

**The
NCAA Division III Membership
Survey**



Findings

April 9, 2008

INTRODUCTION

The Survey

The survey was intended to provide Division III institutions with the ability to express their opinions concerning the future direction of Division III. The responses will help the membership decide the future direction of the division and help the Executive Committee and Division III Membership Working Groups and the other governance committees make related recommendations to the membership. Even though it will be the member institutions, through a vote that will ultimately make those decisions, the survey was not designed to represent a binding referendum. Rather, it was designed as an assessment tool to gather the perspectives and preferences of the institutions that will help to better inform the membership and the governance structure.

Since Division III casts votes on an institutional basis, the survey was intended to capture an institutional response.

442 Division III active and provisional member institutions were requested to submit a survey.

The response rate was: 96%

Campus leaders were strongly encouraged to engage all appropriate colleagues in the completion of the survey. This table presents the involvement of various campus constituents involved in the formulation of survey responses.

Position	%
President or Chancellor	88
Individual to whom the Athletics Director reports	67
Athletics Director	90
Senior Woman Administrator	69
Faculty Athletics Representative	61
Student-Athlete Representative	45
Other: Other athletics administrators, coaches and other campus leaders	46

Adequate space for the inclusion of comments was provided throughout the survey. An additional sheet was provided as well. More than half of all respondents took the opportunity to provide comments. A separate report will address the comments submitted by respondents.

Background

The issues explored in the survey related to membership growth and structure are complex. To date, the NCAA has distributed a wealth of materials providing background for the ongoing discussions.

The growth of the Division III membership has been a topic of discussion for several years. Since 1990 approximately 120 new members have joined the division with around two-thirds of those members coming from the NAIA. Projections are that approximately 60 more institutions will seek to join the division in the coming years. Such growth will bring the total membership to approximately 480 by the 2020 academic year. Planning for that growth is an essential responsibility of the membership and governance structure.

Given such growth, and the diversity in size and mission of the institutions that comprise the division, concern has arisen as to the commonality of perspective on the role of intercollegiate athletics in the educational enterprise. Analysis for the Division III Working Group on recent closely contested legislative votes suggests there is a diversity of perspectives on the role of athletics in Division III. While such diversity is not surprising in such a large organization, there is reason to evaluate whether that diversity of opinion should best be served through structural change.

Ultimately, the membership will have to decide the future of Division III. This survey was designed to allow the division to move beyond speculation and analysis of past preferences and more directly address its future.

DIVISION III IN 2008

I. Current Perceptions

The following questions were designed to address the institution’s current state of satisfaction with Division III and their view of their institutional place in the division. The respondent was asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement. Responses are reported in percentages.

		Percentage						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
1.	Athletics helps in establishing a diverse student-body on our campus (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, socioeconomics).	46.6	36.4	11.8	1.4	2.4	0.5	0.9
2.	There is an appropriate balance between academics and athletics on our campus.	55.5	37.2	6.2	0.9	0.2	-	-
3.	Legislative standards are necessary to ensure opportunities for student-athlete engagement in the life of the school beyond athletics.	8.6	25.3	21.0	13.4	18.9	11.7	1.2
4.	Athletics participation is just as valuable to student development as any other extra-curricular activity.	80.6	17.1	2.4	-	-	-	-
5.	Current Division III legislative standards are consistent with our school’s perspective on intercollegiate athletics.	27.0	49.1	17.8	4.7	0.9	-	0.5
6.	Division III legislative standards should generally become <u>less</u> permissive.	3.2	7.8	15.6	16.5	35.8	16.3	4.9
7.	Division III legislative standards should generally become <u>more</u> permissive.	2.9	8.7	15.5	16.2	31.2	21.3	4.1

II. Recruiting and Initial Eligibility

For most institutions, student-athletes make up an important part of the overall student body. Issues related to the academic profile of student-athletes, and the similarity of those enrolling student-athletes to the general student population, have been much discussed in recent years. Divisions I and II have significant recruiting and initial eligibility regulations, while Division III has fewer legislative standards in this area.

1. Institutional preference concerning current recruiting and initial eligibility standards in general. Responses reported in percentages. Approximately three-quarters responded to this item.

