

2018 NCAA Division II Men's and Womens Cross Country
Championships Selection Procedures

Team Selections

A total of 34 teams will be selected. The process for allocating the berth is outlined below.

Automatic Qualification

The top three teams from each regional meet will automatically advance to the championship finals (24 teams).

At-large Selection

Ten (10) at-large teams will be selected by the NCAA Division II Men's and Women's Cross Country Committee using the below outlined selection criteria (in priority order). There is no limit to the number of at-large teams that may be selected from any given region.

The following are the criteria used by the committee to select at-large teams, in order, until a selection emerges. Criteria 1-4 are to be included in the TFRRS-based computer program. Criteria 5-6, if needed, are up to the judgment of the NCAA Division II Men's and Women's Cross Country Committee.

1. Regional place order/performance. A team cannot be selected ahead of a team that placed in front of them at their respective regional championship meet.
2. a. Head-to-head competition versus other teams under consideration for at-large selection.
 - (1) Each of the eight-teams under consideration in the current comparison will be viewed one duo at a time, 1 vs 1 (i.e. 1 vs 2, 1 vs 3, 1 vs 4, etc.) to determine which is the best of the eight teams to fill out the 25th-34th team spots for the National Championship field after the other 24 teams have already been automatically advanced. For example, the fourth-place finishing team in each of the eight regions are compared and the best of those eight teams advances as the 25th team. After that fourth-place team advances, then the fifth-place team from that region would then move up and be compared to the remaining seven fourth-place teams. The best of those eight teams would be the next team selected to advance as the 26th team and so forth until the 34-team field is selected.
 - (2) For each of the 1 vs 1 comparisons, either there will be a tie and the committee will move on, or one team will be eliminated if that team has a direct losing record to the other team in consideration. (Rationale: The team with a losing record to any of the other eight teams cannot be the best due to the loss).
 - (3) An overall win-loss record of the full eight teams is not to be used. (Rationale: A team that amasses a great quantity of wins over weak opponents is not necessarily better than a team with quality head to head wins).
- b. Results against common Division II opponents (through second tier).

- (1) Each of the eight teams under consideration in the current comparison will be viewed one duo at a time, 1 vs 1 (i.e. 1 vs 2, 1 vs 3, 1 vs 4, etc.).
- (2) Second Tier: For each of the 1 vs 1 comparisons, either there will be a tie or one team will be eliminated if that team has fewer net wins than the other team in consideration. Net wins are to be calculated as follows:
 - Each team will get a win for any direct victory against a common competitor.
 - Each team will get a loss for any direct loss against a common competitor.
 - Each team will get a win for any victory against a second-degree common competitor (i.e. team A beats team B, team B beats team C, team C beats team D, so team A gets a win against team D).
 - Each team will get a loss for any defeat against a second-degree common competitor (i.e. Team A loses to team B, team B loses to team C, team C loses to team D). If there are both wins and losses in the common competitor chain, this will not be counted for or against a team.
 - Net Wins = (Direct wins + 2nd Degree Wins) – (Direct losses + 2nd Degree Losses)

Rationale for Second Tier

- Net wins provide a more accurate assessment of a record rather than winning percentage, where 1-0 would be better than 10-1.
- Net wins reward a team for winning against common competitors, but also penalizes a team for losing against a common competitor. If only wins were counted, 4-2 would be worse than 8-12.
- Net wins, when combined with second-degree comparisons, rewards a team for beating a very strong team, as the stronger team is likely to generate many second-degree “wins” for the team in question.
- Including common comparisons to the second-degree allows for more data in a situation where limited data may be available.
- Including common comparisons to the second-degree allows teams that do not travel outside of their region to benefit from beating teams in their region who have done well against common competitors.

NOTE: During this step, head-to-head competition and common DII opponents will be evaluated simultaneously.

3. Regional meet point gap ratio.
 - a. Each of the eight teams under consideration in the current comparison will be viewed one duo at a time, 1 vs 1, 1 vs 2, etc.
 - b. Comparing the team being considered for an at-large bid to the team that placed directly in front of them in the regional results only if that team has already advanced via an at-large selection, not as an automatic selection.
 - c. Example: In Region A, 6th place team scores 80 points, 7th place team (under that consideration) scores 100 points. $80/100=0.8$ ration. In Region B, 5th place team scores 180

points and 6th place team scores 200 points. $180/200=0.9$ ratio. A higher ratio would be deemed the closer performance, so in this example, Region B would go over Region A.

4. Results against common non-Division II opponents.

- Each of the eight teams under consideration in the current comparison will be viewed one duo at a time, 1 vs 1, 1 vs 2, etc.

5. In the case of a comparison between any two of the eight teams under consideration for an at-large bid in which there is no data generated from the above criteria, the process will be advanced by the judgement of the NCAA II Men's and Women's Cross Country Committee. Regular season success and strength of schedule will be taken into account.

Definitions

- A-Team Definition – An “A-Team” is defined as having at least four of the members of the seven that represent each institution at their NCAA Regional Cross Country Championships.
- Late-season Performance – The committee will use data from regular season meets starting with the date that is seven weeks (51 days) out from the NCAA Division II Regional Championships (except for a Fall Sports Festival year when it will be nine weeks (65 days) that have at least four of the seven runners represented on a team that competed for a team in the regional championships (minimum race distance for women is 5,000 meters and for men is 7,000 meters). Meaning no “B” team results can count against or help a team being considered for selection. For example, a team cannot be penalized for running a split squad or having non-varsity runners competing at a meet.
- Regional Point Gap Ratio – The regional point gap ratio is only used to measure the strength of top teams. A team that is selected automatically is not necessarily a top team thus the comparison would be faulty.

Breaking Team Ties

In the case of a tie-breaker when comparing teams under consideration at a regular season meet/race that includes DI, DIII, NAIA or NJCAA schools, those schools must be taken out of the scoring comparisons by the committee unless used as a common opponent. For example, a team could lose to another team in a large meet with various non-Division II schools factored into the scoring, but still beat them head-to-head if the two teams were scored only against each other as a dual meet.

Additional Individual Selections

After the 34 selected teams have been determined, a minimum 24 additional individuals per gender are selected to compete at the NCAA Championships.

1. The top two individuals who are not part of a qualifying team will automatically advance to the championship (16 individuals).
2. All individuals who finish in the top five at the regional meet and are not part of a qualifying team automatically will advance to the championship.

3. The next eight individuals will be selected at-large. There is no limit to the number of at-large individuals that may be selected from the same region. The top individual from each region not receiving an automatic qualifying spot and not on a qualifying team, will be compared head-to-head using the same model as in the at-large team selection process. Place at the regional meet and strength of region are factored into the formula when comparing at-large individuals using the following equation:

$$[\# \text{ of team qualifiers from the region}] / [\text{Individual regional placing}] = \text{Individual score ratio}$$

The individual with the highest score using the above equation will be selected first. This will account for and reward individuals competing well in stringer regions, based on the number of teams that region qualifies to championships. When an individual receives an at-large selection, the next non-qualifying individual from that region will move up to the consideration round of eight individuals.

- Example:

Region A Individual:
Individual finishes 15th
5 teams qualify
 $5/15 = 0.33$

Region B Individual:
Individual finishes 12th
3 teams qualify
 $3/12 = 0.25$

Individual from Region A would qualify.

Breaking Individual Ties

If a situation occurs where two or more individuals are vying for the last qualifying spot, the tie will be broken by selecting the individual with the highest individual placement at his/her regional. If a tie still remains after the tie breaking procedure has been applied, all tied student-athletes will be selected to the championships.