

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Sunday Issues Forum</b>                 |   |   |
| <b>Roundtable Discussions and Feedback</b> |   |   |
|  |   |   |
| <b><u>Table</u></b>                        | <b><u>Conferences/Institutions Represented</u></b>  | <b><u>Athletics Perspectives</u></b>  |
|  |   | 1. How important is it that the division appears to be split in thirds on key issues?   |
| 1  | Liberty, Centennial, Commonwealth Coast, OAC  | Not important, bar graph seems to be equal across. Very important, we'd like to be more restrictive and get a level playing field   |
| 2  | USA South, Landmark, UAA, Centennial  | Tough to come to consensus on the issues. This is an appeal for DIII. Info does not suggest the need for change. Philosophy is not always represented by voting record. Questioned the validity of the info. How engaging is communication between administrators and presidents? Are philosophical differences bad? Conferences can be more restrictive if they want to be.  |
| 3  | Simpson College, Emory Henry, Denison, SUNY Newport, Western New England, Johnson and Wales, Mitchell, Ohio Wesleyan, Emerson | Do not think it is important because in general we supported the reform movement because we felt we needed to give it a chance. Voting pattern does not cover enough years - would feel more comfortable if stats had been taken over a long period of time and the voting patterns are entirely dependent on the issues that are being voted on and seeing it was only a three year time period, there is no real evidence that there is a membership split. Feel that a split is driven by resources and that the real issue is resource allocation by the NCAA is not being addressed. This should not be solved by a divisional split. How would a new division be supported? |
| 4  | MIAC, Midwest, Whitman College, Penn State - Harrisburg, Meredith College, Cedar Crest, Wellesley                             | Voting patterns least important - bimodal distribution most lie in the middle. Functionality of voting pattern. Playing to the extreme. Little significance to conference/partner conference.   |
| 5  | CCIW (Millikin, North Park, Carthage), MWC (Illinois College), MIAC (Concordia - Moorhead)                                    | Not pertinent because votes have been based on self-interest, economies at each school and may have been based on particular issues (i.e. geography, sport specific).   |

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 6  | MIAA, Midwest, ODAC  | Split and trends are not surprising due to NAIA schools. It seems to be a workable pattern. It does not seem like enough of a compelling argument to make a change. Diversity is a good thing. A proposal for change should come from the membership up, not NCAA down. No reason to expect everyone to be the same. Voting Patterns: While acknowledging differences are good, it also causes tension. Not negative, but positive. (However, if you take a group off, will you see the same distribution/split in the new division?) Why are we only looking at a few years of date on voting patterns - these things develop over time. |
| 7  | Fairleigh Dickinson, Misacordia, NAC commissioner, Vassar, University of Rochester, Brandeis | Most critical issue (in the middle now and if we decide you will have to go to one extreme). However, does three create a viable split? No guidelines - could create two divisions that are basically the same legislatively but have an elitist group. Voting does not necessarily equal philosophy of institutions. Some institutions cannot survive without athletics.   |
| 8  | Widener University, Weelock, Regis College   | Important - two different models splitting into three different issues. Keeps creating a challenge to make a decision. No one is going to be able to find a good "middle of the road" decision to please both sides.  |
| 9  | SUNYAC, Heartland, American Southwest, Northern Athletics                                    | Leading questions, we do not agree with where the lines were split. Isn't it healthy for us to be split in a bell curve? This keeps is diverse.   |
| 10 | Commonwealth   | It is normal. This is a perfect bell curve. It is normal and healthy for an organization. The middle balances the ends. Is this a competitive issue?  |
| 11 | Midwest, Liberty, CCIW, New Jersey   | Statistics are flawed and note used properly. Statistics used to support a position. Subliminal message - if you are this, you should be over here.   |
| 12 | ODAC, NEWMAC, Centennial, Northern Athletics, SLIAC  | Resulting in the size of the organization. Not sold in past with voting patterns. Evidence of voting patterns shifting in time. 10-15 years - where did the growth - better understand why they voted, certainly might be different perspective.  |
| 13 | ADs  | Does not worry us at all. Diversity is good and we welcome different philosophies. Further breakdown will not help. Differences are likely in DI as well. There is an agenda here - elitist and degrading (of both DIII members and NAIA institutions). The presentation put us on the defensive. Do not understand the logic that students cannot do athletics. This is being rammed down our throats.   |
| 14 | NEWMAC, Centennial, WIAC, Landmark   | It is healthy. There is a group that could go either way. Provides a balance to work from.  |

