

Women's Basketball Division II Survey		
Please provide the following demographic information for WBCA use only:		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Name:	100.0%	151
Institution	100.0%	151
City/Town:	100.0%	151
State:	100.0%	151
Email Address:	100.0%	151
<i>answered question</i>		151
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Women's Basketball Division II Survey		
1. Are you currently playing a 27 game regular season schedule?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Yes	96.0%	143
No	4.0%	6
<i>answered question</i>		149
<i>skipped question</i>		2

Women's Basketball Division II Survey		
2. Would you be willing to reduce the number of maximum contests permitted in regular season from 27 to 26?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Yes	51.0%	76
No	49.0%	73
<i>answered question</i>		149
<i>skipped question</i>		2

Women's Basketball Division II Survey		
3. Would you be in favor of a larger reduction in contests?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Yes	6.7%	10
No	85.2%	127
Neither	3.4%	5
Either	5.4%	8
Why or Why not? (please provide specific details how this change would positively or negatively impact schedule issues, student-athletes' experience, missed class time, etc.)	96	96
<i>answered question</i>		149
<i>skipped question</i>		2

#	Why or Why not? (please provide specific details how this change would positively or negatively impact schedule issues, student-athletes' experience, missed class time, etc.)
1	Either one is fine...With a small school and lower budgets, its kind of hard to get 27 without paying so much with travel costs
2	Hopefully, this will provide students with one less missed class day or evening class.
3	I beleive a reduction of one game could help with scheduling issues and missed class time. Any further reduction would take away from the athletes experience and linit oportunites for travel to tournaments. I would also reduce the opportunities to reach milestones of 20 wins and to help qualify for post season play.
4	I think the current number is appropriate and currently our conference only allows 4 teams into the conference tournament, so I'd like my kids to have as much game experience as possible.
5	Students play basketball so that they can play games. I would never be in support of taking away games.
6	We're the only "true" two semester sport. Time span of season (November to March) is too long.
7	One concern for us ends up being the size of our league. Currently we are split in divisons and only have a total of 12 league games. Those non-conference games helps us within region and SOS. The past few years the 4 out of our six teams on our side have finished with a losing record. If we are forced into a reduction the numbers could come back to haunt us for championship play. This is just one example.....I have more if someone would like to visit.

8	I see no reason to reduce the number of contests. A one game reduction will have little of any impact on budgets or missed class time. Every school could reduce their number on contests to 26 if they so choose without new legislation.
9	The games are why the kids play college basketball.
10	I wouldn't mind going down to 25 games. Because of our location, we have a hard time getting home games, so we are on the road a lot. This has a negative effect on our budget and our kids with missing class time.
11	We would not be able to schedule any in region games (GNAC) if this happens as the CCAA need few games. Also, unless you are going to reduce the length of our season - we practice long enough without games!!!
12	Players and Coaches want to play. Personally I feel that 27 is fine but if we are wanting to make changes I vote to add a game to 28
13	we already had our games cut
14	The players work hard all year and their reward is game day. To take that away from them is crazy.
15	Would only reduce the expense of one game. Other than that I can see no impact.
16	As long as all institutions are evenly restricted there is no advantage or disadvantage for any institutions.
17	Any one involved in any given sport wants to play games--I did and so do my players.
18	student' athlete's experience, with the growth in most cofereces, there are already fewer non-conference games
19	I think our system is fine as is.
20	the 27 game schedule seems to be a good number for our sport and for the length of our season. I feel the student-athlete experience could lessened and the attractiveness of DII to prospects be hurt.
21	Our conference is so large that a reduction in games would make us play counter games much sooner in the season. Plus, we already encounter some cancellations due to weather, so if we began with fewer games, we could possibly lose even more contests.
22	the season is long enough and taking away games means the practice time would increase.
23	I think the number of contests is perfect because the way the games can be spread out over the corse of the season (non Conference) and the S.A's are not burnt out
24	Only by one more game - down to 25!
25	Our season is already two weeks shorter than D-I institutions and student-athletes would feel slighted by a reduction in games they can play. Also, our league has expanded to the point where we play as many as twenty-two conference games. If we reduce or game schedule, we may no longer be able to take our teams to nice non-conference tournaments which is used as a recruiting tool.
26	Ithink we have more flexibility in scheduling that allows DII schools to play money game with DI institutions which help our athletic budget.