Fewer Standards		Current Standard		More Standards	
1	2	3	4	5	
1.2	3.7	86.3	7.1	1.6	

- 86.3% of institutions indicated a preference for current standards.
- 4.9% of institutions indicated a preference for fewer standards.
- 8.7% of institutions indicated a preference for more standards.

The respondent was asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement. Responses are reported in percentages.

		Percentage						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
2.	Athletics is a key component in enrollment management strategies at my school.	37.5	28.3	16.2	5.2	9.5	3.1	0.2
3.	It is appropriate for individual schools, or groups of schools (e.g. conferences), to place additional restrictions on recruitment of student-athletes.	18.3	40.4	16.6	6.9	9.7	6.4	1.7
4.	Division III should establish further limits on recruiting (i.e. recruiting calendars, more limited athletics personnel contacts).	4.0	7.4	16.0	11.4	31.0	28.8	1.4
5.	Division III should establish fewer limits on recruiting (e.g. permitting tryouts, unlimited contacts, etc).	2.4	6.7	11.9	13.8	35.5	28.8	1.0
6.	Admitted student-athletes should fit the general academic profile of all incoming freshmen students.	59.2	35.3	4.7	0.2	0.2	0.2	-

7.	Schools should report admissions information on all students to a central body (e.g. conference, NCAA national office).	6.2	25.5	16.2	10.7	20.0	16.2	5.0
8.	Admissions policies for student-athletes should be consistent with the general student body.	59.9	34.4	5.0	0.5	-	0.2	-
9.	It is appropriate to admit students based on their athletics participation and/or ability who would not otherwise meet minimum admissions standards.	0.5	2.8	5.7	6.6	28.2	55.7	0.5

III. Financial Aid

Division III is the only NCAA division that prohibits the awarding of financial aid based on athletics ability and/or participation. In 2004, Division III enacted legislation that requires institutions to participate in an annual financial aid reporting process to ensure adherence to that principle. The respondent was asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement. Responses are reported in percentages.

		Percentage						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
1.	Student financial aid decisions made by the admissions and financial aid departments should be entirely independent and free of influence from the athletics department.	60.3	32.1	5.0	1.9	0.7	-	-
2.	Consideration of leadership in athletics (e.g. team captain) in the awarding of financial aid to students should be allowed provided it is consistent with the consideration of leadership in other student activities.	19.8	32.0	13.4	5.5	11.7	16.0	1.7
3.	Current reporting of student financial aid information to the NCAA is appropriate.	25.4	53.9	10.2	2.9	3.3	2.4	1.9
4.	Punitive sanctions for Division III financial aid bylaw violations found in the reporting process (beyond those currently focused on education) are appropriate.	14.1	52.5	13.4	2.2	4.8	2.4	10.6

IV. Academic Performance and Continuing Eligibility

Division III emphasizes the educational value of athletics participation and focuses on the academic success of its student-athletes. Institutional autonomy in such matters as academic performance, progress, and continuing eligibility has been the guiding philosophical and legislative principle of the division, with limited oversight by any central authority. The respondent was asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement. Responses are reported in percentages.

		Percentage						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
1.	Schools should set their own standards for satisfactory academic performance.	46.3	41.8	5.9	2.4	2.1	1.0	0.5
2.	Conferences should set their own standards for satisfactory academic performance.	10.0	25.4	21.8	10.9	21.1	9.7	1.2
3.	Additional rules for continuing eligibility (e.g. satisfactory progress) should be established by the NCAA.	2.6	11.4	12.6	14.8	36.9	19.8	1.9
4.	The college academic performance of student-athletes should be, at minimum, consistent with the general student-body.	53.7	42.5	3.1	0.7	-	-	-
5.	Schools should report on high school and college academic performance of student-athletes to a central body (e.g., conference, NCAA national office).	3.3	13.6	14.5	11.7	32.6	19.8	4.5
6.	A year of eligibility should be defined by a season of participation rather than a season of competition (i.e., current "red-shirting" prohibition).	21.9	34.5	6.0	9.3	15.2	11.2	1.9
7.	A year of eligibility should be defined by a season of competition rather than a season of participation (i.e. "red-shirting" permitted).	10.7	15.7	10.0	5.5	30.0	26.4	1.7

V. Sports Sponsorship and Sport Equity

One of the key tenets of the division is that its member institutions offer a broad based athletics program. On average, Division III institutions sponsor about 16 sports, roughly eight for women and eight for men. An analysis of recently admitted members of the division reveals that those schools tend to offer smaller athletics programs. (For the 50 schools that have become or will become active members during this decade, the average sports sponsorship is 12.7 sports.)