|    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 15 |   | The perceived "split" in the division epitomizes who we are. It is part of what we must embrace to move forward. We are not convinced there is a problem with DIII membership. Are we splitting to accommodate incoming NAIA schools?  |
| 16 | American Southwest, NEAC, Independent (provisional year 3), | This is standard and not abnormal, why should we worry about it? Would not be different if we had only 200 institutions. Diversity is one of our strengths in DIII. Elitism drives this.   |
| 17 |   | A large group is always divided. Consider our own government!  |
| 18 | WIAC - 6, Midwest - 1                                       | The split is typical for any large organization. The thirds ensure that there is healthy debate and discussion on issues. The thirds prevent any one group or faction from controlling the whole and act as a break on extreme views.  |
| 19 | NJAC, Middle Atlantic, Landmark, Centennial, Pennsylvania   | Questions about whether the 18 votes chosen to compare really provide a clear delineation of an institution's philosophy. Why aren't we looking at voting patterns in DI and DII? Do not like the process of tracking votes to create a division. Sports sponsorship is not always about philosophy, it is often about resources. Sports sponsorship is also connected to the make up of your student body and to requirements of conferences. This applies to both adding and dropping sports. Sports sponsorship is not a good criterion. The philosophical basis for a program is not necessarily tied to the number of sports sponsored. |
| 20 | Nazareth, Rochester Institute of Tech., Elmira College      | Makes sense, not alarmed by results. Bell curve could be found on any issue. We are not always going to agree on certain issues. Financial situation of supporting sports when focus is on education.  |
| 21 | Empire 8, NAC, NJAC, Landmark, MAC                          | This is old news. Already went through five years of pain. Because middle group accepted some and not others, we have come to a middle ground that shows at voting. Problem saying things will be cut shorter. All of this is an non-issue. It is an institutional/conference issue, not a national one. Forcing people in the middle to make a decision. Where is the agenda?   |
| 22 | MASCAC, NJAC, Heartland, OAC, PAC, ODAC,                    | Philosophy of programs overrides the voting pattern. Questioned the middle grouping - what does this mean?   |
| 23 |   | The fact that it is bimodal is important. NCAA has done a great job of data analysis that reflects clear distinctions. Do not lose the DIII brand. Subdivide instead of full division.   |

|    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 24 |  | Very important. Some schools do not want to accept the roll backs on restrictions. Philosophical difference exists, but conference affiliations makes changes very difficult. Many schools do not fit into the two concepts presented. Voting patterns do not necessarily reflect only philosophy. Conference pressures affect voting.   |
| 25 |  | The group felt that we can not wait.   |
| 26 | EASC, ODAC, Liberty, MASCAC, MIAA, Pennsylvania, provisional independent | Very diverse division, but the differing philosophies are not necessarily negative. How do schools feel post-voting on issues - more important statistics. Statistics may not be an accurate representation, conclusions may not be accurate.  |
| 27 | North Coast, ODAC, GNAC, Commonwealth, NESCAC                            | Two new divisions would not change the voting pattern. The direction depends on AD and President. Championships access is an important driver. Let new members adapt to the DIII philosophy. The size of the division allows us to play other schools. Need to tackle and solve problems within DIII as is.  |
| 28 | Heartland - 4, American Southwest, CCIW, OAC                             | Unhealthy to be in thirds. Acceptance of new members and the validity of those members. These hot topics only impact a small number of member schools. Should we accept or have accepted all new members?  |
| 29 | Donnie Brooks - Williams College   | We enjoy the diversity. Create restrictions within your conference. The voting does not represent a true membership perspective. Stigma of DIII/DIV is bad.  |
| 30 | SLIAC, NCAC, MichiganIAA, NEWMAC, MASCAC, DIII SAAC                      | Do not think we are split in thirds, there is no concept differentiation. Majority could be swayed one way or the other. More is a philosophy difference. Proposals have liberalized the members - is this good or bad?  |
| 31 |  | Participants all supported the idea of self determination and believed it ought to be based on philosophy.   |
| 32 | SCAC, Liberty, CUNYAC, Landmark  | Belief it is not split in thirds. Analysis is incomplete. Philosophical issues are obvious. How do we make DIII better? Too long seasons is an issue.  |
| 33 | Empire 8, GNAC   | Some conferences have figured out to be who they are within current structure. Conferences? Where are they at? This is more important. Money/budgets factor into philosophies. Was this considered in the analysis? Too big of a picture, did not look at small components/rationale for why schools voted the way they did. Outside factors to consider in voting: Geography, sport, etc., community support. Concept one alludes to restricting options for SAs. Not anxious for more restrictions, though some voted that way in the past. Still pro-student. |
| 34 | CUNYAC, NJAC, Heartland  | It appears to be very important, more information is needed as well as true opinions from the membership. More choices may be needed to make informed decisions.   |

