

AN EXAMINATION OF ASSOCIATED COSTS WITH RECLASSIFICATION
FOR A PRIVATE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE IN THE NORTHEAST

Gerald R. Fisk

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of
Exercise & Sport Science (Sport Administration)

Chapel Hill
2010

Approved by

Dr. Coyte Cooper

Lance Markos

Barbara Osborne J.D.

© 2010
Gerald R. Fisk
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

GERALD R. FISK: AN EXAMINATION OF ASSOCIATED COSTS WITH RECLASSIFICATION FOR A PRIVATE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE IN THE NORTHEAST Under the direction of Dr. Coyte Cooper

Roberts Wesleyan College (RWC) is located in Rochester, New York. Roberts is currently a member of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA), and the American Midwest Conference. This study examined potential reclassification to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division II or NCAA Division III and conferences within each division. Interviews and analysis of existing financial information were conducted. The study focused on: the reclassification process and associated costs, sport sponsorship costs and trends in expenses and potential revenues, and matching institutional identity and philosophy. The study also compared the core values of the new conferences with those of Roberts. The sports sponsored in each conference and association also were analyzed to determine associated costs, including any new facility needs. A comparison of the NAIA and the NCAA was conducted to help determine the reliability of each association.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to first thank my advisor Dr. Coyte Cooper for his guidance through this process. Coyte, I thank you for your friendship and encouragement, as well as your countless edits and keeping me on task. I could not have done this without you. I would also like to thank my other committee members, Barbara Osborne, J.D., and Lance Markos for their contributions. I am very thankful to have chosen the three of you to mold me throughout this process.

I would also like to thank my loving wife, Sarah. You encouraged and allowed me to follow my heart and chase my dream, showing patience and understanding throughout this adventure. For that I will forever be grateful. Over the past two years, you helped me through all the challenges that arose in a way that no one else could. Thank you for believing in me and making short term sacrifices, so that I could find long term happiness. You are the best and I love you.

Mom and Dad, I also thank you for all the encouragement and support you have been throughout my life, but particularly over the past two years. I am very fortunate to have loving parents like you, who are always there to offer support, guidance, encouragement, and anything else that I might need.

Additionally, I have had the fortune to complete this study while interning working with The College Sports Research Institute. Dr. Southall, I will be forever grateful for believing in me and granting me this opportunity when my need arose, as well as entrusting me with the duties and responsibilities that helped me grow and learn so much over the past eight months. I would also like to thank my friends (Pierce, Hunter, and May) for their help.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	Roberts Wesleyan College.....	1
	The Reclassification Process.....	3
	Cost and Trends in Expenses and Potential Revenues.....	3
	Matching Institutional Identity and Philosophy.....	4
	Statement of Purpose.....	5
	Research Questions.....	5
	Definition of Terms.....	6
	Delimitations.....	8
	Limitations.....	8
	Significance of the Study.....	9
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	10
	Previous Research on Reclassification.....	10
	The Reclassification Process.....	11
	Division II Reclassification Guidelines.....	11
	Division III Reclassification Guidelines.....	15

	The NAIA.....	18
	The NCAA.....	18
	NCAA Division II.....	19
	NCAA Division III.....	20
	Comparison of Division II and Division III.....	22
	Comparison of the NCAA and the NAIA.....	22
III.	METHODOLOGY.....	24
	Analysis of Existing Data.....	24
	Conferences' Sports Sponsored.....	26
IV.	RESULTS.....	27
	Research Question #1.....	27
	Research Question #2.....	29
	Conference Expenses per Member-Institution.....	29
	Conference Expenses per Sport Sponsored.....	31
	Men's Basketball.....	32
	Women's Basketball.....	33
	Men's Soccer.....	34
	Women's Soccer.....	34
	Men's Tennis.....	35
	Women's Tennis.....	36
	Women's Volleyball.....	37
	Men's Golf.....	37
	Men's Cross Country & Track and Field.....	38

Women’s Cross Country & Track and Field.....	39
Softball.....	40
Baseball.....	40
Men’s Lacrosse.....	41
Women’s Lacrosse.....	42
Men’s Volleyball.....	43
Football.....	43
Research Question #3.....	44
Research Question #4.....	45
Facilities.....	45
Lacrosse.....	46
Baseball or Softball.....	47
Scheduling.....	48
Baseball.....	48
Softball.....	49
Student-Athletes.....	49
Research Question #5.....	50
V. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS.....	53
Reclassification.....	53
Association Reclassification.....	54
Divisional Reclassification.....	54
Conference Alignment.....	56
Sports to Add.....	58

Baseball and Softball.....	58
Men’s Volleyball.....	59
Men’s and Women’s Lacrosse.....	59
Contrasting Now and the Future.....	60
Future Research.....	61
APPENDICES	62
REFERENCES	65

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Roberts Wesleyan College (RWC) is a Christian liberal arts school located in Rochester, New York with an enrollment of 2,000 students. Roberts is currently a member of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA), the National Christian College Athletic Association (NCCAA), and the 16-school American Midwest Conference (AMC). Recently two AMC member-institutions, Cedarville University and Notre Dame College, were accepted for National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) DII membership on July 10, 2009 and are leaving the conference (Brown, 2009). Four other AMC schools submitted applications to become NCAA Division II members — Malone University, Mount Vernon Nazarene University, Ursuline College, and Walsh University — but were denied. Overall, six schools have sought to leave the AMC, and whether successful or not during the first attempt, each school still has intentions of leaving the AMC. Shawnee State, another AMC school, is joining the NAIA's Mid-South Conference, which former AMC school Rio Grande joined in 2009 (University of Rio, 2009). The leadership of Roberts has monitored this chain of events, and the leaders now believe that the school needs to consider reclassifying and potentially joining the NCAA at either the Division II or Division III level.

Roberts Wesleyan College

Roberts currently sponsors 14 intercollegiate teams: men's and women's basketball, men's and women's cross country, men's golf, men's and women's indoor

and outdoor track and field, men's and women's soccer, men's and women's tennis, and women's volleyball (Raider Athletics, 2010). Roberts has fielded one NAIA national championship team, multiple individual NAIA national champions, and multiple teams and individuals that have won AMC or NCCAA championships.

In addition to successful athletic performance, Roberts also has many top-notch facilities on which student-athletes can practice and play. Constructed in 1987, the Voller Athletic Center (VAC) houses a full size swimming pool, sauna, racquetball courts, weight room, cardio room, indoor track, and basketball and volleyball courts. The gymnasium has four regulation basketball courts, a one-tenth mile indoor track, and moveable bleachers to host many different events, including graduation. The VAC also has a long jump pit, high jump apparatus, and an indoor pole vault pit and mat.

Roberts Outdoor Stadium is the centerpiece of the outdoor facilities (Raider Athletics, 2010). The stadium was built in 2002 and has a Super-Mondo surface Olympic style track that surrounds a full-size soccer field. No other college or university in western New York has a Super-Mondo surface track, which is the best surface available for outdoor tracks. The facility has full 90° lighting, seating for 1,200 and a heated press box. A synthetic turf field is adjacent to the track and can be used at night with the same lighting. A six-court tennis facility is next to the parking lot and near Roberts Outdoor Stadium. Additionally, Roberts has a cross country course and 92 undeveloped acres, of which approximately 14 acres could be developed into additional fields if the need arose (Raider Athletics, 2010).

Roberts' President, Vice President, and Board of Trustees (Dr. John Martin, Dr. Barry Smith) assembled a task force to provide as much research and useful data as

possible and to help make the decision on reclassification an educated one. Working in conjunction with the task force, an executive summary identified key areas for study. The current study will focus on: (1) the reclassification process, (2) the costs and trends in expenses among the potential suitors, as well as potential revenues, and (3) the degree to which a conference matches Roberts in sports sponsored and organizational philosophy. Analyzing any new affiliation and how those core values align with Roberts', as well as the cost or revenue generated by reclassification and changes in affiliation are key elements to be studied and will help provide base-line knowledge for a reclassification decision. This study will include an examination of the reclassification process, as well as an in-depth look at Division II and Division III. The NAIA, the NCAA, and several potential new conferences for affiliation will also be compared. These three areas will be briefly introduced before going in to each section more in-depth in the data analysis section and throughout this study.

