a. **2016 proposed legislation.** The division will vote on ten proposals at the 2016 NCAA Convention, three governance-sponsored proposals and seven membership-sponsored proposals.

   b. **Playing and Practice Seasons review.** Based on the survey responses, the Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee agreed to include the following items, as topics of discussion, during the 2016 Convention Issue Forum.

      (1) Standardization of contest exemptions across all sports.

      (2) Establishing limitations in the traditional segment, which may include the following:

          - Limitations on weekday contests.
          - Setting a standard date prior to which no fall preseason activities may occur.
          - Reducing contests or establishing a two-period model in baseball and softball.

      (3) Reducing of modifying the nontraditional segment, which may include:

          - Reducing nontraditional segment practice opportunities.
          - Replacing the existing nontraditional segment with skill instruction and/or strength and conditioning opportunities.

   c. **NCAA Board of Governors composition review.** The NCAA Board of Governors will hold a session during the 2016 NCAA Convention to gather input from the membership on its composition.

9. **Future Meetings.** The Strategic Planning and Finance Committee will hold its in-person meeting Wednesday, March 23 from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. at the NCAA national office.

10. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 10:59 a.m.

   *Committee Chair:  Jay Lemons, Susquehanna University*

   *Staff Liaisons:  Jeff O’Barr, Accounting  
   Dan Dutcher, Division III Governance  
   Eric Hartung, Research  
   Jay Jones, Division III Governance  
   Louise McCleary, Division III Governance  
   Jeff Myers, Academic and Membership Affairs*
November 12, 2015
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Division III Strategic Plan

2015-17 Budget Biennium  [Year 1: 2015-16]

Vision Statement: Division III will be a dynamic and engaging group of colleges, universities and conferences of varying sizes and missions committed to an environment that encourages and supports diversity, values, fairness, and equity, and places the highest priority on the overall educational experience of its student-athletes in the conduct of intercollegiate athletics.
INTRODUCTION

The Division III strategic plan serves many purposes. It begins with the Division III Philosophy Statement to establish the framework from which the division’s programs, resource allocations, and regulatory decisions are made. It highlights the Division III Strategic Positioning Platform to clarify the practical impact of the Division III philosophy and summarizes the division’s strategic priorities by outlining what must be accomplished in the current budget biennium for the division to be successful.

The plan also serves to highlight all of the programs and services offered for the division. This list of offerings is arranged in a way that demonstrates the connection of each Division III program to the NCAA Strategic Plan, and explains when a program or initiative is funded from Division III dollars or a different Association budget. To bring further transparency to the division’s operations, the plan justifies every line of the Division III budget against the philosophy statement or NCAA Constitution. Finally, the plan includes a note on its history, which tracks the evolution of the division’s entire strategic initiatives program.

CONTENTS

Philosophy Statement...page 3
Strategic Positioning Platform Summary...page 4
Strategic Priorities for the Budget Biennium...page 5
NCAA Goals and Related Division III Programs and Objectives...page 9
Budget Justification...page 16
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DIVISION III PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

Colleges and universities in Division III place the highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students’ academic programs. They seek to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete’s athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athlete’s educational experience, and an environment that values cultural diversity and gender equity among their student-athletes and athletics staff. To achieve this end, Division III institutions:

(a) Expect that institutional presidents and chancellors have the ultimate responsibility and final authority for the conduct of the intercollegiate athletics program at the institutional, conference and national governance levels;

(b) Place special importance on the impact of athletics on the participants rather than on the spectators and place greater emphasis on the internal constituency (e.g., students, alumni, institutional personnel) than on the general public and its entertainment needs;

(c) Shall not award financial aid to any student on the basis of athletics leadership, ability, participation or performance;

(d) Primarily focus on intercollegiate athletics as a four-year, undergraduate experience;

(e) Encourage the development of sportsmanship and positive societal attitudes in all constituents, including student-athletes, coaches, administrative personnel and spectators;

(f) Encourage participation by maximizing the number and variety of sport offerings for their students through based-based athletics programs;

(g) Assure that the actions of coaches and administrators exhibit fairness, openness and honesty in their relationships with student-athletes;

(h) Assure that athletics participants are not treated differently from other members of the student body;

(i) Assure that student-athletes are supported in their efforts to meaningfully participate in nonathletic pursuits to enhance their overall educational experience;

(j) Assure that athletics programs support the institution’s educational mission by financing, staffing and controlling the programs through the same general procedures as other departments of the institution. Further, the administration of an institution’s athletics program (e.g., hiring, compensation, professional development, certification of coaches) should be integrated into the campus culture and educational mission;

(k) Assure that athletics recruitment compiles with established institutional policies and procedures applicable to the admission process;

(l) Exercise institutional and/or conference autonomy in the establishment of initial and continuing eligibility standards for student-athletes;

(m) Assure that academic performance of student-athletes is, at a minimum, consistent with that of the general student body;

(n) Assure that admission policies for student-athletes comply with policies and procedures applicable to the general student body.

(o) Provide equitable athletics opportunities for males and females and give equal emphasis to men’s and women’s sports;

(p) Support ethnic and gender diversity for all constituents;

(q) Give primary emphasis to regional in-season competition and conference championships; and

(r) Support student-athletes in their efforts to reach high levels of athletics performance, which may include opportunities for participation in national championships, by providing all teams with adequate facilities, competent coaching and appropriate competitive opportunities.

The purpose of the NCAA is to assist its members in developing the basis for consistent, equitable competition while minimizing infringement on the freedom of individual institutions to determine their own special objectives and programs. The above statement articulates principles that represent a commitment to Division III membership and shall serve as a guide for the preparation of legislation by the division and for planning and implementation of programs by institutions and conferences.
Division III Positioning Statement

Follow your passions and discover your potential. The college experience is a time of learning and growth – a chance to follow passions and develop potential. For student-athletes in Division III, all of this happens most importantly in the classroom and through earning an academic degree. The Division III experience provides for passionate participation in a competitive athletic environment, where student-athletes push themselves to excellence and build upon their academic success with new challenges and life skills. And student-athletes are encouraged to pursue the full spectrum of opportunities available during their time in college. In this way, Division III provides an integrated environment for student-athletes to take responsibility for their own paths, follow their passions and find their potential through a comprehensive educational experience.

Division III Attributes

Proportion: Appropriate relation of academics with opportunities to pursue athletics & other passions.
Passion: Playing for the love of the game, competition, fun and self-improvement.
Responsibility: Development of accountability through personal commitment and choices.
Sportsmanship: Fair and respectful conduct toward all participants and supporters.
Citizenship: Dedication to developing responsible leaders and citizens in our communities.

Reasons to Believe

1. Comprehensive educational experience. Division III institutions develop student-athlete potential through a holistic educational approach that includes rigorous academics, competitive athletics and opportunity to pursue other interests and passions.
2. Integrated campus environment. Approximately twenty percent of all students at Division III institutions participate in athletics. Those participating in athletics are integrated into the campus culture and educational missions of their colleges or universities.
3. Academic focus. Student-athletes most often attend a college or university in Division III because of the excellent academic programs, creating a primary focus on learning and achievement of their degree.
4. Available financial aid. Three-quarters of all student-athletes in Division III receive some form of grant or non-athletic scholarship. Student-athletes have equal opportunity and access to financial aid as the general student body – but are not awarded aid based on athletics leadership, ability, performance or participation.
5. Competitive athletic programs. Student-athletes do not receive any monetary incentive (athletics scholarship) to play sports in college. They play for the love and passion of the game and to push themselves to be their best, creating an intense, competitive athletics environment for all who participate.
6. National championship opportunities. Division III has over 185,000 student-athletes competing annually in 28 Division III and nine national collegiate championships. These competitions provide an opportunity for student-athletes to compete at the highest level and fulfill their athletic potential.
7. Commitment to athletics participation. Division III institutions are committed to a broad-based program of athletics because of the educational value of participation for the student-athlete. The division has a higher number and wider variety of athletic opportunities on average than any other division in the NCAA, emphasizing both competitive men’s and women’s sports.
DIVISION III STRATEGIC PRIORITIES FOR 2015-17 BUDGET BIENNIA [Year 1: 2015-16]

1. Clarify the Values of Division III athletics.
   - Communicate the distinct Division III philosophy as articulated in the Strategic Positioning Platform.
     - Clarify the role and purpose of Division III as a conscious alternative to the sport-specialization youth culture, and as an accessible and fulfilling educational and athletics destination.
     - Distribute and discuss the Recruiting Working Group’s resource to assist institutions make recruiting more efficient and effective.
     - Emphasize a fuller, more integrated academic experience as the primary goal and consideration in all divisional endeavors.
     - Continue to communicate the Division III philosophy, attributes, and strategic plan to high school prospective student-athletes, parents and high school Admissions counselors. Enhance use of the coaches’ mobile website and other Division III social media. Enhance visibility with monthly exposure in the national high school athletic administrator e-newsletter; quarterly exposure in the NCAA Eligibility Center’s e-newsletter; and use of an Association-wide comparative divisional summary chart to serve as a recruiting resource for high school guidance counselors; athletics administrators; coaches; parents; and prospective student-athletes.
   - Support significant participation and continued growth in membership activation of Division III Identity Initiatives, specifically including Division III week.
   - Continue to grow the strategic partnership with Special Olympics. Improve the activity reporting program to better tell the partnership’s story from a division-wide perspective. Maintain the Monthly Spotlight Poll that recognizes Special Olympic events on member campuses and conference offices.
   - Add a contractor/FTE to specifically oversee and enhance the division’s communication efforts, including social media platforms and website management.

   - Support integration activities that bring together key institutional and/or conference partners to discuss ways each institution (and the conference as a group) might best support the integration of athletics within the campus environment, consistent with the division’s unique philosophy, identity and strategic positioning platform.

   - Maintain and enhance the partnership with the College Sports Information Directors Association (CoSIDA).
     - Continue to support the growth of sports information directors (SIDs) as strategic communicators, advance the messages of the Division III platform, and communicate the story of Division III at the local level. Continue to provide professional development funding and opportunities for SIDs.
     - Continue to support the Division III-specific Academic All-America program.
     - Maintain the partnership with CoSIDA in the incorporation of a one-day Division III specific workshop in conjunction with the annual CoSIDA/NACDA Convention.
     - Update the Sports Information Director resource and best practices guide for all Division III institutions and conferences as needed.
• Strengthen the advocacy of Division III faculty for the values of the athletics experience.
  o Enhance the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) Fellows Institute by offering professional development training to FARs. Further provide tools to communicate the Division III story to campus and conference peers and enhance the level of engagement of FARs across the division.
  o Provide professional development and networking opportunities for FARs at the annual NCAA Convention.

• Emphasize the values of Division III in order to effectively manage its membership growth. Partner with Divisions I and II to accomplish this membership growth management on behalf of the entire Association.

• Create and implement in-person, full-day orientation programs for new athletics directors and commissioners to assist these individuals in understanding and promoting the division.

2. Appropriately Leverage Presidential and Athletics Direct Reports Leadership in the Division III Governance Structure.

• Continue to selectively forward issues of presidential importance to the division’s presidents. Improve and pursue full conference participation in the Presidents Advisory Group and significant NCAA Convention attendance. Enhance Division III specific presidential programming at the NCAA Convention.

• Enhance communication between the NCAA and the individual overseeing athletics (Athletics Direct Reports) on campus.
  o Effectively engage and educate the athletics direct report and leverage the membership of these individuals serving in the governance structure.
  o Enhance communications with athletic direct reports. Distribute and discuss the working group’s best practices resource - “8 Tips to Improve Effectiveness”.
  o Plan and implement the inaugural ADR Institute, a day and half professional development opportunity held in conjunction with the 2016 annual convention.
  o Build external partnerships. Do not rely solely on presidents attending the NCAA Convention; send NCAA representatives to existing higher education meetings for presidents.
  o Work with the Division III Commissioners Association (D3CA) to develop and distribute best practices to enhance presidential leadership at the conference level.

3. Ensure the Division is Effectively Managing Diversity and Inclusion Issues.

• Partner with the Office of Inclusion, Student-Athlete Leadership staff and the Minority Opportunities Athletic Association (MOAA) to review the objectives and establish meaningful goals for the division’s programs supporting equity and inclusion.
  o Continue the Institute for Administrative Advancement, which provides programming for mid-level administrators of color.
  o Partner with Division III conferences and institutions to support innovative programs that promote inclusion. Maintain the monthly Diversity Spotlight that recognizes an institution or conference office’s diversity program or initiative each month.
  o Partner with the High School Federation to create a system to track the diversity of high school student-athletes.
• Establish strategies to increase and diversify the pool of candidates for Division III committee service and membership job searches.
  o In coordination with the Office of Inclusion and Student-Athlete Leadership, maintain the division’s database of all women and ethnic minorities that have participated in an NCAA program (e.g. women and ethnic minority internship; strategic matching alliance; Institute for Administrative Advancement). The database is shared with Presidents and Athletics Directors who are looking to diversify their applicant pools.
  o Continue to send out a quarterly Diversity and Inclusion newsletter.
  o Continue to promote committee service to women and ethnic minorities within the division.
  o Develop a partnership with the recently created Advocates for Athletic Equity, formerly known as the Black Coaches Association.

• Maintain an existing working group to evaluate the current diversity and inclusion landscape within Division III, evaluate current initiatives and propose next steps (e.g. resources, new initiatives, policies, etc.) to the governance structure, and to the membership at the 2016 NCAA Convention Issues Forum.

4. Enhance the Well-Being of Prospects, Student-Athletes and Staff.

• Maintain and enhance 360 Proof, a web-based, evidence-informed and free alcohol and other drug resource, for Division III and NASPA small college institutions.

• Continue to partner with the Sport Science Institute regarding health and safety issues including sexual assault prevention and/or other banned substances. Provide Division III representatives for on-going sport specific summits (e.g. soccer, wrestling, lacrosse).

• Endorse the Sportsmanship and Game Environment working group to examine Division III’s current use of the Conduct Foul Program and enhance the Division III sportsmanship and game environment initiatives. Further, to identify best practices in this area and provide tools and resources for member institutions and conferences.

• Continue to create specific programming for student-athletes attending the annual Convention to help better engage and educate them on the Division III philosophy.

5. Promote the Division III Philosophical Principle that Student-Athletes’ Academic Performance is, at a minimum, consistent with that of the General Student Body.

• Continue to sponsor a regular and representative academic reporting program to compare the academic success of student-athletes and the general student body. Continue to emphasize the academic success of Division III student-athletes as compared to other students. Continue to focus on graduation rates of teams and demographic groups that are lower than their counterparts who do not participate in intercollegiate athletics.
6. **Enhance Formal Accountability of the Governance Structure.**

- *Monitor a performance scorecard for regular accountability of key Division III programs.*
- *Monitor the formal performance metrics for the governance structure staff liaisons.*
- *Use the 2013 membership survey to help prioritize future programs, services, initiatives, policy and legislative standards.*
- Implement through Management Council Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee a two-year review of the division’s playing and practice seasons with particular attention to nontraditional segments, contest exemptions and the length of playing seasons. Deliverables include proposed models to discuss and garner feedback during the Issues Forum at the 2016 Convention and possible legislative initiatives no earlier than the 2017 Convention.
- Implement two educational videos to assist with committee service – one for committee liaisons and the other for committee members.
- Continue to monitor the enrollment and retention challenges within higher education and the unique challenges affecting the Division III membership.
- Plan and implement a Conference Rules Seminar (CRS) for the summer of 2017 in New England to provide a more regionalized compliance educational opportunity for active Division III member institutions and conferences.

7. **Maintain a Balanced Budget.**

- Develop a divisional biannual operating budget for 2015-17 and beyond that presents policy goals and program preferences that are fiscally responsible and sustainable.
- Develop legislation to increase divisional membership dues to help offset annual operating and travel championships costs.
- Develop models to address the long-term use of the budget’s surplus (beyond the mandated reserve).
- Continue to monitor championships policies such as per diem; travel party sizes; and bracket size expansion.
- Annually publish the division’s budget to maintain the highest level of transparency with the membership.
- Maintain budget transparency by utilizing the newly created budget summary facts and figures that highlights the division’s funding and budget to member institutions and conferences.
Appendix A

NCAA Association Wide Goals and Related Division III Programs and Objectives
Association Wide Goal 1: Athletics as Integral to Higher Education. Student-athletes will be better educated and prepared for increased and lifelong achievement and success.

**Objectives**
- Increase support of reform efforts that emerge from the governance structure.
- Increase the number of student-athletes who succeed academically.
- Increase opportunities for student-athletes to integrate their academic, athletics and social interests.
- Enhance the leadership role of athletics administrators and increase the role of coaches as advocates for the values of intercollegiate athletics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division III Programs and Initiatives</th>
<th>Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Resource Allocation from Division III Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference visits by Presidents Council, Management Council, Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) members and staff.</td>
<td>Improve communication between and among governance structure and membership as evidenced by a satisfaction survey.</td>
<td>Association-wide funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiatives Conference Grant Program: Tier Two Integration activities.</td>
<td>All institutions will access strategic initiative conference grant dollars over a four year period, and all conferences will optimally use the full allocation of funds each year. The integration activities should bring together key conference partners to discuss ways each school (and the conference as a group) might best support the integration concept, consistent with the division’s unique philosophy, identity and Strategic Positioning Platform.</td>
<td>$213,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Initiatives: Inform membership of policy issues, governance updates and hot topics.</td>
<td>Conference visits, quarterly presidential updates, monthly athletics updates and periodic educational columns shall be conducted or distributed on a regular schedule.</td>
<td>Overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Division III Commissioners meeting.</td>
<td>All conferences will be represented annually; commissioners will be provided with the opportunity to discuss governance issues and Division III hot topics. Additional funding is provided through Tier One of the Strategic Initiative Conference Grant Program to supplement the conference’s travel costs.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete leadership forums and campus based leadership programming.</td>
<td>At least 80 percent of eligible institutions will participate annually in DIII Student-Athlete Leadership forums, and the participating coaches and administrators will become stronger advocates for the values of Division III intercollegiate athletics.</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiatives Conference Grant Program: Tier One-Professional Development and SAAC support, Tier Two-Student-Athlete Well Being Initiatives.</td>
<td>All institutions will access strategic initiative conference grant dollars over a four year period, and all conferences will optimally use the full allocation of funds each year.</td>
<td>$831,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National SAAC Outreach.</td>
<td>Celebrate successful campus SAAC community outreach each quarter, engage in community outreach at each National SAAC meeting, and annually educate student-athletes about National Student-Athlete Day and other community initiatives. Support national SAAC’s creation of a short video highlighting the Division III student-athlete experience to be shown at annual campus compliance meetings.</td>
<td>Association-wide funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National student-athlete outreach.</td>
<td>Continue to create specific programming for student-athletes attending the annual Convention to help better engage and educate on the Division III philosophy.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate Reporting.</td>
<td>Sponsor a regular and representative graduation rate reporting program to compare student-athletes and nonstudent-athletes using data currently provided to the Association and the Department of Education.</td>
<td>Overhead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSOCIATION-WIDE GOAL 2: The Student-Athlete Experience. Student-athletes will be enriched by a collegiate athletics experience based on fair and reasonable standards and a commitment to sportsmanship.

Objectives
- Increase the applications of fairer regulations that favor student-athletes.
- Increase the opportunities for women and minorities to participate in intercollegiate athletics at all levels.
- Increase sportsmanship in intercollegiate athletics among student-athletes, coaches and fans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division III Programs and Initiatives</th>
<th>Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Resource Allocation from Division III Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women and Minority Internship Program</td>
<td>The division will assess the original goals of this program to understand its legacy and to formulate future, long term goals related to diversity of the athletics administrative and governance structures.</td>
<td>$890,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alliance Matching Grant</td>
<td>The division will assess the original goals of this program to understand its legacy and to formulate future, long term goals related to diversity of the athletics administrative and governance structures.</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiatives Conference Grant Program: Tier Two-Diversity/Gender Equity and Sportsmanship Initiatives</td>
<td>All conferences and at least 50% of institutions will engage in programming related to diversity, gender equity and sportsmanship initiatives within each four-year grant cycle.</td>
<td>$426,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nominating Committee shall annually review the NCAA’s gender and diversity audit and make personal contact with targeted groups to encourage committee service.</td>
<td>Balance membership of Division III committees to ensure the interests of all Division III constituents are represented in the governance structure.</td>
<td>Association-wide funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get in the Game Web site; Requests and Secondary Reports Online.</td>
<td>The staff will maintain an online resource to provide consistent and complete compliance information to student-athletes for the certification of eligibility process.</td>
<td>Association-wide funding; Provisional/Reclassifying Membership fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees will exercise fair decision making when making waiver and interpretive decisions.</td>
<td>Student-athletes will benefit from the receipt of more individual consideration of their issues in the waiver and interpretations process.</td>
<td>Association-wide funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Rules Seminars (national program) and Conference Rules Seminar.</td>
<td>Education sessions on Division III rules and regulations will be offered annually. The second Conference Rules Seminar was held in the summer of 2015 and the third will occur in 2017.</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules Test.</td>
<td>The Membership Committee shall annually make available a clear and fair rules test that all members can access on-line to comply with the condition and obligation of membership to administer the rules test.</td>
<td>Overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct quality championships with fair selection processes and appropriate access.</td>
<td>The Championships Committee will continually assess policies and NCAA legislation related to the championships program including the appropriateness of bracket sizes, regional alignment and select criteria processes.</td>
<td>$20,989,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA/NACWAA Institute for Administrative Advancement.</td>
<td>The division will fund professional development opportunities for female athletics administrators in a manner most accommodating to applicant individuals.</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship and Game Environment Initiatives.</td>
<td>New initiatives based on recommendations from the Division III Sportsmanship and Game Environment working group, with membership endorsement.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III Programs and Initiatives</td>
<td>Desired Outcomes</td>
<td>Division III Programs and Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine demographic trends and consider whether Division III or Association-wide programming is appropriate to affect change in the division's student-athlete demographic profile.</td>
<td>The percentage of minority individuals in the student-athlete population should be consistent with the percentage of minority individuals in the general student-body.</td>
<td>Association-wide funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference and Institutional Inclusion and Diversity programming.</td>
<td>Partner with Division III conferences and institutions to support innovative programs that promote inclusion and diversity. (e.g., the NCAA’s Institute for Administrative Advancement and the North Coast Conference’s Branch Rickey Program).</td>
<td>$231,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officiating Improvement.</td>
<td>Provide optional funding to conference offices through the Conference Grant Program and encourage support of officiating improvement.</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ASSOCIATION-WIDE GOAL 3: Informed Governance and Decision-Making.**

Member institutions and conferences will have access to data, research and best practices that assist governance and management of intercollegiate athletics.