|    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 35 | NESCAC, Skyline, NWC, Anna Maria College, Whittier College, UAA, Washington and Jefferson | Split is important - some are not adhering to the DIII philosophy. Principle of self determination for NAIA is close to DII profile, why not just go there? Convenience, travel time, but we should make DII more attractive and issues should be addressed at conference level. Largest group is into the middle and you are making them choose extremes. DIII is "surrendering" itself. Solution should not be to abandon ship - this runs counter to what the NCAA is trying to do as a whole. What is the <u>actual</u> philosophy behind this? Financial difficulties for small schools - you can still be successful with more restrictions. |
| 36 | SUNYAC, NJAC, Empire 8  | Not key - enough data to support assumptions.  |
| 37 | USA South, Penn Athletic  | Voting patterns reflecting point in time. Philosophies are similar but have to vote by their conference. Not comfortable assuming there are different philosophies.  |
| 38 | Liberty, UAA, NESCAC, Centennial, Midwest, Great South                                    | Could be true of other divisions - hard to find unanimity of opinion. Diversity is one of DIII's strengths. It does not impact ability to be competitive. We oppose to use this as a reason to divide. Bell curve will always exist.   |
| 39 | Little East, Presidents, Capital, Michigan, Pennsylvania                                  | Broad middle is in agreement. Need to leave at conference level, do not see anything compelling to change at division level. Agenda is pushed by a limited few. We all agree that stronger presidential leadership is needed. Fry should not dictate to us.  |
| 40 | SCAC, NESCAC, Midwest, UAA  | Premise of using prior voting patterns is a bad assumption to use, especially when done over such a short period of time. We would have possibly voted differently had we known the ramifications of a possible split. Must figure out why size is a problem! There is and always will be distinctions between institutions within the division because it also exists within conferences. This is a factor, but not the <u>sole</u> factor.   |
| 41 | Presidents, ODAC, MASCAC, Heartland   | Only important when there is stable, ongoing, consistent vision for the institution from president and board. Philosophy would be very important factor for schools in the middle third. Travel time and money are more important. Size of institution trumps philosophy. Academic orientation is most important.  |
| 42 | Pennsylvania, GNAC  | Not very important   |
| 43 | Northern Athletics Conference   | Why are they split - institutional decision, cost. What is wrong with the multiple splits? Can they profile the individual groups? What types? There are a lot of institutions that have a lot of sports, but go more/less restrictive. Split of votes are because: resources, size, philosophy.   |

