

Friday, June 1, 2007

Rules Discussion

The Commissioner asked coaches if anyone had any new rules to discuss. No one had any to bring to the committee. The Commissioner proposed for discussion the elimination of the protest rule and coaches were unanimously against a move in that direction.

Technical Committee Discussion

Ed Reed, Technical Committee member gave an in-depth explanation regarding how video is used in the evaluation process. The discussion demonstrated the new software used to categorize referee calls for more efficient education.

Officiating Bureau - Next Phase

The Commissioner gave an explanation of the history of the CWPA Officiating situation and indicated the improvements made since the league was established. The next phase discussed the role of mission-oriented referees that would be charged with helping to train and mentor younger officials, as well as run clinics at sport club tournaments throughout the country. These officials would be compensated for their additional time above the game fees. An aggressive attempt will be made by the office to use officials that understand and support the mission of the CWPA as much as possible.

Coaching Conduct

The Commissioner made a presentation about the role of a coach in collegiate athletics with respect to education. Specifically the discussion targeted what coaches are modeling to their athletes as educators in the area of professionalism and respect for officials. The challenge to the coaches was to consider their roles in light of how they want their athletes to act. A summary statement proposed for addition to the Code of Conduct would be the prevention of any public criticism of an official. Appropriate forums exist for discussions of this nature and coaches should utilize these avenues.

Women's Varsity Meeting

Saturday, June 2, 2007

In attendance: Daniel Sharadin, Commissioner; Thomas Tracey, Director of Officials; Ed Haas, Director of Communications; John Benedick, CWPA Board President; Ed Reed, Technical Committee Member; Matt Anderson, Michigan; Erik Farrar, Harvard; John Zeigler, Bucknell; Carl Salyer, Maryland; Alan Huckins, Hartwick; Derek Ellingson, Princeton; Scott Reed, George Washington; Joe McCommons, Queens; Dave Fritz, Grove City; Don Sherman, Gannon University

Proposal VW2-Hartwick made a proposal to realign divisions. After some discussion the proposal was withdrawn. The intent was to provide more crossover opportunities between divisions for like teams. Accordingly coaches agreed that the top six programs based on their finish at the prior season's Eastern Championship would attend a tournament the same weekend of the ECAC Championship and the next best six teams that are ECAC members would attend the ECAC Championship, with the remaining two teams supplied by the MAAC. The regular season tournament schedule will handle all other meetings between the teams. The coaches in attendance were in unanimous support of the new process.

Proposal VW1-Princeton made a proposal to make the Eastern Tournament a three-day event. The motion was seconded by Indiana. The proposal was amended to start the games on the first day at noon with the ensuing games beginning at 1:30 p.m., 3 p.m. and 4:30 p.m. with the banquet starting at 7:00 p.m. on Friday. On Saturday, the games will begin at 3 p.m., 4:30 p.m., 6 p.m., 7:30 p.m. Carl Salyer of Maryland seconded the amendment with the amendment passing unanimously. The motion also passed.

A motion was made to reorder the games on Sunday of the Eastern Championship, to 7th place, 3rd place, 1st place, 5th place. The motion was seconded by Scott Reed of George Washington and passed 6-2.

Princeton made a motion to allow the order of games on Friday of the Eastern Championship be made by the staff to accommodate travel concerns for teams. However, in order to change any scheduled time, all teams involved would need to agree. Scott Reed of George Washington seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Men's Varsity Meeting

In attendance: Daniel Sharadin, Commissioner; Thomas Tracey, Director of Officials; Ed Haas, Director of Communications; John Benedick, CWPA Board President; Ed Reed, Technical Committee; Erik Farrar, Harvard; John Zeigler, Bucknell; Derek Ellingson, Princeton; Scott Reed, George Washington; Joe McCommons, Queens; Carl Quigley & Mikhail Klochkov, St. Francis; Mike Schofield, US Naval Academy;

Discussion began about the involvement of Salem International. Consensus from the teams present was that Salem International University should be placed in the Western Region of the Division to balance the divisions equally at five in each region.

Proposal VM1-Princeton made a motion to change the format of Easterns to the format approved by the women's coaches during their meeting calling for a three-day event. Motion seconded by John Zeigler of Bucknell and approved unanimously.

Proposal VM2-MIT made a proposal to create a combined Division II and III Eastern Championship event. Only Queens was available to vote and they indicated support. Commissioner indicated more discussion would need to take place by conference call.