27	We participate in the WVIAC which has 16 teams. Our conference schedule is 22 games, which only give us 5 out of conference games. I feel we need those out of conference games to get us prepared to be successful in conference.
28	like to keep local rivals as well as mandated conference schedule
29	Many other ways to save money. Our conference is going to 22 game schedule next year. Need some non conference games.
30	In a large conference where we play as many as 20 conference games, it would be harder to diversify the schedule with non-conference games if total games were reduced
31	Limits trips and travel opportunities that would take place during semester break.
32	Our current number of games works very well. Reducing games lessens the SA experience. We have freedom to schedule independent games to strengthen our schedule and to take trips which help in recruiting.
33	If we reduce all sports I'll be in favor. If they're not asking football to reduce then I'm not in favor
34	We have only missed a total of 3 full days of class for games in my 8 years here
35	Missed classes
36	We play 19 game mandated schedule. If we are to have a chance to get into the ncaa, we need some games in the region outside of our league. Also, our games start Nov. 15th and we end in February with the regular season. That's 15 weeks to play 26/27 games. That's only 2 a week and I am sure that the student athletes would rather play games than practice.
37	The student athlete experience would be compromised (competition, practice, recruiting)
38	Spend so much time in preparation, the players should be able to play in games. That is the purpose of all of their off season work.
39	any more of a cut would hurt the student-athlete experience.
40	Season is VERY long. Hard to get games in, hard to schedule out of conference games in our Region.
41	I feel that with the amount of time we practice, the S-A's need actual contests. Reducing the number to 10% or more would be huge.
42	We have a 22 game conference schedule & I would like to keep at least 4 non-conference games
43	I think we need to add 2 more games
44	It would take away from the student athlete experience. Less games means more practice time.
45	26 is a fair number of games over a 4 1/2 month period
46	Student-athletes Exp. and it would effective NCAA bids.
47	Our conference schedule is 22 games it would eliminate our opportunities to play teams within our Region during non-conference.

48	It seems to be a good number so that you can play one or two games a week for the duration of the season. If you play fewer games, then the season seems to be very long if the length of the season remains the same. Players would prefer more games and less practices.
49	Student athletes want to play games! They work year round at the sport they love to compete in competitions during the season. I believe there would not be any student athletes in favor of this.
50	Student athletes spend a great deal of time conditioning and improving their skills during the off-season. They deserve the chance to compete in as many games as possible. As it stands, they play almost 20% of their games during Intersession in which there are no classes.
51	We only have 5 non-conference games as it is. I'd do away with our conference tournament in a heart beat. It's redundant and strictly an ego thing for our conference office.
52	I would be in favor of a 26 game regular season schedule. As it stands currently, the 27 game schedule spread out over 3 1/2 months gives our s-a's a quality competitive experience without too much interference with their academic pursuits. Eliminating one game would allow a little more flexibility in scheduling and travel.
53	I would rather lose exhibition games - once you take away games you will never get them back - Kids would rather go NAIA and play more games -
54	Players want to compete, less games would definitely affect the student athlete experience.
55	The number of contests at 27 allows us to compete against the best in our region and prepare for our conference schedule.
56	Student-athletes' experience-after league games are set(22 for LoneStar Conf) we would have little to work with on region rivalries, tournaments, etc. Also, 26 games fits our time frame for finding a competitive rhythm
57	I think that it is fine as is, but we cannot afford to play more games this year due to the current conditions in CA - that is unless I can get home games.
58	They would likely miss less class with a game schedule reduction / but quite often it takes that extra game or two for players to reach season or career milestones
59	25 is a working number - allows us to play full conference and 2 outside tournaments.
60	26-27 games pretty standard. we have not had any problems with class. things are good..
61	I believe that have a reduction in the number of contests per year will only hurt the athlete. These athletes are in school to get a degree and compete in contests.
62	I believe less games would help the student-athlete
63	we miss very little class time on a Division II level
64	Less than 27 games is does not provide us enough non-conference opportunities. 27 games is not too much, that's why teams play in exempted games when possible to get more games.

