# 2021 Men's Club Annual Meeting Minutes

#### **Texas Division**

### Minutes, April 20, 2021

Attending: Daniel Sharadin, Commissioner; Texas State, Robert Bateman; Texas A&M, Tyler Thambs; Rice University, Robert Idel; Houston, Justin Turet; Baylor, Dylan Van Horn

The conference call opened with a discussion about the lack of competitive equity and how it harms the experience for teams with lopsided scores and multiple forfeits. To resolve this issue there needs to be a revision in the scheduling that increases the number of times similar programs compete against each other. With the Texas Division spanning such a large geographic footprint, merging with another division is not practical, so any effort along these lines will need to be made internally.

The Commissioner agreed to develop an alternative that uses past history as a way to determine future opponents. Teams agreed to review this type of schedule revision for the future.

The Commissioner also explained about the new National Invite that would be open for teams in the lower half of the standings. This new championship will provide a post season opportunity to teams that traditionally will never be able to win their division.

The next conference call to confirm the competitive structure.

Tuesday, April 27 5:00PM EDT, 4:00PM CDT

Dial-in Number: 971-224-6609 Participant Access Code: 426721

#### **Proposed Competitive Schedule Revision**

Option 1 Teams are divided into three groups: 1-3, 4-6, 7-10. Each group plays those in their group twice then the next closest group once, with the balance of the remaining games drawn sequentially.

Advantages-teams will play most of their games against opponents that are close in ability. Disadvantages- teams will play their "B" teams

Team	Gm1	Gm2	Gm3	Gm4	Gm5	Gm6	Gm7	Gm8
1st	2nd	2nd	3rd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th
2nd	1st	1st	3rd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	8th
3rd	2nd	2nd	1st	1st	4th	5th	6th	9th
4th	6th	6th	5th	5th	1st	2nd	3rd	10th

5th	4th	4th	6th	6th	1st	2nd	3rd	7th
6th	5th	5th	4th	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	8th
7th	9th	9th	8th	8th	10th	10th	1st	5th
8th	7th	7th	9th	9th	10th	10th	2nd	6th
9th	8th	8th	10th	10th	7th	7th	3rd	10th
10th	9th	9th	8th	8th	7th	7th	4th	9th

Option 2 – Teams are divided so that 1-3 never play 7-10. This will reduce the chance that teams will play their B teams

Team	Gm1	Gm2	Gm3	Gm4	Gm5	Gm6	Gm7	Gm8
1 <sup>st</sup>	2nd	2nd	2nd	3rd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
2 <sup>nd</sup>	1st	1st	1st	3rd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
3 <sup>rd</sup>	1st	1st	2nd	2nd	4th	4th	5th	6th
4th	1st	2nd	3rd	3rd	5th	6th	7th	8th
5th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	6th	7th	8th	9th
6th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	7th	8th	9th
7th	4th	5th	6th	8th	9th	9th	10th	10th
8th	5th	6th	7th	9th	9th	10th	10th	10th
9th	6th	7th	7th	8th	8th	10th	10th	10th
10th	7th	7th	8th	8th	8th	9th	9th	9th

Option 3 - Split into two brackets according to finish in the standings from prior year

Top five play double round robin in regular season followed by a championship
Bottom five play double round robin in regular season followed by a championship
Each championship winner moves on to their respective National Championship
The following year the worst team in the top five drops to the bottom bracket and the best team from the bottom moves to the top or they have the option to decline to move

## Minutes, May 7, 2021

Attending: Daniel Sharadin, Commissioner; Texas Tech, Wyatt McDonald; Texas State, Robert Bateman; Texas A&M, Tyler Thambs; Rice University, Robert Idel; Houston, Felipe Farias; Baylor, Dylan Van Horn

The second conference call opened with a brief recap of the competitive format options discussed a week prior. The purpose of this call was to select which competitive option would be used this fall.

Teams voted 5-1 in favor of Option 1 presented last week (listed below).

Option 1 Teams are divided into three groups: 1-3, 4-6, 7-10, based on last season's finish. Each group plays those in their group twice then the next closest group once, with the balance of the remaining games drawn sequentially.

Team	Gm1	Gm2	Gm3	Gm4	Gm5	Gm6	Gm7	Gm8
1st	2nd	2nd	3rd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7 <sup>th</sup>
2nd	1st	1st	3rd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	8 <sup>th</sup>
3rd	2nd	2nd	1st	1st	4th	5th	6th	9 <sup>th</sup>
4th	6th	6th	5th	5th	1st	2nd	3rd	10 <sup>th</sup>
5th	4th	4th	6th	6th	1st	2nd	3rd	7 <sup>th</sup>
6th	5th	5th	4th	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	8 <sup>th</sup>
7th	9th	9th	8th	8th	10th	10th	1st	5 <sup>th</sup>
8th	7th	7th	9th	9th	10th	10th	2nd	6 <sup>th</sup>
9th	8th	8th	10th	10th	7th	7th	3rd	10 <sup>th</sup>
10th	9th	9th	8th	8th	7th	7th	4th	9 <sup>th</sup>

The decision regarding how many teams would proceed to the championship was postponed to a later date following an additional discussion about how to accurately determine the seeding. With the current format, teams with a weaker schedule may have a better won/loss record than those playing more experienced programs, which would skew the accuracy of the standings and potentially send the wrong teams to each respective "A" and "B" championship. The Commissioner said he would develop some alternative models that weight the wins according to the seed of the team beaten. This will be issued at a later date and discussed on a separate call.

The Commissioner stated he would send an excel form that teams will need to complete, listing what dates they are unavailable to compete, and which dates they can host. The deadline for the form to be returned is May 15, but the office understands teams may not be able to determine if they can host by that point in time. In this instance, teams should just indicate that on their form and notify the office when they get a date confirmed with their school.