The Reclassification Process

The reclassification process is the process by which a college or university can change affiliations from one association or Division to another (Schwarz, 2003). The NCAA has established a process to guide any school interested in reclassifying either within the NCAA or from the NAIA. A thorough understanding of this process and the costs associated with reclassification will assist in the decision made.

Cost and Trends in Expenses and Potential Revenues

The Roberts' Board of Trustees has set a policy that requires the College to remain debt-free. Therefore, Roberts is in good standing financially, but this policy can be limiting when it comes to facilities and any large-scale changes at the College (Dr.

Barry Smith, Roberts Vice President for Student Life, personal interview, January 4, 2010). Many costs will be encountered as Roberts goes through this process, and most expenses can be broken down into two groupings: one-time costs and recurring costs. A third category of costs is variable costs that may increase or decrease depending on factors that cannot be pre-determined. For example, whether travel costs will increase or decrease depends on the location of the other members in a new conference. The potential increase in enrollment because of student-athletes participating in new sports, the geographical location of the new conference, or the recruitment of students now aware of Roberts may offset costs.

The application fee is the first and best example of a one-time cost. The cost of developing one-sport playing fields, especially baseball, football or softball fields, building scoreboards, erecting grandstands, and creating parking areas can be classified as costs that will not recur annually (though some may need to be addressed periodically). Costs that will occur annually include additional scholarships (for Division II only), additional staffing needs and coaching salaries, and more equipment costs. The addition of new students and student-athletes would be more pronounced if Roberts reclassified to NCAA Division III and did not add additional scholarship costs. An analysis of the average expenses for the sports sponsored by each conference and a more exact look at the expenses per team in individual sports will also better equip the task force in the decision. If we assume that the average expenses are required to gain average results, then it can be assumed that Roberts would not want to fall below the average. Thus, a hypothetical budget can be established for each conference being examined.

Matching Institutional Identity and Philosophy

Roberts has a long history with many traditions that matter a great deal to its stakeholders. The College has a legacy as a Christian college dating back to 1866 and is a dynamic leader among American liberal arts colleges with a Christian worldview (Roberts Wesleyan History, 2010). *The Princeton Review* has named Roberts Wesleyan College a “Best Value”, ranked as high as number three in recent years (Roberts Wesleyan College, 2008). The school and its leadership are very proud of the established reputation and are focused on maintaining or preferably enhancing that reputation through any potential reclassification. The new conference and/or division must align with Roberts’ philosophy, culture and stakeholders. The school has a fifteen year strategic plan that must be referenced and will play a large role in helping determine any moves made.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of the current research is to examine the (1A, 1B, 1C) factors to aide Roberts in its decision on reclassification.

[1A] The Reclassification Process

[1B] Cost and Trends in Expenses and Potential Revenues

[1C] Matching Institutional Identity and Philosophy

Furthermore, this study hopes, logically and systematically, to provide data and key thought processes that Roberts Wesleyan College and other schools considering reclassification should carefully considered.

Research Questions

Based on feedback from Roberts' senior leadership and a review of the literature focusing on the reclassification process, the following Research Questions (RQ) will be answered through this research study:

RQ 1: What association or conference will match up most completely with Roberts Wesleyan College athletically, in terms of sports sponsored and expenses?

RQ 2: What trends in percent change and expenses exist within each of the conferences that are being considered for reclassification?

RQ 3: What conference is the best fit geographically so that cost and missed class-time due to travel are minimized?

RQ 4: What obstacles or costs would be incurred if Roberts was to add baseball, men's lacrosse, women's lacrosse or softball?

RQ 5: What are the characteristics (Christian philosophy, enrollment) of the schools within the conferences that are examined in this research?

Definition of Terms

1. Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference – an NCAA Division III conference with member-institutions located in Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio.
2. American Mideast Conference – the NAIA 14-team conference with member-institutions located in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York of which Roberts is currently a member.
3. Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference – an NCAA Division II conference with member-institutions in Connecticut, Delaware, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

4. Conference – a collection of schools that are grouped together for athletic competitions that typically share common traits.
5. Division II (DII) – an intermediate-level division of competition in the NCAA. DII offers a mid-level alternative to both the highly competitive and expensive NCAA Division I level and to the non-scholarship level offered in Division III. Formerly, DII was called the NCAA College Division.
6. Division III (DIII) – the division of the NCAA that does not offer athletic scholarships. The largest NCAA Division with over 490 member-institutions.
7. East Coast Conference – an NCAA Division II conference with member-institutions located in the New York metropolitan area.
8. Empire 8 – an NCAA Division III conference with member-institutions located in New York and New Jersey.
9. Equity in Athletics Data Analysis (EADA) – a website containing data collected and disseminated by the Office of Postsecondary Education of the US Department of Education. The data is submitted annually by all schools that receive Title IX funding.
10. Member-institutions – individual colleges and universities that collectively compose a conference.
11. National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) – an athletic association that organizes college and university-level athletic programs. Membership in the NAIA typically consists of smaller colleges and universities from across the United States.

12. National Christian College Athletic Association (NCCAA) – an association established to provide a Christian-based organization that functions uniquely as a national and international agency for the promotion of outreach and ministry, and for the maintenance, enhancement, and promotion of intercollegiate athletic competition with a Christian perspective.
13. National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) – a voluntary association of nearly 1,300 institutions, conferences, organizations and individuals that organizes the athletic programs of many colleges and universities in the United States and Canada for athletic competitions.
14. Reclassification – the process by which a college or university makes a “formal request to the NCAA for a change in division membership” (Schwarz, 1998, p.3).
15. Scholarship – a grant-in-aid provided to a student-athlete in exchange for his or her participation in a sport or sports while attending a college or university.

Delimitations

The following delimitations are acknowledged within the current research:

1. This study focuses solely on the athletics department at Roberts Wesleyan College.
2. The study will focus only on a portion of the areas put forth as areas of interest by the presidential task force. The breadth and depth of this research will not allow for all topics to be covered in this study. However, those items can and may be covered in subsequent studies.

Limitations

The following limitations are acknowledged within the current research:

1. The findings and recommendations within the current research are intended for the use of Roberts Wesleyan College. However, when possible, every attempt will be made to generalize and put forth principles that may be used by other institutions in similar circumstances.
2. This study and its reliability depend on information provided by Roberts Wesleyan College and its athletic department. This study also depends on the accuracy of reports provided to the federal government and gathered from the EADA website.

Significance of the Study

Roberts Wesleyan College finds itself in a situation that they deem requires action. The College President, the Vice President of Student Affairs, the Athletic Director, and the task force have requested the data produced through this research. The cost of reclassification and the years required to complete the process represent a serious undertaking. A decision to embark on that process will be based, in part, on the research done in this study. This study and subsequent decision will be among the most consequential acts in the history of Roberts Wesleyan College athletics.

This study is also significant because of the lack of previous research on the reclassification of schools to NCAA Division II or Division III. All of the research reviewed was focused on schools moving to the Division I level, and this study will not evaluate that as a potential destination for reclassification. Throughout this study, an attempt will be made not to focus on Roberts exclusively, but to provide guidelines that other schools considering reclassification may use.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The current research will focus on the most critical aspects of the potential reclassification process for Roberts Wesleyan College. First, the general process for reclassification will be briefly examined. Secondly, the study will focus at the characteristics of the Division II level and the Division III level individually. Lastly, the NCAA and the NAIA will be thoroughly described and compared to help provide more background on each organization, including characteristics of members of each division and the philosophy of Division II and III. The goal of this section is to provide a framework for this study by examining research previously done on the topic of reclassification.

Previous Research on Reclassification

The case study of the reclassification at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro showed that the reclassification of the athletics program had a great impact on the organizational dynamics of the institution and its stakeholders (Weaver, 2005). As illustrated in the study, all stakeholders must be fully on-board and engaged to encourage both short-term success and sustainability. Because of the enormous investment of time, talent and treasure, a college or university should not enter into the reclassification process without understanding the impact such a move would have on the campus constituency (Schwarz, 1998). Understanding the process and associated costs of

reclassification, as well as evaluating how well a new conference will align with Roberts both athletically and philosophically are critical factors that will be analyzed in this study.