65	My athletic director already made us cut our schedule to 25 next year. It is hard when other teams get to play a full schedule and you don't
66	I don't think a large reduction is necessary, perhaps 1-2 games would work. It would take away from the student athlete's experience.
67	I asked our players how they would feel about it, and 100% of our student-athletes believe it would have a negative impact on their experience.
68	I don't think that we are playing too many games
69	the playing schedule now in tact is conducive to a good environment for student athletes and does not need to have big changes made to it
70	I believe we have to many games which hurts the academics of the student athlete. I also believe that most schools do not have adequate budgets for a 27 game schedule plus a conference tournament. I think we should have a 24 or 25 game schedule plus a conference tournament
71	Each institution knows their budgets and money situation. I think it should be up to them. Of the scheduled games with playing 12 Saturdays and about 5 over breaks I don't think missed class time is a big issue.
72	b/c it decreases the amount of games to play in order to get an at large bid if you don't win your conference. it also can affect whether or not we make the playoffs in our league b/c we don't take every team
73	It's been 27 games since I played in college. I think it is just fine the way it is. 27 games is all per year an athlete is guaranteed. I see no need in taking any of that away.
74	Our conference currently requires us to play 22 games. This leaves only 5 contests for non-conf. The non-conf games allow us to host a tournament, travel to other parts of the country to compete and to continue our of conference rivalries. If we were to reduce the game schedule it would begin to impact the SA expereince.
75	We currently play 5 pre-season games due to our large conference. Reducing games seriously impacts our strength of schedule and post season rankings.
76	If you ask the student athletes, I am confident that they feel the actual games are the highlight of the "student-athlete experience." Eliminating 1 contest would have an effect, by eliminating multiple contests, you are greatly diminishing the overall experience.
77	I feel like 27 games is a pretty good number right now. We are already playing 20 conference games, and with UIW coming into our conference that will increase to 22 games. We would not have much of an opportunity to play games outside of our conference.
78	I like the schdule the way it of haveing to play 27 games
79	Demographically on our part the expense is greater and would be cost effective for us! However, the student-athletes would lose out on the overall experience of playing collegiate ball.
80	Student athletes should have a chance to play in the NCAA tournament and reducing games can reduce the teams wins.

81	Because of our current conference schedule we have the ability to schedule 5 regular season games. We host a tournament leaving 3 opportunities to schedule. This, in my opinion, is already a limited amount.
82	Kids and coaches want to play games that count . Remove all scrimmages a, exhibitions, and exempted tournaments.
83	this is good number and works out with conference schedule
84	At this time I do not think that we should reduce games to under 26. This is to enhance the student-athlete's experience.
85	I would like more games like Division I... it affects stats as well... lets keep it consistant
86	Independent school with no conference tournament....need to play as many games as I can
87	We need to allow for enough non-conference games to play. Also reduce the ability to play in tournaments
88	1 game should not make a big difference
89	one contest does not help or hurt anyone
90	I thinks it's good now, but understand why modifying it could be necessary to evaluate.
91	Reduce scrimmages or exhibitions. Do not take away competition opportunities.
92	It would effect recruiting. Also, playing games is what players like to do and there should be limited differences in Division I or II regarding # of games. Cutting games should not be a means of cutting cost.
93	Where we are located it is very difficult to schedule games. This is my second season here at Western and we can't schedule a home pre season game due to finances. I would be interested in playing more conference games.
94	Since our conference is so big, it would take away our non-conference schedule and not allow us to travel as much or play in or hosts some great tournaments with other non-conference teams.
95	I think the number of contests is adequate.
96	With conference play you would not have enough games to prove your self for regional rankings with outside of your leage compentation if you reduce the schedule very much. It would benefit the larger conferences more and would make finding games for smaller ones outside of there league even harder.

Women's Basketball Division II Survey

4. Do you think a reduction of 1 contest (27 to 26) in the maximum number permitted would have an effect on the quality of the student-athlete experience? (indicate all the ones that apply)

Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
No, I do not think it would lessen the SA's experience	49.7%	74
Yes, I think it would lessen the opportunity for travel	28.9%	43
Yes, I think it would lessen the opportunity to compete	47.7%	71
Comments		21
<i>answered question</i>		149
<i>skipped question</i>		2

#	Comments
1	I think the more oportunites kids have a chance to play the better their focus.....you can only get them so far in a practice mindset..
2	The WVIAC plays 22 league contests. That leaves only 5 non-conference games to allow for enriching travel for a student-athlete.
3	No comment
4	Because our conference is 22 games, this leaves us only 5 other games to schedule...does not leave much opportunity to travel and compete
5	Both the opportunity to travel and to find out of conference competitions would be restricted
6	having that one more game will give teams the chance to play in a tournament where they will get quality competition
7	Only unless it goes below 25 games, I would not have a problem with having a 25 max game schedule.
8	Our conference (PSAC) is already going to drop 1 game for next year I believe....so that would make 2 games dropped for us.
9	I'm in a smaill conference in a region that has 2 big conferences. If the big conferences are limited to the amount of games they can play. We will actually have a tougher time scheduling.
10	One game should not effect anything. I am not sure if it would save lots of money either but I would like to think it may if everyones on board 292 division II institutions it may help.