**Objectives**
- Increase opportunities and support for chief executive officers to participate and make more informed decisions about intercollegiate athletics.
- Increase opportunities for member institutions and conferences to share best practices in support of the Association’s core values.
- Increase the number and quality of research initiatives on relevant issues to help member institutions and conferences make informed decisions.
- Increase opportunities for affiliated organizations to provide input for more informed decision-making.
- Enhance hiring practices for administrators, coaches and other athletics personnel, resulting in more inclusive leadership in intercollegiate athletics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs and Initiatives</th>
<th>Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Resource Allocation from Division III Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategically engage presidents and athletics direct reports in the Division III governance structure</td>
<td>Continue to promote greater strategic focus and more selective legislative engagement by presidents in the Division III governance structure, led by the Presidents Council in consultation with the Presidents and Chancellors Advisory Group (PAG).</td>
<td>Association-wide funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Presidential Communication.</td>
<td>The chair of the Presidents Council will reach out to all presidents on a quarterly basis via formal correspondence.</td>
<td>Association-wide funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III Governance Outreach to Affiliates.</td>
<td>Governance structure representatives will engage with affiliates on an issue-specific basis (e.g., higher education association meetings, annual sports chairs and championships committee meeting, FARA annual meeting and symposium, National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators Seminar, etc...).</td>
<td>Overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Programming at the NCAA Convention.</td>
<td>Presidential involvement at the NCAA Convention will be enhanced by presidentially-focused programming.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Best Practices for Commissioner Leadership.</td>
<td>Work with the Division III Commissioners Association (D3CA) to develop and distribute best practices to enhance presidential leadership at the conference level.</td>
<td>Overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional and Conference Self-Studies (CSSG).</td>
<td>All institutions and conferences will conduct regular reviews with active participation of campus/conference presidents. Presidential involvement shall promote an understanding of institutional control and the primary compliance role of presidents. Institutional reviews shall assess standards on recruiting, admissions, academic eligibility, student services, student-athlete profiles, personnel and a commitment to Division III philosophical priorities. Conference reviews shall include an assessment of conference alignments, values and priorities to support partnerships between conference members.</td>
<td>Overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports sponsorship and Institutional Self-Study (ISSG) audits.</td>
<td>The Membership Committee shall annually review member compliance with sports sponsorship requirements and completed Institutional Self-Study instruments to assess compliance with membership criteria and assess educational needs of the membership. Members placed on probation shall be required to complete an athletics program assessment.</td>
<td>Provisional/Reclassifying membership fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing and Practices Seasons Comprehensive Review.</td>
<td>Implement through Management and Presidents Councils a two-year review of the division’s playing and practice seasons with particular attention to nontraditional segments, contest exemptions and the length of playing seasons. Deliverables include proposed models to discuss and garner feedback during the Issues Forum at the 2016 Convention and possible legislative initiatives no earlier than the 2017 Convention.</td>
<td>Overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360 Proof.</td>
<td>Maintain and enhance 360 Proof, a web-based, evidence-informed and free alcohol and</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continually monitor Division III membership size and related access to championship and other services. The governance structure shall analyze data and collect feedback from institutions to continually develop a growth management strategy for Division III.

**Athletics Direct Report (ADR) Institute.** Conduct an inaugural ADR Institute in 2016 in conjunction with the annual NCAA Convention. For Division III member institutions that have an ADR reporting structure, ADRs should be consulted for input on key institutional and conference operational and strategic issues facing the athletics program. The Institute will allow for an intentional level of engagement and professional development to assist ADRs in overseeing and managing the athletics department on campus.

**Financial Aid Reporting Process.** All institutions will participate in the data-driven reporting process. Greater availability of historical data shall enable increased emphasis on institutional accountability (i.e., enforcement and penalties).

**Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) Fellows Institute.** Conduct a FAR Fellows institute to offer professional development training to and provide FARs with tools to communicate the Division III story to their campus peers and enhance the level of engagement of FARs across the division.

**Strategic Initiative Conference Grant Program: Tier IV – Third Party Review.** Continue to provide assistance for conference offices to provide documentation of a third-party external review of grant fund usage to the national office annually.

**Programming at the NCAA Convention.** Continue to create specific programming for delegates attending the annual Convention (e.g. educational sessions, Issues Forum, and technology to support all sessions) to help better engage and educate the membership.
ASSOCIATION-WIDE GOAL 4: Effective National Office Administration.
The National Office will be operated in an accountable, efficient manner.

Objectives
- Increase partnership with the membership. Better define the national office’s role.
- Increase flexibility, responsiveness and efficiency of interpretations, enforcement and appeals processes.
- Increase the timeliness, clarity, conciseness and effectiveness of membership communication.
- Increase use of technology to improve the effectiveness and efficiencies of Association processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs and Initiatives</th>
<th>Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Resource Allocation from Division III Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement use of available technology to regularly deliver NCAA messages and rules education.</td>
<td>The governance structure will continually assess common needs and available technologies to increase the timeliness, clarity, conciseness and effectiveness of membership communication.</td>
<td>Overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership with National Association of Division III Athletics Administrators.</td>
<td>The governance structure will provide financial support to the NADIII AA. National office staff will support this membership-led organization in its professional development offerings.</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate the membership on the role of the NCAA national office.</td>
<td>Increase membership understanding of the role of the national office by including this information in governance presentations made at Leadership Conferences, Regional Seminars, conference meetings, and other appropriate venues.</td>
<td>Overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Contact program.</td>
<td>Continue to service all conferences and ensure new conferences are accommodated according to program guidelines.</td>
<td>Overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiative Conference Grant Program: Tier Three - Technology Grants.</td>
<td>Provide funding to conferences offices to upgrade or maintain technical capabilities to access technical platforms used by the NCAA.</td>
<td>$586,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New orientation programs to support athletics directors and commissioners.</td>
<td>Create in-person, orientation programs for new athletics directors and commissioners to assist with the knowledge, resources and philosophy of the division.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSOCIATION-WIDE GOAL 5: Perceptions of the Association and Intercollegiate Athletics.
The public will gain a greater understanding of and confidence in the integrity of intercollegiate athletics and will more readily support its values.

Objectives
- Increase awareness of and advocacy for the positive values of intercollegiate athletics among the media and the public and within the membership.
- Increase the public's confidence in the Association as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs and Initiatives</th>
<th>Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Resource Allocation from Division III Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiative Conference Grant Program: Tier Three-Promotions/Marketing/Division III Identity.</td>
<td>Increase opportunities for promotion and marketing efforts on behalf of Division III institutions and conferences, consistent with the messages of the Strategic Positioning Platform.</td>
<td>$272,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III Identity Initiative.</td>
<td>Clarify and promote the unique Division III philosophy as articulated in the Division’s Strategic Positioning Platform. Enable conferences and institutions to better tell the Division III story to a variety of target audiences. Support the following identity activation initiatives: Division III week, and mobile web site for coaches, national and customizable videos.</td>
<td>$446,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Olympics Partnership.</td>
<td>Continue to grow the strategic partnership with Special Olympics. Maintain Special Olympics events as a signature element of the Division III championships program and continue to encourage campus and conference engagement with local Special Olympics chapters.</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic All-America Partnership with CoSIDA.</td>
<td>Promote academic success of Division III student-athletes through financial support of a Division III Academic All-America Program.</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiative Conference Grant Program: Tier One - Professional development support for Sports Information Directors (SIDs).</td>
<td>Continue to identify new ways to support the growth of SIDs as strategic communicators, advance the messages of the Division III platform, and communicate the story of Division III at the local level. Offer professional development support through the Conference Grant Program, and position support through the Strategic Alliance Matching Grant and Internship Program.</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Division III Budget Justification
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected NCAA Division III 2015-16 Budget Breakdown</th>
<th>Division III Philosophy Statement and Constitutional Principles Justifying Funded Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III 3.18% Revenue分配</td>
<td>$29,670,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Championships Expense (excluding overhead)</td>
<td>$20,989,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiative Conference Grant Program</td>
<td>$2,541,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAD3AA Partnership</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Commissioners/SID Meeting</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Rules Seminar Association-wide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACWAA Enhancement Grants</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division-wide Sportsmanship Initiative</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alliance Matching Grant</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women &amp; Minority Intern Program</td>
<td>$890,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Athlete Leadership Forum</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Based Student-Athlete Leadership Programming</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360 Proof</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR Fellows Institute</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support student-athletes in their efforts to reach high levels of athletics performance, which may include opportunities for participation in national championships, by providing all teams with adequate facilities, competent coaching and appropriate competitive opportunities. (Division III Philosophy Statement – section r)

Place special importance on the impact of athletics on the participants rather than on the spectators and place greater emphasis on the internal constituency (e.g., students, alumni, institutional personnel) than on the general public and its entertainment needs; (Bylaw 20.11-(b))

The purpose of the NCAA is to assist its members in developing the basis for consistent, equitable competition while minimizing infringement on the freedom of individual institutions to determine their own special objectives and programs. (Bylaw 20.11)

The Association shall assist the institution in its efforts to achieve full compliance with all rules and regulations and shall afford the institution, its staff and student-athletes fair procedures in the consideration of an identified or alleged failure in compliance. (Constitution 2.8.2)

Support ethnic and gender diversity for all constituents; (Bylaw 20.11-(p))

Encourage the development of sportsmanship and positive societal attitudes in all constituents, including student-athletes, coaches, administrative personnel and spectators; (Bylaw 20.11-(e))

Support ethnic and gender diversity for all constituents; (Bylaw 20.11-(p))

Seek to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete's athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athlete's educational experience, and in which coaches play a significant role as educators. (Bylaw 20.11)

Seek to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete's athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athlete's educational experience, and in which coaches play a significant role as educators. (Bylaw 20.11) Funding may be used for professional development workshops for staff and administrators; SAAC retreats, meetings and workshops; student-athlete leadership academies; and teambuilding workshops for athletic teams and staffs.

Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be conducted in a manner designed to protect and enhance the physical and educational well-being of student-athletes. (Constitution 2.2)

Colleges and universities in Division III place highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students' academic programs. They seek to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete's athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athlete's educational experience (preamble to philosophy statement)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses, continued:</th>
<th>Division III Philosophy Statement and Constitutional Principles Justifying Funded Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division III Academic All-America (CoSIDA) $44,000</td>
<td>Colleges and universities in Division III place highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students’ academic program (preamble to philosophy statement).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Working Groups/Task Forces $21,000</td>
<td>This initiative exists to provide opportunities for working groups/tasks forces in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Initiatives $446,000</td>
<td>This initiative is reflective of the entire Division III Philosophy Statement (Bylaw 20.11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Olympics Partnership $35,000</td>
<td>Institutions seek to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete’s athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athlete’s educational experience (preamble to philosophy statement).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion and Diversity Partnership $231,000</td>
<td>Support ethnic and gender diversity for all constituents; (Bylaw 20.11-(l))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III Financial Recovery Insurance (event cancelation coverage) * $55,000</td>
<td>Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be administered in keeping with prudent management and fiscal practices to assure the financial stability necessary for providing student-athletes with adequate opportunities for athletics competition as an integral part of a quality educational experience. (Constitution 2.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Grad Rate Reporting Stipend $25,000</td>
<td>Honorarium for institutions that submit data for the voluntary graduation rate reporting program to compare student-athletes and nonstudent-athletes using data currently provided to the Association and the Department of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention Programming including specific student-athlete programs $70,000</td>
<td>Continue to create specific programming for student-athletes attending the annual Convention to help better engage and educate on the Division III philosophy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Direct Report (ADR) Institute $80,000</td>
<td>Conduct an inaugural ADR Institute in 2016 in conjunction with the annual NCAA Convention. For Division III member institutions that have an ADR reporting structure, ADRs should be consulted for input on key institutional and conference operational and strategic issues facing the athletics program. The Institute will allow for an intentional level of engagement and professional development to assist ADRs in overseeing and managing the athletics department on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Athletics Director Orientation $45,000</td>
<td>Create in-person, orientation programs for new athletics directors to assist with the knowledge, resources and philosophy of the division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Commissioner Orientation $5,000</td>
<td>Create in-person, orientation programs for new commissioners to assist with the knowledge, resources and philosophy of the division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Division III Initiatives $10,000</td>
<td>This includes contracting costs, as well as money earmarked to support future initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Allocation (including National Office staffing) ** $1,290,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Division III Expenses $28,267,000

* The $5 million event cancellation insurance protects the budget in case of a catastrophic event that would reduce or eliminate, for one year, the division’s share of association wide revenue.

** The $1,283,000 overhead fee covers time and miscellaneous expenses related to Division III staff and programs.
Appendix C

History of the

Division III Strategic Plan
The original Division III strategic plan was unveiled in 1998 as the division embarked on its new federated structure. The Division III Management Council Strategic Planning Subcommittee developed the framework for the plan with broad participation of the Presidents Council, Division III and Association-wide committee structure, and the Division III membership. The 2004 version of the Division III Strategic Plan was developed by a joint subcommittee of the Management and Presidents Councils consistent with the Association-wide Strategic Plan adopted by the NCAA Executive Committee in April, 2004. The 2004 plan contained many of the existing initiatives and priorities to ensure that the programs and results remain consistent with Division III objectives. However, significant changes occurred as the 2005 and 2006 plans linked the relationship to the Division III philosophy with each Association-wide goal and outlined a series of outcome measures for each goal. Another significant change occurred in 2006-07 as the Division III Strategic Initiatives Grant Program resources were funneled directly to Division III Conferences and the Association of Independents. With this change, many strategic initiatives previously administered at the NCAA national office moved to the local control of conferences and institutions. The localized program encourages collaboration and involvement of all Division III constituent group representatives in the planning, decision-making and accountability of programming and funding to achieve the goals established in the Division's Strategic Plan. Presidential oversight and accountability with the process and budget allocations, consistent with the legislated leadership role of presidents within conference governance, is paramount.

In 2008-09, the strategic plan underwent a format change to create a forward looking document that highlights the goals and expectations of a budget biennium. Much of the reporting done in previous plans was moved into a Division III Annual Report, and standard committee operations are now reflected in each committee's policy and procedure guide (available on each committee's home page on ncaa.org). The plan clearly articulates the division's funding priorities, and explains when an initiative is funded by Division III, and when it is funded by a broader Association-wide budget. The plan also includes an appendix to show the philosophical or constitutional justification for all programs funded with Division III dollars.

In 2009-10, the plan was updated to highlight the division’s near-term strategic priorities. Most 2009-10 priorities resulted from a series of presidentially authored white papers on membership growth published in September 2008. For 2010-12, the plan was updated based on the Division’s release of a Strategic Positioning Platform, and clearly defined the near- and medium-term goals the division needed to accomplish to be successful in embodying the platform.

For 2012-15, the plan was updated to reflect the Association’s move to a three-year budget cycle.

With the 2015-17 budget, the plan returns to a two-year budget cycle and emphasizes budget accountability and management to address recent championships budget overages.
### NCAA Division III Proposal No. 2016-1 - NCAA MEMBERSHIP -- DUES OF MEMBERS -- CURRENT ANNUAL DUES -- MEMBERSHIP DUES INCREASE

**Intent:** To establish membership dues as $2,000 for an active institution ($1,100 increase) and $1,000 for member conference offices ($550 increase).

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Strategic Planning and Finance Committee)].

**Effective Date:** September 1, 2017.

**Rationale:** At the 2015 NCAA Convention Issues Forum, the Division III membership indicated significant support for a membership dues increase, provided Division III would retain all additional generated revenue. Membership dues have not increased since 1985. The proposed membership dues increase would be used to offset rising championships travel cost, which are anticipated to result in a budget deficit for the division in coming years.
### Revenue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division III 3.18% Revenue Allocation</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>26,342,000</td>
<td>28,358,306</td>
<td>27,117,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses:</td>
<td>26,342,000</td>
<td>28,358,306</td>
<td>27,117,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenses:

#### Men's Championships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championship Expenses</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>1,821,330</td>
<td>1,970,795</td>
<td>1,825,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>874,810</td>
<td>(180,602)</td>
<td>519,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>569,530</td>
<td>334,918</td>
<td>519,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>1,625,070</td>
<td>1,928,733</td>
<td>1,747,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>512,840</td>
<td>543,997</td>
<td>523,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey</td>
<td>349,090</td>
<td>338,285</td>
<td>303,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
<td>493,280</td>
<td>524,809</td>
<td>431,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>1,143,870</td>
<td>1,129,597</td>
<td>1,088,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>544,160</td>
<td>524,266</td>
<td>496,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>575,220</td>
<td>619,432</td>
<td>592,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track, Indoor</td>
<td>478,050</td>
<td>539,928</td>
<td>546,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track, Outdoor</td>
<td>716,650</td>
<td>763,261</td>
<td>744,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>252,320</td>
<td>164,503</td>
<td>164,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>312,720</td>
<td>387,001</td>
<td>367,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Championship Other</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>4,074</td>
<td>624,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Men's Championships</td>
<td>10,283,940</td>
<td>11,047,010</td>
<td>10,225,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Women's Championships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championship Expenses</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>988,640</td>
<td>1,339,458</td>
<td>1,250,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>543,870</td>
<td>547,004</td>
<td>538,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>429,240</td>
<td>453,284</td>
<td>416,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>287,580</td>
<td>320,498</td>
<td>311,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey</td>
<td>268,040</td>
<td>262,224</td>
<td>273,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
<td>699,690</td>
<td>770,838</td>
<td>686,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>399,400</td>
<td>302,151</td>
<td>294,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>1,226,270</td>
<td>1,307,956</td>
<td>1,182,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>1,809,920</td>
<td>1,504,278</td>
<td>1,369,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>550,780</td>
<td>542,952</td>
<td>508,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track, Indoor</td>
<td>479,610</td>
<td>563,337</td>
<td>592,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track, Outdoor</td>
<td>752,750</td>
<td>794,328</td>
<td>778,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>991,730</td>
<td>1,099,244</td>
<td>963,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Championship Other</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>4,074</td>
<td>647,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Women's Championships</td>
<td>10,090,290</td>
<td>10,361,646</td>
<td>9,785,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Championship Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></td>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiative Conference Grants</td>
<td>2,490,900</td>
<td>2,482,953</td>
<td>7,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Division III Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>820,000</td>
<td>820,642</td>
<td>(642)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alliance Matching Grant</td>
<td>670,000</td>
<td>542,746</td>
<td>127,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III Identity Program</td>
<td>600,500</td>
<td>401,539</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Athlete Leadership Conference</td>
<td>356,000</td>
<td>342,555</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIII Diversity Initiatives</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360 Proof (formerly Drug Education and Research)</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>637,349</td>
<td>(257,349)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR Institute</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>71,410</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-based Student-Athlete Leadership Programs</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>65,653</td>
<td>14,347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Division III Projected Unallocated Funds** | 16,487,353 | 9,152,486 | 7,334,867 | 16,487,353 | 9,152,486 | 7,334,867 | 16,487,353 | 9,152,486 | 7,334,867 |

**Total Division III Expenses** | 28,063,280 | 28,727,905 | (664,625) | 12,831,238 | 27,459,400 | 26,293,076 | 29,699 | 26,293,076 | 28,000,000 | 11,033,339 | 17,233,661 |

**Excess Revenue over Expense** | (1,721,280) | (369,599) | - | (342,400) | 3,446,694 | 276,863 | 3,446,694 | 276,863 | 3,446,694 | (3,291,913) |

**Additional Spring In-Person SAAC Meeting** | 35,000 | 20,877 | 123 | 8,880 | 21,000 | 24,205 | 3,425 | 21,000 | 6,811 | 14,189 |

**Conference Commissioners Meeting** | 15,000 | 19,136 | (4,136) | 2,453 | 15,000 | 12,257 | 2,743 | 1,162 | 20,000 | - | 20,000 |

**Division-wide Sportsmanship Initiative** | 15,000 | 17,500 | (2,500) | 10,250 | 15,000 | 13,250 | 1,750 | - | 50,000 | - | 50,000 |

**CoSIDA Partnership** | 44,000 | 43,061 | - | 939 | 44,000 | 39,500 | 4,500 | 39,500 | 44,000 | 39,500 | 4,500 |

**Special Olympics Partnership** | 50,000 | 28,000 | 22,000 | 29,133 | 35,000 | 28,000 | 7,000 | 27,439 | 35,000 | 31,439 | 3,561 |

**SWA Enhancement Grant Program (NACWAA/HERS)** | 26,000 | 28,667 | (2,667) | 2,517 | 26,000 | 29,699 | (3,699) | 6 | 28,000 | 1,200 | 26,800 |

**Academic Reporting Honorarium** | 25,000 | 24,797 | - | 203 | 25,000 | 24,208 | 792 | - | 25,000 | 24,282 | 718 |

**Other Working Groups** | 21,000 | 20,877 | 123 | 8,880 | 21,000 | 24,435 | (3,435) | - | 21,000 | 6,811 | 14,189 |

**Conference Commissioners Meeting** | 15,000 | 19,136 | (4,136) | 2,453 | 15,000 | 12,257 | 2,743 | 1,162 | 20,000 | - | 20,000 |

**Additional Spring In-Person SAAC Meeting** | 35,000 | 12,316 | 22,684 | 982 | 35,000 | 18,184 | 6,811 | 2,743 | 20,000 | - | 20,000 |

**Miscellaneous Division III Initiatives** | 25,000 | 24,797 | - | 203 | 25,000 | 24,208 | 792 | - | 25,000 | 24,282 | 718 |

**Sickle Cell Trait Testing Reimbursement Program** | 220,000 | 8,271 | 211,729 | 6,575 | 220,000 | 8,271 | 211,729 | 6,575 | - | - | - |

**Exemplary/Provisional Membership** | 2,789 | 3,789 | (3,789) | 3,642 | 2,789 | 3,789 | (3,789) | 3,642 | - | - | - |

**Non-Championships Expense** | 6,203,400 | 5,833,599 | 369,801 | 4,966,646 | 6,203,400 | 5,379,107 | 824,293 | 4,354,644 | 5,988,000 | 4,473,988 | 1,514,012 |

**Overhead Allocation** | 1,064,100 | 1,064,100 | - | 532,050 | 920,000 | 920,000 | - | 460,000 | 957,000 | 478,500 | 478,500 |

**Total Non-Championships Expenses** | 7,267,500 | 6,897,699 | 369,801 | 5,498,696 | 7,123,400 | 6,299,107 | 824,293 | 4,354,644 | 6,945,000 | 4,952,488 | 1,992,512 |

**Total Division III Expenses** | 28,063,280 | 28,727,905 | (664,625) | 12,831,238 | 27,459,400 | 26,293,076 | 29,699 | 26,293,076 | 28,000,000 | 11,033,339 | 17,233,661 |
Scenario 1 - Per diems and swim equity

Assumptions:
- Game Operations increases by X% each fiscal year based on FY2010-11 thru FY2014-15 average increases.
- Committee expenses increase by X% each fiscal year based on FY2010-11 thru FY2014-15 average increases.
- Team Transportation increases by X% each fiscal year based on cost per traveler analysis for FY2009-10 thru FY2014-15.
- $1,100 membership dues increase for institutions and $550 increase for conferences in 2017-18.
- Beginning in FY2017-18, only increase non-championships budget every two years.