The Reclassification Process

The reclassification process is the process by which a college or university can change affiliations from one association or Division to another (Schwarz, 2003). A body of published research that deals with reclassification already exists, though very little of that research has been done on the reclassification process from NAIA to NCAA DII or NCAA DIII. Based on the literature, a vast majority of the research deals with schools moving to NCAA DI because the costs, perceived benefits and publicity of those moves are much greater. The potential revenue stream Division I athletics offers is a major reason administrators are willing to reclassify in an attempt to become bigger and better (Cross, 1999; Schwarz, 1998; Tomasini, 2003). Research addressing intercollegiate athletics indicates that university administrators viewed athletics as a means to generate publicity and increase enrollment (Brooks & Althouse, 1993, Chu, Segrave, & Becker, 1985, Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986). However, the application of this research may be limited in relevance when considering the reclassification to divisions outside of Division I.

Division II Reclassification Guidelines. The first step after a prospective Division II member has decided to apply for reclassification is to secure a sponsoring institution or conference. An institution applying for Division II membership shall complete an application, signed by the president, and received by the national office no later than June 1 annually (NCAA DII bylaw 20.3.2.1). The received application and application fee officially begins the process. The Management Council can limit the

number of teams that are allowed to apply annually if they choose to. Further, the Membership Committee has the authority to accept or reject an institution's application to enter the membership process. Last year, six schools from the AMC applied, but only two were accepted. The other four have the right to reapply, but the bylaw clearly illustrates that it is not an automatic acceptance (NCAA DII bylaw 20.3.2.1).

A school that has received notice that it has been accepted to begin the membership process is in the Candidacy Period. This period lasts a minimum of two years, and an assessment is done before the school is given permission to proceed to the Provisional Period. Each year of the Candidacy Period has an itinerary that the school must follow to stay on track for reclassification (NCAA DII bylaw 20.3.2.2).

Year one of the Candidacy Period has the following five essential requirements:

- (1) The reclassifying institution must visit an active member's campus. The Membership Committee will choose the campus that must be visited to meet this requirement,
- (2) The reclassifying institution must complete a Division II Institutional Self-Study Guide (ISSG). The ISSG will help the institution critically analyze itself and its athletic department to help prevent undiscovered issues that could cause trouble later on,
- (3) The President of the reclassifying institution must be fully committed and must "demonstrate involvement and commitment in the membership process",

- (4) An outside group will conduct an on-campus assessment to review the readiness of the institution to become an active member. The reclassifying institution will be measured against other Division II active members,
- (5) A report must be submitted by June 1, and must include the ISSG, and an athletics department's strategic plan (NCAA DII bylaw 20.3.2.2.1.a).

Year two of the Candidacy period requires repetition of two elements of year one, and only a slight change in another element (NCAA DII bylaw 20.3.2.2.1.b). Unlike year one, year two's on-campus assessment is conducted by the Membership Committee itself, not an outside group. The ISSG and updated athletics department strategic plan are required to be resubmitted by June 1, and the President's demonstrated involvement in and commitment to the reclassification process are the other two requirements (NCAA DII bylaw 20.3.2.2.1.b).

After successful completion of the Candidacy Period, an institution will be invited to enter the Provisional Period of the membership process (NCAA DII bylaw 20.3.2.3). During the Provisional Period, an institution's readiness to become an active member institution will continue to be evaluated. The length of the Provisional Period will vary depending on an institution's readiness to become an active member institution; however, in no event shall the provisional period be less than one year. There is a "member education" fee assessed when the reclassifying institution is invited to the Provisional Period, along with the appropriate membership dues (NCAA DII bylaw 20.3.2.3).

Requirements also exist in the Provisional Period (NCAA DII bylaw 20.3.2.3.1). Once again, involvement and commitment by the President of the college or university is a documented requirement for successful completion of this period and to continue advancing towards active membership. An on-campus assessment is again conducted by an outside group to review the status of the institution. The outside agency will use a compliance blueprint review and judge progress since the candidacy period assessment. Based on those reports, the institution may be invited to active membership. An annual report must be submitted by June 1 (NCAA DII bylaw 20.3.2.3.1).

The reclassification process is very thorough, and consists of many steps. Failing to complete the steps will typically require the reclassifying institution to complete additional years in the Candidacy or Provisional Period (NCAA DII bylaw 20.3.3.1). The institution could also be placed in corresponding membership or have its membership terminated by the Membership Committee. If the latter was done, a written notice would be given in writing to the President of the institution. The Membership Committee has final say in all of these decisions (NCAA DII bylaw 20.3.3.1.1).

The application fee due with the completed application for NCAA Division II membership is \$28,000, and then \$14,000 is due per year in the subsequent years as the member-institution reclassifies (NCAA Membership Application Forms, 2010). The membership fee for active Division II members for the 2009-2010 school year was \$900 (NCAA Membership Application Forms, 2010). Roberts paid \$5,400 as a member of the NAIA and \$8,000 as a member of the AMC for 2009-2010 (Mr. Mike Faro, RWC athletic director, personal interview, March 15, 2010).

Division III Reclassification Guidelines. The reclassification process to NCAA Division III has some similarities to Division II, but the process is no less demanding. The first step in applying for membership in Division III is to be accredited by one of the six regional accrediting agencies (NCAA D III Bylaw 3.6.3.2). This accreditation determines if the institution meets the Association's requirements for acceptable academic standards (NCAA D III Bylaw 3.6.3.2). After successful accreditation, the application will be referred to the Division III Management Council for further consideration.

The Management Council may approve the application from the reclassifying institution if the institution satisfies the following four standards for consideration:

- (1) The institution must have met the minimum in number of varsity intercollegiate sports sponsored, the number of contests, and met participant requirements,
- (2) The institution must complete the viability statement decreeing the commitment to the Division III philosophy statement. This form will be provided by the Membership Committee as part of the provisional member application,
- (3) The potential reclassifying institution must be sponsored by an active Division III member. The two institutions must establish a good-faith mentoring relationship. A letter of recommendation must be signed by the sponsoring institution's president or chancellor, athletics director, senior woman administrator, and faculty athletics' representative,

(4) The institution must demonstrate a functioning compliance system. The compliance assessment form will be provided by the Membership Committee as part of the application (NCAA DIII Bylaw 20.3.1a-d).

Division III has a bylaw that limits the number of institutions admitted to the membership program in a year (NCAA Division III Bylaw 20.3.2). Only four institutions may be admitted per year, and any beyond those four will be assigned a class year. The Management Council will use the following criteria to rank the applicants and determine which institutions will be accepted as a current year application: Geographic location, reclassifying versus provisional status, existing or potential membership in an active DIII conference, and institutional support of a broad-based athletics program (NCAA Division III Bylaw 20.3.2a-d). Division III also requires the appointment of a Faculty Athletic Representative and formation of a Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (NCAA Division III Bylaw 20.3.2.1).

The reclassifying institution typically has a four year provisional membership, or transition period (NCAA Division III Bylaw 20.3.3). This transitional period allows the current student-athletes on scholarship to finish out their careers and to be less disruptive to the college experience of those student-athletes. The reclassifying institution, which is now a provisional member, may apply for active membership at the end of the four year period. Also, if certain conditions are met, the institution may file for a waiver of year three and year four of the four-year period. The Membership Committee may waive years three and four if compelling evidence is provided at the end of year-two that the institution has:

- (a) Satisfied sports sponsorship requirements (including minimum contests and participant requirements) in years one and two;
- (b) Not awarded institutional financial aid based on athletics during any provisional year;
- (c) Completed a successful financial aid report;
- (d) Attended all required functions for provisional members;
- (e) Completed a successful year two on-campus visit;
- (f) Displayed evidence of a properly functioning athletics compliance system (previously mentioned assessment must be submitted with the waiver request);
- (g) Not been required to repeat any year of provisional membership;
- (h) Displayed evidence of effective mentoring by the Membership Committee or other DIII members;
- (i) Satisfied all other membership requirements (NCAA Division III Bylaw 20.3.3.1.1).

The process for reclassification to NCAA Division II or Division III is significant and takes multiple years. Standards have to be met periodically throughout the time period, and the resources required to make this move are clearly evident and sizable. The process must be followed precisely and thoroughly to increase the likelihood of successful completion.

The application for NCAA Division III membership does not require that a check be sent with the forms that are due May 15th. However, if the application is accepted, then a check for \$20,000 plus \$900 for annual dues is due by September 1st. The fee for active NCAA Division III members for the 2009-2010 school year was \$900 (Application for

NCAA Division III, 2010). For comparison purposes, Roberts paid \$5,400 as a member of the NAIA and \$8,000 to be a member of the AMC for 2009-2010.