11	Student athletes want to play games! They work year round at the sport they love to compete in competitions during the season. The student athlete needs to be the one we think about in making this decision.
12	In our league we have 21 league games and we are going to have 22 league games - that would only allow 4 contests - maybe one tournament - one of the best things about college athletics is seeing different parts of the country thru the game
13	One game would not be noticed significantly
14	We've had seasons with 26 or 25 games and literally no one noticed at all
15	Yes, with the number of conference games we have it would reduce the number outside games and travel.
16	When we take games away from the student-athletes...we are taking away another experience to learn from.
17	1-2 games would be fine.
18	we have 22 conference games and it would take away opportunities for me to take my team on trips I feel are important to enhancing their experience at Merrimack
19	One game would not effect it greatly
20	Any reduction of competition lessens the experience. If finances play a part in the reduction, then I would be in favor of simply making teams play more games within their region.
21	But I disagree

Women's Basketball Division II Survey

5. Do you think a reduction of 2 to 3 contests in the maximum number permitted would have an effect on the quality of the student-athlete experience? (indicate all the ones that apply)

Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
No, I do not think it would lessen the SA's experience	16.1%	24
Yes, I think it would lessen the opportunity for travel	56.4%	84
Yes, I think it would lessen the opportunity to compete	79.2%	118
Comments		28
<i>answered question</i>		149
<i>skipped question</i>		2

#	Comments
1	Reduction of that much would completely lessen the opportunity and would encourage players to play Juco ball so that they can play many more games, especially if they don't have the conference tournament experience.
2	If were going to go down to 24 or 25 games we may as well be a high school league.
3	High school and AAU teams play more games than we do already.
4	Even more so of what I said above
5	same as above
6	I think games are what the kids want
7	If it helps contain costs, I would settle for it. I think it is ok where it is now. But I am willing to sacrifice in these tough economic times...
8	If we reduce to many games, then the only experience is playing the league games and not against other competition. It might impact league play in that there are no tune up games to get ready for "league season".
9	2 or 3 is the max. Anything beyond that I think it would.
10	Almost our entire season would be our conference schedule which would eliminate travel and exposure for our team.
11	The student athlete needs to be the one we think about in making this decision.
12	To reduce contests by 2 or 3 games would be unjust! These athletes are 17+ in age and should be able to manage a 27 game schedule.
13	It would adversely affect our ability to prepare for our conference play.

14	Our conference is comprised of 16 teams. We play a 22 game conference schedule. That would only give us 2 or 3 opportunities to play outside of our Conference which would more than likely eliminate any travel out of region for us. That would be unfortunate as I believe that traveling to other parts of the country is an extremely valuable experience for our s-a's.
15	HUGE - back to the last answer - that would allow us 2 non-league games - that would be terrible for our league and our student/athlete experience
16	Players want to play games-they work hard year round for the opportunity to compete. A 2-3 game reduction would be felt
17	3 could be pushing it but overall I don't think it would matter much
18	If it is an NCAA rule -everyone is on an even playing field with regards to number. Not in favor of any reduction if it is conference mandated.
19	In our confrence structure now being playing each team in our confrence three times it gets a bit boring. By cutting 2-3 games does not give are kids a chance to play other confrences.
20	Taking away from the student-athlete.
21	depending on where teams are located if you lessen it by 3 games this would have a big effect on teams. I feel the max should be 2 games.
22	Non conference trips are memorable for student athletes, most of fundraise for these type of trips, so why take away from us this valuable experience.
23	What I have stated above
24	At the Division II level, institutions strike a great balance between academics, social life, and athletic participation. Reducing a significant number of contests (more than one) is penalizing the student-athlete more than any other measure that can be taken.
25	For us, it would make an impact. We would be limited to mostly conference play, and then maybe one tournament. I also feel like we would have some major gaps between games which could affect performance as well.
26	Student-athletes want to play games and if we reduce our maximum number of contest, we could hurt ourselves as we recruit against NAIA schools who are allowing their SA's to compete more often.
27	I do not think it would lessen the SA's experience, but where would the games get cut from...our home end or away end?
28	You would lose non conference games and lose at large chances to NCAA tourney.

Women's Basketball Division II Survey

6. Would you be willing to have annual or discretionary exemptions (e.g. contests against non-Division II opponents, foreign teams, conference championships, alumni games), that are currently exempted from counting against maximum contest limits count as regular season games?

Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Yes	27.5%	41
No	72.5%	108
<i>answered question</i>		149
<i>skipped question</i>		2

Women's Basketball Division II Survey

7. Please rank the following options in order of preference (1 through 5 - 1= best case / 5 = worst case)

Answer Options	Best Case	Might Prefer (with changes)	No Preference	Would Not Prefer (without changes)	Worst Case	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
Reduce regular season maximum number of games by 1 (27-26) and still permit annual/discretionary exemptions to not count in that total	43.6%	26.2%	3.4%	17.4%	8.1%	1.3%	2.19	149	
Reduce regular season maximum number of games by 2 (27-25) and still permit annual/discretionary exemptions to not count in that total	7.5%	15.0%	6.8%	44.9%	25.2%	0.7%	3.66	147	
Reduce regular season maximum number of games by 3 (27-24) and still permit annual/discretionary exemptions to not count in that total	2.0%	3.4%	2.0%	27.2%	63.3%	2.0%	4.49	147	
Keep regular season games at 27 but annual/discretionary exemptions would count in the 27 game total	19.7%	19.0%	15.6%	23.8%	19.0%	2.7%	3.03	147	
Reduce regular season maximum number of games by 1 (27-26) and allow only 1 annual/discretionary exemptions to not count in that total	10.3%	33.6%	14.4%	23.3%	16.4%	2.1%	3.02	146	
Comments								22	
								<i>answered question</i>	149
								<i>skipped question</i>	2

#	Comments
1	Do not start season till Dec.1 Start practice Nov. 1
2	You did not offer the option of keeping 27 regular season games and still permitting exempt games. That option would be my true "Best Case".
3	Best case scenerio is to leave it like it is

4	Compared to Baseball and Softball Basketball does not have a problem.
5	Do away with all discretionary exceptions.
6	I am opposed to any reduction in games under any formula
7	annual/discretionary exemptions provide student athlete's with the opportunity to play Division I games
8	why not limit overnight travel to contain costs- according to mileage of course.....some teams make the same trip in a day as others spend the night- unfair advantage....
9	We need the exhibition games to supplement our budgets-they are a big fundraiser for us
10	If you drop to many games and count the exemptions in the total, it doesn't help conferences that don't take all the teams to playoffs and they would be stuck with the minimum number and not helped by any conference tournament to make up games others are able to play
11	Cutting one game would not be a big deal and could save some money...any more than that would hurt the overall experience of the student-athlete. As far as the exemption games, either way would be fine with me.
12	I understand the current economic climate. But I don't want to make a rash decision on this. The economy is starting to turn around and if we give up games right now we will never get them back. Let look at this in a couple of years and if the economy is still bad, then lets make some changes.
13	Anything to keep the games at 27 would be best!
14	I'm flexible. I don't think the whole thing is that huge of a deal.
15	I do not believe that we should reduce the amount of regular season games.

16	Would prefer no change in number of games.
17	2 scrimmage/exhibition games are fine, but give us alumni games that would be exempt.
18	students have a good environment now which has seemed to work well over the years. if not broke, do not fix
19	the annual/discretionary games are an important part of helping to supplement our budget.
20	I ranked these 5 points 1-5 related to each other, not as independent statements.
21	I think we should reduce the playing and practice season as a whole and not just reduce the number of games.
22	Reducing opportunities to compete is a worst case senario.

Women's Basketball Division II Survey	
8. Any other comments regarding playing/practice season?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	29
<i>answered question</i>	29
<i>skipped question</i>	122

#	Response Text
1	no
2	My vote is to keep things just as they are. If teams want to plat 1 or 2 less games that can make that decision on their own.
3	Why not make the same amount of money and work less? The coaches know this is a done deal. Just like "regionalization".
4	I see no need for a change. If a school wants to reduce its' number of games then do so.
5	I think the best thing we can do for our student athletes is totally ban anything after season. We all do it because everyone else is - but this would be a great time for the athletes to just be college kids. They could still play pick up to stay in shape.
6	Go back to two officials in basketball
7	I do like the idea of a mandatory week off around Chirstmas.
8	would rather take one scrimmage away
9	I hope there are no chages...
10	Would like to see it left as is
11	Reducing the annual exemptions will affect those who utilize them. Some schools don't have the money to do the exemptions with the exception of league playoffs if they qualify for their leagues post season. If this is truly to be a cost cutting measure, it will save those schools who are paying for all the exemptions. If you don't limit the exemptions and the number of games, then you will probably see schools that have a reduction in games take advantage of the exemptions. This doesn't help schools that can't afford the exemptions to compete against those who can. This creates an even more unfair advantage to schools who don't have the budget to play those games, but still hope to compete for ncaa championships.
12	Season should always begin on a weekend. This year's start date of 11/15 takes away an opportunity to get 2 games in with no lost class time.
13	Keep things as they are!
14	If elect to reduce the number of games, then back start date for practice and season up by 2 weeks.