Proposal VMS1- George Washington made a motion (seconded by Bucknell) to revise the manner in which the teams are seeded for the Southern Division Championship. After some discussion the motion was withdrawn and a new motion was made to have all Southern Division Coaches vote at the close of the regular season to determine the seeding for the championship. Bucknell Seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

General Meeting

In attendance: Daniel Sharadin, Commissioner; Thomas Tracey, Director of Officials; Ed Haas, Director of Communications; John Benedick, CWPA Board President; Ed Reed, Technical Committee; Matt Anderson, Michigan; Erik Farrar, Harvard; John Zeigler, Bucknell; Carl Salyer, Maryland; Alan Huckins, Hartwick; Derek Ellingson, Princeton; Scott Reed, George Washington; Joe McCommons, Queens; John Wagner, San Jose State; Carl Quigley & Mikhail Klochkov, St. Francis; Mike Schofield, U.S. Naval Academy; Igor Samardzija, Columbia; Don Sherman, Gannon University

The Board of Directors was reelected with the members of the board slated to expire in 2006 having their terms expire in 2008, while the members slated to expire in 2007 will have their terms expire in 2009. No new nominations were submitted, as John Benedict of MIT, Scott Reed of George Washington, Mark Gensheimer (non institutional), John Zeigler of Bucknell, Matt Anderson of Michigan, and Marv Christopher of Cal State Maritime Academy were elected by unanimous vote.

The Commissioner presented the Annual Report, a copy of which is available online. In addition, he presented a status report for the current strategic plan for 2005-08, also available online.

General Proposals

Proposal GC01-Board of Review requests made by an institution must be made or endorsed by the appropriate school administrator. Motion passed 34-3 (including mail ballots from clubs)

Dan Sharadin proposed restructuring the selection process for the Technical Committee to give the staff responsibility for filling the personnel, with approval from the Board of Directors. Mike Schofield of Navy seconded the motion. Technical Committee members will serve without term limit at the pleasure of the Executive Board. Nominations for new members will be solicited from the membership and CWPA referees. Motion carried unanimously.

Luis Nicolao, Jason Gall, Ted Bresnahan nominated for Board of Review. Nicolao and Gall voted in unanimously.

Erik Farrar of Harvard proposed holding the Annual Meeting on the first Wednesday of June. John Wagner of San Jose State seconded the motion which passed 10-2.

Note: The change in the annual meeting date must be ratified by a membership-wide vote before it can be official.

Carl Salyer of Maryland made a motion to make select a Rookie of the Year in each varsity division. Motion seconded by Erik Farrar of Harvard and passed 10-2.

Mikhail Klochkov of St. Francis motioned to establish a men's All-Star game between the All-South and All-North Divisions which would occur at the women's Eastern Championship. Motion was discussed and does not receive a second. A note was made that if coaches went back to their institutions and determined that sufficient interest exists from their student-athletes to attend a self-funded tournament of this nature, the CWPA office would take steps to organize the event.

Mike Schofield of Navy moves for a Rookie of the Year at men's and women's Eastern Championships. Motion seconded by Alan Huckins of Hartwick and passed 12-0 unanimously. A clarification was made after the vote that eligible players include any participant/player appearing in their first Eastern Championship and will not be limited to traditional freshmen.

Discussion was held regarding the host reimbursement policy, but the membership present at the meeting did not feel that it required change at this time.

2007 Annual Meeting Proposal Ballot

Proposals (*G Proposals are voted on by all members (varsity & club); GC Proposals are voted on by Club members only; PCM/SWM Proposals are voted on by members of the Pacific Coast & Southwest Club Divisions only; VW Proposals are voted on by Women's Varsity members only; VM Proposals are voted on by Men's Varsity members only; VMS Proposals are voted on by Men's Varsity Southern Division members only*)

General Proposals (All Members – Varsity & Club)

Proposal G1	Motion Passed 34-3
------------------------	--------------------

Club Proposals (Club Members Only)

Proposal GC01	Motion Passed 15-7
--------------------------	--------------------

Proposal GC02	Motion Passed 17-7
--------------------------	--------------------

Specific Club Proposals (Pacific Coast/Southwest)