The National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA)

The NAIA, which is based in Kansas City, Kansas, is an organization with nearly 300 member-institutions (Member Institutions, 2010). The NAIA's mission states that the NAIA "exists to advance character-driven intercollegiate athletics" (NAIA Mission, 2010). The NAIA has member-institutes throughout the United States and Canada that are divided into 25 conferences and the Association of Independent Institutions (A.I.I.). The NAIA offers 23 championships in 13 sports (baseball, men's and women's basketball, men's and women's cross country, football, men's and women's golf, men's and women's soccer, softball, men's and women's swimming & diving, men's and women's tennis, indoor and outdoor men's and women's track & field, women's volleyball and wrestling (Championship Sports, 2010).

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)

The NCAA, founded in 1906, is a voluntary organization composed of nearly 1,300 members that organize and conduct athletics for member institutions (Composition & Sport Sponsorship, 2010). The organization is composed of conferences, colleges, universities, and affiliated organizations, such as the Knight Commission and Corresponding members that are usually media-related. A common leadership governs all of the NCAA, though many differences exist in principles that govern each of the three divisions (The History of the NCAA, 2010).

The NCAA's three divisions are comprised of colleges and universities that have similarities that set them apart from the other divisions, and these divisions align with

certain characteristics that the NCAA has set forth for being a member of that particular division. These division-defining characteristics and philosophies help us understand why certain schools are in the division they are in (Composition & Sport Sponsorship, 2010).

NCAA Division II. NCAA Division II has approximately 288 members (NCAA Division II, 2010). The NCAA requires each school at the Division II level to field ten varsity intercollegiate teams, but the minimum number will increase to twelve in the 2011-2012 school year (the average number of sports that are fielded is currently 14.5) (Facts & Figures, 2010). Division II schools are required to give the equivalent of at least 20 full scholarships, or \$250,000, with at least ten of those being to women. Division II schools provide on average 37 men's scholarship equivalents and 27 women's scholarship equivalents. The average budget for a Division II school in 2006 was \$4.893 million dollars (Facts and Figures, 2009). Though relatively small compared to Division I, Division II schools put a much higher dollar amount into athletics than RWC currently does.

Division II has had to cope with an identity crisis for years (Brown, 2009). The schools in DII do not put the resources into athletics that DI schools do, but they still place a high priority on athletics. *Learning, Service, Passion, Sportsmanship, Resourcefulness, and Balance* are the focus of a new Division II marketing campaign called, "I choose Division II" (Division II Strategic, 2009). Many Division II coaches also teach or perform other functions in addition to coaching. The athletic departments are frequently fully integrated into the institution's operations and budget. Division II also tries to help minimize expenses by mandating a regionalized philosophy to help minimize travel costs. Division II directly states that its athletic events are affordable,

fans are in close proximity to the action, and the environment is fan-friendly (Division II Strategic Planning, 2009). Graduation and athletics as a part of the educational process are emphasized by Division II.

NCAA Division III. NCAA Division III has 447 member-institutions (Division III Facts & Figures, 2009). Division III is committed to not giving athletic scholarships. Colleges and Universities in Division III place highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students' academic programs (Division III Philosophy Statement, 2010). To achieve this Division III has fourteen points of emphasis which member-institutions shall follow:

- (a) Place special importance on the impact of athletics on the participants rather than on the spectators and place greater emphasis on the internal constituency (e.g., students, alumni, institutional personnel) than on the general public and its entertainment needs;
- (b) Shall not award financial aid to any student on the basis of athletics leadership, ability, participation or performance (*Revised: 7/24/07*);
- (c) Encourage the development of sportsmanship and positive societal attitudes in all constituents, including student-athletes, coaches, administrative personnel and spectators;
- (d) Encourage participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities for their students;
- (e) Assure that the actions of coaches and administrators exhibit fairness, openness and honesty in their relationships with student-athletes;

- (f) Assure that athletics participants are not treated differently from other members of the student body;
- (g) Assure that athletics programs support the institution's educational mission by financing, staffing and controlling the programs through the same general procedures as other departments of the institution. Further, the administration of an institution's athletics program (e.g., hiring, compensation, professional development, certification of coaches) should be integrated into the campus culture and educational mission (*Revised: 1/9/06 effective 8/1/06*);
- (h) Assure that athletics recruitment complies with established institutional policies and procedures applicable to the admission process (*Adopted: 1/12/04 effective 8/1/04*);
- (i) Assure that academic performance of student-athletes is, at a minimum, consistent with that of the general student body (*Adopted: 1/9/06 effective 8/1/06*);
- (j) Assure that admission policies for student-athletes comply with policies and procedures applicable to the general student body (*Adopted 1/9/06 effective 8/1/06*);
- (k) Provide equitable athletics opportunities for males and females and give equal emphasis to men's and women's sports;
- (l) Support ethnic and gender diversity for all constituents (*Adopted: 1/12/99*);
- (m) Give primary emphasis to regional in-season competition and conference championships; and

(n) Support student-athletes in their efforts to reach high levels of athletics performance, which may include opportunities for participation in national championships, by providing all teams with adequate facilities, competent coaching and appropriate competitive opportunities (Division III Philosophy Statement, 2010).

These fourteen governing principles help define Division III, and differentiate it from the other Divisions.

Comparison of Division II and Division III. A pronounced difference exists between Division II and Division III. Division II has 293 members while Division III has 449 members. Interestingly, Division II institutions field 14.5 teams on average and DIII institutions actually field more teams, 16.3 on average. The average Division II institution provides 64.3 scholarship equivalencies, while Division III offers no athletic scholarships. Division III even performs studies on member-institutions to ensure that student-athletes are not getting more financial aid per capita. The research could reveal that though no athletic scholarships were being given per se, but that athletes still were being provided with more aid. Division III strives to provide for passionate participation in a competitive athletic environment, where student-athletes push themselves to excellence and build upon their academic success with new challenges and life skills. And student-athletes are encouraged to pursue the full passions and find their potential through a comprehensive educational experience.

Comparison of NCAA and NAIA

The NAIA is similar in role and function to the NCAA. Both are governing bodies that help establish order within intercollegiate sports and championships through

rules and regulations, and provide support to paying member-institutions. The NAIA has made numerous forward-thinking decisions that were ground-breaking, and led the way for many innovations regarding race and gender equity (History of the NAIA, 2010).

The two organizations differ in many ways. The foremost is the trend in the number of member-institutions in each organization. The NAIA membership reached a high of 558 member-institutions in 1973-74 and had 527 members in 1982-83 (Wilson, 2006). Over the past 37 years, the number of NAIA members has decreased by 268, and the current number (290) represents 52% of the all-time high (Wilson, 2006). Meanwhile, the NCAA had 747 members in 1970, 1,034 members in 1990 and 1,291 members in 2009-2010 (2008-2009 NCAA Annual). The NAIA has not seen an increase in membership since 1988-89, and no NCAA members are currently reclassifying to the NAIA.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study will focus extensively on Roberts Wesleyan College and the potential move from NAIA to NCAA Division II or NCAA Division III. The case study approach was chosen because it allowed the researcher to identify, discover, and explain each university's reclassification process (Weaver, 2005). Case studies take the reader into the university setting with a vividness and detail not typically present in more analytical reporting formats (Marshall & Rossman, 1990). Schramm and Roberts (1971) describes the essence of a case study by stating, "the central tendency among all types of case studies, is that it tries to illuminate a decision or set of decisions: why they were taken, how they were implemented, and with what result" (p. 12).

The method of the current research will be to examine current databases and available information that is relevant to the reclassification process for Roberts Wesleyan College. This method (data collection and analysis) was chosen primarily because it was most suitable for use with the EADA data. Several sources of data will be used to answer the research questions of this study. The first analysis will consist of the data gathered from the EADA Report (EADA, 2010) and conference websites for the five prospective conferences. Previous legislation gives researchers the right to request, and public institutions the duty to disclose any public documents, but many colleges and universities were not interested in providing those documents in a timely fashion.