Potential Add-backs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Implement?</th>
<th>Value of Change</th>
<th>Implementation Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(65,196)</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(354,000)</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(86,000)</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(321,000)</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(354,000)</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(53,000)</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplement No. 6

**Division III Budget Projections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division III 3.18% Revenue Allocation (Note 1)</td>
<td>$29,639,760</td>
<td>$29,677,760</td>
<td>$30,389,760</td>
<td>$31,102,760</td>
<td>$31,849,760</td>
<td>$32,630,760</td>
<td>$33,413,760</td>
<td>$34,102,760</td>
<td>$34,253,760</td>
<td>$34,311,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Revenue from Membership Dues Increase</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III Other Revenue</td>
<td>$100,010</td>
<td>$98,510</td>
<td>$74,135</td>
<td>$46,250</td>
<td>$46,250</td>
<td>$46,250</td>
<td>$46,250</td>
<td>$46,250</td>
<td>$46,250</td>
<td>$46,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue:</td>
<td>$30,350,770</td>
<td>$30,755,760</td>
<td>$31,095,905</td>
<td>$31,612,265</td>
<td>$31,840,825</td>
<td>$32,668,235</td>
<td>$33,303,585</td>
<td>$33,661,785</td>
<td>$34,062,760</td>
<td>$34,333,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Championships Game Operations</td>
<td>$4,134,762</td>
<td>$4,060,762</td>
<td>$4,043,762</td>
<td>$4,012,762</td>
<td>$4,012,762</td>
<td>$4,012,762</td>
<td>$4,012,762</td>
<td>$4,012,762</td>
<td>$4,012,762</td>
<td>$4,012,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Championships Committee</td>
<td>$309,635</td>
<td>$309,635</td>
<td>$309,635</td>
<td>$309,635</td>
<td>$309,635</td>
<td>$309,635</td>
<td>$309,635</td>
<td>$309,635</td>
<td>$309,635</td>
<td>$309,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Championships Per Diem 1</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Championships Overhead Allocation</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses:</td>
<td>$18,993,069</td>
<td>$19,145,069</td>
<td>$19,335,093</td>
<td>$19,535,093</td>
<td>$19,735,093</td>
<td>$19,935,093</td>
<td>$20,135,093</td>
<td>$20,335,093</td>
<td>$20,535,093</td>
<td>$20,735,093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Division III Expenses | $26,393,062 | $26,555,062 | $26,715,092 | $26,875,092 | $27,035,092 | $27,195,092 | $27,355,092 | $27,515,092 | $27,675,092 | $27,835,092 |

| Net Change in Fund Balance | $3,466,694 | $3,466,694 | $3,466,694 | $3,466,694 | $3,466,694 | $3,466,694 | $3,466,694 | $3,466,694 | $3,466,694 | $3,466,694 |

| Projected Expense Increase | -8.5% | -7.5% | -6.5% | -5.5% | -4.5% | -3.5% | -2.5% | -1.5% | -0.5% | 0.0% |

Notes:
1. Mandated reserve is 50% of the annual DIll revenue allocation, including $5MM insurance policy coverage beginning in fiscal year 2014-15.
2. Committee expenses increase by X% each fiscal year based on FY2010-11 thru FY2014-15 average increases.
3. Team Transportation increases by X% each fiscal year based on cost per traveler analysis for FY2009-10 thru FY2014-15.
4. $1,100 membership dues increase for institutions and $550 increase for conferences in 2017-18.
5. Beginning in FY2017-18, only increase non-championships budget every two years.
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REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION III CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 9-10, 2016, MEETING

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative items.
   - None.

2. Nonlegislative item.
   a. Bracket size and championship administrative changes.
      (1) Recommendation. That the following changes to bracket sizes and championship
          administration be adopted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Basketball</td>
<td>Increase bracket – 62 to 64 teams</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Golf</td>
<td>Increase bracket – 41 to 42 teams</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Golf</td>
<td>Increase bracket – 21 to 22 teams</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Ice Hockey</td>
<td>Increase bracket – 11 to 12 teams</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Lacrosse</td>
<td>Increase bracket – 32 to 34 teams</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Soccer</td>
<td>Increase bracket – 61 to 62 teams</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>$36,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Volleyball</td>
<td>Increase bracket – 10 to 12 teams</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>Add super regional round</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>Provide per diem for additional</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>$11,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>day at joint championship</td>
<td></td>
<td>(one-time only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>Increase host stipend by for two-</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>day meet in large regions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>Select full teams for at-large</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>positions (vs. single boats)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>Add two committee members to</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>$6,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>match number of regions (six)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Provide stipend to championship</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>officials coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Effective date. Various as noted in chart above.

(3) Rationale. The requests for bracket increases are a result of increased sport
      sponsorship and a commitment to maintaining the 1:6.5 access ratio for team sports.
      Although the increase in sport sponsorship for some sports would yield a higher
number (e.g., 35 for men’s lacrosse and 23 for women’s golf), the committee remains committed to the principle of increasing brackets to even numbers. For men’s soccer, the recommendation to increase to 62 teams also brings stand-alone first-round games to the same site as second-round play where one team, typically the host team, has a bye. The committee also discussed the rapid increase in sport sponsorship in men’s lacrosse and men’s volleyball. Although the Championships Committee did not support the preferred formats the sports committees presented, those formats will be discussed again when bracket expansion is considered in the future.

The committee also supported a change to the baseball championship format to add a round of super regional competition. With 16 nonpredetermined, on-campus regional sites compared to eight predetermined sites in the current model, the format will create shorter regional tournaments, allow teams to travel shorter distances to a competition site, and alleviate missed class time or conflicts with final exams. From a hosting perspective, preliminary rounds occur at a busy time, often conflicting with graduation, and hosts will be better equipped to manage issues (e.g., hotel availability, weather delays) with shorter tournaments and fewer teams. The championship selection date will remain the same and the championship will conclude one week later (eight days after Memorial day.

In field hockey, the 2017 joint championship with Division I and Division II was approved with a host assignment in 2013. This recommendation outlines the budget support needed to accommodate an additional day of per diem for participating teams.

Finally, the committee reaffirmed its support for championship enhancements it had presented in concept last fall for wrestling, rowing and football. The summary above provides a list in priority order for these enhancements.

(4) Estimated budget impact. The budget impact is noted in the chart above.

(5) Estimated student-athlete impact. In almost all instances, the recommendations provide for expanded opportunities for student-athletes. With the remaining recommendations, the changes will enhance the championship experience for student-athletes or improve championship administration.

b. Committee meeting.

(1) Recommendation. That the Championships Committee conduct a fourth in-person meeting in 2016 to accommodate necessary work to review and approve host site recommendations for 2018-2022.

(2) Effective date. November or December 2016 (specific meeting dates to be determined).
(3) **Rationale.** The host site selection process for 2018-2022 championships is currently underway. After sport committees provide recommendations in the fall, the Championships Committee will review and approve host site selections for the four-year period, which will include as many as 88 finals sites. Due to the volume and significance of the work, the committee believes it best to conduct the business during an in-person meeting in late November or early December. The request is a one-time exception to the standard schedule of three in-person meetings in a given year.

(4) **Estimated budget impact.** $9,000 for travel, lodging, per diem, and onsite meal expense.

(5) **Estimated student-athlete impact.** None.

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.**

1. **Opening remarks and review of schedule and agenda.** The Division III Championships Committee chair facilitated introductions, reviewed the meeting schedule and highlighted key discussion items.

2. **Committee roster and liaison assignments.** The committee reviewed the committee roster and available sport liaison assignments as a result of committee turnover. As a liaison to a sport committee, Championships Committee members are expected to remain apprised of sport-specific issues and concerns. Members agreed on several changes to the sport liaison assignments.

3. **December teleconference report.** The committee reviewed and approved the December teleconference report as presented.

4. **Governance update.** NCAA governance staff reviewed the following key items with the committee: 1) Division III budget update, including impact of legislative change to increase membership dues; 2) Recent NCAA Sport Science Institute initiatives; 3) Division III identity initiatives; 4) Playing and practice seasons review; 5) Sportsmanship and Game Environment Working Group; 6) Diversity and Inclusion Working Group; and 7) Technology Users Group.

5. **NCAA Division III Management Council/Presidents Council updates.** No additional updates were provided from the recent Management Council and Presidents Council meetings.
6. **NCAA Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee update.** The SAAC liaison provided an update on behalf of the Division III SAAC from the NCAA Convention, including the launch of the “It’s On Us” campaign.

7. **Academic and membership affairs update.** NCAA staff provided updates on the following topics: 1) AMA staff assignments by sport to help with legislative issues; and 2) Highlights of Divisions I and II recent legislative discussion.

8. **Playing Rules Oversight Panel.** An NCAA playing rules staff member updated the committee on the panel’s most recent report.

9. **Proposal for Division I rules committees in football and men’s and women’s basketball.** An NCAA Division I governance staff member joined the meeting to update the group on preliminary discussion within the Division I men’s and women’s basketball and football oversight committees to formulate Division I-specific playing rules structures for those sports. Staff summarized the current rules-making structure (i.e., via the Association-wide Playing Rules Oversight Panel) along with the necessary steps to change the structure. Given the Association-wide nature of the current playing rules structure, any proposed legislative change would be a common provision and thus require a vote of all three divisions at the NCAA Convention.

10. **Championships and alliances updates.**

   - **General updates.** NCAA staff updated the committee on championships group projects and initiatives, including those related to ongoing work with broadcast partners and an alcohol sales pilot program in conjunction with the Division I Men’s and Women’s College World Series. The committee asked about greater flexibility regarding television broadcasts for preliminary-round competition (i.e., reduced or zero rights fee) and the impact of ongoing sports gambling litigation on potential hosts.

   - **Host site selection.** NCAA staff provided an overview of the timeline and process for the 2018-2022 host site selection project.

   - **Fall championships survey summary.** NCAA staff presented an overview of results from the 2015 fall championships surveys sent to participating student-athletes, coaches, administrators, tournament directors and sport committee members. Ninety-eight percent of Division III respondents indicated they were either “satisfied” or “extremely satisfied” with the championship experience in preliminary-round competition and at the finals sites. The committee discussed awards presentations across championships, specifically whether they should be standardized across sports for preliminary-round competition, and asked staff to summarize the practices by sport for a future discussion.
• **Championship access ratios by sport.** The committee reviewed a comparison of the number of championship participants to the total number of student-athletes based on 2014-15 participation rates data and championship opportunities. The summary showed that 8.6 percent of Division III male student-athletes and 11.5 percent of Division III female student-athletes have access to championships.

11. Championships budget.

• **Fall budget recap.** NCAA staff reviewed game operations, team transportation and per diem expense for the 2015 fall championships and noted that while several charges are still outstanding, there will likely be a favorable budget outcome. The committee will review final budget numbers from the 2015 fall championships during an upcoming teleconference.

• **Charter seat review.** NCAA staff reviewed results of the charter flight pilot program implemented for the fall championships. The pilot program provides a fixed ticket cost for student-athletes, staff or others affiliated with the participating team who do not fit within the reimbursable travel party size. Many of the institutions traveling by charter flight took advantage of the fixed ticket cost; as a result, the pilot program did not bear any expense in the fall. The committee will monitor the results from the winter and spring championship seasons to further evaluate the program.

• **Evaluation of championships access and bracket sizes.** The committee discussed sponsorship growth across all sports and evaluated those sports meriting an increase in bracket size according to the access ratio (see Nonlegislative Action Item No. 2-a).

• **Budget priorities and recommendations for Strategic Planning and Finance Committee.** The committee reaffirmed its position on several budget proposals that the Division III Management Council previously supported (e.g., per diem rate increase, reintroduction of host per diem, and an increase to the women’s swimming and diving field size) and prioritized four sport-specific proposals that had been supported in concept last fall (see Nonlegislative Action Item No. 2-a).

12. Sport committee reports.

a. **Baseball.**

   (1) **Automatic qualifiers.** The committee approved the following 40 conferences for automatic qualification to the 2016 Division III Baseball Championship:

   Allegheny Mountain Conference; American Southwest Conference; Capital Athletic Conference; Centennial Conference; Collegiate Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin; Colonial States Athletic Conference; Commonwealth Coast Conference; Great
Northeast Athletic Conference; Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference; Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Landmark Conference; Liberty League; Little East; Massachusetts State Collegiate Athletic Conference; Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association; Middle Atlantic Conference – Commonwealth; Middle Atlantic Conference – Freedom; Midwest Conference; Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; New England Collegiate Conference; New England Small College Athletic Conference; New England Women’s and Men’s Athletic Conference; New Jersey Athletic Conference; North Atlantic Conference; North Coast Athletic Conference; North Eastern Athletic Conference; Northern Athletics Collegiate Conference; Northwest Conference; Ohio Athletic Conference; Old Dominion Athletic Conference; Presidents’ Athletic Conference; Skyline Conference; Southern Athletic Conference; Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference; St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; State University of New York Athletic Conference; Upper Midwest Athletic Conference; USA South Athletic Conference; Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

(2) Bracket expansion to 58 teams. The committee denied the request to increase the championship bracket size by two to 58 teams. While the committee remains committed to supporting bracket expansion whenever possible, the committee was more compelled by the baseball committee’s request to change the championship format (see Nonlegislative Action Item No. 2-a). The committee indicated that it would consider bracket expansion in the future if the baseball committee submits a proposal.

(3) 2016 regional site. The committee approved that the following site serve as host for the 2016 NCAA Division III Baseball Mideast Regional:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Institution/Conference Host</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>Washington and Jefferson College</td>
<td>Washington, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Men’s basketball. See Nonlegislative Action Item No. 2-a.

c. Men’s and women’s cross country. The committee approved that Morrisville State College be moved from the Mideast Region to the Atlantic Region for cross country to align the institution with the other North Eastern Athletic Conference members.

d. Men’s golf. See Nonlegislative Action Item No. 2-a.

e. Women’s golf. See Nonlegislative Action Item No. 2-a.

f. Field hockey. See Nonlegislative Action Item No. 2-a.
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g. Men’s ice hockey.

(1) **Bracket expansion.** See Nonlegislative Action Item No. 2-a.

(2) **Nonpredetermined finals site.** The committee approved a recommendation to conduct the championship finals at a nonpredetermined site in at least one of the four years of the 2019-22 championship bid cycle. The men’s ice hockey committee will consider which year(s) to commit to a nonpredetermined finals site in conjunction with its review of submitted bids for predetermined site selection in the upcoming bid cycle. The Division III Women’s Ice Hockey Championship finals are conducted at a nonpredetermined site. Given the similar geography and nature of the sport’s fan base, a change to a format comparable to that of the women could be productive for men’s ice hockey.

h. Men’s lacrosse. See Nonlegislative Action Item No. 2-a.

i. Women’s lacrosse. The committee approved Salem, Virginia, as the host site for the 2017 and 2018 NCAA Division III Women’s Lacrosse Championships.

j. Men’s soccer. See Nonlegislative Action Item No. 2-a.

k. Men’s and women’s soccer. The committee approved that the men’s and women’s championship finals may be held at separate sites, beginning with the 2018-19 academic year. Currently, the men’s and women’s championships are held at a joint site, with finals sites selected through the conclusion of the 2017-18 academic year. The men’s and women’s soccer committees will solicit both combined and separate bids for future championships, opening up more possibilities for host sites.

l. Softball.

(1) **Bracket expansion.** The committee did not approve an increase from a 62-team bracket to a 63-team bracket in 2017 based on the 1:6.5 access ratio for championships and the sport sponsorship for softball for 2015-16. The committee will reconsider bracket expansion when sport sponsorship supports a change to an even-sized 64-team bracket.

(2) **Regional format.** The committee approved that the two three-team regional tournaments be conducted over three days rather than two in order for the number of games played per day and the rest and recovery for participating student-athletes (specifically pitchers) to resemble four-team regional tournaments. The pairings and order of games will not change. The change is effective for the 2016 championship season. If one or both of the regionals go to a third day, the additional per diem
required for officials and visiting teams (maximum $8,550) can be absorbed by the existing per diem budget.

m. **Men’s volleyball.** See Nonlegislative Action Item No. 2-a.

13. **In-region competition requirement waiver requests:** The committee approved the following in-region competition waiver requests for the 2016-17 academic year:

- **University of California, Santa Cruz** – men’s basketball, women’s basketball, women’s golf, men’s soccer, women’s soccer, men’s tennis, women’s tennis, men’s volleyball and women’s volleyball.

- **Finlandia University** – men’s soccer, women’s soccer, women’s volleyball, men’s basketball, women’s basketball, baseball, softball, football, men’s tennis and women’s tennis.

- **University of Maine-Presque Isle** – men’s soccer, women’s soccer, women’s volleyball, men’s cross country, women’s cross country, men’s golf, men’s basketball, women’s basketball, baseball and softball.

- **Mills College** – rowing, women’s soccer, women’s tennis, women’s volleyball

- **Nebraska Wesleyan University** – men’s soccer, women’s soccer, softball, men’s tennis and women’s tennis.

- **Pacific University** – rowing.

14. **2015 fall championships reports.**

- **General reports and enhancements.** The committee reviewed reports from the 2015 fall championships.

- **Web streaming metrics.** The committee reviewed the fall championships live video streaming report.

15. **Selection criteria.** The committee discussed including nonconference strength of schedule in its championships selection criteria either as primary or secondary data. Currently, sport committees do not consider that data point in the selection process. The committee took no action, but will seek feedback from sport committees, gather additional data and continue discussing the potential change in future meetings. In addition, the committee will seek feedback on the results-versus-ranked-teams proposal that the men’s and women’s soccer committees presented previously.
16. **Team trophies.** The committee did not approve a proposal that the Division III Baseball Committee submitted previously to provide a team trophy to the runner-up team at the finals site. Currently, the eight regional winners receive a team trophy, and the committee was not compelled to support the additional trophy to the runner-up team (members of the team travel party will continue to receive individual mini-trophies). The committee also noted that other sports with a similar awards format (i.e., team trophies awarded to regional winners) do not also provide a team trophy to the runner-up team at the finals site.

17. **Women’s basketball joint championship.** NCAA staff provided an update on operations and marketing plans for the 2016 Division III Women's Basketball Championship to be held jointly with Divisions I and II at Banker’s Life Fieldhouse in Indianapolis.

18. **Webstream production standards.** The committee reviewed production standards for finals site championship webstream broadcasts. Committee members noted that, for some championships (e.g., cross country), earlier contact from the production company to the finals site hosts regarding webstream capabilities and requirements can improve the production. In addition, committee members briefly discussed applying similar production standards to preliminary-round contests that are webcast but took no action.

19. **Future meetings dates and sites.** The committee reviewed dates for in-person meetings through February 2017. In addition, NCAA staff outlined an alternative to hosting the annual in-person meeting with sport committee chairs. The alternative suggests holding a meeting every other year with sport committee chairs and a “state of the sport” teleconference with sport committee members and championships committee representatives in the off-year. The committee took no action but agreed to consider the concept more thoroughly during a future teleconference. The committee also identified the need for an additional in-person meeting in late November or early December 2016 to review host site selection recommendations for 2018-2022 (see Nonlegislative Item No. 2-b).

20. **Other business.**

- **National Collegiate men's gymnastics.** The committee approved that the date formula for the National Collegiate Men's Gymnastics Championships be held the third weekend in April. This proposal will also be presented to the Division I Competition Oversight Committee and the Division II Championships Committee for approval.

*Committee Chair:* Gerald Young, Carleton College,
*Staff Liaisons:* Liz Turner Suscha, Championships and Alliances
Maureen Harty, Academic and Membership Affairs
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**Division III Championships Committee**
### February 9-10, 2016, Meeting

#### Attendees:
- Corey Borchardt, Upper Midwest Athletic Conference;
- Jennifer Chuks, Williams College; New England Small College Athletic Conference.
- Bill Stiles, Alvernia University;
- Susan Fumagalli, Gettysburg College;
- Terry Small; New Jersey Athletic Conference.
- Joe Weber, University of Texas at Dallas; American Southwest Conference.
- Gerald Young, Carleton College; Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

#### Absentees:
- Julie Johnson, Ripon College; Midwest Conference.
- Tracey Ranieri, State University of New York at Oneonta; State University of New York Athletic Conference.

#### Guests in Attendance:
- None.

#### NCAA Staff Support in Attendance:
- Maureen Harty, academic and membership affairs;
- Laura Peterson-Mlynski, championships and alliances;
- Liz Turner Suscha, championships and alliances.

#### Other NCAA Staff Members in Attendance:
- John Baldwin, championships and alliances;
- Anucha Browne, championships and alliances;
- John Bugner, championships and alliances;
- Dan Dutcher, governance;
- Jan Gentry, championships and alliances;
- Elisa Halpin, championships and alliances;
- Tracie Hitz, championships and alliances
- Will Hopkins, championships and alliances;
- Liz Horvat, championships and alliances;
- John Kuzio, championships and alliances;
- Mark Lewis, championships and alliances;
- Louise McCleary, governance;
- Jeff O’Barr, finance;
- Nancy O’Hara, championships and alliances;
- Roberta Page, championships and alliances;
- John Pfeffenberger, finance;
- Rachel Seewald, championships and alliances;
- Juanita Sheely, finance;
- Kelly Whitaker, championships and alliances;
- J.P. Williams, championships and alliances;
## Division III Championships Budget Priority Items
### February 2016 Meeting of Championships Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team¹</td>
<td>Host Per Diem @ $30</td>
<td>Prior review and support by Champs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$377,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team¹</td>
<td>Host Per Diem @ $35</td>
<td>Prior review and support by Champs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All²</td>
<td>Increase Per Diem to $95</td>
<td>Prior review and support by Champs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$367,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All²</td>
<td>Increase Per Diem to $100</td>
<td>Prior review and support by Champs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$367,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSD</td>
<td>Field Size Increase</td>
<td>Prior review and support by Champs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$86,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH³</td>
<td>2017 Joint Champs Per Diem</td>
<td>Prior support in concept by Champs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Change to Super Regional Format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBB</td>
<td>Bracket Increase from 62 to 64</td>
<td>1:6.7 ratio w/out increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGO</td>
<td>Bracket Increase from 41 to 42</td>
<td>1:7.1 ratio w/out increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIH</td>
<td>Bracket Increase from 11 to 12</td>
<td>1:6.9 ratio w/out increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA⁴</td>
<td>Bracket Increase from 32 to 34</td>
<td>1:6.7 ratio w/out increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSO⁵</td>
<td>Bracket Increase from 61 to 62</td>
<td>1:6.6 ratio w/out increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$36,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVB⁶</td>
<td>Bracket Increase from 10 to 12</td>
<td>1:7.6 ratio w/out increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB⁷</td>
<td>Revise 3-team Regional Format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGO⁸</td>
<td>Bracket Increase (by one, to 22 teams)</td>
<td>1:7.5 ratio w/out increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRE</td>
<td>Mandate 2-day Regionals as needed</td>
<td>Prior support in concept by Champs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>At-Large Teams to Full Teams</td>
<td>Prior support in concept by Champs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRE</td>
<td>Increase Committee by two</td>
<td>Prior support in concept by Champs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td>Coordinator of Officials</td>
<td>Prior support in concept by Champs Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expense by Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$141,750</td>
<td>$999,480</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$429,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Legislated access ratio for team sports is 1:6.5 (golf = 1:7.0; tennis = 1:7.5)
² Expenditure does not account for additional game sites added due to 2016-17 bracket
³ Expenditure reflects 2016-17 bracket expansions, but would increase with additional
⁴ One-time expense.
⁵ Expense for alternate option = $17,000
⁶ Expense for alternate option = $37,000
⁷ Proposed $8,550 reallocation of existing softball budget.