Current regulations require institutions to sponsor a minimum of 10 sports (five men’s and five women’s). In 2010 those minimums will increase to 12 sports (six men’s and six women’s) with an allowance for schools with small enrollments (10 sports for schools with enrollments less than 1,000) and single-gender schools.

1. Institutional preference for a minimum sports sponsorship standard assuming certain allowances for schools with small enrollments and single-gender institutions. Responses are reported in percentages.

	Fewer	8	Current Standard 10	2010 Standard 12	14	16	18	20	More
	1.2	1.9	21.8	52.2	9.6	12.2	1.2	-	-

- 52.2% of institutions indicated a preference for the 2010 standard of 12 sports.
- 75.2% indicated a preference for a higher minimum than the current standard of 10 sports.
- 23.0% indicated a preference for a higher minimum than the 2010 standard of 12 sports.
- 24.9% indicated a preference for a minimum below the 2010 standard of 12 sports.

2. Importance for a membership grouping to include institutions that sponsor a comparable number of sports. Responses are reported in percentages.

Not Important at All				Highly Important
1	2	3	4	5
10.3	12.7	34.9	29.1	13.0

The respondent was asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement. Responses are reported in percentages.

		Percentage						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
3.	A commitment to sport equity, the equal treatment of all sports, should be a key component of any athletics department mission.	50.7	31.4	10.2	2.9	2.4	1.0	1.4
4.	A policy to prioritize certain sports ahead of others in areas such as finance, staffing, facilities, recruiting and scheduling, is <u>not</u> appropriate.	35.6	30.5	9.3	10.5	10.0	2.9	1.2

VI. Presidential Leadership

As with most issues on a college campus, the chancellor or president is ultimately responsible for institutional actions. As the chief decision-maker on a campus, chancellors or presidents have a defined leadership role within the NCAA governance structure. The President’s Council, the President’s Advisory Group, service on the Management Council, and service on a number of additional governance committees are all avenues for chancellors and presidents to provide leadership to the division. Each Division III conference is also required to have as its ultimate authority a presidential governing board.

1. Description of institutional reporting lines – the Director of Athletics reports directly to the:

	%
Chancellor or President	17.7
Chief Financial Officer	4.6
Chief Academic Officer	17.0
Chief Student Affairs Officer	47.6
Other	13.1

The respondent was asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement. Responses are reported in percentages.

		Percentage						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
2.	Chancellors or presidents should be more actively involved in the governance of Division III intercollegiate athletics at the conference level.	19.4	33.7	25.1	9.8	9.1	1.0	1.9
3.	Chancellors or presidents should be more actively involved in the governance of Division III intercollegiate athletics at the national level.	16.1	32.6	28.3	11.0	8.6	1.0	2.4
4.	The ultimate authority to decide NCAA legislative issues should rest with the chancellor or president.	39.1	36.8	9.8	6.2	5.3	1.9	1.0

VII. Playing and Practice Seasons

Few areas have a greater impact on student-athletes than the regulations related to playing and practice seasons. The 18/19 week season, the number of days per week (though not an hourly limit), out-of-season coaching contacts and number of contests are all areas in which the membership has established limits. The next five questions address issues related to length of the playing season, the number of participation opportunities, and the non-traditional season.

Length of the Playing Season and Number of Contests

The current maximum length for the playing season is 18 weeks for fall sports and 19 for winter and spring. The maximum number of contests permitted varies by sport.

1. Preference for the maximum length of the playing season in terms of weeks. Responses are reported in percentages.

Fewer	16/17	17/18	Current Standard 18/19	19/20	20/21	More
0.5	1.4	3.8	81.2	7.6	5.2	0.2

- 81.2% of institutions indicated a preference for the current standard.
- 5.7% of institutions indicated a preference for fewer weeks.
- 13.0% of institutions indicated a preference for more weeks.

2. Preference for the maximum length of the playing season in terms of number of contests. Responses are reported in percentages.

Fewer	20% Decrease	10% Decrease	Current Standard For Each Sport	10% Increase	20% Increase	More
-	0.7	8.3	86.5	4.0	0.2	0.2

- 86.5% of institutions indicated a preference for the current standard.
- 9.0% of institutions indicated a preference for fewer contests.
- 4.4% of institutions indicated a preference for more contests.