|    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| 44 | Independent, PAC, MIAC, NJAC, Commonwealth, Freedom/PAC, Skyline  | Would like better understanding of middle 1/3. It is a large group that does not fit neatly or that can be lumped as neutral. Dividing in half does not follow from three different perspectives shown by data. Seems as though data was chosen to serve a purpose. Stats do not tell the whole story and institutional voting and motivations depend on numerous factors. There will always be philosophical differences, it seems the drive behind this is new members and championships access. There is a presumption from the data about new schools and their voting/potential voting patterns. |
| 45 | NEWNAC, Commonwealth Coast, Skyline, MASCAC, UAA, North Coast   | In a large group it is rare that everyone would vote the same. Votes not always a reflection of issue but philosophical view. Extremes are more important, not those in the middle.   |
| 46 | Landmark (8), OAC   | You can move those in the middle to half on each side. This seems healthy, not unhealthy. There are many reasons behind the difference in voting (geography, etc.). Does not seem to be an important issue, should not be used as a good predictor.   |
| 47 | Midwest, Skyline, MASCAC, AMCC, Independent   | Would like a longer history for stats. Diversity of membership is the driver in the variations in voting. Does it represent a disparity based on endowments and monies available? Has any conference come out and took the position to support Division IV? EDA report should be considered.  |
| 48 | Connecticut College, St. Thomas, Salem State, McCallister, Lutheran, Minnesota Intercollegiate, Finlandia, Middlebury | How important is winning to support? Diversity is good to a point - this is the problem we are wrestling with. If the above is true, then the issue would have come from the presidents, would have come in a whole different way. Something does not add up. We are proud of our diversity.  |
| 49 | SCAC, SCIAC, UAA, Commonwealth Coast  | Not a true indication of institutions position. Have achieved balance for limiting nontraditional redshirting, length of season. Should look to maintain what we have done.   |

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 50 | MIAA, MIAC, AMCC, Independents                                 | Anytime you have a group, if you do not have differences you are stagnant. There has been the belief that DI doesn't have membership issues and are consistent in voting patterns and philosophy, but that is wrong. Have they done the same research on voting patterns in DI and DII as they have in DIII? Student-athletes do not want a less restrictive division. Have the differences changed or has the division become a little more balanced? As much as student-athletes want to compete, good coaches want to coach so the good, young coaches would not want to coach in a more restrictive division. DII should be looked at for a potential new grouping. |
| 51 | Little East, MIAC, WIAC, AMCC, NESCAC, Presidents, Independent | This big of a group will always be divided.   |
| 52 | North Coast, UAA, GNAC, CCC, Fisk University                   | Do not see anything wrong in having a difference in voting patterns. Just because there is a difference of opinion does not mean we cannot get along. What are the key issues? (spring football, redshirting). The sense of the table was that we are not split on key issues. Students at DIII campuses are more engaging, you cannot legislate how students should engage. This is an example of trying to find a cure for cancer for a scratch. It is important only if we can determine what the key issues are.  |
| 53 | USA South, ASC, ODAC (all presidents)                          | Not important to group. Most simply do not understand. What is the issue - size or philosophy? Very concerned that past voting records are being used to predict the future or pigeon hole institutions. Some diversity is healthy within conferences, etc.   |
| 54 |  | Not very important at all. Believe there would be this type of a bell curve. No matter what the issues or the number, there will almost always be a split like this (or at least there should be).  |
| 55 | Heartland, OAC   | Newer members anomaly due to sports sponsorship. Votes contingent on presidents' perspectives. Conferences tend to be aligned similarly with regard to limitations on practice/play.  |
| 56 | NEWMAC, MIAC, North Atlantic, SCIAC, MIAA, Centennial          | This is not a significant definition of the issues. True philosophy of DIII is that we have differences. Are voting patterns a true indication to justify a split? The middle 42% could be much larger. Failure to bring a lot of other variables beside less/more restrictive issues.  |