Analysis of Existing Data

The purpose of collecting and analyzing existing data will be to determine costs associated with reclassification and sponsoring sports in each potential conference. The costs associated with any necessary facilities that Roberts Wesleyan College does not currently have, and the operational costs of any added sports will be analyzed to help the task force make its decision based upon the best information possible. The study will also collect statistics regarding average expenses for athletic departments in the following divisions: DII, DIII and the NAIA. The primary source for the information is the Equity in Athletics Data Analysis (EADA) Cutting Tool, a report provided by the Federal Government. The EADA website provides details on number of students enrolled, number of sports sponsored, and revenues and expenses for the athletic departments. The data is available for the years 2003-2008, so that will be the time frame used for this study.

The data from the EADA report will be analyzed to determine expenses per member-institution and per team for individual sports. The conference websites will be utilized to determine the number of member-institutions that participated in each sport in each year. Having both of these pieces of information will allow the calculations to be accurate and provide data and insight as to costs associated with conducting sports in each conference.

Data will also be collected for costs that would be associated with field construction or other costs that would be necessary as a result of adding any new sports. Information gathered from websites for businesses in those industries will be presented so that initial costs of adding sports can be properly calculated. Costs included will be bleacher costs, field turf costs and field construction costs.

Conferences' Sports Sponsored

One of the biggest factors in analyzing the potential new conferences is the sports that each conference currently offers. If Roberts, or any college or university reclassifies into a conference or division that sponsors sports that the school's current facilities cannot support, the school must add facilities or make other arrangements to compete in those sports. This process could not only add cost, but also could cause additional stress and situations that will only encumber the intended move. Therefore, it makes sense to thoroughly evaluate the sports that are sponsored by the conferences that are being considered.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Results that correspond with all stated research questions will be answered, and data and findings will be reported for three different levels of expenses. First, an examination of the conference expenses per member-institution will provide a look at the total expenses for the average athletic department in each conference. Then, those expenses will be divided by the number of sports that that conference sponsors to provide a look at the average expense per sport that those conferences offer. This analysis will help provide a better idea of what might be necessary for Roberts to compete within that conference per sport. Lastly, an examination of expenses will be provided in fifteen different sports so that a comparison may be made between what Roberts currently spends per each sport versus what the average team in each individual sport spends.

RQ 1: What association or conference will match up most completely with Roberts Wesleyan College athletically in terms of sports sponsored and expenses?

Roberts is currently a member of the American Mideast Conference (AMC). The AMC sponsors fifteen sports, including seven for men and eight for women (American Mideast Conference Athletics, 2010). The sports sponsored are: baseball, men's basketball, women's basketball, men's cross country, women's cross country, men's golf, women's golf, men's soccer, women's soccer, softball, men's tennis, women's tennis, men's track and field, women's track and field, and women's volleyball. Even though Roberts is a member of the AMC, it does not sponsor all of the sports that the conference

offers. Roberts does not currently field teams in baseball, women's golf, and softball. Roberts does not currently offer any men's or women's sports that are not offered by the AMC.

The Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference (AMCC) sponsors fourteen sports, including seven for men and seven for women (AMCC Sports Archive, 2010). The sports sponsored are: baseball, men's basketball, women's basketball, men's cross country, women's cross country, men's golf, men's soccer, women's soccer, softball, men's swimming, women's swimming, men's tennis, women's tennis, and women's volleyball. The sports that the conference offers that Roberts does not currently are baseball, softball, and men's and women's swimming. Roberts currently offers men's and women's indoor and outdoor track and field, but the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference does not.

The Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference (CACC) sponsors thirteen sports, six for men, and seven for women (CACC Athletics, 2010). The sports sponsored are: baseball, men's basketball, women's basketball, men's cross country, women's cross country, men's golf, women's lacrosse, men's soccer, women's soccer, softball, men's tennis, women's tennis, and women's volleyball. The sports that the CACC sponsors that RWC does not currently field are baseball, women's lacrosse, and softball. Roberts currently offers men's and women's indoor and outdoor track and field, but this potential conference does not.

The East Coast Conference (ECC) sponsors six men's sports and seven women's sports (ECC Sports, 2010). The sports sponsored by the ECC are: baseball, men's basketball, women's basketball, men's cross country, women's cross country, men's

lacrosse, women's lacrosse, men's soccer, women's soccer, softball, men's tennis, women's tennis, and women's volleyball. The sports that the ECC offers that Roberts does not are baseball, softball and men's and women's lacrosse. Roberts currently sponsors men's and women's indoor and outdoor track and field, and men's golf, but the ECC does not.

The Empire 8 sponsors eleven men's sports and twelve women's sports (Empire 8 Athletics, 2010) though not all conference members participate in every sport. For example, Buffalo State will be joining the Empire 8 as a football-only member starting in 2011. The sports sponsored by the Empire 8 are: baseball, men's basketball, women's basketball, men's cross country, women's cross country, field hockey, football, men's golf, women's golf, men's indoor track, women's indoor track, men's lacrosse, women's lacrosse, men's outdoor track, women's outdoor track, men's soccer, women's soccer, softball, men's swimming and diving, women's swimming and diving, men's tennis, women's tennis, and women's volleyball. The Empire 8 has many sports that Roberts does not currently sponsor, and the most prominent of which is football. Football is the sport that would allow Roberts to add the most student-athletes, but would also require the largest start-up expenditure. The Empire 8 sponsors all sports that Roberts currently sponsors.

RQ 2: What trends in percent change and expenses exist within each of the conferences that are being considered for reclassification?

Conference Expenses per Member-Institution

The first data set analyzed was total expenses per member-institution in the four conferences that are being examined as Roberts' potential suitors. The total expenses per

member-institution for Roberts' current conference (AMC) along with the CACC, ECC, AMCC, and Empire 8 were collected for the six-year period from 2003 to 2008. As illustrated in Table 1, all conferences saw an increase in expense per member-institution. However, a marked difference is demonstrated between the expenses for the NAIA and NCAA Division II conferences versus those of the NCAA Division III conferences. The average percent increase in the former group was over 159% whereas the latter group's percent increase was 76.3%. Of the five conferences, only the AMCC had a lower average expense per member-institution. Roberts' conference ranked in the middle regarding percent change, but the expense per member-institution for the AMC is only 43% of what it is for the ECC. That represents a difference of \$2,585,803 between the

Table 1
Conference Expenses per Member-Institution

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	774,613	795,467	1,774,796	601,957	1,586,569
2004	925,033	984,944	1,954,767	635,100	1,814,964
2005	1,254,920	1,357,503	3,005,859	689,357	2,416,681
2006	1,617,872	1,686,127	3,022,730	762,688	2,623,975
2007	1,904,253	1,862,380	3,730,766	946,110	2,510,496
2008	1,971,058	2,122,466	4,556,861	1,039,485	2,854,609
	(154.5%)	(166.8%)	(156.8%)	(72.7%)	(79.9%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

AMC and the ECC. Looking at the 2008 numbers, the \$2,112,466 in expenses for the average member-institution in the CACC would put the conference in the third quartile of all Division II programs, and \$4,556,861 would put the ECC in the second quartile (Facts & Figures, 2009). The two Division III schools each support football, and the median

expenses for Division III schools that support football in 2008 was \$2,494,000 (Division III Facts & Figures, 2009). The Empire 8 is slightly above the median, while the AMCC is less than 50% of the median.

Conference Expenses per Sport Sponsored

In addition to the overall conference expenses, the data was also analyzed to calculate the expenses per sport for the five conferences (see Table 2). The dollar amount of the total expenses per sport sponsored provides a mean for comparison purposes. This report clearly illustrates that the average expenses of the NAIA/DII grouping is higher than either of the Division III conferences. Roberts once again represents the median, and the data suggests that if Roberts were to join the ECC the average expense per sport would need to triple to equal that of the average ECC team. If we assume that greater expenses equate to a greater product on the playing field, then it might mean that Roberts would need to significantly up spending in order to compete within that conference.

Table 2
Average Expense per sport per member-institution

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	51,641	61,190	147,900	42,997	68,981
2004	61,669	75,765	162,897	45,364	78,911
2005	83,661	104,423	250,488	49,240	105,073
2006	107,858	129,702	251,894	54,478	114,086
2007	126,950	143,260	310,897	67,579	109,152
2008	131,404	163,267	379,738	74,249	124,113
	(154.5%)	(166.8%)	(156.8%)	(72.7%)	(79.9%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

The next calculations will look at each sport individually. After analyzing the conferences per member-institution percent change and the average expense per sport sponsored, Roberts must have a complete understanding of the amount that the average team in each conference is spending on each sport. It should serve as an indication of how much each school is spending per sport, and help represent the amount that Roberts should plan on spending to compete in that sport in that given conference.