Revised 3/10/2016
### Updated Future Budget Projections

#### Assumptions:
- Game Operations increases by X% each fiscal year based on FY2010-11 thru FY2014-15 average increases.
- Committee expenses increase by X% each fiscal year based on FY2010-11 thru FY2014-15 average increases.
- Team Transportation increases by X% each fiscal year based on cost per traveler analysis for FY2009-10 thru FY2014-15.
- $1,100 membership dues increase for institutions and $500 increase for conferences in 2017-18.
- BI/20 Split in champs/non-champs spending beginning in 2020-21

#### Potential Add-backs:

| X1 | Maximum amount needed to fund charter pilot, if there are no buy backs, but only for 2015-16 | Yes (85,196) | 2016 |
| X2 | Increase per dam to $95 per person in 2017-18 | Yes (367,000) | 2018 |
| X3 | Increase women's swim and dive budget to equip to make access ratio in 2017-18 | Yes (86,000) | 2018 |
| X4 | Re-introduce host per dam at $30 per person in 2017-18 | Yes (377,000) | 2018 |
| X5 | Increase per dam to $100 per person in 2020-21 | Yes (367,000) | 2021 |
| X6 | Increase host per dam to $35 per person in 2020-21 | Yes (62,000) | 2021 |
| Y1 | Increase bracket for men's basketball due to sports sponsorship figures in 2016-17 | Yes (23,000) | 2017 |
| Y2 | Increase bracket for men's golf due to sports sponsorship figures in 2016-17 | Yes (8,000) | 2017 |
| Y3 | Increase bracket for men's ice hockey due to sports sponsorship figures in 2016-17 | Yes (12,000) | 2017 |
| Y4 | Increase bracket for men's tennis due to sports sponsorship figures in 2016-17 | Yes (7,000) | 2017 |
| Y5 | Increase bracket for men's soccer due to sports sponsorship figures in 2016-17 | Yes (36,705) | 2017 |
| Y6 | Increase bracket for men's volleyball due to sports sponsorship figures in 2016-17 | Yes (37,000) | 2017 |
| Y7 | Increase bracket for women's golf due to sports sponsorship figures by one team in 2016-17 | Yes (5,000) | 2017 |
| Y8 | Increase bracket for women's hockey joint championship with DI and DII in 2017 (one-time expense) | Yes (11,048) | 2018 |
| Y9 | Change men's baseball format to super region | Yes (89,000) | 2018 |
| Y10 | Change at-large teams for women's rowing to full teams | Yes (28,000) | 2018 |
| Y11 | Increase men's wrestling committee by two members to match number of regions | Yes (6,520) | 2018 |
| Y12 | Provide funding for a football coordinator of officials beginning in 2017-18 | Yes (5,000) | 2018 |
| Y13 | Mandate 2-day regions, as needed, for men's wrestling | Yes (18,000) | 2018 |

### The National Collegiate Athletic Association

#### Division III Budget Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue (Note 1)</td>
<td>$29,875,750</td>
<td>$29,875,750</td>
<td>$30,384,135</td>
<td>$31,102,760</td>
<td>$31,844,790</td>
<td>$32,630,760</td>
<td>$33,413,760</td>
<td>$34,102,760</td>
<td>$34,735,760</td>
<td>$35,413,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations to DIII</td>
<td>$159,000</td>
<td>$740,000</td>
<td>$1,165,000</td>
<td>$1,695,000</td>
<td>$2,220,000</td>
<td>$2,745,000</td>
<td>$3,270,000</td>
<td>$3,795,000</td>
<td>$4,320,000</td>
<td>$4,845,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Revenue from Membership Dues Increase</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III Other Revenue</td>
<td>$100,010</td>
<td>$98,510</td>
<td>$74,135</td>
<td>$46,250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Increase</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenses:

- **Championships Game Operations**: $4,134,762
- **Championships Committee**: $369,835
- **Championships Team Transportation**: $6,917,372
- **Championships Per Diem**: $6,117,360
- **Championships Pre-Season**: $325,000
- **Championships Pre-Season**: $325,000
- **Non-Championships Expenses**: $21,322,000
- **Non-Championships Pre-Season**: $21,322,000
- **Supplemental Non-Championship Spending from reserves**: $588,640
- **Total Division III Expenses**: $29,739,770
- **Net Change in Fund Balance**: $3,446,694
- **Actual Budget**: $26,293,076
- **Projected Budget**: $26,293,076

#### Notes:
- **Projected Expense Increase**: 8.5% 7.5% 3.7% 6.9% 2.7% 3.3% 4.1% 3.3% 2.9% 3.0%
- **Change in Fund Balance**
  - **Beginning Fund Balance (Projected Reserve and Unallocated Funds)**: $18,316,554
  - **Change in Fund Balance**: $3,446,644

- **Existing Fund Balance (Projected Reserve and Unallocated Funds)**: $21,767,298

#### Funding:

- **Event Cancellation Insurance Policy**: $5,000,000
- **Total Reserve Funding Available**: $26,001,780
- **Mandated Reserve**: $18,415,886

#### Use of Reserve:

- **Emergency Reserve**: $2,273,168
- **Financial Reserve**: $2,273,168
- **Mandated Reserve**: $2,273,168

#### Summary:

- **Percentage DI Spend - Championships**: 76% 75% 75% 26% 76% 76% 76% 76% 76% 76%
- **Percentage DI Spend - Non-Championships**: 24% 25% 25% 24% 24% 24% 24% 24% 24% 24%
2016 Evaluation

1. Please evaluate the overall institute experience

36 Well worth my time (exceptional!)
3 Just acceptable
0 Wish I would have stayed home

2. What content piece or part of the agenda do you think will be most valuable to you as an ADR?

Check all that apply:
19 DIII Philosophy (know this, but great presentation!)
16 Relationship Building
23 Athletics Budgeting
20 Student-Athlete Well-Being
19 Managing Athletics Personnel
12 Conference Office Engagement
20 NCAA Governance and Committee Service
4 Best Practice Discussions led by Moderator
4 Other (please write in): Frankly- very very worthwhile overall. It was all woven together. Networking (2),

3. What content piece or part of the agenda do you think will be least valuable to you as an ADR?

Check all that apply:
2 DIII Philosophy (we know this)
9 Relationship Building (a bit vague in presentation)
7 Athletics Budgeting (too institutionally based. With spreadsheet on drive; detail)
5 Student-Athlete Well-Being (not enough detail. Sort of knew this stuff)
4 Managing Athletics Personnel (Just didn’t need this session, but it was a good session)
6 Conference Office Engagement
4 NCAA Governance and Committee Service (could be extremely valuable for those interested in national office, though.
8 Best Practice Discussions led by Moderator
0 Other (please write in):

4. What other topics should be included in future institutes?

• More about the financial and strategic plan for DIII should DI change occur- I’d be interested in being on a planning committee for this.
• Would have liked to hear from the NCAA a little more. More best practices.
• People skills, budget skills, more sharing with each other.
• Have an opportunity to have ADs here for part of the time.
• Leadership development or build a team across campus.
• What is the definition of a successful athletic program.
• Recruitment (management with connection to enrollment). How to navigate the Convention. Perspective of student-athletes.
• Deeper dives into all topics. More success, concern stories from learners.
• Managing coaches- performance management.
• Planning, recruiting and retention.
• What threats are there to DIII sports- facility arms race? FLSA? Are there elements that are unsustainable?
• Compliance
• NCAA Compliance concepts should be included. Everyday, ADRs are being held accountable for ethical and rules violations. ADRs should understand the compliance framework and the issues that most commonly arise.
• What next… how do we change the culture. Three steps we need to do as we leave.
• Legislative process
• More about the role of the ADR and discussion on proactive things ADRs can do to help ADs, Presidents and Cabinet members.
• Instead of biography of people, maybe details of school-size, athletic programs, etc.
• Educating boards of trustees
• Specific best practices
• Coach evaluations/accountability
• Fewer topics/more time per topic.
• Compliance. Legal issues on forefront.
• Developing new sports. Engaging athletics staff with academic side of the university. Dealing with aging and/or underperforming coach.
• Itemize, if possible, roles of ADR from NCAA perspective for institutional use!
• How to manage relationship with president, especially in their roles of overseers of conference. Still not sure of mine with the conference.
Please use the following values to indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Strongly Agree</th>
<th>(2) Agree</th>
<th>(3) Neutral</th>
<th>(4) Disagree</th>
<th>(5) Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. My experience at the ADR Institute has empowered me with an understanding of best practices to oversee and manage athletics departments.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am leaving with specific ideas about how to create a triad of communication between athletics directors, presidents and ADRs as well as Faculty Athletics Representatives (FARs).</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My experience at the ADR Institute has positioned me to become a key institutional liaison to the athletics department and the student-athlete.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My experience at the ADR Institute has inspired me to get more involved in conference business.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am leaving with specific ideas that I can implement this year to more effectively support the institutional president in his or her responsibility to maintain final authority over the conduct of intercollegiate athletics.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My experience at the Institute has empowered me to build strong faculty and staff advocacy on behalf of the student-athlete and the Division III model of intercollegiate athletics.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am leaving with an awareness of NCAA postgraduate scholarships, funded programs and student-athlete well being resources.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Networking with other ADRs has enhanced my understanding of the role.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My experience at the ADR Institute has inspired me to seek involvement in the NCAA governance structure.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My experience at the ADR Institute has inspired me to attend future NCAA Conventions.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. How would you describe your experience at the Institute?

- Very proactive and helpful in terms of access to people, resources and ideas.
- Excellent! (2)
- A little too much sitting.
- Informational, Beneficial, Connectedness. Enjoyed getting to know the other ADRs. Appreciate knowing that I am not alone in the issues I face as ADR.
- Content needs to be much more substantial. More time could be spent learning from each other, rather than presenters (we can read their ideas). Workshops are better learning
from each other. Human learning works best when participants get up and move every 20 minutes.

- Great networking opportunity.
- I have already sent text messages to 5 ADRs who should attend next year.
- Very much needed, and educational!
- This was amazing. I feel very honored to be a part of this experience. This should be continued for sure!
- Very beneficial! Affirming and educational.
- I really appreciated the case studies and information networking opportunities
- Great experience- thank you! This was incredibly beneficial and I am very appreciative of the experience.
- Very nice overview. Wish we have more networking time or sense of other institutional types.
- Positive- please expand to day and a half so there’s reflection time for sharing tips, take aways and questions. Please let us know how to access the ADR listserve.
- Great- wonderful topics, great presenters. Heavy day- lots put into it.
- Engaging and thoughtful.
- Good. Networking opportunity most beneficial.
- Great networking opportunity. Very Informative.
- Positive, interactive, networking
- I was super thankful that I came and was given this opportunity.
- More discussion of campus practices.
- Very good.
- Very good access to info, new people and ideas.
- I really liked that our seating was purposeful- especially enrollment size. I appreciated the dinner the night before to begin networking. Very beneficial day.
- Very good. Needs to be 1.5 days. More details/time in some areas.
- Good experience and the ability to talk to others and hear their experiences and best practices.
- Overall great day. Lots to think about.
- It would be helpful to hear from non student affairs ADRs. CAOs or Finance ADRs have a different relationship to ADs and athletics, by basis of their role at the institution- it would be useful to provide this perspective to round out how athletics at D3 works.
- Affirming. Thought provoking.
- Very pleased to be here. This workshop is needed!
- Informative, reassuring/confirming.
- Very good!
- Great day- thank you.
- Great!
16. Other comments?

- I’d be interested in learning more about how religiously based institutions can contribute to discussions about policies and education concerning their continued involvement in the NCAA.
- I will continue my attendance at Convention. I have come for 11 years since I became ADR!
- Thanks for finally putting this together! Great job!
- Overall good, but felt rushed on many topics. Would be nice to have healthy snacks available during morning and afternoon breaks.
- President Roush’s session was excellent!
- Thank you! (5)
- Thank you for presenting the Institute and the opportunity to attend!
- Something at the beginning about confidentiality would have been good to mention as we are sharing information about our campuses.
- This has the potential to be quite beneficial to ADRs. Thank you for allowing me to attend.
- Appreciate the goal of engagement in the sessions but at times it felt difficult and obligatory. Would be helpful to have guidance as a first time Convention participant-what to expect for certain sessions.
- Great job
- Nice job in the first run of this program. Good luck with future ones- I will recommend it to fellow ADRs.
- Loved the interaction with fellow ADR peers.
- Very helpful. Very worth repeating regularly.
- A little more time to talk at our tables- we had good conversations. Good speakers- very energizing.
- Thanks for putting on!
- I didn’t find the piece on relationship building useful… maybe because I have a strong working relationship already.
- NCAA governance needs to be limited. P.S. Leah was great and President Roush’s remarks were fantastic.
- Thank you for creating and supporting my attendance! John Tumiel
- Well done! Thank you!
- Will this occur again?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th># participants</th>
<th>Budget per individual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel for participants</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
<td>$19,905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel for facilitators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging for max. 3 nights</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$175/night</td>
<td>$25,200</td>
<td>$27,956</td>
<td>hotel rate is $209/night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging for facilitators. 1 night</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$175/night</td>
<td>$875</td>
<td>$1,045</td>
<td>hotel rate is $209/night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals - Wed. dinner</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$2,880</td>
<td>$2,237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals - Thurs. breakfast</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$38.00</td>
<td>$1,824</td>
<td></td>
<td>breakfast and lunch aggregated in next line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals – Thurs. lunch</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$74.00</td>
<td>$3,552</td>
<td>$5,767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs. Reception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$720</td>
<td>$720.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$11,738</td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional 38.5 hours ($2,887.50) in previous FY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA Convention registration fee waiver</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$10,750</td>
<td>$10,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$2,529</td>
<td></td>
<td>audiovisual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,251</td>
<td>$89,801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After the NCAA Convention Division III Ethnic Minority Participant Program debrief session, on January 16, 2016, the participants filled out a brief feedback survey that included three rating questions and seven open-ended questions. Overall, 30 participants provided their input. The summary of their comments can be found below.

### OVERALL ACADEMY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="left">How helpful was the NCAA DIII Ethnic Minority Participant Pilot Program Welcome Session?</th>
<th align="left">Very Helpful</th>
<th align="left">Somewhat Helpful</th>
<th align="left">Not Helpful</th>
<th align="left">No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="left">26</td>
<td align="left">4</td>
<td align="left">0</td>
<td align="left">0</td>
<td align="left"></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="left">How informative did you find the content of the welcome binder materials?</th>
<th align="left">Very Helpful</th>
<th align="left">Somewhat Helpful</th>
<th align="left">Not Helpful</th>
<th align="left">No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="left">24</td>
<td align="left">6</td>
<td align="left">0</td>
<td align="left">0</td>
<td align="left"></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="left">How informative and/or helpful did you find the speakers?</th>
<th align="left">Very Helpful</th>
<th align="left">Somewhat Helpful</th>
<th align="left">Not Helpful</th>
<th align="left">No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="left">27</td>
<td align="left">2</td>
<td align="left">0</td>
<td align="left">1</td>
<td align="left"></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Briefly, tell us your thoughts on the selection process and the correspondence you received pre-convention:**

Overall, the response from all thirty (30) participants was positive. Many indicated that the selection process was effective and fair. There were some responses (5) that indicated there needed to be a more selective and intentional process to ensure participants were interested in a career in athletics and attended convention for the right reasons. In regards to the correspondence they received pre-convention, some (6) participants would have liked to receive more information in advance. Such information included: 1) information/bios of all mentors; 2) information/bios of all participants; 3) what types of things to bring to convention; 4) a clearer explanation of mentor and mentee expectations; 5) what to expect at convention; 6) what needed to be covered in terms of cost; and 7) descriptions of programming.

**Briefly, identify any expectations met or not met with your assigned mentor:**

While a majority of the participants noted that their expectations with their assigned mentor were met or exceeded, some provided recommendations related to receiving advanced information about their mentors. One respondent expressed an interest in having access to all mentors. Another thought a more formalized meeting between mentors and mentees would be beneficial. Some individuals also requested...
extra time to meet with mentors to discuss career aspirations, goals for convention and strengths and weaknesses.

**Briefly, identify any expectations met or not met during the Division III Ethnic Minority Participant Pilot Program:**

Many of the participants disclosed that their expectations were succeeded; one noted it was a “priceless experience,” while another said it was “beyond anything I could have expected.” The overall consensus was that they expected to meet people, to network, to further their knowledge of the NCAA and college athletics, and to understand the role of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. A number of participants (7) wished they had more time to network and meet other women and ethnic minorities. Others (3) had hoped that there could have been an open forum with NCAA staff and people from the membership to discuss issues of diversity and inclusion, and how to negate the lack of diversity within the division.

**Recommendations for future pilot programs:**

Most of the participants provided recommendations for future programs. Of those recommendations, eight (8) respondents noted that more time on the front end of the programming would have been beneficial and may have resulted in an opportunity to spend more time getting to know their mentors and other participants (5). Almost a third of the respondents (9) requested a “speed-dating” icebreaker in order for all participants to meet and get to know each other upon arrival. Several of those respondents (4) noted that a “pre-profile” of all participants should be sent out before the start of programming. Several (5) participants expressed an interest in meeting other ethnic minorities; either through an open forum on diversity and inclusion, or a reception with others within the membership. A few (3) participants also recommended there be clearer expectations for mentors and mentees leading up to convention, while a couple (2) requested more interaction and integration between National SAAC members.

**Was the information presented in a useful manner?**

A strong majority (24) of the respondents said that the information was presented in a useful manner, noting that what they received was very helpful, informative, clear and well organized. A few (3) made specific mention of the binder and the pre-convention email. One respondent requested there be a resources page with websites listed.

**Do you feel more prepared to start a career in Division III athletics?**

Of the 30 respondents, 24 felt more prepared to start a career in Division III athletics. Three respondents failed to provide a response to the question, while two said that a career in athletics is not their intended path. The majority of respondents acknowledged that the information provided has allowed them to not
only feel more confident in starting a career in Division III athletics, but has also given them a better understanding of what to expect.

General Comments:

Attendees expressed their thanks to those who put the program together, as well as the speakers involved, and their appreciation for the opportunity to attend convention. One respondent noted that this was a “life-changing experience,” and a few expressed the necessity to continue outreach with current participants and to expand the program in upcoming years. The Honors Celebration was a highlight for a few participants (3) as well.
## 2016 Ethnic Minority pilot program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th># participants</th>
<th>Budget per individual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel for participants</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
<td>$20,558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging for max. 2 nights (2 per room)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$209/night</td>
<td>$9,196</td>
<td>$10,248.42</td>
<td>hotel rate is $209/night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals - Thurs. snack (participants and mentors)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$13.69</td>
<td>$1,026.55</td>
<td>$628.20</td>
<td>snacks are $60.40 per dozen and sodas are $8.05 each, order 7 doz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals – Sat. box lunch (participants and mentors)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$3,055</td>
<td>$3,053.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$2,324.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA Convention registration fee waiver</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$975</td>
<td>$975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors tickets</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$780</td>
<td>$780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$2,135.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>audio visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,383</td>
<td>$40,704.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Institutional Travel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Total Budgeted Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airline Travel</td>
<td>$50,000 per institution (20 persons/4 teams)</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>Amount figured into per diem rate: $250 per room; 20 persons; 6 nights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem</td>
<td>$225 per person (DI rate); 6 days for winning teams (each division)</td>
<td>$108,000 $59,400 $48,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Transportation</td>
<td>$800 per bus/day; 6 days (each division)</td>
<td>$20,000 $10,000 $10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $328,000 $169,400 $158,600

### Women’s Basketball Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Total Budgeted Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$650 travel costs per committee member; 16 members</td>
<td>$10,400 $5,200 $5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem</td>
<td>$75 per day; 16 members; 6 days</td>
<td>$7,200 $3,600 $3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>$250 per night; 16 members; 5 nights</td>
<td>$20,000 $10,000 $10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $37,600 $18,800 $18,800

### Game Officials (4 per division)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Total Budgeted Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$650 travel costs per official; 4 officials (each division)</td>
<td>$5,200 $2,600 $2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Diem</td>
<td>$75 per day; 4 officials; 3 days (each division)</td>
<td>$1,800 $900 $900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>$250 per night; 4 officials; 3 nights (each division)</td>
<td>$6,000 $3,000 $3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Fees</td>
<td>$300 per official; 3 officials; $200 for standby (each division)</td>
<td>$2,200 $1,100 $1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>Hotel and/or meal at venue on game day</td>
<td>$1,000 $500 $500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $16,200 $8,100 $8,100

### Facility (estimated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Total Budgeted Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event Charges*</td>
<td>Includes all front of house needs for the day: ushers, ticket takers, security, guest services, police, EMS/ambulance, utilities, clean up, video production, halftime, etc.</td>
<td>$50,000 $25,000 $25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>In-house catering (media buffet, band, locker rooms, DI suite catering)</td>
<td>$ - $ - $ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Parking for 25-35 media/ops on site, sat truck fees would be required</td>
<td>$1,000 $500 $500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $51,000 $25,500 $25,500

### Miscellaneous

---

2/24/2016 4:31 PM
Owners: Kelsey Cermak and Kelly Whitaker
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimate 1</th>
<th>Estimate 2</th>
<th>Estimate 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Game Mgmt Expenses*</td>
<td>Basketballs, towels, floor decals, coolers, slip notts, ball racks, basketball stanchion wraps, back of house product, game apparel, etc.</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salute</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Escorts</td>
<td>Team escorts</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Hosts</td>
<td>Travel to quarterfinal/semifinal sites (both divisions)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Programs</td>
<td>Complimentary to teams in locker rooms</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branding/Décor*</td>
<td>Production of signage for team hotels/division specific signage in arena</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing*</td>
<td>Pregame fan fest in the Ober Lot</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ESTIMATE OF EVENT COSTS NOT INCLUDING TRAVEL**

**GRAND TOTAL ESTIMATE OF EVENT COSTS (including travel)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate 1</th>
<th>Estimate 2</th>
<th>Estimate 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$150,800</td>
<td>$75,400</td>
<td>$75,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$478,800</td>
<td>$244,800</td>
<td>$234,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The NCAA Division III Strategic Initiatives Conference Grant Program allocates funds to all NCAA Division III voting conferences and the Association of Division III Independents to encourage collaboration, involvement and accountability among all Division III constituent groups in support of the priorities espoused in the Division III Strategic Plan. The program offers Division III conferences and the Association of Independents the opportunity to advance Division III priorities in ways most meaningful at the local level. Presidential oversight and accountability with the process and budget allocations, consistent with the legislated leadership role of presidents within conference governance, is paramount.