Proposal PCM1	Motion Passed 7-4
--------------------------	-------------------

Proposal SWM1	No quorum received
--------------------------	--------------------

Proposal SWM2	No quorum received
--------------------------	--------------------

Varsity Club Proposals (Varsity Members Only)

Proposal VW1	Motion Passed (with amendments)
-------------------------	---------------------------------

Proposal VW2	Withdrawn
-------------------------	-----------

Proposal VM1	Motion Passed (with amendments)
-------------------------	---------------------------------

Proposal VM2	No quorum received
-------------------------	--------------------

Proposal VMS1	Withdrawn
--------------------------	-----------

CWPA Membership Proposals

Proposal G1-Board of Review Process All CWPA teams vote

Sponsor: CWPA Office

Division(s) Affected by Proposal: All

Proposal

All Board of Reviews submitted by institutions must be endorsed by the school administrator in charge of the team (i.e. club sport supervisor or athletic director supervising the varsity team).

Statement of intent

To ensure issues brought to the Board of Review have been communicated and supported by the institution's administration before the Board deliberates.

Statement of financial impact expected on member teams

None

Current policy that the proposal seeks to change

Any coach or player may request a Board of Review

Rationale for proposal

Institution of this proposal will do two things:

1. Increase communication between institutional administrators and the CWPA to ensure all parties are in agreement moving forward with a Board of Review.
2. Decrease the number of Boards of Review that are unwarranted, which consume valuable staff and personnel resources. This will free CWPA staff to accomplish more for the membership.

Club Proposals

Proposal GC01- All clubs vote

Divisions Affected: Men's and women's club divisions

School #1 Sponsoring Proposal: St. John's University

School #2 Sponsoring Proposal: Yale University, University of Minnesota

Proposal: Because many divisions have multiple teams that are qualified to be considered the "top team" in their respective divisions, but often must end the season at conference and not continue on to Nationals, I propose we host a tournament for the runners up from several neighboring divisions during Nationals weekend. This would extend the playing season for more athletes, as well as increase top line competition. The top three schools from the previous season of each division would confer with the top 3 schools from several neighboring divisions to decide on a suitable site and back-up site for the competition. After the Conference Champion is chosen for nationals, the 1st and 2nd runners up would be chosen to go to the regional consolation site. If the Regional Consolation Host has been chosen for Nationals, the back-up host site would be used. Each Regional would consist of 6-8 teams, a number which would decide how many divisions constitute the Region. Possible groupings for men could include the Northwest and Pac Coast; the Southwest, Rocky Mountain and Texas; the Great Plains, Heartland, Missouri and Great Lakes; Southeast and Atlantic; Mid Atlantic and New York; and the New England and North Atlantic Divisions. A similar structure could be established for Women.

Statement of intent: Extend the conference playing season with a regional consolation tournament.

Statement of financial impact expected on member teams: The cost incurred would be that of paying officials for the additional games. This could be spread across the conference, because every team technically has an equal chance of qualifying. Travel would be an additional cost individual to each team.

Current policy that the proposal seeks to change: Current Policy is that official League play ends for the vast majority of teams after the conference tournament.

Rationale for proposal: Many divisions have teams that are equally qualified to progress to the national tournament, however only one is chosen each year. This means to continue playing, the teams must schedule their own games, which often must be done short notice, based on championship performance. This structure also promotes inter-division play, and increases possible public exposure to the sport. Often, teams play the same teams year after year with much the same result. This structure increases variability and encourages teams

to work considerably harder. As more games are played and more people are exposed to the sport and to more teams, the sport in theory will become more popular and expand to schools where it does not already exist. While some teams are able to schedule additional games, others are prohibited by distance from making frequent road trips to other conferences. Even when travel is an option, conflicting conference schedules may prohibit inter-division play.

Commissioner's Note: The CWPA will not have staff available to run these regional events since they will be at the National Championship. Each regional tournament would essentially be an invitational coordinated by the institution hosting the games. Essentially this can be done now by any team wishing to host. The CWPA can assist in distributing invitations for those teams wishing to do so.

Proposal GC02- All clubs vote

Sponsor: CWPA Office

Divisions Affected: Men's and women's club divisions

Proposal: Require the head referee and Technical Committee Members to make all assignments for all games during the National Collegiate Club Championships, including the championship game.

Statement of Intent: To permit the individuals charged with evaluating the officials during the event the license to appoint the individuals they feel are most capable at the time to officiate the championship game, thereby aligning this game with other championship assignments and events.