|    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| 57 |   | Is it split in thirds? On the graph, should it be more of a bell shaped curve? The stats are being manipulated in order to present what they want. 30/30/40...15-70-15 looks more accurate. Is it issue based? Depending on how it affects us. Are we middle ground? Some feel very like minded. It does not seem to make sense how the groupings are drawn. Can we presume to draw our own curve within our own conferences? Can be both good and bad, but again can't we draw these curves with stats within our own conferences. Let us be careful here. |
| 58 |   | Always have outliers in any distribution. If there are three groups, why split into two? Middle group is angst group. Issues - admissions, conference affiliation, image. 35% enrollment involved in athletics. New group, less emphasis - how does this affect recruiting?   |
| 59 | North Coast, Commonwealth Coast, MIAA, NEWMAC (all interested in dividing), SUNYAC (not interested) | Extremes are examples of the two divisions. Middle number is bigger than indicates. Issues with the methodology in voting. Diversity in a division is not always bad. Different needs with different number of sports sponsored. New members will probably vote on the extremes. Stats can always be manipulated to support or hinder a position.   |
| 60 |   | Not that important. Votes are based on institutional needs. Reality vs. philosophically. Large split - cannot put schools into groups. Two extremes do not accommodate the middle ground. Good information to have. Schools may vote based on conference needs not totally accurate of their own views.   |
| 61 | NEWMAC, UAA, MIAA (Hope President), NWC, Little East, SCIAC   | Stats were interpreted to support the proposal of the working group.  |
| 62 | American Southwest  | Bell curve = no consensus. Middle group being told/pulled in one direction or another. ASW represents both top 1/3 and bottom. Sports sponsorship does not correlate to philosophy for ASW. Campus life experience already full/beneficial. Diversity of conference will affect each statistic.   |
| 63 | MIAA, Skyline, SCIAC, Midwest, Landmark, MASCAC, Little East, Liberty                               | Not important. Diversity of opinion is good. Conferences are where philosophical issues should be determined. Concerns about the fact many schools agree with the concepts and yet the Executive Committee has already "mis-labeled" schools (i.e. interest in new grouping). Concern that DIII is drifting towards DI - similar issues. How much does institutional financial profile factor in?   |
| 64 | MIAC, Independent, SUNYAC, Capital, Commonwealth  | The middle group is voting based on self-interest, not because they are indecisive about restrictions.  |

|    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 65 | AMCC, Heartland, Middle Atlantic, USA South, CCIW, Presidents, American University (Cairo, Egypt) | Stats can be interpreted in other ways. Assumptions that new members will be static in philosophy and sport sponsorship/intensity is wrong. Implication that offering few sports are more intensive is wrong. Some of the least restrictive schools are newer/smaller members.   |
| 66 | North Coast, NESCAC, Landmark, GNAC, Presidents, Centennial                                       | Concern that are we really split in thirds? A normal distribution of opinions currently exists. On primary issues, the division is on the same page regarding philosophy. Concern that the present movement is only the desire of a few. Questions regarding the validity of the data presented. What other models have been explored? Management of growth, participation as ratio of student enrollment.   |
| 67 | CCC, NCAC, NEWMAC, MASCAC   | Why was only three years of voting patterns used? Concern about the significant weight the voting pattern has, the do not necessarily indicate a particular conceptual philosophy.   |
| 68 | NESCAC, SCIAC, Iowa, Midwest  | Different interpretation than what is being given. Sees it as ten years of hard work of what they could agreed on - representing the large middle. Splitting dilutes this so that screamers pull on one side pull one way and screamers on the other side putt the other way, but the center is valuable. Group in center represents common ground. Would have rather seen focus on growth and championships access and how to staff that. If you took votes from the U.S. Congress you could use this data to do something else. Disagrees with the progressive change to something that is not broken. More fundamental issue is fiduciary and finance related and staff would grow either way. This is an association wide issue and DI and DII perspective is important. Others feel DI and DII would be used as a power tactic. |
| 69 | North Coast, SCAC, Centennial, OAC  | Look prospectively, ternd likely to get more extreme. There is a different set of decision drivers for enrollment driven and nonenrollment driven institutions. We could handle higher numbers if the institutions were similar. Concerns are more in the details than the overall concept. Comparison to DI diversity, why is it okay to be diverse in DI but not in DIII?  |
| 70 | Provisional members in last year  | Not important - close vote does not mean statistical conclusions were not convincing. Seems as though first group of "older" members is concerned. Enrollment trends could be more closely related to demographics.  |