**Goals of the Grant Program:**

1. Make efficient use of national resources to serve local needs and realize Division III strategic priorities.

2. Encourage broad-based strategic initiative participation and collaboration between conference constituents.
General Overview of Tiers:

The funding for this grant program consists of three primary tiers and an administrative stipend. A summary of the three primary tiers is provided here, with specific funding usage instructions for each tier provided in a later portion of this policies and procedures guide.

Tier One – Professional Development, Education and Communication. Conferences are provided funding to support the attendance of designated constituents at specific professional development events. There is a list of preapproved constituents and events for this tier. The focus of Tier One is to support administrative advancement for the following constituent groups or events: student-athlete advisory committee (SAAC), compliance and rules seminar education, faculty athletics representative (FAR) enhancement, senior woman administrator (SWA) enhancement, sports information director (SID) enhancement, athletics direct report (ADR) enhancement, athletic trainers enhancement, ethnic minority/diversity enhancement and conference office travel. Conferences are expected to support most of these constituent groups on an annual basis; exceptions are described in the Tier One policy section of this guide. Conferences may request approval to send designated constituents to events beyond the preapproved list by making such request to the grant administrator at the NCAA national office, and, while Tier One does not cover coaching related events, coaching related professional development may be funded using Tier Three. Tier One policies allow conference offices to spend up to 25 percent of Tier One annual funding on conference office travel.

Tier Two – Social Responsibility and Integration. Tier Two operates on a four-year cycle and includes four core values or initiatives:

1. Student-Athlete Well-Being/Community Service;
2. Sportsmanship;
3. Equity and Inclusion; and
4. Identity and Integration Activities (optional).

A conference must demonstrate financial support of each of initiatives one through three in the above list over the course of a four-year period, though this financial support may come from a source other than the Strategic Initiatives Conference Grant Program. In satisfying Tier Two, funds may be used for conference-wide programming or provided directly to institutions. The Identity and Integration Activity is not a required initiative (though that initiative remains a permissible use of Tier Two funds).

Tier Three – Quality of the Participation Experience. Tier Three includes a series of optional strategic enhancements (technology, officiating improvement, athletics training/sports medicine and nutrition, promotions and marketing/Division III Identity, championships enhancements and professional development). Conferences may also use Tier Three funds on permissible Tier One or Tier Two initiatives, or any other initiative that can be justified by the Division III Strategic Plan.
Administrative Stipend (‘‘Tier Four’’). Conferences are provided with an administrative stipend to offset the costs of grant program administration including coordination of the annual required third-party review. Conferences may choose to contract out the grant administration or manage the program with existing staff. This administrative stipend is listed under ‘‘Tier Four’’ within the grant reporting system; however, reporting on how the administrative stipend was used is not required. Sample grant administrator duties may be accessed on the Division III Strategic Initiatives Grant Program homepage.
Overall Grant Program Policies and Procedures:

1. This program was formally approved by the governance structure and endorsed by the Division III Commissioner’s Association in 2005 and launched in 2006-07. Grant allocations and policies are reviewed annually by the NCAA Division III Strategic Planning and Finance Committee, which includes representation from the Division III Commissioner’s Association.

2. Currently, conferences are allocated between $45,000 - $90,000 annually based on the number of active conference members.

3. To receive funding, conferences must complete the following annual forms:

   a. Impact form report – due July 15 (following the academic year in which funds were used). The impact form report describes fund use and its impact on the conference (including self-certification), which affirms with the commissioner’s signature that the conference office will submit a third-party external review by October 15 each year. The annual impact form report is completed through the online conference grant program and can be accessed on the Division III Strategic Initiatives Grant Program homepage. The homepage also contains a detailed online grant program users guide.

   b. Requisition form – due July 15 (in advance of the academic year in which funds will be provided). The Requisition Form affirms that the conference office will accept funds and use them in an appropriate manner. The form also provides verification from the conference office on the number of member institutions the conference will have in the year of grant funding. The annual requisition form is completed through the online conference grant program and can be accessed on the Division III Strategic Initiatives Grant Program homepage. The homepage also contains a detailed online grant program users guide.

   c. Third-Party Review form – due October 15 (following the academic year in which funds were used). The third-party review form provides documentation of a third-party external review of grant fund usage. The current third-party review form may always be accessed on the Division III Strategic Initiatives Grant Program homepage.

4. Conferences should initiate broad-based, conference-wide dialogue to establish the policies governing the distribution of funds and the selection of grant recipients. To acknowledge this broad-based dialogue, upon submission the conference office will be checking a box that indicates that the grant usage has been shared and reviewed by an AD, SWA, FAR and a conference SAAC member. These four individuals will also receive an email copy of the final report and will be given two weeks to express any concerns related to that report to the grant administrator at the NCAA national office. This step is taken to ensure that the conference has used a broad-based and inclusive approach in determining grant usage and distribution of funds.

5. In July and August, the NCAA national office staff will conduct its standard review of each conference’s Impact Form submitted to the national office, as well as confirm receipt of the conference’s requisition form. If a Level Two (for cause) assessment is deemed necessary, it
would entail the NCAA collecting some of the conference’s receipts and other grant related documents for examination and validation. Issues that may trigger a Level Two assessment include:

a. Not submitting the third party external review by the October 15 deadline;
b. Inconsistencies between accounting and narrative sections of the Impact Form;
c. Lack of detail provided in the narrative section of the Impact Form: and
d. Failure to abide by grant program policy with reported spending.

This list is only a sample and not an exhaustive list.

6. Following the Level Two (for cause) assessment, a report is presented to a subcommittee of the Strategic Planning and Finance Committee to outline any findings and outstanding questions that may have resulted from the assessment.

7. If a conference allocates, or an institution uses, funds in a manner inconsistent with grant program policy, the Strategic Planning and Finance Committee will take one of four actions, depending on the nature of the fund use:

a. Issue a warning to the commissioner, conference athletics director and conference president/chancellor that such fund use shall not be permitted in the future;
b. Deduct the misused funds from the conference’s next annual grant allocation;
c. Require the conference to reimburse the NCAA in an amount equal to the misused funds. The conference is responsible for this reimbursement; however, it may require the institution to submit funds to the conference; or
d. Audit fund use and take other steps as deemed necessary by the staff or committee.

8. The deadline for completion of the Impact Form and Requisition Form (including required signatures) is July 15. The online Impact Form may be accessed on the Division III Strategic Initiatives Grant Program homepage. The homepage also contains a detailed online grant program users guide. The deadline for the annual third party review form is October 15 each year.

9. Conferences will be provided a two-day grace period for submitting the online Impact Form before being penalized a late fee of $500 per week. The fine will be removed from the coming year’s administrative portion of the grant.

10. Funds are typically distributed in September each year.

11. If a conference has a question about application of grant program policy or permissible use of funds, those questions may be forwarded to Jay Jones (jkjones@ncaa.org), the grant program administrator, who will apply program precedent in granting approval or submit the question
to the Division III Commissioner’s Association Conference Grant Subcommittee or to the Division III Strategic Planning and Finance Committee representatives for review.


a. For every check that is distributed, a receipt or document will be kept in the conference office.

b. Conference offices will complete and submit a Requisition Form with the annual Impact Form. The Requisition Form affirms that the conference office will accept funds for the coming year and use them in an appropriate manner.

c. Conferences must submit an annual third-party external review form not later than October 15. Third-party external reviewers will be independent of the conference’s daily operations, accounting and approval processes. Examples of appropriate third-party reviewers are a member institution’s business office (that does not handle conference finances directly); chair of the conference’s presidential oversight body (e.g., institutional president); the conference’s bank; or an outside accounting firm; etc. The current third-party review form may always be accessed on the Division III Strategic Initiatives Grant Program homepage.

d. Beginning in 2012, $400 in additional Tier Four grant funding was added to offset the cost of a third-party external review each year.


a. Provisional members are not taken into account in the determination of the allocation of funds to each conference; however, conferences that have provisional members may choose to share grant resources with those member institutions.

b. Conferences with members in two conferences will receive allocations for "half-members" (.5). With the adoption of NCAA Division III Proposal No. 2012-2, there shall not be any new conferences entering into such an arrangement, but relationships existing on or before August 1, 2012, will continue to be honored.

c. The Association of Division III Independents will support its current members as well as independent institutions that are not members of that Association.

d. Tier One and Tier Two allocations are based on the number of active member institutions in a conference. Tier Three allocations include an equal-base allocation for all conferences, plus an additional allocation per member institution. All conferences shall receive an equal allocation to support the administrative expense of managing this program including the annual third party external review.

e. Because Tier Three is the flex tier, those funds may be spent as described in the Tier Three policies, which includes any initiative permissible under Tiers One or Two, since these tiers are based on the Division III Strategic Plan. Use of Tier One and Tier Two funds are limited to the specific parameters described for those tiers.
f. Allocations will vary each year based on fluctuating membership numbers and overall grant program budget adjustments.

13. Unused funds must be returned to the NCAA with two exceptions:

   a. Exception One: If the conference has a remaining unused amount of funds amounting to $300 or less within a particular tier, those dollars will not ‘carry over’ for required usage in the following year. In addition, the conference will not be required to provide a plan for future usage of those dollars, nor will the system flag those dollars for an explanation. Any tier with a carryover of $301 or more will continue to require an explanation and plan for future usage. A conference may retain any unused funds totaling $1,000 or less (across all three tiers combined), provided that the conference submits its justification and plans for the future use of the excess funds in the conference’s impact form. This does not require committee approval.

   b. Exception Two – A conference may retain unused funds in excess of $1,000 (beyond $301 in any single tier) provided that the conference submits a detailed plan regarding how the excess funds will be used and the Strategic Planning and Finance Committee approves the plan.

Conferences may pre-emptively request authorization to pool funds across years of the grant program, as long as the funds are to be allocated within the four-year grant cycle (e.g., 2014-18).
Appropriate Usage of Funds Within Each Tier

Tier One – Professional Development, Education and Communication: Specific Spending Requirements and Preapproved Uses

Tier One funds are meant to support administrative professional development. While coaches are eligible for Tier One funds in some cases, these funds may not be used to support coaching specific events. There is a Tier One infographic available on the Division III Strategic Initiatives Grant Program homepage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC).</th>
<th>Preapproved uses of SAAC funds include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual spending is required.</td>
<td>1. Conference SAAC meeting and communication expenses (e.g., travel and meals for student-athletes and advisors).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences shall spend at least $200 per member institution in support of the conference SAAC.</td>
<td>2. Guest speakers for conference SAAC meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Conference SAAC t-shirts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Conference SAAC leadership banquet or retreat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Expenses related to conference SAAC directed community service projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Conference SAAC website creation and maintenance (including blogs and polling devices).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Promotions of conference SAAC initiatives (e.g., sportsmanship giveaways, posters, marketing of National Student-Athlete Day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Conference SAAC logo development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Increasing committee size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Conference SAAC Scholar-Athlete of the Month program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Student or SAAC led initiatives to raise awareness of equity or inclusion issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Other uses may be permissible; however, require approval from the conference grant administrator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance and Rules Seminar Education.</th>
<th>Preapproved uses of Compliance and Rules Seminar Education funds include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual spending is required.</td>
<td>1. NCAA Regional Rules Seminars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no set minimum dollar amount that is required to be spent.</td>
<td>2. Up to $1,500 to support the overall costs of a regional-based Conference Rules Seminar event. (Only permissible in the year which a conference is hosting a Conference Rules Seminar).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Other uses may be permissible; however, require approval from the conference grant administrator.
### Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR)*

**Annual spending is required.**

There is no set minimum dollar amount that is required to be spent.

Preapproved uses of FAR funds include:

1. FARA Annual Meeting and Symposium.
2. NCAA Convention.
4. NCAA Regional Rules Seminar.

If a conference desires to host a professional development event not on this list (i.e., a conference-based event), it may do so on a schedule not to exceed once every three years. In order to permissibly use funding in this manner, an agenda and attendee list must be approved by the NCAA staff grant administrator in advance of such an event.

**NOTE:** Other uses may be permissible; however, require approval from the conference grant administrator.

### Campus Senior Woman Administrators (SWA)*

**Annual spending is required.**

There is no set minimum dollar amount that is required to be spent.

Preapproved uses of SWA funds include:

1. NACWAA or NCAA Convention.
2. NCAA Equity and Inclusion Forum.
3. NCAA Women's Leadership Symposium.
4. NACWAA Institutes (Administrative Advancement, Leadership Enhancement and Executive).
5. Title IX seminars, generally.
6. NCAA Regional Rules Seminar.

If a conference desires to host a professional development event not on this list (i.e., a conference-based event), it may do so on a schedule not to exceed once every three years. In order to permissibly use funding in this manner, an agenda and attendee list must be approved by the NCAA staff grant administrator in advance of such an event.

SWA funds may not be used to fund professional development for a female director of athletics, including attendance at the NCAA Convention.

SWA funds may be used to support attendance at the list of preapproved events for SWAs and individuals aspiring to hold the designation of SWA.

**NOTE:** Other uses may be permissible; however, require approval from the conference grant administrator.
## Tier One – Appropriate Usage

| **Campus Sports Information Directors (SID)** | Preapproved uses of member institution SIDs funds include:  
1. The annual CoSIDA meeting.  
2. The annual ECAC SIDA meeting.  

- If a conference desires to host a professional development event not on this list (i.e., a conference-based event), it may do so on a schedule not to exceed once every three years. In order to permissibly use funding in this manner, an agenda and attendee list must be approved by the NCAA staff grant administrator in advance of such an event.  

**NOTE:** Other uses may be permissible; however, require approval from the conference grant administrator. |
| **Annual spending is required.** |  
**At least $1,000 is required to be spent in this category in support of member institution’s SIDs.** |

| **Athletic Direct Reports (ADR - Vice Presidents OR Presidents to whom athletics directly reports)** | Preapproved uses of ADR funds include:  
1. NCAA Convention.  
2. NCAA Inclusion Forum.  
3. NCAA Regional Rules Seminar.  

**Funding for these preapproved uses can be provided for a president if he or she serves as the ADR.**  

- If a conference desires to host a professional development event not on this list (i.e., a conference-based event), it may do so on a schedule not to exceed once every three years. In order to permissibly use funding in this manner, an agenda and attendee list must be approved by the NCAA staff grant administrator in advance of such an event.  

**NOTE:** Other uses may be permissible; however, require approval from the conference grant administrator. |
| **Annual spending is strongly encouraged, but optional.** |  |

| **Conference Office Staff (including Commissioners, Assistant Commissioners and conference Sports Information Directors)** | Preapproved uses of Conference Office Staff funds include:  

**Commissioner:** In odd years (e.g., 2015, 2017), conferences shall fund commissioner attendance at the biannual summer meeting hosted by the NCAA staff in conjunction with the conference SIDs.  

In even years (e.g., 2014, 2016), conferences may fund commissioner attendance at the summer meeting hosted by the D3CA in conjunction with the NCAA Regional Rules Seminars or the NCAA Convention.  

**Preapproved events for conference office SIDs include:**  
1. In odd years (e.g., 2015, 2017), conferences shall fund conference SID attendance at the bi-annual summer meeting hosted by the NCAA staff in conjunction with the Division III Commissioners Association.  

- No more than 25% of the Tier One total amount can be spent within this category. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Minorities</th>
<th>Preapproved uses of Ethnic Minority funds include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Biennial spending is required (e.g., at a minimum there must be some funding provided within this category every other year) | 1. General administrative professional development opportunities offered by the affiliate groups of the BCA, MOAA, NACDA, NACWAA, NADIIAA.  
2. NCAA Inclusion Forum.  
3. NCAA Regional Rules Seminar.  
4. Professional membership dues to specific organizations geared toward ethnic/minority athletics administrators. (In order to receive the funding under this usage, the recipient must show proof of attending or participating in an educational/professional development program with the organization.) |
| There is no set minimum dollar amount that is required to be spent. |  |

If a conference does not have a racial or ethnic minority administrator available to attend one of the preapproved events, they also may send an ethnic minority coach to an event other than a coaching convention or send an ethnic minority student-athlete to the NCAA Convention. In the latter case, the student-athlete must have an interest in pursuing a career in athletics, and the conference must commit to making the Convention a meaningful experience for the student-athlete.

If all options for racial or ethnic minority candidates have been exhausted, conferences may provide funding for any administrator to attend an event specifically designed to increase campus or conference diversity or to help campuses or conferences develop strategies to generate diverse candidate pools. An example of such an event would be the NCAA Inclusion Forum.

If a conference desires to host a professional development event not on this list (i.e., a conference-based event), it may do so on a schedule not to exceed once every three years. In order to permissibly use funding in this manner, an agenda and attendee list must be approved by the NCAA staff grant administrator in advance of such an event.

NOTE: Other uses may be permissible; however, require approval from the conference grant administrator.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Athletic Trainers</strong></th>
<th>Preapproved uses of Athletic Trainers funds include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Annual spending is optional. | 1. NATA Annual Clinical Symposia & AT Expo  
2. College Athletic Trainers’ Society (CATS) Annual Meeting  
3. Any expenses Related to Certification-Based Clinics or Training Sessions (e.g., Local, Regional or State Clinics). |

If a conference desires to host a professional development event not on this list (i.e., a conference-based event), it may do so on a schedule not to exceed once every three years. In order to permissibly use funding in this manner, an agenda and attendee list must be approved by the NCAA staff grant administrator in advance of such an event.

NOTE: Other uses may be permissible; however, require approval from the conference grant administrator.

*If a conference does not satisfy the requirement to support an FAR and/or SWA's professional development for two consecutive years, it shall be penalized $500 from its administrative grant. To avoid being subject to this penalty, a conference may opt out of a required category. A conference that opts out of a required category will lose funding for that category, but will not be subject to additional penalty. Forfeited funds will be redistributed to conferences that have historically satisfied all required categories and have unmet needs in Tier One.
Tier Two – Social Responsibility and Integration: Specific Spending Requirements and Preapproved Uses

The conference must support each of the following areas within the four-year grant cycle (2014-18):

1. Student-Athlete Well-Being/Community Service.
2. Equity and Inclusion.
3. Sportsmanship.

Identity and Integration Activities is an optional initiative during the four-year cycle. Tier Two dollars may be used to support Identity and Integration Activities, but that usage is not required.

Conferences may spend the entire Tier Two allotment in one area in a given year, or may divide it between areas. A conference must demonstrate financial support of each of the three required Tier Two areas over a four-year period; though this financial support may come from sources other than the Strategic Planning and Finance Committee.

Preapproved uses of Student-Athlete Well-Being/Community Service funds include the following:

1. Academic banquet and awards.
2. Adversity training.
3. Alcohol abuse prevention programs or speakers.
4. Anger management programs.
5. Career planning seminars for student-athletes*.
6. Community outreach.
7. DIII week activities.
8. Etiquette training*.
11. Hazing education.
12. Healthy relationships/sexual health and abuse education or programming.
13. Concussions education (e.g., Impact Program).
14. Leadership development speakers or materials*.
15. Life planning programming*.
16. Life skills programming*.
17. Media training for student-athletes.
18. Mental discipline/performance psychology training*.
19. Motivational speaker for student-athletes*.
20. Nutritional/diet information (handbook, access to nutritionist).
21. Purchase of AEDs.
22. Rest/recovery education.
23. Safe competition techniques.
24. Special Olympics initiatives (See the Division III Special Olympics partnership website for programming ideas).
25. Sports massage and relaxation techniques.
26. Time management skills training*.
27. Training for student-athlete mentors (SAM program).
28. Treatments by sports psychologist to address issues including stress management, anxiety, burnout and life balance.
29. Sports Wagering Prevention (this is a subtopic of student-athlete well-being). The NCAA’s Sports Wagering webpage offers further information.

a. Funding for awareness around National Problem-Gambling Awareness week. This can be a campus-wide event with a sport wagering focus. Awareness week is strategically placed in March soon after Super Bowl and before March Madness.

b. Giveaways for students during National Problem-Gambling Awareness week for participation in organized prevention events.
c. Advertising about Awareness week or other gambling prevention on campus (television scrolls, campus newspaper; local newspaper, mass emails).

d. Posters/postcards to promote prevention events or to disseminate information about gambling (i.e., sports betting/office pools).

e. Campus speaker about gambling.

f. Distribution of problem-gambling brochure to student-athletes and parents.

g. Employ the Step Up program, a pro-social behavior/bystander-intervention program. Annual letters to local media.

h. Gambling websites blocked in computer labs.

i. Conduct a Wellness Assessment Survey.

j. Props for tabling events to attract students (green felt, card shuffler, display board).

k. Funding for a campus task force lead by athletics using the National Center for Responsible Gaming (NCRG) report to help guide policy and prevention (See ncrg.org website for report and recommendations).

*Per NCAA Division III extra benefit regulations, similar programming must be open to the general student-body for these services to be provided to student-athletes (see NCAA Division III Bylaw 16.3.2). Please contact your Academic and Membership Affairs conference contact if you have interpretive questions regarding the extra benefit regulations.

Impermissible fund use includes the following:

- Televisions or entertainment equipment for locker rooms or other common spaces.

Preapproved uses of Equity and Inclusion funds include the following:

1. Attendance by student-athletes, coaches or administrators at equity or inclusion focused education or professional development events.

2. Campus or community equity or inclusion workshops.

3. Creative presentations to raise awareness of equity or inclusion issues (e.g., plays, spoken word performance, art exhibits or other artistic expressions).