Financial Impact: No financial impact

Current Policy: Coaches on the semi-final game submit their rankings of officials and the votes of the two coaches that qualify for the championship are tallied in combination with the head referee to determine who officiates the championship game. All other assignments are made by the head referee and Technical Committee members present.

Rationale: Current process does not adequately take advantage of the expertise of the individuals that are expressly brought in to the tournament to evaluate the officials. The Technical Committee members and head referee watch all of the games from an unbiased perspective, making them the ideal individuals charged with this responsibility. Likewise, revising this policy will make it consistent with every other championship the CWPA sponsors.

Specific Club Division Proposals

Proposal PCM1 Men's Pacific Division-only Pacific Coast men's club teams vote

Author: Dylan Malot (Vice President, UC Davis Men's Water Polo Club)
Division(s) Affected by Proposal: Pacific Coast Division

School #1 Sponsoring Proposal UC Davis
School #2 Sponsoring Proposal UCLA

Proposal:

We propose to change the rule of eligibility in the Pacific Coast Division, so that players that have merely appeared on a Varsity roster at their school are no longer ineligible to compete in CWPA games with their respective school's club team. We propose that the rule of eligibility is made to be the same as the Pacific Coast Division's rule for women's collegiate club teams: An athlete is eligible if he or she has appeared on a Varsity roster for two years or less.

Statement of intent: To proliferate the sport of water polo, and allow committed club athletes that have previously made Varsity teams to compete in the CWPA.

Statement of financial impact expected on member teams: None

Current policy that the proposal seeks to change: The club division's eligibility stipulation that in the Pacific Coast League if an athlete has appeared on a Varsity roster he may not compete for the same school as a club athlete.

Rationale for proposal: To fulfill the mission and purpose of the CWPA and sports clubs and provide an opportunity for dedicated and enthusiastic athletes to compete as full members on their respective sports club teams. Many athletes make an ICA Varsity roster, only to find the experience unrewarding. By all means, they should be able to compete in the CWPA. Instantiating the women's rule is both fair and egalitarian. The CWPA understandably has an interest in preventing dominant Division I athlete from tainting the club division's talent pool. However, the same rationale that promotes the women's rule applies to the men's division. Most of the turnover that occurs in large Varsity programs is in the first two years. The club division is there to provide athletic opportunities to those not in Varsity programs, and that opportunity needs to be extended to ex-ICA athletes that have not had substantial Division I careers.

Proposal SWM1-Men's Southwest Division-only Southwest men's club teams vote

Author: Todd Clapper – ASU

Division(s) Affected by Proposal: Southwest Men

School #1 Sponsoring Proposal - ASU

School #2 Sponsoring Proposal - NAU

Proposal: To allow full-time staff/faculty members of the institution to participate in the regular season (no post-season or conference tournament).

Statement of intent: Same as proposal

Statement of financial impact expected on member teams: None

Current policy that the proposal seeks to change: Right now in the SW Division, only students can participate (undergraduate and graduate)

Rationale for proposal: Allowing these people to participate will grow the interest and the support across the campus. In addition staff members are a much more permanent fixture on the college campus, which will help promote the longevity of the program. The precedent exists in other divisions to allow this to happen

Proposal SWM2-Men's Southwest Division-only Southwest men's club teams vote

Division(s) Affected by Proposal - Southwest Men

School #1 Sponsoring Proposal - ASU

School #2 Sponsoring Proposal - NAU

Proposal: To eliminate the 50% rule for the SW division as a requirement for post-season competition.

Statement of intent: A Full-Time Student should be eligible to compete if they join the team late or had scheduling conflicts for past tournaments.

Statement of financial impact expected on member teams: None

Current policy that the proposal seeks to change: Right now, you are required to compete in 50% of the competitions prior to the conference tournament to be eligible for the conference tournament

Rationale for proposal: Eligible students, are eligible students. If someone joins the club late, they should still be allowed to participate. If someone had scheduling conflicts during other weekends, he should still be allowed to compete at the conference tournament. The current legislation should be something that each individual club determines, not the league. The criteria for conference tournament eligibility should be simple, full-time student – can compete.

Varsity Proposals

Commissioner's Note: Proposals VW1 and VW2 will be discussed together since they will impact each other if either one is passed.