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 71 |  | Not important at all, not a reflection of today. Insulting to suggest that how we voted in discrete discussions is the basis for assumptions about things like a desire for further restriction, or a worry that our student-athletes are not already involved in other campus activities.  |
| 72 |  | Homogeneous is dangerous. Within DIII and DIV we will still need to compromise. Why have two groups compromise instead of just one? Another Division would be more exclusive rather than less. Are we being unfair to student-athletes by being exclusive? Where do all women institutions fit in? Athletics drives enrollment and inclusiveness hurts individual institutions.   |
| 73 | Midwest, CUNYAC, Empire 8, MIAC, ASC                                 | All are in standard derivatives of each other, shows hardly any difference. Growth problem - new membership will look different from current (fewer sports, less money). If split into two divisions, what happens to the group in the middle?  |
| 74 |  | Very important, 42% in the middle. Misnomers about self-selection. Forced into one or two areas. Low sports sponsorship with high restrictiveness.  |
| 75 | MIAC, Iowa, Independent  | have the different views compared to DI and DII. New members with different profiles should form the new division. There will be the "good old boys club" no matter what. Exclusivity will develop.   |
| 76 | Liberty, NESCAC, MIAC, NEWMAC, North Coast, Centennial, Midwest CCIW | Institution in conference with restrictions believes overall diversity of Division III is good and current structure should be maintained. Five table members warned that the "split in thirds" structure is very important considering the trend in new membership to impact and fill more of that "less restriction" third will impact the new division significantly. This leads to a greater overall % voting in a less restrictive manner. |
| 77 | Heartland, UAA, Independent, NJAC, Pennsylvania                      | Votes do not reflect clear difference in philosophy. Diversity is positive. Many reasons for why institutions vote different ways. Concern over affect on conferences and tendency to divide conferences. These issues have not been as significant as others considered in the past.   |

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 78 | SUNYAC, IIAC, SCAC                         | Celebrating diversity is important in DIII. There may not be a split and some conferences vote because they disagree with the legislative proposals because they do not represent a particular conference's objectives. Often legislative voting is only reflective of what a particular conference needs, not necessarily of what should be the overall goals of DIII as a whole. The differences were more subtle than drastic and there is a concern that there may have been other research conducted/obtained that has not been shared with the group today that may be helpful. There may be differences but so what? This is no different than what occurs in politics, but this is not necessarily reflective of the notion that DIII needs to change completely. It is inconsistent and concerning that DI can impose caps and the otehr two divisions now have to adjust and deal with it. There should discussions with all three divisions on this issue. |
| 79 | Midwest, Provisional, SUNYAC, NJAC         | Is there a split in DI or DII on voting based on philosophy or is it an enrollment issue? SUNYAC did not reform, big programs. More schools that come in are smaller and bigger schools get out voted (cannot remain together). Should decide on philosophy for grouping.   |
| 80 |  | It was tough to look at the chart. It seemed to be a stretch to get to thirds. It looked more like half. The trend did not seem there. Concern with the idea that there is no one that has difference of opinion in the working group.  |
| 81 | Skyline, NESCAC, NAC, IIAC, NEWMAC         | Voting pattern changes may not be an inditcation of change in totality. Depends on perspective, but only as an advocate to change. Only pushing for change, wedge is being created. 40% undecided is critical - depending on issues they go each way. Spectrum can be a positive for diversity of opinion. Typical of many polls, middle group can lose out and perhaps not serve membership well. Are there similar patterns in DI and DII?  |
| 82 | CCC, MASCAC, CCIW, Centennial, SCIAC, NAIA | Value diversity - are student-athletes not involved in extracurricular activities? What is the data on this? There is a large group of schools in the center, then two sets of outliers. This probably represents the majority of us. Not convinced of "not broke, don't fix it." Analysis of thirds seems biased. Index very unclear to some.  |

|    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 83 | Franklin and Marshall, Wheaton, Bridgewater State, Bowdoin, Hidleburg College | Not an issue. That which differentiates us is not as critical as what keeps us together. Philosophical differences are less important than operational differences. We compete against each other and the difference sbeyond that are not as important. We need to be different theother two divisions. Why don't we change our criteria if we want sport sponsorship to be 16? Is this issue driven by conferences that want to be different? |
| 84 |   |  |
| 85 |   |  |
| 86 |   |  |
| 87 |   |  |
| 88 |   |  |