5. Recruitment and retention of ethnic minority student-athletes.

6. Recruitment and retention of women and ethnic minority staff.

7. Events to encourage women and ethnic minorities to pursue careers in athletics (e.g., Winning Careers in Athletics, women’s coaching symposiums, student-athlete attendance at the NCAA Convention).

8. Guest speakers on equity or inclusion topics.

9. Panel discussions on equity or inclusion topics.

10. Service or mentoring activities with a focus on equity or inclusion awareness.

11. Sponsor an internship program for female or ethnic minority junior or senior students with an interest in pursuing a career in athletics. The duties and responsibilities for the internship will vary and the overall goal is to provide administrative duties, including sports information, and professional networking in order to give a quality career experience in college athletics. Since the internship is meant for current students, there would be no coaching responsibilities assigned.

12. Student or SAAC-led initiatives to raise awareness of equity or inclusion issues.

13. Student-Athlete Retreat focusing on equity and inclusion issues.

The Commissioners Association Diversity and Well-Being Subcommittee constructed an inventory of equity and inclusion programs that have enhanced the educational experiences of student-athletes on Division III campuses, and created opportunities for increasing understanding and appreciation for diversity by all campus constituents. That list can be accessed on the Division III Strategic Initiatives Grant Program homepage. The list includes program titles, descriptions and costs, where possible and is updated annually.

Preapproved uses of Sportsmanship funds include the following:

1. All-Conference sportsmanship teams or other conference-based awards.

2. Banners and signage.


5. Division III Week activities.

6. Educational materials, including, but not limited to, mailings to parents and program inserts.

7. Establishment of good sportsmanship student body pep group or pep rally.

8. Guest speakers.

9. Halftime events.

10. In-game announcements.

11. Newspaper ads promoting sportsmanship.

12. Partnering with SAAC for workshops and seminars.

13. Play with Respect ... Live Respectfully – Program includes five seminars on positive sports behavior, appropriate decision making and core life values for student-athletes, coaches and athletics staff.


15. Promotional items including, but not limited to, awareness bracelets and t-shirts.

16. Sportsmanship day.

17. Sportsmanship summit including supervisor of officials, student-athletes, coaches and directors of athletics.

For additional information, please refer to The NCAA Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct Committee webpage.

Identity and Integration Activities

Effective with the 2014-15 to 2017-18 conference grant program’s four-year cycle, the Identity and Integration Activity is no longer a required initiative. Activities and symposiums should emphasize the Division III identity and the integration of intercollegiate athletics in the campus and conference context. Conference Identity and Integration Symposiums and Activities are intended to bring key conference constituents together in an effort to discuss ways in which each school (and the conference as a group) might best support the integration concept, consistent with Division III’s unique philosophy, identity and Strategic Positioning Platform. To assist in the planning and conduct of an Identity and Integration symposiums, please see the Sample Identity and Integration Symposium and Activity Guide on the Division III Strategic Initiatives Grant Program homepage.
Other permissible identity and integration activities that may include key conference constituents or campus only key constituents include the following:

1. Support of faculty mentor programs designed to promote a better understanding of the student-athlete experience.

2. Campus-based identity/integration discussions: Provide various campus constituencies (e.g., faculty, academic staff, administration) with the opportunity to learn about the role of athletics, the Division III philosophy, how athletics is integrated within the university as a whole and how athletics contributes to the overall mission of the institution and conference.

3. Celebration of Division III Week incorporating various campus departments.

4. Host a faculty forum on intercollegiate athletics.

5. Recognize National Student-Athlete Day, incorporating various campus departments.

6. Collaborate with admissions office to conduct an annual recruiting seminar.

7. Partner with development office and devise a specific fundraising project that would aid both athletics and development.

8. SAAC-led identity and integration presentations to institutional constituents, such as boards of trustees, faculty, and alumni, and facilitate other campus discussions.

9. Student-athlete integration discussions: engage student-athletes in discussions about the Division III philosophy, how athletics is integrated within the university as a whole, and how athletics contributes to the overall mission of the institution.

10. Programs focused on establishing and assisting students in achieving essential learning outcomes through the identification and integration of learning outcomes taught both on and off-the-field.

11. Conferences may use Tier Two funds on promotional materials (including video) supporting the Division III Identity.
Tier Three – Quality of the Participation Experience: Specific Spending Requirements and Preapproved Uses

Tier Three funds may be used on any permissible Tier One or Tier Two initiative or any other initiative justified by the Division III Strategic Plan.

Impermissible Tier Three fund use includes the following and will be denied:

1. Salary or benefits for campus or conference full-time employees.
2. Standard operating expenses beyond technology expenses.
3. Property plant and equipment that cannot be linked directly to enhancing the participation experiences (e.g., replacing standard athletics equipment or facility maintenance).

Preapproved uses of Technology funds include the following:

1. Color printing equipment and supplies.
2. Communication hardware and software.
5. Game film exchange.
6. Internet and cellular service.
7. Wind gauge (automatically feeds wind speeds into track results program).
8. Statistical software packages and updates.
9. Webcasting (web production and equipment).
10. Web enhancements, including a conference scoreboard.

Preapproved uses of Officiating Funds include the following:

1. Assignment software (e.g., Arbiter Sports).
2. Funding pre-season officiating meetings.
3. Hiring officials’ observers, who evaluate, educate and recruit officials.
4. Officials’ enhancement education, including attendance at the annual July National Association of Sports Officials (NASO) Annual Sports Officiating Summit.

5. Officials training (could include subsidizing registration with Arbiter Sports).

6. Officiating crew manuals.

Preapproved uses of Athletic Training/Medicine/Nutrition funds include the following:

1. Athletic training equipment.


3. Eating to Win program.

4. Funding for planning team to implement heat protocol (including communication initiatives and educational materials).

5. Health and safety posters.


7. Nutrition lectures.

8. Portable AED units.

9. Professional development session for certified athletic trainers.

10. Renew site licenses for IMPACT Concussion Management software.

11. Session for staff or student-athletes: identify signs or symptoms of depression.

Preapproved uses of Promotions/Marketing/Identity (Division III identity activation) funds include the following:

1. Conference banners.
2. Conference directory.
3. Logo development.
4. Schedule cards.
5. Traveling conference trophies.

Preapproved uses of Championships Enhancement funds include the following:

1. Championship t-shirts for participants.
2. Conference awards (participant, MVP, other).
3. Conference-wide championships program.
4. Employment of a professional timing company for swimming, indoor and outdoor track and field and/or cross country championships.
5. Increased signage.
6. Reimbursing expenses for sportsmanship chaperones.

Preapproved uses of Professional Development, Administration/Coaching Education Enhancement funds include the following:

1. Professional development activities for coaches, other campus athletics staff, conference interns or any of the constituents included in Tier One. Events include the preapproved list from Tier One or other events the conference determines to be effective professional development programming.
2. Conference SAAC leadership retreat.
3. Host a professional development day for entire conference.
4. Host session on professional ethics in coaching.
5. Host speaker on catastrophe management.
6. Attendance at Intercollegiate Athletics Forum.

7. New coach’s seminar (compliance review, general).

8. Support attendance at the NCAA Coaches Academy.
Administrative Stipend (“Tier Four”)

Conferences are provided with an administrative stipend to offset the costs of grant program administration including coordination of the third-party review. Conferences may choose to contract out the grant administration or manage the program with existing staff. This administrative stipend is listed under “Tier Four” within the grant reporting system; however, reporting on how the administrative stipend was used is not required. Sample grant administrator duties may be accessed on the Division III Strategic Initiatives Grant Program homepage.
Referral Related to Conference Grant Spending

- **Use of Tier-One Conference Grant Funds for Conference Rules Seminars.** During its November 12, 2015, teleconference, the NCAA Division III Strategic Planning and Finance Committee referred a request from the Division III Commissioners Grant Subcommittee back to that group for further refinement and consideration.

Excerpt of language from Strategic Planning and Finance Committee November 12, 2015, Teleconference Report - Item 3(a). The committee reviewed several requests from the Division III Commissioners Grant subcommittee and took the following actions:

- Referred back to the subcommittee a request to allow Tier One spending on operational expenses for Conference Rules Seminars. Currently, Tier One funding in the area of compliance is limited to travel dollars provided to individuals within a conference to attend Regional or Conference Rules Seminars. Any grant funding for conferences to conduct the NCAA approved Conference Rules Seminars must be drawn from Tier Three funds. The commissioners subcommittee’s request contended that it is reasonable to allow conferences to use Tier One funds to cover other expenses associated with conducting the Conference Rules Seminars (e.g., meals, materials, registration, facility rental, etc.). During the committee’s discussion, it noted that this modification would be more appropriate if the change to Tier One would only be applicable to conferences hosting a Conference Rules Seminar, as well as determining a reasonable maximum funding amount that would be allowed for this purpose. The committee also noted concerns that the request didn’t protect Tier One funding for institutional member travel to the event.

Updated request from the Division III Commissioners Grant Subcommittee. In the year in which a conference is hosting a Conference Rules Seminar event, allow $1,500 to $2,000 of Tier One funds in the area of compliance to be used to support the overall costs of that event.

Rationale for requested modification: Currently, Tier-One funding in the area of compliance is limited to travel dollars provided to individuals within a conference to attend regional or conference rules seminars; however, dollars needed for conferences to conduct the NCAA-approved conference rules seminars must be drawn from Tier Three funds. The Division III Commissioners Grant Subcommittee believes it is reasonable to allow conferences to use Tier One funds to cover other expenses associated with conducting the seminars (e.g., meals, materials, registration, facility rental, etc…). This updated request would limit funding to a maximum of $1,500 to $2,000 and the expenses would only be permitted in the year in which the conference is hosting the event.

Staff recommendation: The staff feels that these Tier One dollars should be limited to $1,500. The conference can continue to utilize Tier Three dollars for this event if they were to need additional funding.
Conference Grant Funding for Association of Division III Independents

Background:

- Excerpt from Report of the NCAA Division III Strategic Planning and Finance Committee November 12, 2015, teleconference

Item 3(a). Denied the recommendation to empower the staff to assign a contractor to ascertain how grant funding was used by the Association of Division III Independents in 2014-15 and to outline appropriate Tier One and Tier Two spending allowances for 2015-16. The Association of Division III Independents is unique in that it does not have a typical conference arrangement, or a full-time commissioner. The reporting in years past had been performed by a consultant chosen by the independent institutions. Following the 2014-15 academic year, the Association of Independents failed to submit its Conference Grant Impact Form or provide any details regarding the use of the $44,088 that was distributed to its seven member institutions. In addition, the association did not submit its third-party review form by the October 15 deadline. NCAA staff attempts, via email and telephone, to contact the contractor have gone unanswered. As a result, the 2015-16 Conference Grant funds for the Association of Division III Independents have been held by the NCAA staff and not distributed to those institutions. Due to the unique situation, the staff requested that they be able to secure a contractor to submit last year’s impact and third party forms and oversee this year’s grant spending. However, the committee instead instructed the staff to inform the Association of Division III Independents that grant dollars would continue to be withheld until it submits a report for previous usage and a plan for future use. The committee noted that by withholding the conference grant, it may provide motivation for the independent institutions to hire a new contractor to manage the conference grant dollars.

In response to the committee’s action, the staff issued a letter (see Supplement No. 15b) and held a meeting with the Association of Division III Independents (Independents) representatives during the 2016 NCAA Convention.

The Independents have written a letter detailing the grant funding usage, corrective next steps and a request for this year’s grant dollars (See Supplement No. 15c).

The total 2014-15 grant dollars spent by the Independents was $23,977.66. With a total grant allocation of $44,889, $20,110 is unaccounted for.

Staff Recommendation: Approve issuing 2015-16 Conference Grant funding in the amount of $24,779. This amount represents the $44,889 that was originally allocated to the Independents minus the $20,110 that is unaccounted for in the 2014-15 funding cycle. The staff has confidence in the Independent’s plan for the use of funds and future reporting by Mr. Ira Zeff.
TO: Presidents and Directors of Athletics of Division III Independent Institutions.

Following the 2014-15 academic year, the Division III Association of Independents failed to submit its required Division III Conference Grant Impact Form by the July 15, 2015 deadline. Thus, the NCAA was not provided any details regarding the use of the $44,088 that was distributed to your seven member institutions. In addition, the Division III Association of Independents did not submit its required third-party review form by the October 15 deadline. In previous years, Mr. Ted Breidenthal completed these reports on behalf of your institutions. Multiple NCAA staff attempts, via email and telephone, to contact Mr. Breidenthal throughout the spring and summer have gone unanswered. As a result, the Division III Strategic Planning and Finance Committee has determined that 2015-16 Conference Grant funds for the Association of Division III Independents will not be distributed to your institutions until you provide an appropriate report for use during 2014-15 and a viable plan for future use, including improved reporting.

The committee and staff recognize that your institutions do not function in the same manner as a typical conference; however, it is our recommendation that you retain an outside contractor who can complete this relatively simple annual reporting process on your behalf so that you may continue to benefit from this grant funding. Your annual grant allocation contains a $3,000 administrative stipend that could be used for the purpose of paying a contractor.

It is imperative to recognize the importance of fiscal responsibility with Association dollars and we are hopeful this communication will assist in getting this issue resolved in a timely manner. I will be in attendance at the annual NCAA Convention and am happy to join you during your Friday afternoon meetings if you would like to discuss this matter further. Please feel free to reach me at 317-917-6004 with any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Jay Jones
Associate Director of Division III
Division III Strategic Initiatives Grant Administrator

JJ:dfb

cc: Selected NCAA Staff Members
2014-15 Association of Division 3 Independents AD3I
NCAA Strategic Initiative Grant

On behalf of the NCAA III Independent Institutions, I want to apologize for the lack of professionalism we have demonstrated by not having our NCAA Strategic Grant documentation turned in by the July deadline. As I shared with Jay Jones and Dan Dutcher, the Commissioner of our organization Ted Breidenthal has discontinued communication with the Independent Institutions. As President of the AD3I, I have attempted to communicate with Mr. Breidenthal countless times via phone and email since November. He has not returned any calls or emails. I reached out to a mutual friend to see if he could connect with Ted, which he did but still no response to my communications. I finally received an email from Ted Breidenthal on January 28 sharing his frustration with the members of AD3I and the NCAA. In that email he shared that he removed himself from his position with the Independents back in the fall but failed to tell us that he did so. I have sent Ted follow up emails and phone calls to arrange a meeting with him to transfer all AD3I paper work and money that belongs to the Independent Schools and NCAA. I have not heard back from him.

Enclosed, I have done my best to share an accounting of the 2014-15 NCAA Strategic Grant provided to the Independent Institutions. From my work on this project I have learned that only Nebraska Wesleyan, Maranatha Baptist and St. Joseph's College Brooklyn received Tier I and Tier II grant funds through the AD3I in 2014-15. Mount Mary and UCSC were affiliate members of the Great South Athletic Conference thus receiving Grant money through that conference. The College of New Rochelle and Rust College did not receive any funds. I have included receipts from Maranatha Baptist and Nebraska Wesleyan. St Joseph's College Brooklyn has had a change in administration and could not provide me with receipts.

Again please accept my sincere apology for the untimely and incomplete Strategic Grant report. Unfortunately until we can truly communicate with Ted Breidenthal I do not know about all of the expenses attributed to the Grant. As the AD3I moves forward I will be the contact person.

Thanks for your understanding.

Ira A. Zeff
Athletic Director
Nebraska Wesleyan University
AD3I President
NCAA DIII CONFERENCE GRANT –
2014-15 INSTITUTIONAL GRANT USAGE WORKSHEET

Association of Division 3 Independents AD3I

Total amount of 2014-15 grant dollars received: $44,088

Tier One – Professional Development, Education and Communication.

Information about Tier 1: Conferences are provided funding to support the attendance of designated constituents at specific professional development events. There is a list of pre-approved constituents and events for this tier, the focus of which is to support administrative advancement for the following constituent groups or events: student-athlete advisory committee (SAAC), compliance and rules seminar education, faculty athletics representative (FAR) enhancement, senior woman administrator (SWA) enhancement, sports information director (SID) enhancement, athletics direct report, commissioners meeting and ethnic minority/diversity enhancement.

SAAC

Maranatha Baptist University - $400 was used for SAAC Awareness around campus with the purchase of sweatshirts for new members. SAAC also started a project for SAAC and student-athlete recognition on campus with the posting of accomplishments (AD#1 All Conference recognition, Scholar Athlete recognition, etc.) in the Athletic Department/Gym facility. The SAAC does a fundraiser annually to aid a cancer victim. This year they were able to raise $276 for the Nursing Department’s Administrative Assistant who had just been diagnosed with cancer.

Apparel for new members $201.60
Bracelets for cancer awareness $153.04
Frames and printing 45.36

Nebraska Wesleyan University - $447.95 was used for pizza at 1st SAAC meeting of the second semester and to supply a portion of the Raising Cane’s Chicken Fingers for the Howl Like Hell Homecoming Pep Rally. The Pep Rally had 700 students attend.
Pizza for SAAC Meeting $39.00
Food for Homecoming Pep Rally $408.95
St Joseph’s College Brooklyn – $400 was used for promoting SAAC on Campus

**Compliance/Rules Seminar/Commissioners Meeting**

Nebraska Wesleyan University – Ira Zeff Athletic Director attended the Denver Rules Seminar June 2015 as well as the Commissioners Meeting in his role as AD3I President - expenses totaled $1240.90

**Professional Development**

Maranatha Baptist University – SWA attended the NCAA National Convention in January 2015 – expenses totaled $917.94

St. Joseph’s College Brooklyn – SID attended CoSIDA – expenses totaled $1000

**TOTAL Tier 1 Awarded** $9962.00

**TOTAL Tier 1 Spent** $4406.79

**Tier Two – Social Responsibility and Integration**

Information about Tier 2: This tier includes four-core values or initiatives:

1. Student-Athlete Well-Being/Community Service;
2. Sportsmanship;
3. Equity and Inclusion; and
4. Identity and Integration Activities.

Funds may be used for conference-wide programming or provided directly to institutions.

AD3I Tier II Money to each Institution that requested funds from this category:
Maranatha Baptist University used Tier 2 Money for Equity and Inclusion.

MBU spent $1428.25 sending its Title IX Coordinator to the 2015 NCAA Inclusion Forum. This experience gave the Title IX Coordinator more knowledge to work with the institution to improve the educational and professional environment for student-athletes and the student body as a whole. Sessions on adaptive activities have brought a new awareness to campus regarding how to accommodate individuals with physical challenges. This Forum also provided knowledge on ways to better serve the MBU minority student-athletes and students.

MBU also spent $327.36 on technology upgrades for the Soccer Program and $144.39 on more frames and posters for the SAAC Project mentioned in Tier I. **TOTAL Spent $1900**

Nebraska Wesleyan University used Tier 2 Money for Student-Athlete Well Being.

NWU held its annual Student-Athlete Celebration on April 28. Ed Timm, a former IIAC basketball coach and current educator, was our speaker on leadership. We presented our top student-athlete award and sportsmanship award for each team; recognized our All-Americans, Academic All-Americans and NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship recipients. We announced the 2014-15 Male and Female Athletes of the Year and an Unsung Hero Award and we provided a meal to conclude our program.

**Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>$731.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arena Set Up Expenses</td>
<td>$130.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>$1228.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL Spent** $2090.87

St. Joseph’s College Brooklyn used Tier 2 Money to connect campus to new athletic facility – student-athletes held several events in the new athletic facility for the entire campus – **TOTAL Spent $1909**
TOTAL Tier 2 Awarded $13,333
TOTAL Tier 2 Spent $5899.87

**Tier Three – Quality of the Participation Experience**

Information about Tier three: This tier includes a series of optional strategic enhancements (technology, officiating improvement, athletics training/sports medicine and nutrition, promotions and marketing/Division III Identity, championships enhancements and professional development). Conferences also may use Tier-Three funds on any other initiative that can be justified by the Division III Strategic Plan or that were permissible under Tier 1 or Tier 2.

**Technology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presto Sports Website</td>
<td>$1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet and Cellular service</td>
<td>$667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stat Crew Software upgrades</td>
<td>$3564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT Technology Software</td>
<td>$1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBU $300 AT System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$400 ImPACT Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWU $640 AT System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$600 ImPACT Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Information Contract</td>
<td>$6000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL Tier 3 Awarded $18,000
TOTAL Tier 3 Spent $13,671
REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION III
SPORTSMANSHIP AND GAME ENVIRONMENT WORKING GROUP
FEBRUARY 25, 2016, TELECONFERENCE

ACTION ITEMS.

- None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Reaffirmation of commitment to serve on the working group.** Gary Williams, chair of the Sportsmanship and Game Environment Working Group, reaffirmed members’ commitment to the working group and asked that if they are no longer able to fulfill the duties of the working group, they should reach out to him or Jay Jones. Given the composition of the working group, Mr. Williams also noted that the need to solicit additional members and support from the Division III membership may be necessary. Mr. Williams is especially interested in gaining insight from a representative from the Collegiate Event and Facility Management Association (CEFMA). It also was noted that despite President Erik Bitterbaum’s term on the Division III Presidents Council have come to an end, he is still willing and committed to serving on this working group.

2. **Review of the report from November 10, 2015, teleconference.** The working group reviewed and approved the set of minutes from its November teleconference.

3. **Review of straw poll results from 2016 Division III Issues Forum.** Mr. Jones reviewed the straw poll results from the 2016 Division III Issues Forum. He indicated that despite the questions being purposefully broad, the feedback they received from the membership should prove helpful. Mr. Jones also noted that some participants may have been absent from the room or chose not to respond to each question, which explains the discrepancy in number of respondents for each question. The results indicate there is a desire from the membership to address fan civility and game environment, and that many respondents are willing to participate in a module-based certification regardless of any incentive being provided. The results validated the working group’s initial thoughts:
   a. Parents/Guardians are the group that causes the most difficult issues at institutions’ events and,
   b. There is a greater desire to have best practices in the area of crowd control than there is to having established national guidelines.
4. Review tentative training module that were discussed on the working group’s September 2015 teleconference in light of straw poll feedback. Mr. Williams reviewed the following tentative training modules that were developed based on discussions during the group’s September teleconference:
   
a. Why a certification program is important;
   
b. A self-assessment tool for an institution’s current game environment;
   
c. A learning module focused on creating service excellence for institutions events, regardless of resources and staff capabilities;
   
d. Assistance with conflict resolution or bystander intervention; and
   
e. A campus action plan.

The group agreed that the creation of established best practices is a critical next step. Based on the working group’s discussion, as well as National SAAC feedback provided by Mr. Jones, the group agreed to move forward with the creation of a module based learning environment. The initial focus should be on fan civility. After the implementation and assessment of a fan civility based learning tool, the working group can decide whether similar tools should be used in addressing other aspects of sportsmanship and game environment.