15	Please do not do this! I feel like we should always try to advance the game. Is this making the game better?
16	It's not broke so let's not fix it. The better prepared the student-athletes are with ahead knowledge of scheduling will allow them to plan their class schedule accordingly.
17	This would penalize the schools that follow NCAA guidelines. The schools that don't would continue not following the rules.
18	Length of season is fine to me.
19	It's very difficult to get office work done with all of the individual workout and team conditioning times during the preseason and post season.
20	follow division I preseason and postseason-eliminate restrictions of player/coach ratio
21	Don't change
22	none
23	I believe we need to have a mandatory stoppage of play and practice from Dec 23 to Dec 27. This will only be five days and it prevent coaches from having practice the day after Christmas. I realize we have many holiday with many different religious backgrounds. However, I believe this would be a great rule. Let put family life first. I also beleive we should not be able to start conditioning until 1 month before the season starts. I think weights and individual is fine but the season has become year round.
24	Please consider input from both the coaches and the student-athletes before any major changes are made to the playing / practice season legislation.
25	When conference tournament ends so does basketball. No 8 hour rule till fall semester.
26	it is fine as it is...do not change
27	4 man workouts need to be changed to the Div. I policy for pre-season. Just my opinion...
28	Due to limited coaching staffs, and practice facilities I think Division II should allow coaches to work with 4 to 6 players during individual skill development sessions. 2 hours is 2 hours and the number of players should not matter. Here at Belmont Abbey finding available practice space for individual skill dev. is a difficult task due to shared facilities & academic class offerings. This causes coaches to go at numerous times within a given day and workouts to be at "off" hours for the student-athlete.
29	Leave the number of games and play-offs alone. The players can handle the load. Don't hurt the players experience.

Women's Basketball Division II Survey									
9. Please indicate your opinion to the follow scenarios:									
Answer Options	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
It is important to have the #1 seed host the regional tournament – regardless of location.	41.9%	39.9%	4.1%	10.8%	3.4%	0.0%	1.94	148	
The team that finishes in the top 4 of the regional to host based on the most central location to all 8 teams.	8.8%	30.4%	9.5%	32.4%	18.9%	0.0%	3.22	148	
The team that is most centrally located should host the 8 team regional regardless of their seed.	2.0%	11.5%	6.1%	36.5%	43.2%	0.7%	4.08	148	
It is important to have all 8 teams in the regional tournament at the same site – regardless of location.	49.7%	20.4%	10.9%	15.6%	3.4%	0.0%	2.03	147	
All 8 regions must have the exact same format to determine who advances to the Elite Eight.	62.6%	21.1%	5.4%	7.5%	3.4%	0.0%	1.68	147	
The "Elite 8" should remain an 8 team format.	63.0%	26.7%	6.8%	2.7%	0.7%	0.0%	1.51	146	
The "Elite 8" should stay in 1 city for longer than 2 years.	26.4%	20.3%	28.4%	19.6%	4.7%	0.7%	2.56	148	
Comments									25
								<i>answered question</i>	148
								<i>skipped question</i>	3

#	Comments
1	Our regionalization keeps some of the best teams out of the tournament and makes regionals a glorified conference tournament. The best teams should get in regardless of region like D1 and D3.
2	Depending on the city I believe that there are many positives to having a set location that could host the tournament year after year. If you get the right town that would be the best way to go. D-II men have done this for years along with the NAIA with both of their men and women's tournaments.

3	Have a final 4 and combine regionals. Two geographically located teams would host a 4 team regional. The two winners of each regional 4 team tournament would advance to a geographically located sight for a 4 team tournament between the two winners from one regional and the two winners from an adjoining regional. The winners would make up the final 4.
4	relationship" with the location. ie. cost of hotels, easy of travel to venue, options for places to eat as well as things to do.
5	I think the Elite Eight should stay in San Antonio EVERY year.
6	If it is a good city and the event is well supported, then stay there for as long as they'll have you!
7	I have mixed feelings about the site of the Elite 8. From a student-athlete experience I would prefer it be in a larger city for the S-A's to sightsee. However a larger city may not embrace it as well and attendance may not be good. Being from Florence, Alabama were we host the Div II. Football Championship and our community embraces it. Maybe it a host city that has a school that is constantly in hunt to be in the Elite 8.
8	1st round region could be played at the higher seed, then have a final four at a central. would help crowds for the 1st rd. If a city wants to host for more than 2 yrs and gets the bid, and does a good job, they should be allowed to
9	The longer the "Elite 8" could stay in a city the better. I really think that the event would benefit from being in the same city for multiple years. It could become an event that the city looks forward to each year and would generate some more excitement.
#	I believe the E-8 should stay in a city longer than 2 years. It takes at least 2 years for the community to take ownership. The overall experience for the student-athlete would be enhanced by a community who takes pride in hosting.