The Non-Traditional Season

For baseball, field hockey, lacrosse, soccer, softball and women’s volleyball, the current maximum number of days of athletically related activity is 16 during no more than five weeks, including one date of competition.

3. Preference for the maximum number of days of athletically related activity in the non-traditional season. Responses are reported in percentages.

None	Fewer	14	15	Current Standard 16	17	18	More	Unlimited
2.8	10.7	2.6	3.6	64.5	1.4	3.8	10.0	0.7

- 64.5% of institutions indicated a preference for the current standard.
- 19.7% of institutions indicated a preference for fewer days.
- 15.9% of institutions indicated a preference for more days.

4. Preference for the maximum number of dates of competition permitted in the non-traditional season. Responses are reported in percentages.

None	Current Standard 1	2	3	4	More	Unlimited
17.3	49.5	16.8	10.2	2.8	3.3	-

- 49.5% of institutions indicated a preference for the current standard.
- 17.3% of institutions indicated a preference for no competition.
- 33.1% of institutions indicated a preference for more competition.

5. Top priority of playing and practice seasons issues. Percentage of institutions indicating issue as top priority is reported.

Issue	%
Maximum length of the playing season in terms of weeks	22.0
Maximum length of the playing season in terms of contests	11.0
Maximum number of days of athletically related activity in the non-traditional season	22.2
Maximum number of dates of competition permitted in the non-traditional season	19.0
None of the above	25.9

VIII. National Championships

National championships are an important component of the programmatic offerings of Division III, funding for which represents approximately 75% of the divisional budget. At present, entrance to the national championship is either through a conference’s automatic qualification slot (with related slots allocated to independents) or through at-large bids. Each national championship (with the exception of football) is conducted within a three week timeframe. Current championships policy provides one berth for every six and a half institutions sponsoring a team sport. Future growth will begin to impact access ratios, bracket sizes and championship length in many team sports by the year 2016.

The respondent was asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement. Responses are reported in percentages.

		Percentage						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
1.	Division III members should have the opportunity to qualify to participate in a national championship.	73.4	24.0	1.9	0.5	-	0.2	-
2.	The ultimate measure of success in an athletics program is participation in national championships.	2.9	7.4	20.2	11.4	28.7	28.5	0.9
3.	Participation in national championships should be available to conference champions only (i.e., automatic qualification only with no at-large bids) with appropriate access for independent institutions.	1.7	6.0	4.3	12.4	35.3	39.9	0.5
4.	Participation in national championships should be based on independent evaluative criteria established by the Championships and Sports Committees (i.e., no automatic qualification; at-large bids only).	1.7	2.2	6.0	7.4	33.0	49.5	0.2

The current championships access ratio in team sports stands at 1:6.5. This ratio is used to determine the bracket sizes. With this ratio, there is one opportunity for every six and half teams participating in the sport. A higher ratio would mean fewer championships berths per number of institutions sponsoring a sport, where a lower ratio would mean a greater number of berths.

5. Preference for a championships access ratio. Responses are reported in percentages.

	Current Standard					
Lower	1:5	1:6	1:6.5	1:7	1:8	Higher
1.7	4.4	8.0	58.6	16.1	8.5	2.7

- 58.6% of institutions indicated a preference for the current standard.
- 14.1% of institutions indicated a preference for increased access.
- 27.3% of institutions indicated a preference for decreased access.

6. Preference for the maximum number of weeks allowed to conduct the championships. Responses are reported in percentages.

	Current Standard					
1	2	3	4	5	Longer	
-	1.7	85.8	11.8	0.5	0.2	

- 85.8% of institutions indicated a preference for the current standard.
- 12.5% of institutions indicated a preference for more weeks.
- 1.7% of institutions indicated a preference for fewer weeks.

7. The current distribution of the Division III budget is approximately 75% toward championships and 25% toward non-championship programming.