5. Assign working group members to various modules and discuss who else in the membership (and outside experts) can serve as module ‘builders’. Mr. Williams tasked the working group members with brainstorming initial ideas and talking points for each of the five (a-e) potential modules, asking them to seek feedback from their respective campuses (classes, teams, student-athletes, administrative staff, and coaches). Members will compile information and create a one-page executive summary to be turned into Mr. Jones by Friday, April 8, in preparation of the next teleconference. The group will discuss its findings and decide on next steps during its April teleconference.

6. Other business. The next teleconference will be at 2 p.m. Eastern time April 21, 2016. Mr. Jones will look in to adding another SAAC member to the working group.
7. **Adjournment.** The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m. Eastern time.

Chair: *Gary Williams, Wittenberg University, North Coast Athletic Conference*

Staff Liaisons: *Jay Jones, Division III Governance*

Jess Duff, Division III Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teleconference: February 25, 2016</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Absentees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erik Bitterbaum, State University of New York at Cortland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tracy King, Liberty League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Jacobs, Augsburg College</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chuck Mitrano, Empire 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Mooney, Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris O’Rourke, Becker College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Tompson-Wolfe, Westminster College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Wigley, Shenandoah University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Williams, Wittenberg University, chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Participants:</td>
<td>Ben Brownlee, NCAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jess Duff, NCAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jay Jones, NCAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTION ITEM.

- Renewal of Ethnic-Minority Student Grant Program to NCAA Convention.
  
  a. **Recommendation.** For the 2016-17 academic year, provide up to $2,000 each for 40 Division III ethnic-minority students to attend the 2017 NCAA Convention and related Division III programming.
  
  b. **Effective date.** August 1, 2016.
  
  c. **Rationale.** The Division III governance and the Office of Inclusion successfully partnered on a pilot program that brought 39 ethnic-minority students to the 2016 NCAA Convention. The students were exposed to Division III, its members and the governance process with the goal of building the Division III pipeline in an effort to ultimately diversify the division. After reviewing the participant’s positive feedback, the working group recommends this program for the 2017 NCAA Convention. [Attachment A]
  
  d. **Budget Impact.** $55,000 from the diversity line in the existing 2016-17 budget.
  
  e. **Student-Athlete Impact.** An opportunity for minority students to experience the Convention, the Division III governance process and related Convention programming.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Welcome and roster.** The NCAA Division III Diversity and Inclusion Working Group commenced business at 3:03 p.m. Eastern time Tuesday, February 23, 2016. Chancellor Dennis Shields welcomed the group and staff conducted a roll call.

2. **Report of December 16, 2015, teleconference.** The working group reviewed the report and had no changes.

3. **2016 NCAA Convention debrief.** NCAA staff provided updates on the following resources and programs provided at Convention.
   a. **Final Executive Summary.** The working group had an opportunity to review the executive summary of the group’s work the past year that was shared with the Convention participants at the Division III Issues Forum.
b. Infographics. Research updated the Division III Diversity and Inclusion Fast Facts adding the gender and ethnic/racial diversity of presidents and chancellors. [Attachment B] The working group discussed finding ways to add the diversity data of athletics direct reports (ADRs). However currently the NCAA’s annual sports demographic form doesn’t collect this information. The working group encouraged staff to partner with NASPA to obtain the data.

c. Straw poll question results. The working group reviewed the results of the straw poll question asked during the Issues Forum. While the working group made no decision, the survey results indicate the most support for using additional diversity and inclusion funding on administrators.

d. Delegate’s feedback. Staff reported that two Convention delegates specifically requested additional funding be spent on coaches and in particular supporting female and racial/ethnic assistant coaches to stay in Division III.

e. Ethnic-minority programming. The working group reviewed the participant’s feedback and programming budget. [See action item]

f. NCAA Board of Governors resolution. Staff updated the working group on the recent Board resolution on diversity and inclusiveness. The ad hoc committee’s charge is to focus on cultural diversity. The ad hoc committee’s work will also include considering recommendations from the NCAA’s Gender Equity Task Force. The ad hoc committee has a March teleconference and April in-person meeting.

4. **Senior Woman Administrator (SWA).** The working group reviewed the NCAA’s SWA resource and discussed the current role of the SWA. Working group members and the Office of Inclusion have heard that the SWA role needs to be re-examined as there is still confusion with the SWA designation. The Office of Inclusion has scheduled a session on the SWA role for the 2016 Inclusion Forum that will be held in Indianapolis from April 16-18. The Office of Inclusion anticipates updating its resource, and the working group may include the SWA’s role in its best practices resource.

5. **Black Women in Sports Foundation.** The working group received a request for funding to support the foundation’s proposed Division III specific mini-forums. At this time, the working group is still developing proposed funding options. It agreed to not recommend funding of the mini-forums at this time, but will consider in the future.

6. **Next steps.** Time did not permit the working group to discuss next steps. However in preparation for its April teleconference, the working group will email staff areas it wants
included in the best practice resource. On its April call, the working group will begin developing a best practice resource, as well as discuss possible new diversity initiatives, programming and educational resources for 2016-17.

7. **Other business.** The working group agreed to add two working group members – a faculty athletic representative and an ADR – since neither constituent group is currently represented on the working group. The next teleconference is scheduled for 2 p.m. Eastern time April 14.

8. **Adjournment.** The call adjourned at 4:05 p.m. Eastern time.

---

**Staff Liaisons:**  
*Louise McCleary, Division III Governance*  
*Nicole Hollomon, Research*  
*Sarah Sadowski, Leadership Development*  
*Amy Wilson, Office of Inclusion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teleconference date: February 23, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendees:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nnenna Akotaobi, Swarthmore College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Benning, The Midwest Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Beverly, The College of New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Brandon, Penn State University, Abington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Fein, Drew University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Shields, University of Wisconsin-Platteville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolle Wood, Salem State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Absentees:**                        |
| Callie Olson, Lakeland College        |
| Joe Onderko, Presidents Athletic Conference |
| Chris O’Rourke, Becker College        |
| Natalie Winkelfoos, Oberlin College   |

| **NCAA Staff Support in Attendance:** |
| Jessica Duff, Nicole Hollomon, Louise McCleary, Sonja Robinson, Sarah Sadowski and Amy Wilson. |
After the NCAA Convention Division III Ethnic Minority Participant Program debrief session, on January 16, 2016, the participants filled out a brief feedback survey that included three rating questions and seven open-ended questions. Overall, 30 participants provided their input. The summary of their comments can be found below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL ACADEMY</th>
<th>Very Helpful</th>
<th>Somewhat Helpful</th>
<th>Not Helpful</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How helpful was the NCAA DIII Ethnic Minority Participant Pilot Program Welcome Session?</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How informative did you find the content of the welcome binder materials?</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How informative and/or helpful did you find the speakers?</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Briefly, tell us your thoughts on the selection process and the correspondence you received pre-convention:

Overall, the response from all thirty (30) participants was positive. Many indicated that the selection process was effective and fair. There were some responses (5) that indicated there needed to be a more selective and intentional process to ensure participants were interested in a career in athletics and attended convention for the right reasons. In regards to the correspondence they received pre-convention, some (6) participants would have liked to receive more information in advance. Such information included: 1) information/bios of all mentors; 2) information/bios of all participants; 3) what types of things to bring to convention; 4) a clearer explanation of mentor and mentee expectations, 5) what to expect at convention; 6) what needed to be covered in terms of cost; and 7) descriptions of programming.

Briefly, identify any expectations met or not met with your assigned mentor:

While a majority of the participants noted that their expectations with their assigned mentor were met or exceeded, some provided recommendations related to receiving advanced information about their mentors. One respondent expressed an interest in having access to all mentors. Another thought a more formalized meeting between mentors and mentees would be beneficial. Some individuals also requested
extra time to meet with mentors to discuss career aspirations, goals for convention and strengths and weaknesses.

**Briefly, identify any expectations met or not met during the Division III Ethnic Minority Participant Pilot Program:**

Many of the participants disclosed that their expectations were succeeded; one noted it was a “priceless experience,” while another said it was “beyond anything I could have expected.” The overall consensus was that they expected to meet people, to network, to further their knowledge of the NCAA and college athletics, and to understand the role of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. A number of participants (7) wished they had more time to network and meet other women and ethnic minorities. Others (3) had hoped that there could have been an open forum with NCAA staff and people from the membership to discuss issues of diversity and inclusion, and how to negate the lack of diversity within the division.

**Recommendations for future pilot programs:**

Most of the participants provided recommendations for future programs. Of those recommendations, eight (8) respondents noted that more time on the front end of the programming would have been beneficial and may have resulted in an opportunity to spend more time getting to know their mentors and other participants (5). Almost a third of the respondents (9) requested a “speed-dating” icebreaker in order for all participants to meet and get to know each other upon arrival. Several of those respondents (4) noted that a “pre-profile” of all participants should be sent out before the start of programming. Several (5) participants expressed an interest in meeting other ethnic minorities; either through an open forum on diversity and inclusion, or a reception with others within the membership. A few (3) participants also recommended there be clearer expectations for mentors and mentees leading up to convention, while a couple (2) requested more interaction and integration between National SAAC members.

**Was the information presented in a useful manner?**

A strong majority (24) of the respondents said that the information was presented in a useful manner, noting that what they received was very helpful, informative, clear and well organized. A few (3) made specific mention of the binder and the pre-convention email. One respondent requested there be a resources page with websites listed.

**Do you feel more prepared to start a career in Division III athletics?**

Of the 30 respondents, 24 felt more prepared to start a career in Division III athletics. Three respondents failed to provide a response to the question, while two said that a career in athletics is not their intended path. The majority of respondents acknowledged that the information provided has allowed them to not
only feel more confident in starting a career in Division III athletics, but has also given them a better understanding of what to expect.

General Comments:

Attendees expressed their thanks to those who put the program together, as well as the speakers involved, and their appreciation for the opportunity to attend convention. One respondent noted that this was a “life-changing experience,” and a few expressed the necessity to continue outreach with current participants and to expand the program in upcoming years. The Honors Celebration was a highlight for a few participants (3) as well.
Differences Among Student and Student-Athlete Populations

- **Female**: 40%
- **Ethnic Minority**: 23%

Change in Director of Athletics Positions By Gender and Ethnicity

**Previous ADs**
- White Males - 42
- White Females - 21
- Minority Males - 4
- Minority Females - 3

**Current ADs**
- White Males - 46
- White Females - 21
- Minority Males - 2
- Minority Females - 1

Note: These figures are derived from membership requested changes to the membership database during the 18 month period of April 2014 - October 2015. There were 70 positions that turned over during this time.

Current Population Figures for Select Division III Positions By Gender and Ethnicity

- **Student-Athletes**: 70,938 (White Males: 24,975, Ethnic Males: 52,650)
- **Asst. Coaches**: 9,290 (White Males: 1,657, Ethnic Males: 3,871)
- **Head Coaches**: 4,501 (White Males: 437, Ethnic Males: 1,749)
- **Asst. ADs**: 325 (White Males: 28, Ethnic Males: 191)
- **Assoc. ADs**: 185 (White Males: 11, Ethnic Males: 162)
- **ADs**: 307 (White Males: 19, Ethnic Males: 125)
- **Presidents**: 290 (White Males: 33, Ethnic Males: 115)

Note: These figures represent the 2014-15 populations and were derived from the data reported in the annual sport sponsorship and demographic forms. Additionally, head coach, assistant coach and student-athlete totals include only outdoor track figures, to reduce the incidence of potential triple counting.
## 2016 NCAA Convention Voting Grid – NCAA Division III
(Saturday, January 16, Business Session)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>Business Session</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>455-18-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion to Divide 2</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>263-192-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A and B</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Defeated</td>
<td>106-365-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 C</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Defeated</td>
<td>62-410-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Defeated</td>
<td>154-232-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>223-45-185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>409-53-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>333-128-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>461-3-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>452-14-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>418-44-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>423-21-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal NC 2016-4 separated from Consent Package. Approved NC 2016-4 by paddle vote.

**APPROVED THE REMAINING BLUE PAGES**

**APPROVED THE ADOPTION OF THE NOTICE AND PROGRAM AS AMENDED**

*Effective immediately*
Playing and Practice Seasons Straw Poll Results

A. Standardization of contest exemptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count all conference championship participation as one contest/date of competition.</th>
<th>Number Responses</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count all conference championship participation as one contest/date of competition.</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate all sport specific exemptions.</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate all existing sport specific exemptions, but allow each sport one discretionary exemption.</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate all sport specific exemptions, but allow each sport two discretionary exemptions.</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain conference and NCAA championship exemptions along with two discretionary exemptions, but eliminating all other exemptions.</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other concept.</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Count all conference championship participation as one contest/date of competition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/ADR (59)</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Administrator (349)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Athletics Representative (37)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (104)</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Administrator (48)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Eliminate all sport specific exemptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/ADR (56)</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Administrator (359)</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Athletics Representative (36)</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (101)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Administrator (46)</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Eliminate all existing sport specific exemptions, but allow each sport one discretionary exemption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/ADR (57)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Administrator (370)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Athletics Representative (37)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (98)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Administrator (45)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Eliminate all sport specific exemptions, but allow each sport two discretionary exemptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/ADR (59)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Administrator (377)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Athletics Representative (37)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (101)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Administrator (49)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Maintain conference and NCAA championship exemptions along with two discretionary exemptions, but eliminating all other exemptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/ADR (57)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Administrator (379)</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Athletics Representative (36)</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (101)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Administrator (48)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Other concept.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/ADR (58)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Administrator (370)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Athletics Representative (34)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (103)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Administrator (48)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Nontraditional Segment Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Responses</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce practice opportunities from 16 to 12.</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a standard start date for the nontraditional segment in the fall.</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow institutions to choose between the current nontraditional segment model and small group instruction and/or strength training throughout the academic year.</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other concept.</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Responses</th>
<th>Small group instruction</th>
<th>Strength training</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replace the current nontraditional segment model with small group instruction and/or strength training throughout the academic year.</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Reduce practice opportunities from 16 to 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/ADR (51)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Administrator (354)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Athletics Representative (30)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (105)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Administrator (47)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Establish a standard start date for the nontraditional segment in the fall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/ADR (50)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Administrator (353)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Athletics Representative (29)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (102)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Administrator (46)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Replace the current nontraditional segment model with small group instruction and/or strength training throughout the academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small group instruction</th>
<th>Strength training</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/ADR (53)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Administrator (373)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Athletics Representative (31)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (103)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Administrator (47)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Allow institutions to choose between the current nontraditional segment model and small group instruction and/or strength training throughout the academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/ADR (53)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Administrator (361)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Athletics Representative (35)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (101)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Administrator (47)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Other concept.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/ADR (53)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Administrator (345)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Athletics Representative (31)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (99)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Administrator (49)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Contest Limitations in Select Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Number Responses</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce contest maximums in baseball/softball by 5%.</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce contest maximums during the baseball/softball traditional</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>segment by four but add two dates of competition during the nontraditional segment.</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a two-period model for baseball/softball, similar to golf,</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rowing, tennis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other concept.</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Reduce contest maximums in baseball/softball by 5%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/ADR (57)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Administrator (353)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Athletics Representative (35)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (103)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Administrator (44)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Reduce contest maximums during the baseball/softball traditional segment by four but add two dates of competition during the nontraditional segment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/ADR (53)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Administrator (353)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Athletics Representative (35)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (101)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Administrator (42)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Create a two-period model for baseball/softball, similar to golf, rowing, tennis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/ADR (52)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Administrator (357)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Athletics Representative (35)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (101)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Administrator (43)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Other concept.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/ADR (54)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Administrator (349)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Athletics Representative (33)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (96)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Administrator (42)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the January 15, 2016 NCAA Division III Issues Forum, roundtable discussions were held regarding what steps, if any, need to be taken to reform the current playing and practice seasons legislation. Roundtable topics centered on three key areas: (a) Standardization of contest exemptions; (b) Nontraditional segment alternatives; and (c) Contest limitations in softball and baseball. The participants included presidents/chancellors, athletics direct reports, commissioners, directors of athletics, senior woman administrators, athletics communicators/sports information directors, associate and assistant directors and coaches, as well as student-athletes and faculty athletic representatives. Participants were provided with materials which included the background of each area, straw-poll questions and a flier identifying the standard exemptions and sport specific exemptions. Each straw-poll question was presented in a format that asked the participants if there was interest in continuing to discuss a particular topic. The roundtable discussions occurred prior to the straw-poll questions. The summary of responses from the 108 roundtables (approximately 1,000 participants) helps to supplement the findings from the straw-poll responses.

### STANDARDIZATION OF CONTEST EXEMPTIONS

Discuss what interests and concerns you have about each concept listed below. Some issues to consider may be the impact on: (a) Budgets; (b) Student-athlete experience; (c) Retention; (d) Division III philosophy; (e) Administrative operations; and (f) Compliance. This discussion will inform potential future discussions of the subcommittee, so please include anything you want that group to consider.

1. **Count all conference championship participation as a single contest/date of competition.** A strong majority of the room (approximately 70 tables) were in opposition to counting all conference championship participation as a single contest/date of competition. The rationale for this opposition is that because not all teams advance to the conference tournament, most teams would be penalized as a result of having to predict the future of their season. Additionally, some tables (seven) noted that doing so would make scheduling problematic. A small portion of the room (four tables) stated that counting all conference participation as a single date/contest would be beneficial for the division.

2. **Eliminate all sport specific exemptions.** Approximately 50 tables opposed the elimination of all sport specific exemptions. While the consensus of the room remained that consistency is important, all sports are unique and therefore eliminating sport specific exemptions may be unrealistic. Overall, the room seemed to prefer standardization over complete elimination. Rather than taking away exemptions from some sports, adding to other sports would be more desirable. Of the tables that favored eliminating sport specific exemptions (14), there was a desire to do so in order to be consistent, and to reduce compliance and financial issues.

3. **Eliminate all existing sport specific exemptions, but allow each sport one discretionary exemption.** Of the tables that responded to this question, approximately 35 thought the idea of eliminating all existing sport specific exemptions, but allowing each sport one discretionary exemption was not a good idea. There was opposition for reasons similar to the above question: eliminating sport specific exemptions is problematic because each sport is different. Approximately
ten tables thought the idea of eliminating all existing sport specific exemptions, but allowing each sport one discretionary exemption, was a step in the right direction.

4. **Eliminate all sport specific exemptions, but allow each sport two discretionary exemptions.** The consensus of the room was more mixed when asked if all sport specific exemptions should be eliminated, but allow each sport two discretionary exemptions. Fifteen tables found this concept appealing because institutions and teams could decide what is best for each sport. About twice as many tables (approximately 30) still disagreed with the concept and noted that exemptions should be assessed on a sport by sport basis.

5. **Maintain the existing conference championship and post-season exemption, while eliminating all other standard and sport specific exemptions and allowing each sport two discretionary exemptions.** Approximately 40 tables believed maintaining the existing conference championship and post-season exemption, while eliminating all other standard and sport specific exemptions and allowing each sport two discretionary exemptions, is the most viable option of those given because it is the least restrictive. However, there were still approximately 15 tables that did not agree with this concept either because (a) one discretionary exemption is preferred; (b) sports and season differences (e.g., start dates and academic calendars) are too different that eliminating sport specific exemptions is not ideal; or (c) standard exemptions should not be eliminated.

**Are there alternatives to the concepts presented that would accomplish a standardization of contest exemptions across all sports, that you would like the subcommittee to consider?**

When asked if there are other alternatives to the concepts presented that would accomplish a standardization of contest exemptions across all sports, that the subcommittee should consider, the following themes emerged from the tables in the room:

- Concept #5 with only one discretionary exemption (approximately 12 tables).
- Protect the alumni game – either as a standard exemption, or in addition to the discretionary exemptions (approximately seven tables).
- Provide a set number of sport specific exemptions, but leave it to the discretion of the sport committees to decide which ones (approximately seven tables).
- Make the exemption based on a percentage of the number of games (approximately five tables).
- Maintain the status quo (approximately 15 tables).

**Summary:** Overall, there seems to be an appetite for standardizing exemptions, but how that looks is yet to be determined. Schools (i.e., resources), sports (i.e., length of season) and regions (i.e., weather) are all different that standardizing across the division is a difficult task. There seems to be concern about potential unintended consequences for the diverse division and across sports. Many tables also expressed an interest in maintaining the status quo.
NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT ALTERNATIVES

Discuss what interests and concerns you about each concept listed below. Some issues to consider may be the impact on: (a) Budgets; (b) Student-athlete experience; (c) Retention; (d) Division III philosophy; (e) Administrative operations; and (f) Compliance. This discussion will inform potential future discussions of the subcommittee, so please include anything you want that group to consider.

1. Reduce practice opportunities in the nontraditional segment from 16 to 12. A strong majority (approximately 60 tables) expressed no interest in reducing nontraditional practices from 16 to 12. Some (five tables) even believed 16 practice opportunities is not enough. The idea that sports are unique arose again, and while some tables (15) thought a reduction would be sufficient for some sports, it may hinder others. Approximately eight tables were under the impression that reducing these nontraditional segment opportunities could hurt retention and recruiting of prospective student-athletes. Additionally, approximately ten tables stated that this reduction may already be occurring at some schools, and that a division wide mandate is unnecessary. A small portion of the room (approximately five tables) voiced some interest in the reduction from 16 to 12.

2. Establish a standard start date for the nontraditional segment in the fall. Of the tables that responded to whether there should be a standard start date for the nontraditional segment in the fall, approximately 55 believed there should be institutional autonomy given the diversity of the division – geography, weather and academic calendars play a large part in the decision of when the nontraditional segment should commence. Additionally, approximately ten tables believe a standard start date would put a strain on athletic training staff, while four tables were actually under the impression that a standard start date could benefit athletic trainers.

3. Replace the current nontraditional segment model with either limited small group instruction or strength and conditioning throughout the academic year. Approximately 50 tables expressed that replacing the current nontraditional segment model with either limited small group instruction or strength and conditioning throughout the academic year is not ideal for a number of reasons. Approximately twelve tables raised concerns with how schools would monitor it. From a compliance point of view, this could raise issues, especially considering the number of tables (30) that expressed the need for more explanation regarding the definition of “small groups.” Additionally, over 25 tables believed that mandating this concept would be detrimental to institutions without full-time strength and conditioning coaches. There would be an added strain for facilities and staffing. Fifteen tables brought up the notion that replacing the nontraditional segment with only small group instruction or strength and conditioning, could hurt the team concept, and it would be especially detrimental for team sports that rely heavily on the offseason to enhance team chemistry and cohesion. A year-round model as proposed above would also limit opportunities for student-athletes, potentially conflicting with the Division III philosophy, a concern raised by approximately ten tables. This concept of replacing the nontraditional with year-round activities also had some tables (approximately eight) posing the question of how winter sports would be incorporated should such a model be adopted.
4. Institutions can choose to maintain current nontraditional segment format OR replace current nontraditional with small group instruction or strength and conditioning throughout the academic year. Because this concept allows for institutional autonomy, some tables (14) expressed an interest in exploring it further. However, approximately twenty tables did not believe this concept was one to move forward on given the pressure it puts on administrators and compliance officers. The same number of tables expressed an interest in this concept only if it could be decided on a sport by sport basis, or made a conference-wide decision. The most notable idea, however, was to incorporate a blended model of the current nontraditional segment and small group instruction/strength and conditioning throughout the year (approximately 30 tables).