Proposal VW1-All Women's Varsity teams vote

School #1 Sponsoring Proposal Princeton
School #2 Sponsoring Proposal Indiana University

Proposal: Change the Eastern Championship to a three day event, with each participant playing one game a day. With the current rule changes adding time to each game, it only makes for less rest time for the evening games.

Statement of intent: To make the Eastern Championship the best tournament we can.

Statement of financial impact expected on member teams: With the additional day there would be an increase of budget, one extra night in a hotel and extra day of meal money. The cost of the tournament would also increase due to an increase of the officials' costs.

Current policy that the proposal seeks to change: Currently the Eastern Championship is a two-day event

Rationale for proposal: The rationale is to make Easterns the best tournament we can by providing equal opportunity of winning to each team participating. Under our current policy of two games on Saturday there is not enough time to rest or prepare for the evening games. With the game changing to eight minute quarters the preparation time is only less. Going to a three day format will allow each team the chance to prepare regardless of the game they are in. The following is the proposed format:

FRIDAY	SATURDAY	SUNDAY, May 14
Game 1 — 3 p.m.	Game 5 — 1:30 p.m.	Game 9 — 9:00am
Game 2 — 4:30 p.m.	Game 6 — 3 p.m.	Game 10 — 10:30 a.m.
Game 3 — 6 p.m.	Game 7 — 4:30 p.m.	Game 11 — Noon.
Game 4 — 7:30 p.m.	Game 8 — 6 p.m.	Game 12 — 1:30 p.m.

Game 1	1 v 8	
Game 2	4 v 5	
Game 3	2 v 7	
Game 4	3 v 6	
Game 5	Loser Game 1 vs. Loser of Game 2	
Game 6	Loser Game 3 vs. Loser of Game 4	
Game 7	Winner Game 1 vs. Winner of Game 2	
Game 8	Winner Game 3 vs. Winner Game 4	
Game 9	Loser Game 5 vs. Loser Game 6	7 th Place
Game 10	Winner Game 5 vs. Winner Game 6	5 th Place
Game 11	Loser Game 7 vs. Loser Game 8	3 rd Place
Game 12	Winner Game 7 vs. Winner Game 8	1 st Place

Proposal VW2

School #1 Sponsoring Proposal Hartwick College

School #2 Sponsoring Proposal George Washington University

Proposal: Realign the divisions. One division would include: Michigan, Indiana, Maryland, Hartwick, Bucknell, George Washington, Princeton, Brown, and Harvard. (We will call this group Division 9A for the purpose of this proposal.) These teams would play 6* of the other members throughout the season. This would be easy to do because teams would be allowed to play their league games in either league or invitational tournaments or in single matches. There would be no Divisional Championship.

Second division would include: Gannon, Washington & Jefferson, Grove City, Slippery Rock, Mercyhurst, Penn St. Behrend, Utica, Queens, Connecticut College. (For the purpose of this proposal this group will be known as Division 9B) These teams would play 6* of the other members throughout the season.

Again teams would be allowed to play their league games in either league or invitational tournaments or in single matches. In addition, Division of 9B would have a Division Championship (They would use the current CWPA model for 9 teams) to determine the 3 teams that qualify for the CWPA Championship. (It is suggested that this tournament be the second weekend of April to allow the teams to make travel plans)

Teams are encouraged to try and play all division members but must designate the 5/6 games as the official league games.

(The divisional Alignments can be looked at on a yearly or every other year basis to determined if teams should be moved to the other division). These “league” games could take place at any of the numerous tournaments throughout the year (Bucknell, Maryland, Princeton, Michigan, Indiana, Utica, and Penn St. Behrend currently host tournaments) or schedule as individual games (non-tournament). Coaches should schedule these games thru a conference call that would take place no later than April 1 of the previous year. The three teams that the Division of 9a and the three teams that the Division of 9b does not schedule for a league game in a year must be scheduled in the next year and so on and so forth. If coaches can’t agree on a place and time for all their league games the league would then schedule remaining games – **these games would not be able to be changed for anything other than inclement weather.** (This scheduling is similar to the way the WWPA and MPSF schedule their games)

NCAA Qualifying CWPA Championship (Eastern Championship)

For the CWPA Championship all teams from Division of 9A would qualify as well as the top 3 from Division of 9b. A seeding committee would then seed the championship accordingly (Division of. 9A would not necessarily be seeded 1-8; they would have to earn the appropriate seeding.) The top 4 teams would get a bye in round 1. Winners advance to play an 8 team tournament losers play out 9 – 12th places