Men’s Basketball. Men’s basketball represents the largest expense for the conferences on average. As illustrated in Table 3, men’s basketball expenses have increased in all conferences over the six-year period. However, the expenses for the two Division III conferences increased less than those for the other three conferences (34.6% for the DIII conferences and 85.6% for the NAIA and DII conferences). A large

Table 3
Conference Per Team Expenses for Men’s Basketball

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	164,429	110,178	200,312	49,095	95,355
2004	170,158	129,153	227,847	43,325	100,101
2005	226,831	165,327	249,219	49,039	124,760
2006	279,427	220,216	279,443	50,034	121,728
2007	283,466	213,296	326,342	60,789	123,305
2008	280,006	244,755	335,063	65,715	129,024
	(70.3%)	(122.1%)	(67.3%)	(33.9%)	(35.3%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

difference in the expense amount between the conferences is demonstrated. The AMCC expenses (\$65,715) are the lowest of any of the conferences analyzed and are roughly half of that of the next lowest conference (Empire 8, \$129,024). The AMC ranks as the

second highest per team in expenses with the average team spending \$280,006. If we assume that Roberts' expenses are near the average, then there would be an exponential change to move to either Division III conference, but the difference in moving to either DII conference would be relatively small. The average expenses for a Division II men's basketball team in 2003 was \$270,000, so the CACC was below the average and the ECC was about the average in expenses.

Women's Basketball. Women's basketball, like men's basketball, shows a bimodal variance between the NAIA/DII and Division III (see Table 4). The average expenses for the conferences that provide scholarships are \$238,149 and the average percent change is 103.2%. The average dollar amount for the DIII conferences was \$79,152 and the percent change was actually -2.3%, or a slight decrease over the past 6 years. The AMC represents the median in women's basketball expenses. The average expense for a Division II women's basketball team in 2003 was \$220,000. Both the CACC and the ECC are well below average in expenses relative to the entire Division II population.

Table 4
Conference Per Team Expenses for Women's Basketball

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	116,536	86,887	170,292	57,808	97,202
2004	125,845	96,726	201,881	35,118	95,028
2005	163,189	146,378	232,973	37,783	111,560
2006	202,997	195,813	255,113	42,909	115,255
2007	220,183	199,050	222,935	48,738	107,707
2008	223,960	229,377	261,109	46,562	111,741
	(92.2%)	(164.0%)	(53.3%)	(-19.5%)	(15.0%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

Men's Soccer. Men's soccer continues the trend by again showing a bimodal variance between the NAIA/DII and Division III in percent change (see Table 5). The

Table 5
Conference Per Team Expenses for Men's Soccer

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	63,076	99,738	181,797	37,754	167,893
2004	69,726	102,053	206,590	31,817	149,841
2005	105,398	163,149	214,931	27,787	175,027
2006	166,868	191,847	217,425	32,763	199,352
2007	168,848	178,957	217,957	37,229	121,237
2008	190,871	174,126	256,759	37,626	181,291
	(202.6%)	(74.6%)	(41.2%)	(-0.3%)	(8.0%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

average percent change for NAIA/DII was 45.5% and for DIII it is 3.9%. The Empire 8 saw a \$13,398 increase for the *entire* six-year period, while the AMC saw an increase of \$21,299 *annually*. If Roberts was to change conferences, the rate of increase in expenses would not be as high as the rate is for the AMC.

Women's Soccer. Women's soccer once again shows a bimodal variance between the NAIA/DII and Division III in percent change, and this time it is accompanied by a large increase in the average expenses per team as well (see Table 6). The AMC is once again the median in per team expenses, but its percent change is actually much higher than the others, even the two DII conferences. The AMCC is the only conference to show a percent decrease, just as they were with men's soccer. Interestingly, the conference expenses increased 72.7% over the six year period for the conference as a whole, but both men's and women's soccer saw a decrease over the six

year period. The average expenses for a team in the NAIA/DII grouping are \$188,020 and for Division III it is \$82,754. The percent change is also much different, as the NAIA/DII conferences had a 178.5% increase while the DIII conferences had a 24.9% increase.

Table 6
Conference Per Team Expenses for Women's Soccer

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	55,625	74,498	78,652	33,955	86,052
2004	56,283	71,966	95,245	27,813	82,972
2005	73,803	135,023	111,869	30,844	101,943
2006	108,368	158,555	130,254	34,551	102,197
2007	139,955	179,943	168,004	30,753	115,410
2008	176,481	193,789	202,911	32,258	133,249
	(217.3%)	(160.1%)	(158.0%)	(-5.0%)	(54.8%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

Men's Tennis. Men's tennis once again shows a bimodal variance between the NAIA/DII and Division III in percent change, and again, it is accompanied by a large

Table 7
Conference Per Team Expenses for Men's Tennis

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	20,617	13,852	34,707	8,048	26,369
2004	20,973	8,887	45,492	9,078	29,277
2005	38,147	26,361	64,172	6,913	31,324
2006	52,310	24,985	69,486	7,866	32,907
2007	72,198	36,817	81,369	4,902	34,770
2008	80,571	53,242	91,117	11,869	39,698
	(290.8%)	(284.3%)	(162.5%)	(47.5%)	(50.5%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

increase in the average expenses per team (see Table 7). The average percent change in the NAIA/DII grouping is 245.9%, a very large increase, while the DIII percent increase is 49%. The average expense per team in the NAIA/DII grouping increased \$51,918 over the six year period, meaning that the increase in the expenses for those schools is more than the total expenses for the two NCAA DIII conferences in 2008. Roberts' conference ranks second highest, and has seen a 290.8% increase over the six years.

Women's Tennis. Women's tennis also shows a bimodal variance between the NAIA/DII and Division III in percent change, and is again accompanied by a large dollar amount increase (see Table 8). The AMC increase was nearly 300%, and the CACC was 386.3%. None of the other conferences were over 80%, but as a dollar amount, the ECC saw an increase per team of \$30,827. The percent change for the two DIII conferences was below 5.5% annually. Assuming Roberts' women's tennis spends the average amount for their conference, they would see a decrease by moving to any other conference.

Table 8
Conference Per Team Expenses for Women's Tennis

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	18,276	13,106	38,587	5,696	28,305
2004	16,802	14,259	34,759	4,965	28,156
2005	25,693	33,883	53,043	4,561	32,243
2006	31,672	32,089	45,951	3,472	32,771
2007	53,842	52,905	57,673	4,567	35,247
2008	73,085	63,732	69,414	6,813	37,159
	(299.9%)	(386.3%)	(79.9%)	(19.6%)	(31.3%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

Women’s Volleyball. Women’s volleyball shows a bimodal variance between the NAIA/DII and Division III in percent change, and again accompanied by a large dollar amount increase (see Table 9). Roberts’ conference had the largest percent increase and is ranked second in expense per team. The NAIA/DII grouping saw an increase of 149%, and the DIII conferences saw an increase of 26.5%.

Table 9
Conference Per Team Expenses for Women’s Volleyball

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	52,455	48,207	81,612	23,436	58,327
2004	58,000	53,501	109,537	24,640	60,307
2005	73,328	68,730	134,539	19,641	71,457
2006	102,887	89,469	122,563	23,737	74,384
2007	127,689	112,573	153,994	24,545	87,812
2008	148,040	127,864	162,886	25,959	82,839
	(182.2%)	(165.2%)	(99.6%)	(10.8%)	(42.2%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

Men’s Golf. Men’s golf, as illustrated in Table 10, is the first sport analyzed that

Table 10
Conference Per Team Expenses for Men’s Golf

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	42,564	30,118	93,879	6,233	7,638
2004	36,480	45,587	90,580	5,803	12,107
2005	55,490	39,360	92,183	6,659	10,340
2006	60,509	50,415	91,178	9,277	13,789
2007	75,124	54,578	133,293	6,749	14,824
2008	91,202	65,044	153,356	8,223	17,625
	(114.3%)	(116.0%)	(63.4%)	(31.9%)	(130.8%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

deviates from the pattern created by the previous seven sports. Instead of the NAIA/DII percent change and dollar amounts increasing at a much higher percentage than those of the Division III conferences, it is relatively similar, and the largest percent change is observed in the Empire 8. Once again, the AMCC has the smallest percent change and smallest expense per men's golf team fielded, and the AMC ranks second.