Appropriateness of current allocations. Responses are reported in percentages. **

	%
Yes, current expenditures are appropriately balanced.	68.1
No, we should allocate more to championships.	11.9
No, we should allocate more to non-championship programming.	20.1

** Approximately 10% of survey respondents did not respond to this item.

If growth trends continue and current access ratios stay the same, several team championships (i.e. men’s and women’s basketball, men’s and women’s soccer, baseball, softball, volleyball) will confront significant challenges by the year 2016. At present the practical limit for brackets is 64 teams, keeping in mind the current 3 week structure and reasonable limits on frequency of play and related travel as well as a consideration of the academic commitments for student-athletes.

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of support for the following methods to address membership growth. Responses are reported in percentages.

		Percentage						
		Strongly Support	Support	Somewhat Support	Somewhat Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Don't know
8.	Expand the championships format.	6.4	16.4	20.7	12.6	30.2	9.3	4.3
9.	Increase the number of mid-week contests.	1.7	5.2	18.5	15.9	35.2	21.6	1.9
10.	Eliminate Pool C (at-large) berths to preserve automatic qualification to all conferences.	1.9	6.9	11.9	13.4	32.7	30.3	2.9
11.	Increase the minimum size of conference sponsorship needed to maintain the automatic qualifier.	4.3	15.2	20.9	13.1	27.3	15.0	4.3
12.	Change the access ratio to limit the field to 64.	13.1	34.1	18.6	11.0	14.1	4.3	4.8

CONSIDERATION OF STRUCTURAL ISSUES

I. General

The NCAA Executive Committee has determined that recent divisional growth, the expiration of recent moratoriums, continuing pressure on the championships structure, and the anticipation of negotiations on the new media contract have combined to make this the right time to discuss the current structure of Division III and indeed the entire Association. The task is to determine if the current arrangement is the best structure to serve the membership in the long term. The Executive Committee believes a thorough discussion and debate on these fundamental issues is necessary to better position the Association and its membership for the future.

This final section of the survey asked that the respondent reflect on the issues and challenges that will face Division III in the future. They were asked to consider the projections and forecasts for the membership and how Division III will look in the years ahead. The importance of remembering that the membership will ultimately determine the resolution of these issues was noted as well as the fact that the current structure and several alternatives to it are options that are before the division and the association.

1. Respondents were asked to indicate which course of action the Association and/or Division III should follow to prepare for the future, at this time. Responses are reported in percentages.

	Strongly Support	Support	Somewhat Support	Somewhat Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose
a. Maintain the current Division III structure.	60.6	21.6	4.8	6.2	5.0	1.9
b. Create subdivisions of Division III. *	2.9	4.9	15.9	8.6	28.2	39.5
c. Create a new division of the NCAA. *	4.2	5.2	6.7	6.7	24.2	53.1

*Approximately 5% of survey respondents did not respond to this item.

- 82.2% of institutions support or strongly support the maintenance of the current Division III structure.
- 7.8% of institutions support or strongly support the creation of subdivisions of Division III.
- 9.4% of institutions support or strongly support the creation of a new division of the NCAA.
- 15.3% of institutions indicated support or strong support for the creation of a subdivision OR a creation of a new division.

2. Other structural options that should be considered. 112 institutions responded to this item. Of those...
 1. Approximately one-half, noted the desire for the inclusion of Division II in any restructuring discussions. For example, the creation of a non-scholarship subdivision of Division II.
 2. Less than 20 schools indicated a separation by geographic location to address championships access issues.
 3. Less than 10 schools indicated an option where one grouping would be established for public institutions and one for private institutions.

3. Primary reasons for support of maintaining the current Division III structure. Approximately half of all respondents provided a reason. Listed are the most commonly cited items.
 1. The negative impact of a structural change (e.g. conference break-ups, increased travel, loss of traditional rivalries, branding difficulties, harm to enrollment or to prospective student-athletes, harm to retention of current student-athletes).
 2. The current structure works well (e.g. serves needs of members, provides adequate championships opportunities, embraces diversity of institutions, is a strong brand, the current structure has worked well for so long).
 3. A compelling case for a structural change has not been made (e.g. a philosophical divide is exaggerated, the current structure can support growth, sense of urgency is overstated).

4. Primary reasons for support for the creation of a new division or a subdivision:

Of the 65 schools that indicated support or strong support for a new division or subdivision...