**Are there alternatives to the concepts presented that would accomplish a standardization of contest exemptions across all sports, that you would like the subcommittee to consider?**

When asked if there are alternatives to the concepts presented that would accomplish a standardization of contest exemptions across all sports, that the subcommittee should consider, the following themes emerged from the tables in the room:

- Maintain the status quo and incorporate small group instruction/strength and conditioning throughout the academic year (approximately 30 tables).
- Eliminate the nontraditional segment altogether (approximately seven tables).
- Eliminate the nontraditional segment date of competition (approximately seven tables).
- Allow for the nontraditional segment to be determined at the discretion of the institution (approximately ten tables).

**Summary:** Overall, the consensus of the room remained split between maintaining the status quo, and therefore making no changes to the current nontraditional segment, and creating a hybrid model that includes the current nontraditional as well as year-round strength and conditioning/ small group training.

**CONTEST LIMITATIONS IN SELECT SPORTS (baseball and softball)**

Discuss what interests and concerns you about each concept. Some issues to consider may be the impact on: (a) Budgets; (b) Student-athlete experience; (c) Retention; (d) Division III philosophy; (e) Administrative operations; and (f) Compliance. This discussion will inform potential future discussions of the subcommittee, so please include anything you want that group to consider.

1. **Reduce baseball/softball contests by 5% (reduce from 40 to 38 contests).** Of the tables that responded to the question of reducing baseball and softball contests by five percent, approximately 40 tables had no interest. Half of those stated that a two contest reduction is arbitrary and would not make a difference in the overall budget or student-athlete experience.

Similar to responses regarding contest exemptions and the nontraditional segment, institutional autonomy is vital in the discussion of contest limitations (approximately 15 tables). Some tables (approximately nine) believed date of competitions should be reduced, not overall contests. Approximately the same number of tables (ten) believed a reduction in softball/baseball contests is appealing.
2. **Reduce contest maximums in the traditional segment by four (40 to 36) but add two dates of competition in the nontraditional segment (three total in the nontraditional segment).** Approximately 50 tables were of the notion that reducing contest maximums by four and adding two dates of competition in the nontraditional segment was not where the division should focus its efforts. Factors contributing to this included issues in staffing, especially for athletic trainers (approximately seven tables); the limitation of fall opportunities for student-athletes (approximately seven tables); and the potential for compliance related issues to arise, such as seasons of participation (approximately three tables). Approximately eight tables expressed an interest in this concept, assuming the two dates of competition are not added to the nontraditional segment.

3. **Create a two period model similar to golf, rowing and tennis.** The concept of a two period model for softball and baseball resulted in very mixed feedback. While approximately 20 tables expressed interest in exploring this concept further, due to weather issues (i.e., cancelled games) and potential budget savings (i.e., the elimination of a spring break trip), a majority of tables (ranging from 30 to 50) brought up potential issues of the split season model. Approximately 40 tables believed having a split model would hinder dual sport athletes, and about the same number of tables expressed concern with the lack of staffing and facility space if baseball/softball were added to the fall lineup. Approximately 30 tables expressed that a two period model would take away from the overall student-athlete experience (i.e., the ability to study abroad).

**Are there alternatives to the concepts presented that you would like the subcommittee to consider?**

When asked if there are alternatives to the concepts presented that the subcommittee should consider, the following themes emerged from the tables in the room:

- Baseball and softball should be looked at separately (approximately 30 tables).
- Baseball and softball should be moved to the fall season (approximately ten tables).
- Innings for baseball should be reduced (approximately 5 tables).
- Dates of competitions should be reduced, not contests (approximately 10 tables).
- There should be institutional autonomy for contest limitations for baseball and softball (approximately ten tables).
- Maintain the status quo (approximately seven tables).
- Reduce the minimum contest dates (approximately five tables).
- Extend the baseball/softball seasons (approximately five tables).

**Summary:** While there were several alternatives raised in the discussion of contest limitations in baseball/softball, the overall consensus is that before the subcommittee can explore options in reducing contests for these sports, they need to be separated. To lump them under the same legislative umbrella would not make sense as they are two different sports with different challenges and different needs.
**Executive Summary – Board of Governors Committee on Structure and Composition Survey**

The NCAA Board of Governors’ Committee on Structure and Composition commissioned a survey of the membership to gather perspectives on the structure of the NCAA Board of Governors and to test several concepts for the Governor’s consideration and discussion of its structure. The survey was distributed in early November of 2015 to a broad swathe of the membership including Presidents and Chancellors, Directors of Athletics, Senior Women Administrators, Faculty Athletics Representatives, and conference personnel.

**Demographic Information on Respondents**

In total 5,254 individuals received an invitation to participate in the survey. There were 1,956 individuals who responded* to all or parts to the survey, bringing the gross participation rate to approximately 37%. Divisional Response rates were: division I = 35%, division II = 29%, division III = 35%. The respondents represented a mix of divisions and positions.

*Presidents or chancellors: 327; Athletics directors: 555; Senior woman administrators: 376; Faculty athletic representatives: 338; Conference commissioners: 122; Other members of the membership: 238.

Representation from the various Division I subdivisions was:

- FBS - 306 respondents (169 from the Autonomous Group)
- FCS - 217 respondents, and
- 172 respondents from division I institutions that do not sponsor football.

Fifty-seven percent of the respondents were either currently serving on NCAA governance committees or have served in the past. This includes 49 current members of the division II or III Presidents Council or DI Board of Directors, and 72 who currently serve on the division II or III Management Council or the DI Council.

**Familiarity and satisfaction with current structure**

Respondents were asked if they had a good understanding of the role and structure of the Board of Governors. Overall 35% either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they did, an additional 37% “somewhat agreed.”
In all, 81% of respondents reported that they were satisfied (at some level) that the Board was fulfilling its stated role. 42% of those respondents were in the “somewhat satisfied” category, 35% were “satisfied”, and 4% were “very satisfied”.

Another question asked if respondents were satisfied with the current structure of the Board. Among all respondents, 27% said they were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with the current structure. An additional 28% said they were “somewhat satisfied.” Division I respondents report being “very satisfied” or “satisfied” (35%) than in division II (24%) and division III (20%). If the “somewhat satisfied” respondents are added to the calculation; division I= 67%, division II= 51%, division III= 44%.

Concepts for revision to the Board of Governors Structure

A major portion of the survey questionnaire asked for opinions on some concepts for revisions to the Board of Governors structure. A total of five concepts were mooted for consideration by the survey respondents. They were:

- Creating greater divisional balance among the membership of the Board of Governors
- Adding current student-athletes to the Board
- Requiring the Board to be comprised of only presidents and chancellors
- Adding membership representation to the board from among athletics administrators and others such as FARs, Conference commissioners, etc.
- Adding external members to the Board, for example community or business leaders.

Among these concepts, three garnered support from at least half of the respondents, though there were some divisional and positional differences.

- Creating greater divisional balance:
  - Overall: 80% support, 47% "strongly supporting" the concept.
  - By division: DI=56%, DII=91%, DIII=93%
- Adding members to the Board who are not presidents or chancellors (e.g. ADs, SWAs, FARs)
  - Overall: 75% support
  - Presidents and Chancellors=31%, All others=83%
- Adding current student-athletes to the Board
  - Overall: 56% support
  - Presidents = 42%
  - By division: DI=63%, DII=52%, DIII=46%

Concept for revision to the Board of Governors Composition: Terms in Office

The final question on the survey asked if the terms in office for Board members should be fixed for a set number of years rather than coinciding with service on another governance committee as it does currently. Overall, 76% of respondents supported that concept, while only 6% voiced opposition.
### 1. Please indicate your current position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>President or Chancellor</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Director of Athletics</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Senior Woman Administrator</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Faculty Athletic Representative</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Conference Administrator</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other*: Coach=63, Associate or Assistant AD=42, SAAC=27, Compliance Administrator=12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>1,956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. In which division does your institution primarily compete?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Division I</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Division II</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Division III</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>1,956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Please indicate the Division I subdivision in which you compete:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Football Bowl Subdivision - Autonomous Group</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Football Championship Subdivision</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Division I Subdivision</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Football Bowl Subdivision - Non-Autonomous group</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistic | Value  
---|---
Min Value | 1
Max Value | 4
Mean | 2.40
Variance | 1.12
Standard Deviation | 1.06
Total Responses | 695

4. Are you currently a member of the following NCAA governance committees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Presidents Council (DII or DIII) or Board of Directors (DI)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Management Council (DII or DIII) or Council (DI)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Any other NCAA Committee (please specify)</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am not currently on an NCAA Committee but I have served in the past</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I have never served on an NCAA Committee</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,923</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistic | Value  
---|---
Min Value | 1
Max Value | 5
Mean | 4.00
Variance | 1.09
Standard Deviation | 1.05
Total Responses | 1,923
5. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statement: I have a good understanding of the role and structure of the NCAA Board of Governors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistic | Value
---|---
Min Value | 1
Max Value | 6
Mean | 3.05
Variance | 1.48
Standard Deviation | 1.22
Total Responses | 1,916

6. How satisfied are you that the Board of Governors effectively ". . . ensure(s) that each division operates consistent with the basic purposes, fundamental policies, and general principles of the Association."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistic | Value
---|---
Min Value | 1
Max Value | 6
Mean | 2.86
Variance | 1.05
Standard Deviation | 1.03
Total Responses | 1,663
8. How satisfied are you with the current structure of the Board of Governors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Would you support or oppose the concept of all members of the current Board of Governors being designated as voting members?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistic | Value |
---|---|
Min Value | 1 |
Max Value | 5 |
Mean | 2.50 |
Variance | 0.81 |
Standard Deviation | 0.90 |
Total Responses | 1,738 |
10. Would you support or oppose the concept of greater divisional balance among the membership of the Board of Governors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,734</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistic | Value
--- | ---
Min Value | 1
Max Value | 5
Mean | 1.87
Variance | 1.07
Standard Deviation | 1.04
Total Responses | 1,734

11. Would you support or oppose the concept of adding current student-athletes to the membership of the Board of Governors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistic | Value
--- | ---
Min Value | 1
Max Value | 5
Mean | 2.59
Variance | 1.38
Standard Deviation | 1.18
Total Responses | 1,741
12. Would you support or oppose the concept of the Board of Governors consisting entirely of presidents and/or chancellors with no ex officio members?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Support</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,722</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Would you support or oppose the concept of adding membership representatives that are not presidents or chancellors (for example, directors of athletics, conference commissioners, senior woman administrators, faculty athletic representatives, etc.) to the membership of the Board of Governors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistic | Value
---|---
Min Value | 1
Max Value | 5
Mean | 3.53
Variance | 1.04
Standard Deviation | 1.02
Total Responses | 1,722

Statistic | Value
---|---
Min Value | 1
Max Value | 5
Mean | 2.12
Variance | 1.28
Standard Deviation | 1.13
Total Responses | 1,735
14. Would you support or oppose the concept of adding external members (for example, community or business leaders not affiliated with member institutions) to the membership of the Board of Governors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>1,747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Would you support or oppose the concept of establishing a fixed term for members of the Board of Governors that is independent of their status on a divisional governing body?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Support</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Oppose</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>1,744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSED MODELS FOR DISCUSSION

Based on the
November 2015 Membership
Survey.
Current model

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

VOTING BOARD MEMBERS

- 6 DI/II presidents
- 2 DII presidents
- 2 presidents from DI schools without football
- 2 DII presidents

EX OFFICIO

- Chair of DI Council, DII and DIII Management Councils
- NCAA president

From DI Board of Directors

From DII Presidents Council

From DIII Presidents Council
Divisional balance

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

VOTING BOARD MEMBERS

EX OFFICIO

Divisional presidents

Division I  Division II  Division III

Chair of DI Council, DII and DIII Management Councils

NCAA president
Divisional balance

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

VOTING BOARD MEMBERS

Divisional presidents

Division I  Division II  Division III

EX OFFICIO

Chairs of DI Council, DII and DIII Management Councils

NCAA president
Additional athletics administrators

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

VOTING BOARD MEMBERS

Divisional presidents

EX OFFICIO

NCAA president

Chairs of DI Council,
DII and DIII Management Councils
Include student-athletes

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

VOTING BOARD MEMBERS
Divisional presidents

EX OFFICIO
NCAA president

STUDENT-ATHLETE
Include student-athlete

**BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

- **VOTING BOARD MEMBERS**
  - Divisional presidents

- **EX OFFICIO**
  - NCAA president

- **STUDENT-ATHLETE**
Include student-athlete

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

VOTING BOARD MEMBERS

EX OFFICIO

STUDENT-ATHLETE

Divisional presidents

NCAA president

NCAA
Include student-athlete

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

VOTING BOARD MEMBERS

EX OFFICIO

STUDENT-ATHLETE

Divisional presidents

NCAA president

NCAA
RESOLUTION REAFFIRMING THE ASSOCIATION'S COMMITMENT TO CULTURAL DIVERSITY AND INCLUSIVENESS IN ATHLETICS LEADERSHIP

On Tuesday, January 19, 2016, the Board of Governors of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) approved the following resolution.

WHEREAS NCAA Constitution Article 4.1.2 charges the NCAA Board of Governors with identifying core issues that affect the Association as a whole and with overseeing Association-wide issues and ensuring that each division operates consistent with the basic purposes, fundamental policies and general principle of the Association;

WHEREAS NCAA Constitution Article 2.2.2 requires each member institution to establish and maintain an environment that values cultural diversity among its intercollegiate athletics department staff;

WHEREAS the Board of Governors regularly takes action to preserve and enhance student-athlete well-being and promote nondiscriminatory and effective learning and competitive environments;

WHEREAS the Board of Governors reaffirms the Association's commitment to establish and maintain an inclusive culture that fosters equitable participation for student-athletes and career opportunities for coaches and administrators from diverse backgrounds.

WHEREAS the Board of Governors acknowledges a growing concern with the low representation of racially and ethnically diverse individuals in the intercollegiate coaching and athletics administration at all levels.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Board of Governors recognizes the critical importance of diversity and inclusion being reflected in coaching and athletics staff in intercollegiate athletics. The Board of Governors acknowledges that it is our members’ individual and collective responsibility pursuant to the Principle of Student-Athlete Well-Being, to conduct athletics departments in a manner designed to protect and enhance the physical and educational well-being of student-athletes and to ensure that the values and principles articulated in the Constitution are realized. Racially and ethnically diverse and inclusive campuses will improve the learning environment for all—student-athletes, administrators and staff—and will enhance excellence across our Association.

To that end, the Board of Governors recognizes the importance of presidential leadership, engagement and the appropriate resources necessary to support this issue. It will create an ad hoc committee to address matters of diversity and inclusiveness across the membership and the national office. The Board of Governors further encourages all member institutions to engage in the development of:
• Partnerships with coaching and athletics staff associations, particularly those representing diverse constituencies, to promote recruitment, support retention and broaden pathways to opportunities.
• Association-wide best practices supported by coaching and athletics staff associations with an emphasis on fostering diversity and inclusion within athletics departments.
• Engagement with overall individual campus efforts to better foster diversity and inclusion within athletics departments.

The national office will lead the following initiatives:

• Development of strategies to encourage the membership to provide real-time information about career opportunities to ensure a more comprehensive NCAA database that is centralized and more accessible.
• Pipeline program development in areas where cultural diversity may be especially lacking, with a particular emphasis on men and women of color.
• Develop a Diversity and Inclusion recognition metric.
• Engage minority-serving institutions within the membership to assist with identifying resources and initiatives related to cultural diversity.
## NCAA BOARD OF GOVERNORS
### AD HOC COMMITTEE TO PROMOTE CULTURAL DIVERSITY & EQUITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROSTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Kevin Anderson**  
Director of Athletics  
University of Maryland  
Phone: 301-314-1167  
Mobile: 845-667-6163  
Email: kevina@umd.edu  
Assistant: Denise O'Rourke  
Phone: 301-314-0013  
Email: dorourke@umd.edu |
| **Dan Guerrero**  
Director of Athletics  
University of California, Los Angeles  
J.D. Morgan Center, 325 Westwood  
P.O. Box 24044  
Los Angeles, California 90024  
Phone: 310/206-6382  
Email: dguerrero@athletics.ucla.edu  
Assistant: Leslie Dalziel Miller  
Email: ldalziel@athletics.ucla.edu |
| **Michael Drake**  
**Ad Hoc Committee Chair**  
President  
The Ohio State University  
205 Bricker Hall  
190 North Oval Mall  
Columbus, Ohio 43210  
Phone: 614/292-2424  
Email: president@osu.edu  
Assistant: Mira Zimmerman  
Email: zimmerman.638@osu.edu |
| **Tori Haring-Smith**  
President  
Washington and Jefferson College  
60 South Lincoln Street  
Washington, PA 15301  
Phone: 724/223-6000  
FAX: 724/250-3329  
Email: tharingsmith@washjeff.edu  
Assistant: Debbie Morris  
Phone: 724/223-6000  
Email: dmorris@washjeff.edu |
| **Deborah L. Ford**  
**Ad Hoc Committee Chair**  
Chancellor  
University of Wisconsin-Parkside  
900 Wood Road  
Kenosha, Wisconsin 53141  
Telephone: 262/595-2211  
FAX: 262/595-2630  
Email: ford@uwp.edu  
Contact: Diane Donnelly – donnelly@uwp.edu |
| **Dianne Harrison**  
President  
California State University, Northridge  
18111 Nordhoff Street, UN 200  
Northridge, California 91330-8239  
Phone: 818/677-2121  
Email: dianne.harrison@csun.edu  
Assistant: Ken Rappe  
Email: ken.rappe@csun.edu  
Phone: 818/677-2121 |
| **Glendell Jones, Jr.**  
President  
Henderson State University  
HSU 7532  
Arkadelphia, Arkansas 71999-0001  
Telephone: 870/230-5091  
FAX: 870/230-5147  
Email: gjones@hsu.edu  
Assistant: Flora Weeks  
Telephone: 870/230-5091  
Email: weeksf@hsu.edu |
| **G.P. (Bud) Peterson**  
President  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
225 North Avenue N.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30332-0325  
Phone: 404/894-5051  
Email: bud.peterson@gatech.edu  
Assistant: Stephanie Johnston  
Phone: 404/894-8162  
Email: Stephanie.Johnston@gatech.edu |
## NCAA BOARD OF GOVERNORS
### AD HOC COMMITTEE TO PROMOTE CULTURAL DIVERSITY & EQUITY

#### ROSTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Title</th>
<th>Institution/Affiliation</th>
<th>Address/Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| L. Jay Lemons            | NCAA Board of Governors vice chair    | Ad Hoc Committee Chair                           | President  
Susquehanna University  
514 University Ave.  
Selinsgrove, PA 17870  
Email: lemonsj@susqu.edu  
Assistant: Sharon Pope  
Phone: 570-372-4018  
Email: popes@susqu.edu |
| Tracey Ranieri           | Director of Athletics                 | State University of New York at Oneonta (SUNYAC) | Alumni Fieldhouse  
Room 312, Ravine Parkway  
Oneonta, New York 13820  
Phone: 607/436-2446  
FAX: 607/436-3581  
Cell Phone: 607/437-0056  
Email: Tracey.Ranieri@oneonta.edu |
| Jacqueline McWilliams    | Commissioner                          | Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association     | Commissioner  
4725 Piedmont Row Drive, Suite 200  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28210  
Telephone: 704/910-2133  
Cell: 757/298-4504  
FAX Number: 704/910-2855  
Email: commissioner@theciaa.com  
Assistant: Jessica Incorminias  
Telephone: 704/910-2133  
Email: jincorminias@theciaa.com |
| Michael Rao              | President                             | Virginia Commonwealth University                 | President  
Virginia Commonwealth University  
910 West Franklin Street  
Richmond, Virginia 23284  
Phone: 804/828-1200  
Email: president@vcu.edu  
Assistant: Marella Briggs  
Email: mbriggs@vcu.edu |
| George C. Wright         | President                             | Prairie View A&M University                      | President  
Prairie View A&M University  
P.O. Box 188  
Prairie View, Texas 77484  
Phone: 936/857-2111  
Email: gcwright@pvamu.edu  
Assistant: Shauna King  
Phone: 936/857-2111  
Email: slking@pvamu.edu |
**NCAA BOARD OF GOVERNORS**  
**AD HOC COMMITTEE TO PROMOTE CULTURAL DIVERSITY & EQUITY**  
**ROSTER**

**Ad Hoc Committee Liaisons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nnenna Akotaobi</th>
<th>Ms. Kayla Porter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIII Management Council</td>
<td>Vice chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Opportunities &amp; Interests Committee (MOIC)</td>
<td>DIII Student-Athletic Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Woman Administrator</td>
<td>Frostburg State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swarthmore College</td>
<td>126 Center Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 College Avenue</td>
<td>Frostburg, MD 21532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swarthmore, Pennsylvania 19081</td>
<td>Phone: 301/268-7178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 610/328-8222</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kayla.porter@comcast.net">Kayla.porter@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAX: 610/328-7798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:nnenna@swarthmore.edu">nnenna@swarthmore.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assistant: Sharon Green | |
|-------------------------||
| Phone: 610/328-8218 | |
| Email: sgreen1@swarthmore.edu | |

| Ms. Sherika Montgomery | |
|------------------------||
| Member, Committee on Women's Athletics (CWA) | |
| Assistant Commissioner Big South | |
| 7233 Pineville-Matthews Road, Suite 100 | |
| Charlotte, NC 28226 | |
| Phone: 704-341-7990 | |
| Email: sherikam@bigsouth.org | |

**NCAA Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr. Bernard Franklin</th>
<th>Donald M. Remy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Vice President of Education and Community Engagement/Chief Inclusion Officer</td>
<td>Executive Vice President of Law, Policy &amp; Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 317-917-6947</td>
<td>Phone: 317-917-6914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:bfranklin@ncaa.org">bfranklin@ncaa.org</a></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:dremy@ncaa.org">dremy@ncaa.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>