#	I think it's important to have a fan base developed at least two years. The Men Div II are returning to Springfield , MA because they believe in that concept of consistency.
#	It is nice to have the location change year to year.
#	I have always believed in the "Final Four" format. When the DII tournaments were held on campus sites with the top 4 teams, it was an incredible event - the crowds were awesome and it was a true championship event. Since going to the Elite Eight neutral site format, I think the championship atmosphere has definitely suffered. I know the argument to change to a neutral site was the attempt to gain impartiality and limit the "home court advantage"...but we (DII women's basketball) are not ready for a neutral site in terms of attracting a crowd for the games. The argument about home court advantage is false. If you look back at those DII Final Fours held at campus sites, you would see that more often than not, the home team did not win. I would urge the Championships Committee to go back to a Final Four format to be held on a campus of one of the 4 competing teams. It can be done - history has proven it so! Those tournaments were the greatest experiences for all teams involved - win or lose.
#	I think one of the top four teams should host - considering the best facilities/hotels/etc. then that team should host to make it a great experience for the student-athletes. We played in a horrible gym once and it was embarrassing to have it there.
#	Two super regionals is ridiculous to me. I understand that because of the economy, something has to be done, but I think it is unfair to DII student-athletes to be treated so differently from DI. The student-athletes recognize this fact, and comment on it a lot. It's not hard to understand the discrepancy between the two levels when it is displayed on television for all to see.
#	Teams with more central locations could gain a recruiting advantage by emphasizing greater relative likelihood of hosting regional

#	Depending on the city. It would have to be in a place that people want to go to.
#	The best way to have a true "national champion" is to eliminate Regionalization. I know that this will not happen, but the problem with regionalization is that strong regions get hurt and weak regions still have teams compete in the Elite Eight. We don't have a true national tournament. We have a national tournament based on regionalization. I just wish we could find a way to have the 64 best teams compete at the end of the year, and not just the 8 best in each region.
#	give the cities a chance to embrace the event and make it a special thing for their community to take ownership in
#	If the NCAA is looking to cut costs of championships, look at cutting from Division I instead of DII. Outrageous expenses at the DI level.
#	If the number one seed wants to host the tournament they should have that right, they have earned it throughout the season.
#	Give each region X amount of NCAA money and let them determine their championship however they wish.
#	I would have to see different tournament situations to determine my feeling on the Elite 8 and the region. I do not agree with any of the 8 teams in the region hosting.
#	I have found through my experience in NJCAA that regional qualifiers with the first round being hosted by the higher seed (in the case of an 8 team format); and then the top four going to the site of the number one seed OR to a pre-determined site by bid process worked the best! the region made more money and the teams had a goal. A. for a home game in the first round; and B. for a trip the pre determined site to play for the region championship!
#	I believe that a neutral site for hosting the regional is the best case scenario...I do understand that cost is a factor.

Women's Basketball Division II Survey

10. Please indicate your opinion to these possible options regarding the championship format:

Answer Options	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
Have the #1 and #2 host a 4 team sub-regional with the winners playing at the site of the highest seed remaining.	12.2%	31.1%	14.9%	30.4%	11.5%	0.0%	2.98	148
Have the top 4 seeds host a single game at home and winners play in a 4 team regional at the site of the highest seed remaining.	8.8%	26.4%	14.2%	32.4%	18.2%	0.0%	3.25	148
Have the top 4 seeds host a single game first-round, the second round is a single game at the highest seed remaining ending in a	4.1%	8.8%	14.2%	36.5%	35.8%	0.7%	3.92	148
Comments								26
<i>answered question</i>								148
<i>skipped question</i>								3

#	Comments
1	Have the conferences in each region rotate hosting regionals. Criteria should be ease of travel (close to major airport) and quantity/quality of hotel rooms and restuarants. This would ensure that the quality of the student athlete 's experience would be paramount, instead of how their seeded. Teams in the Gulf South Conference have hosted 21 of the past 25 regionals. What about the SIAC and SSC? Are their teams always that bad, and if so, does that mean their conference should so rarely represent? The kids in our region are sick of always going to Mississippi and Arkansas. What about Nashville, Memphis, Atlanta, Birmingham, Charleston, Orlando, Tampa, West Palm Beach?
2	I like the format the way it is. If it is a money issue, we should be looking at Division I and the excess that is spent there.
3	It makes sense to have 4 teams host - as they have the best chance at getting a great gate. The final four teams allow the players that earn it to compete in a tournament format leading up to the Elite 8