Men's Cross Country and Track & Field. The manner in which the EADA reported men's cross country and track & field represented a challenge to this research. Many athletic departments did not report the cross country and track and field individually, and thus for the purposes of this research they are grouped. The numbers that are available show two groups that are trending divergently (see Table 11). Per team expenses in the NAIA/DII grouping show an average increase of 153.7%, while the DIII expenses per team decreased over 10% per year for the six year period for each conference. The AMC expenses per team have increased 91.2% for

Table 11

Conference Per Team Expenses for Men's Cross Country and Track & Field

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	89,641	16,081	61,570	17,991	20,936
2004	101,614	22,517	58,980	14,594	32,222
2005	132,181	40,025	89,143	6,947	6,779
2006	197,650	50,155	93,584	4,358	16,552
2007	175,744	49,696	110,751	5,657	10,153
2008	171,437	62,304	112,280	6,278	8,283
	(91.2%)	(287.4%)	(82.4%)	(-65.1%)	(-60.4%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

the time period, but came into 2003 with expenses that were greater than any other two conferences combined. If Roberts was to join any of the four conferences being studied, the expenses could be decreased significantly, and based on the average expenses, Roberts could expect to still compete.

Women’s Cross Country and Track & Field. Just as in men’s cross country and track & field, the two sports were reported differently within different conferences, and thus had to be grouped for the purposes of this study. The numbers show two groups that are trending in opposite directions, and look very much like the men’s numbers for these sports (see Table 12). Per team expenses in the NAIA/DII grouping show an average increase of 230.8%, but the DIII expenses per team decreased 56.8% for the six year period. The AMC has a large lead in the average expense per team for women’s cross country and track & field, and has seen a 96.5% increase in expenses

Table 12

Conference Per Team Expenses for Women’s Cross Country and Track & Field

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	88,346	14,571	50,141	14,211	19,432
2004	81,824	17,620	52,745	13,661	36,518
2005	120,964	42,295	73,903	7,932	6,781
2006	139,377	50,245	79,820	4,320	20,171
2007	168,876	66,506	116,951	5,784	8,281
2008	173,588	81,660	118,138	5,985	8,613
	(96.5%)	(460.4%)	(135.6%)	(-57.9%)	(-55.7%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

over the six year period. It should be noted that the CACC’s growth in expenses for this sport is the second highest of any sport studied (460.4% increase).

Softball. Softball displays a bimodal variance and the NAIA/NCAA DII grouping is not only increasing more rapidly than DIII, but the dollar amounts are much higher as well (see Table 13). Roberts' conference was second to last in spending in 2003, but due to a percent

Table 13
Conference Per Team Expenses for Softball

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	45,109	79,783	92,603	28,302	47,144
2004	52,082	90,740	119,772	23,782	67,766
2005	72,251	111,675	139,939	24,597	62,847
2006	111,012	137,962	144,188	27,802	70,780
2007	127,299	182,250	176,402	36,064	79,849
2008	154,620	177,211	212,550	37,215	87,953
	(242.8%)	(122.1%)	(129.5%)	(31.5%)	(86.6%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

change that is more than 100% higher than any other conference, the AMC has climbed to third and is much more in-line with the other conferences in its grouping. The average expense per year for an AMC softball team was \$154,620 in 2008 with an annual increase of \$18,252 per team. Softball is the first sport focused on in this research that Roberts does not currently support. For Roberts to begin sponsoring softball, they should anticipate expenses approximately equal to the per team expense calculated for each conference to compete.

Baseball. Baseball displays the bimodal variance and the three schools belonging to the NAIA or NCAA DII group are increasing at a much faster pace and doing so with much higher dollar amounts (see Table 14). The average expenses across the

NAIA/Division II conferences increased 81% to \$264,689 while the Division III conferences saw an increase of 42.5% to \$91,839. Roberts does not currently sponsor baseball, and in order to add baseball, Roberts should anticipate expenses to be near the levels suggested by the averages reported in this study.

Table 14
Conference Per Team Expenses for Baseball

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	133,773	112,398	201,226	42,733	85,534
2004	153,310	100,046	229,068	43,167	105,822
2005	227,530	135,544	298,355	42,853	113,007
2006	297,779	198,046	333,968	45,496	137,087
2007	292,079	178,285	279,425	49,615	112,233
2008	274,085	203,238	316,745	59,930	123,748
	(104.9%)	(80.8%)	(57.4%)	(40.2%)	(44.7%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

Men’s Lacrosse. Men’s Lacrosse is the first and only sport researched that is not sponsored by Roberts’ current conference. However, the sport is sponsored by both the Division II and Division III conferences that Roberts is considering for reclassification. The available data on men’s lacrosse reveals some other results that are dissimilar from most other sports studied (see Table 15). Lacrosse is only the second sport in which either of the Division III conferences have a higher expense per team than any of the NAIA/Division II conferences. The expenses per team in the Empire 8 are more than \$100,000 more than those of the CACC. If Roberts decides to begin sponsoring men’s lacrosse, the school should expect expenses similar to the average to compete within each conference.

Table 15

Conference Per Team Expenses for Men's Lacrosse

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	---	18,375	122,397	5,427	102,562
2004	---	25,048	124,072	7,408	115,122
2005	---	22,807	156,537	2,887	124,751
2006	---	26,521	244,543	13,273	154,649
2007	---	55,564	289,796	10,968	139,055
2008	---	54,046	194,521	19,982	155,618
	---	(194.1%)	(58.9%)	(268.2%)	(51.7%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

Women's Lacrosse. The examination of women's lacrosse revealed findings that more closely reflect the findings for the groupings in general, with higher dollar amounts

Table 16

Conference Per Team Expenses for Women's Lacrosse

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	0	32,178	84,777	47,004	72,301
2004	52,491	21,392	101,242	45,138	76,691
2005	104,056	59,472	142,011	30,218	80,590
2006	166,502	86,480	159,900	39,946	105,115
2007	126,677	163,119	180,310	40,945	99,161
2008	123,478	199,840	231,417	56,519	105,311
	(135.2%)	(521%)	(173.0%)	(20.2%)	(45.7%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

and much higher percent increases for the NAIA/DII grouping when compared to the DIII conferences. The average per team expense for the AMC is \$123,478, for the two DII conferences it is \$184,912 and for the two DIII conferences it is \$80,915. The NAIA/DII grouping saw a 276.4% increase and the DIII conferences saw a 33% increase.

The percent change for the CACC (521%) is the largest percent change for any conference in any sport in this study.

Men’s Volleyball. Men’s volleyball is a sport that is only offered in the two Division III conferences being examined. The average expenses for the two sponsoring conferences increased 77.5% to \$44,553 on average. Roberts does not currently sponsor men’s volleyball.

Table 17
Conference Per Team Expenses for Men’s Volleyball

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	---	---	---	12,564	34,549
2004	---	---	---	11,655	42,244
2005	---	---	---	16,090	45,779
2006	---	---	---	12,652	47,447
2007	---	---	---	22,353	58,681
2008	---	---	---	19,151	69,954
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(52.4%)	(102.5%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

Football. Football is not offered in either of the Division II conferences that are being examined, but is offered in the AMC and in both Division III conferences. In spite of the limited sample for football, the trends observed in the other sports seem to hold true (see Table 18). Football in the NAIA is a higher expense per team sport when compared to NCAA Division III teams (\$859,289 to \$389,981), and those expenses are increasing at a greater rate (145.5% to 32.1%). Roberts is not currently considering adding football, but this data shows the costs that may be associated if it were considered in the future.

Table 18

Conference Per Team Expenses for Football

	NAIA	NCAA DII		NCAA DIII	
	AMC	CACC	ECC	AMCC	Empire 8
2003	349,973	---	---	387,144	205,418
2004	462,501	---	---	529,662	223,260
2005	795,460	---	---	368,907	229,668
2006	829,003	---	---	456,591	280,619
2007	948,602	---	---	434,409	268,534
2008	859,289	---	---	505,523	274,439
	(145.5%)	(%)	(%)	(30.6%)	(33.6%)

Note. Percent increases per team within each conference are included in parentheses for six-year time period.