Day 1

Round 1

#1 9th seed vs. 8th seed

#2 12th seed vs. 5th seed

#3 10th seed vs. 7th seed

#4 11th seed vs. 6th seed

Round 2

#5 1st seed vs. W1

#6 4th seed vs. W2

#7 2nd seed vs. W3

#8 3rd seed vs. W4

Day 2

Round 3

#9 L1 vs. L2

#10 L3 vs. L4

#11 L5 vs. L6

#12 L7 vs. L8

#13 W5 vs. W6

#14 W7 vs. W8

Day 3

Round 4

#15 L9 vs. L10 (11th Place)

#16 W9 vs. W10 (9th Place)

#17 L11 vs. L12 (7th Place)

#18 W11 vs. W12 (5th Place)

#19 L13 vs. L14 (3rd Place)

#20 W13 vs. W14 (1st Place)

Rationale: Create more competition between like teams. Gives every team a legitimate shot at making the championship, which is a lot easier to sell to an athletic director when trying to save a program or entice a new team to join the league.

Let's look at NCAA basketball. There is a reason that the Jackson State's of the world don't play the North Carolina's on a regular basis. Even if they don't play them they still have a chance to qualify for the NCAA tournament and play at least one game. Who knows what might happen in that one game. Just look at Bucknell a couple of years ago, if they were in the Big 12 they would not have even qualified for the tournament but because they were in a league where they could qualify, for one game one day they were able to pull off one of the biggest upsets ever. For a lot of our teams the CWPA championship is there "NCAA's". This would give the Division of 9b a better opportunity to make the CWPA championship as well as let them play in a division championship. This can only promote the sport and make all teams stronger.

As of now many CWPA teams have to travel to California to obtain stiffer competition. If more competitive games could be found on the East Coast then that would save a school the expense of traveling to California. This is a good selling point in times of school budget crunches.

Cost: Little change if any. A closer look at this years schedules and games that would need to be played in 2008 if this proposal was in place this year. Most teams already play the games they would need to play.

Hartwick	Princeton	Indiana	Michigan
Indiana	Indiana	Michigan	Indiana
Princeton	Michigan	Hartwick	Princeton
G.W.	G.W.	G.W.	G.W.
Bucknell	Bucknell	Maryland	Bucknell
Brown	Maryland	Brown	Brown
Harvard	Hartwick	Princeton	Maryland
2008			
Michigan	Harvard	Harvard	Harvard
Maryland	Brown	Bucknell	Hartwick

G.W.	Maryland	Brown	Bucknell
Hartwick	Indiana	Hartwick	Hartwick
Indiana	Michigan	Michigan	Michigan
Michigan	Princeton	Harvard	Hartwick
Maryland	Bucknell	Indiana	Princeton
Bucknell	G.W.	Maryland	Princeton

2008

Harvard

Brown

Harvard

Brown

Hartwick

(In 2006 Harvard played everyone except Indiana)

Division B

Gannon	Queens	Utica	Mercyhurst
Utica	Utica	Gannon	Gannon
Queens	Gannon	Queens	Utica
Mercyhurst	Mercyhurst	Mercyhurst	Queens
Slippery Rock	Conn College	Slippery Rock	Slippery Rock
W&J	Grove City	Grove City	W&J

Penn St. B

Penn St. B

Penn St. B

Penn St. B

Grove City

Conn College

Grove City

(played 7)

(Played 7)

(played 7)

2008

Conn College

Slippery Rock

W&J

W&J

W&J

Penn St. B

Grove City

W&J

Slippery Rock

W&J

W&J

Slippery Rock

W&J

Gannon

Gannon

Gannon

Gannon

Mercyhurst

Mercyhurst

Mercyhurst

Mercyhurst

Utica

Utica

Grove City

Utica

Queens

Queens

Penn St. B

Penn St. B

Slippery Rock

Slippery Rock

Grove City

Grove City

PennSt. B

(played 7)

(played 7)

2008

Conn College

Conn College

Conn College

Queens

Conn College

Queens

Utica

Proposal VM1

Author Luis Nicolao

Division(s) Affected by Proposal All

School #1 Sponsoring Proposal
School #2 Sponsoring Proposal

Princeton University
Queens College

Proposal: Would like to see Eastern Championships changed to a three day event, this way each participant would play one game a day. With the current rule changes adding time to each game will only make for less rest time for the evening games.

