

COLLEGE ATHLETIC DEPART- "POSITION ON DIVISION III RESTRUCTURING"

In response to the NCAA survey sent to the membership from the working group on restructuring, the athletic department at _____ College wishes to express the following position:

- A. The two models for sub-division/new division do not address the concerns of our department. Namely,
 - 1. Neither addresses our primary concern with respect to "a level playing field".
 - 2. Both models are too vague in design to allow us to critically evaluate the relative issues in choosing one model over the other.
 - 3. We are comfortable with the "basic philosophy" of the present division III structure and believe change should occur for more pragmatic reasons.

- B. The survey was not entirely clear in its purpose. Additionally, there was little area to discuss other issues relevant to our present structure apart from the two choices the survey featured.

It is the opinion of our department that Division III is too large AND too diverse. We believe it has little to do with philosophy, but has a great deal to do with the relative size of institutions currently grouped together. Success in athletic programs is often linked to resources. Additionally, athletic success is often linked to "cost of education". With the tremendous difference in the sizes of institutions currently aligned as division III members and with the tremendous differences that exist in the "cost of education" within this grouping, a very uneven playing field has been created. To resolve this issue we propose the following restructuring for the current division III model:

1. All state institutions and those institutions with fulltime undergraduate populations of 2500 students or more are aligned together in a division III grouping (ex 3AA).
2. All institutions with fulltime undergraduate populations below 2500 be aligned together in a division III grouping (ex.3A).
3. Any institution falling into the 3A category would have the ability to self select to 3AA. 3AA institutions would need to remain in this grouping as long as they fit the parameters of item #1.

All current rules would remain the same until the two new groupings were formed. At that time the membership of each particular group with discuss issues related to rules within their segment of division III. Change could occur surrounding the 2500 enrollment divisional line as institutions increased or decreased their fulltime undergraduate population.

This clear cut line immediately addresses the concerns of size, resources, cost of education, etc.

It effectively addresses our main concern of creating an "even playing field" within this division of the NCAA.

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

is unequivocally opposed to the creation of a Division IV. As a colleague president recently pointed out: "We are proud of the philosophy of Division III and find it untenable that we might be forced to secede from Division III to preserve that philosophy." We are equally strongly opposed to Association procedures that allow representatives of Division I and Division II to participate in the determination of the future of Division III. In our view, this is a matter that should be determined by the members of the division. After all, it is they - - not the members of Division I or Division - - that have the principal interest in the future of the division. Finally, we want to very strongly urge the Working Group on Membership Issues to: (i) carefully review the statement recently released by the Conference; (ii) answer the questions posed or implied in this statement; and (iii) seriously, actively and creatively explore alternatives to the strategies and options outlined at the recent NCAA meeting and in this survey.

(Addendum to survey)

February 27, 2008

Additional Comments

We have found some of the questions impossible to answer because they assume a change in Division III that we find highly undesirable. We would add two comments:

1. Schools and conferences that support Division III philosophy as it is currently defined should stay in Division III. If there are schools that want to offer fewer sports and have less emphasis on academics (which seems to be the characterization the working group is creating) then it would seem to make more sense to let them form a new division and leave the rest of us alone.
2. The damages of the division growing larger are far outweighed by the damages caused by false dichotomies that are forced on the division. We would accept a larger ratio for championship access before accepting the choices presented in this survey. The choices presented are not acceptable.

President