	If we go to something like this I know exactly what is going to happen in our region. They are going to take 4 from the Northern Sun and 4 from the RMAC and we are simply going to play our conference tournament over again. That is what happened to our softball team this week and that is what you will get if you start trying to split up the region tournament. D-II has made a big deal about region play for years so lets don't water it down now. Let's have a true region tournament. Seed them fairly 1-8 regardless of location or conference - let the #1 team host it and battle it out for 3 days. It's a much better
4	experience for the kids.
5	S-A would miss the championship atmospher
6	There is NO tournament atmosphere, wouldn't be memorable experience for the student-athlete.
7	I like the way we do it now.
8	Let teams get togeter for a championship feel!!
9	The NCAA Regional should be an event not just playing a single game. I went with our men's team to the 2007-08 Regional in Lakeland, Fl and there was nothing special about it.
10	the money from the gates in either of these scenarios would be very good
11	The whole 8 team single host is a great experience for the student-athletes. It makes the event feel like a big deal. Beaking up the regional into two or more locations will hurt the luster of the tournament...I can see the cost saving benefits, but the overall experience will suffer.
12	The 3rd option would entail a lot of traveling and take away from game preparation and the entire tournament experience.
13	Teams play all year. Why not reward the top teams for being the best. It's important to have seeding and regionalization to make sure there is no problems with this format. Let the top teams play at home for being the best all year.
14	I like the eight team format for regionals. It gives your team a sense of a championship tournament and one they may not experience at any other time during the season. If you have the top four teams host, it might feel like just another game.

15	I think this takes away from the total student athlete experience.
16	By the time there are only 8 teams remaining I do not think it's fair to give the higher seed an extreme advantage such as hosting 1 game.
17	All three scenario's are bad ideas.
18	I like it with all eight teams - then it truly seems like a tournament - not just another game. Home court is to important and rankings can be biased!
19	Seems like more travel doing it this way. And less time to plan for the travel because not sure where the next round will be.
20	Unfortunately, we're not competing at that level so I do not have a strong opinion.
21	Need to keep a tournament atmosphere-banquet etc. before 1st game. Travel could get complicated in 2nd and 3rd scenarios
22	Seems logistically like this might be a night mare.
23	It gives the student athlete a much better experience and tournament feel to all be at 1 site.
24	keep a true tournament setting
25	I am not in favor of the sub-regional format. The team that wins and is the lower seed has a disadvantage built in to the final game by having to travel again.
26	don't want any changes

Women's Basketball Division II Survey	
11. Any other comments regarding Championships?	
Answer Options	Response Count
	16
<i>answered question</i>	16
<i>skipped question</i>	135

#	Response Text
1	no
2	Put Regionals near major airports. We spend a ridiculous amount on charter flights from out of the way places.
3	Get the Elite Eight back on campus at one of the participating institutions.
4	I would like to have Div II be as close to a mirror of Div I championships as possible.
5	Championship City in San Antonio and Regional format stay the same!
6	Unless the NCAA is willing to send Division II teams to different regions, schools in the ncaa tournament will continue to play the same schools they have played basically all year long. If you really want major cost cutting methods, you would have the Division I follow the Division II championship format and play out of you region instead of sending someone from the east out to the west site. However, that affects making money as well. You would never have a team from the same region playing for a championship. For example, Duke would never play No. Carolina for a national title. You would have 8 schools from 8 different regions playing for the chance at the final four and title.
7	Keep one site regional and national tournaments as it gives exposure to the sport/region and allow a special opportunity to the athletes. It is something to work toward and a great reward!
8	I hope any changes don't lose the national tournament atmosphere by delaying at least 4 teams coming together at one site.
9	A thought maybe put the Men & Women at one location for the championships: Springfield, MA. After two years rotate to another region. Have eight regions every two rotate. Just a thought. Good luck! Can we take the model of how Div I does it? Should we have RPI maybe we should?
10	Is it broken? May not have to fix it!!!

11	Hosting first round games at the four higher seeds might be exciting for the home team, yet at the same time, it is exactly like the high school play-off format in CA. A team in the CCAA could conceivably be playing at the same school three consecutive weeks in a row (last part of conference, conference tournament and first round of NCAA tourney). How would that be any type of experience for the student-athletes? To have to travel to a place like Arcata (Humboldt State) three consecutive weeks in a row is not any type of positive experience for the student-athletes. I am glad that the Championships Committee is asking for input, but if you're going to say that the mission is the student-athlete experience, then let's truly make it that.
12	none
13	Keep it an 8 team format at the highest seed!!
14	I think it is important to keep the integrity of the championship intact. By this I mean, making sure that the match ups are based on seeds. I believe some sports have either changed this or talked about changing it based on locations. I think there are ways to help cut costs based on central locations, but I think it is important to reward the top teams for finishing in those spots.
15	Seriously consider ending all non championship season workouts after the championship. Let the women have some college fun and rest.
16	A championship should be held with at least 4 teams at one site. If we separate and have highest seed hosting, I do not feel that is a true tournament feeling for the SA's.