	%
Management of divisional growth	8.3
Accommodation of distinct athletics perspectives	6.7
Both management of divisional growth and accommodation of distinct athletics perspectives	80.0
Other	5.0

5. Naming of a new division. Approximately two-thirds responded to this item.

	%
It should have an alpha-numeric designation (e.g. Division IV)	48.4
It should have a proper name (e.g. Roosevelt Division, Blue Division)	27.1
Other: III-A or III-AA, Athletic Division/Academic Division	24.5

6. Naming of a subdivision. Approximately two-thirds responded to this item.

	%
It should have an alpha-numeric designation (e.g. Division III-A or III-AA)	49.1
It should have a proper name (e.g. Roosevelt Subdivision, Blue Subdivision)	26.6
Other: Geographic name (e.g. North, South), Public/Private, Athletic/Academic	24.2

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement to the following items. Responses are reported in percentages.

		Percentage						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
7.	If a significant number of institutions (e.g. approximately 150) are interested in establishing a new grouping, the Association and/or division should make a reasonable effort to accommodate them. *	10.1	29.6	21.7	7.1	10.6	16.0	4.9
8.	Our school would be interested in a new grouping if that grouping featured legislative standards <u>less permissive</u> than current standards. *	1.2	6.0	8.7	7.2	23.6	44.7	8.7
9.	Our school would be interested in a new grouping if that grouping featured legislative standards <u>more permissive</u> than current standards. *	3.2	4.7	5.7	7.2	23.5	47.9	7.9
10.	Our school is satisfied with the current Division III rules and regulations, and would be interested in a new membership grouping that would emphasize preservation of those standards. **	16.1	22.8	13.5	4.9	8.8	21.8	12.2

*Approximately 5% of survey respondents did not respond to this item.

** Approximately 10% of survey respondents did not respond to this item.

II. Components of a New Grouping

It is important to project how any new group might structure itself, should that option come to fruition. It was emphasized that inclusion of these questions should not be construed as a new category of membership being a “done deal”. Rather, it should serve as a prudent approach to plan for any eventuality.

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement to the following items. Responses are reported in percentages.

		Percentage						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
1.	If a new grouping is established, schools should have considerable flexibility in designating their affiliation for a period of time. **	39.0	36.9	10.0	2.8	1.8	2.6	6.9
2.	Initial membership standards in the new grouping should reflect <u>only</u> basic philosophical principles. **	2.1	9.3	10.3	15.2	36.3	11.9	14.9
3.	Initial membership standards in the new grouping should reflect basic philosophical principles <u>and</u> related legislative standards. **	10.6	40.5	20.1	3.6	5.2	4.6	15.5
4.	Any new grouping should preserve opportunities to compete against traditional opponents regardless of affiliation (i.e competition across groupings). **	32.1	44.4	8.2	1.3	1.5	3.6	9.0

** Approximately 10% of survey respondents did not respond to this item.

Respondents were asked to indicate how appropriate various legislative standards are for entrance into a new grouping. Responses are reported in percentages.

		Percentage						
		Very Appropriate	Appropriate	Somewhat Appropriate	Somewhat Inappropriate	Inappropriate	Very Inappropriate	Don't know
5.	A minimum sports-sponsorship level higher than the current minimum <u>without</u> allowances for low institutional enrollment. **	2.9	7.6	8.1	15.4	33.9	21.4	10.7
6.	A minimum sports-sponsorship level higher than the current minimum <u>with</u> allowances for low institutional enrollment. **	6.5	29.0	24.0	9.1	13.8	6.0	11.5
7.	A minimum sports sponsorship level lower than the current minimum. **	1.6	7.8	7.6	11.2	33.6	27.1	11.2
8.	A minimum level of student-athlete participation as a proportion of the student-body. **	3.4	7.3	9.4	8.3	34.1	25.8	11.7
9.	Allowances should be made for entire conferences to move as a group if a limited number of conference members do not initially meet membership standards of the new grouping. **	10.4	41.1	20.6	4.9	6.0	6.3	10.7
10.	Geographic location of the school (e.g., region, state) should be used to determine eligibility. **	4.9	10.7	16.7	10.2	24.0	19.3	14.3
11.	Success in the Director's Cup standings or some other measure of athletic success should be used to determine eligibility. **	0.5	0.8	2.1	4.7	29.1	54.2	8.6

** Approximately 10% of survey respondents did not respond to this item.

12. Other grouping criteria that should be considered. Approximately one-quarter responded to this item.

1. Overall enrollment of institution.
2. Athletics finance.
3. Institutional mission.