Proposal: Change the Eastern Championship to a three day event, with each participant playing one game a day. With the current rule changes adding time to each game it only makes for less rest time for the evening games.

Statement of intent: To make Eastern Championship the best tournament we can.

Statement of financial impact expected on member teams: With the additional day there would be an increase of budget, one extra night in a hotel and extra day of meal money. The cost of the tournament would also increase due to an increase of the officials' costs.

Current policy that the proposal seeks to change: Currently the Eastern Championship is a two-day event

Rationale for proposal: The rationale is to make Easterns the best tournament we can by providing equal opportunity of winning to each team participating. Under our current policy of two games on Saturday there is not enough time to rest or prepare for the evening games. With the game changing to eight minute quarters the preparation time is only less. Going to a three day format will allow each team the chance to prepare regardless of the game they are in. The following is the proposed format:

FRIDAY	SATURDAY	SUNDAY, May 14
Game 1 — 3 p.m.	Game 5 — 1:30 p.m.	Game 9 — 9:00am
Game 2 — 4:30 p.m.	Game 6 — 3 p.m.	Game 10 — 10:30 a.m.

Game 3 — 6 p.m.

Game 7 — 4:30 p.m.

Game 11 — Noon.

Game 4 — 7:30 p.m.

Game 8 — 6 p.m.

Game 12 — 1:30 p.m.

Game 1 1 v 8

Game 2 4 v 5

Game 3 2 v 7

Game 4 3 v 6

Game 5 Loser Game 1 vs. Loser of Game 2

Game 6 Loser Game 3 vs. Loser of Game 4

Game 7 Winner Game 1 vs. Winner of Game 2

Game 8 Winner Game 3 vs. Winner Game 4

Game 9 Loser Game 5 vs. Loser Game 6 7th Place

Game 10 Winner Game 5 vs. Winner Game 6 5th Place

Game 11 Loser Game 7 vs. Loser Game 8 3rd Place

Game 12 Winner Game 7 vs. Winner Game 8 1st Place

Proposal VM2-Varsity Men's Teams in Division II and III vote

Divisions Affected: Men's Varsity Division II and III institutions

School Sponsoring Proposal: MIT

School Sponsoring Proposal: Penn State Behrend

Proposal: Combine the Division III Championship with Division II championship games

Schedule: (could be modified if all four D2 schools participate)

A--D3 B--D3 C --D2

1 2 1

4 3 2

5 3

Friday

Game.

8 B2 B3 1

9 10 A1 A5 2

Saturday

9 C1 C3 3

10 10 A1 A4 4

12 C2 C3 5

11 0 A4 A5 6

3 C1 C2 7 1st in Bracket C is D-2 Champ

4 10 1st in B 2nd in A 8 2nd in Bracket C is D2 Runner-Up

520	2nd in B	3rd A	9	3rd in Bracket C is D2 3rd
710	1st in A	Winner 8	10	D3 1st place game
820	Winner 9	Loser 8	11	D3 3rd Place Game

Sunday

9	2nd C	Loser 10		Small Colleges 3rd place game
1010	1st C	Winner 10		Small Colleges 1st place game
1120	3rd C	Winner 11		Small Colleges 5th place game
1230	Loser 11	Loser of 9		7th place game

Statement of Intent: Re-establish the Division II championship and bring the two events together

Financial Impact: No financial impact beyond the cost of the tournament

Current Policy: Division III championship exists by itself and the Division II tournament was dropped.

Rationale: This will help promote the Division III event while re-establishing the DII tournament.

Proposal VMS1-Varsity Southern Division-Only Southern Division
Men's Teams vote

Author: Scott Reed

Divisions Affected: Southern Division

School Sponsoring Proposal: George Washington University

School Sponsoring Proposal: Bucknell University

Proposal: Seed Southern Championships by committee (poll committee, coaches) based on in-season performance.

Statement of Intent: Change the current seeding system.

Financial Impact: No financial impact

Current Policy: Alternate seeding with West and South regions determined by regular season order of finish.

Rationale: Current process does not fairly seed teams by actual in-season performance. The current system does not reward the number one seed with the easiest way to the championship game. Under current system a true 4-5, 2-7, 3-6 match-up does not happen.