RQ 3: What conference is the best fit geographically so that cost and missed class-time due to travel are minimized, and a new niche for recruiting students can be developed?

It is important to consider the student-athlete when looking at this or any potential reclassification. Missed class-time and spending hours on buses and in hotels away from campus must be considered. Many schools have rules that govern travel and time away from campus. Roberts has a rule that any trips that take five or more hours must include an overnight stay. Thus, it is important that we examine not only the mileage, but also the time spent getting to these destinations.

To calculate this travel time, the researcher went to the website of each school that is in each of the five conferences to determine the address of the campus. That address was then entered into Google maps, and the distance and time was calculated from that school to Roberts' campus in Rochester. Each conference was aggregated and the results are displayed below (see Table 19). The data suggests that a large difference exists between the total travel time and distance among the conferences. The average time from Roberts to schools in the Empire 8 is over three and a half hours less than the average time from

Roberts to schools in the ECC or CACC. If Roberts was to join one of those conferences, it would be sensible to try and combine trips, as the locations would require an overnight stay regardless.

Table 19
Distance and Time Calculation for Conferences

Conference	# Members	Total Miles* (1-Way)	Avg Miles (1-Way)	Total Hrs	Avg Hrs	# 5 Hr Trips
AMC	15	3871.2	258.1	62.48	4.17	5
AMCC	11	2307.1	209.7	38.48	3.50	1
CACC	14	4953.0	353.8	79.75	5.70	14
ECC	8	2977.0	372.1	46.95	5.87	8
Empire 8	9	1087.5	120.8	19.21	2.13	1

*Note. Indicates total one-way mileage from Roberts Wesleyan College to each member-institution in conference.

RQ 4: What obstacles or costs would be incurred if Roberts was to add baseball, men's lacrosse, women's lacrosse or softball?

Coaching staffs and salaries, equipment, facilities, scheduling, and student-athletes must all be considered when adding new sports. Coaching staffs and salaries vary greatly depending on the institution's pay scale. Roberts, or any other college or university using this research will be best equipped to determine those costs for its own institution. Equipment is a category whose costs vary widely, and often today, a student-athlete uses his or her own equipment. Facilities, scheduling, and student-athletes will be examined more closely so that the task force and others reviewing this study can formulate ideas and opinions based upon a complete analysis.

Facilities

Facilities are a major hurdle in adding any new sports. Land that can be developed is necessary to add any fields necessary for new outdoor sports. Roberts does not

currently have a baseball or softball field, and the fields that could be used for lacrosse are not marked for the sport. Each sport will be analyzed individually, as the fields are not compatible for more than one sport. It will be assumed that both men's and women's lacrosse will utilize the same field.

Lacrosse. The sports turf field at Roberts is eight years old and too old to consider relining for lacrosse. The field surface would need to be replaced to be used for lacrosse. The company that laid the original turf down is no longer in business, and relining it is not an option because other companies will not reline another company's product. It is also not a viable option to have the current grass field lined for lacrosse. The field currently supports both men's and women's soccer, and attempting to have all four teams practice and play on the same field would create scheduling issues, and the grass field may not hold up to that increased wear and tear. The best option to add lacrosse may involve installation of new field turf where the current sports turf field is located.

The foremost company in the field turf industry is a company called Field Turf. They were the original company to design and manufacture synthetic turf fields, and the company has many patents that give them a competitive edge over the competition (Field Turf, 2010). Independent studies have demonstrated the safety of Field Turf versus even natural grass, and Field Turf is proven to be the safest (The Safest Turf, 2010). The installation time for a new Field Turf field is approximately twelve weeks, and the field can immediately be used for practice or competition. The cost of a Field Turf field is approximately \$10 per square foot. However, the maintenance costs for a Field Turf field is lower than those of a grass field, and so in addition to more playability, the field would have less ongoing costs. The lines down on the field for the sports are more permanent

than they are on grass fields. If both fields were done at the same time it may be possible to get a discount as well. The cost for the Field Turf field the dimensions of Roberts' Outdoor Stadium Field to be installed would be approximately \$810,000.

Another necessary cost if games were to be played on a new synthetic turf field, and not on The Stadium's main field, would be the purchase of bleachers. A bleacher that seats 180 fans can be purchased for approximately \$13,000 (BSN Sports, 2010). If lacrosse was added and became a sport that draws large crowds for certain contests, additional bleachers could be purchased or those particular matchups could be played on the stadium field to accommodate larger crowds.

Baseball or Softball. Baseball and softball can not be played on the same field; however, for the purposes of assessing the costs associated they will be grouped. In approximating the costs for the field, two assumptions are made. First, the land where the field will be built is a fairly flat parcel and clear of any woods. Second, no irrigation will be installed. Irrigation is a nice feature to have, but not all fields have irrigation.

The cost of the field itself, which would include the grading, infield mix, sod and seeding for either a baseball or softball field is approximately \$100,000 (Mr. Mike Curley, Town of Chili Director of Parks and Recreation, personal email, March 31, 2010). The fencing, which would include 6 foot vinyl coated chain-link with a cap (for the outfield wall) and the backstop would be approximately \$50,000. The precast concrete dugouts with a bench would cost approximately \$30,000. The total complex cost would be approximately \$180,000 for each field (Mr. Mike Curley, Town of Chili Director of Parks and Recreation, personal email, March 31, 2010).

Similar to lacrosse, bleachers would also be needed for baseball and softball as well. A bleacher that seats 180 can be purchased for approximately \$13,000 (BSN Sports, 2010). Bleachers large enough to seat 180 people are not mobile and would need to be purchased for each individual field (BSN Sports, 2010).

Scheduling

Sponsoring outdoor sports in western New York presents many challenges. The most significant challenge is the weather and the limitations that weather puts upon game and practice time. Weather can impact travel for all sports, but from October to April the weather can be very unpredictable.

Baseball. An analysis of the 2010 baseball schedules for teams located in the five conferences and other schools located in the Rochester area are also included as they most closely replicate the conditions and limitations that Roberts would face in Rochester. The average baseball team plays 40 games, of which 15 are home games (see Table 20). Other games

Table 20
Conference Scheduling Breakdown for Baseball 2010

Conference/Group	Total Contests	Home Contests	First Home Date
AMC	49.7	18.3	March 17
AMCC	34.4	11.8	March 25
CACC	44.2	15.8	March 18
ECC	48.5	22.8	March 15
Empire 8	33.4	12.2	March 23
Rochester area	35.0	14.3	March 29
Averages	40.9	15.9	March 21

consist of games that take place on the road or at a neutral site. Every team that is represented in the analysis took a trip south for seven or more days to begin the year, and this kind of trip is a significant expense to a school that sponsors baseball. March 21st is the average first home baseball game for the sample.

Softball. An analysis similar to that of baseball was done for softball. Once again, the results are similar in that there are many more road or neutral contests, and that the

Table 21
Conference Scheduling Breakdown for Softball 2010

Conference/Group	Total Contests	Home Contests	First Home Date
AMC	39.2	15.3	March 23
AMCC	37.5	14.6	March 26
CACC	45.5	18.6	March 21
ECC	48.6	17.3	March 23
Empire 8	35.6	13.6	March 30
Rochester area	35.3	12.8	March 31
Averages	40.3	15.4	March 26

average first home game is March 26. The average softball team plays 40 contest, of which 25 contests away from home (see Table 21). The average team played 62of its games at road or neutral sites this season. Nearly every softball team analyzed took a trip to Florida or South Carolina to begin its season, an expense to be considered.

Student-Athletes

First, student-athletes will be examined. Many of the items that must be considered are costs that would be incurred, but adding student-athletes that would compete in these sports will be a revenue stream for the school. The cost of attending Roberts Wesleyan College for the 2010-2011 academic year is \$33,186. If sponsoring the

new sport(s) brings additional student-athletes on campus that wouldn't have been there otherwise, Roberts would realize a new revenue source directly as a result of adding a new sport.

RQ 5: What are the characteristics (Christian philosophy, enrollment) of the schools within the conferences that are examined in this research?

A brief examination of the schools in the conferences that Roberts is considering will help to evaluate further the potential fit of Roberts not only athletically, but also socially, ethically, religiously and financially. Roberts would be unwise to consider reclassifying and realigning into a conference with schools that were not like-minded and had a completely different profile. Previous research suggests that schools should believe that, "their reclassification would improve their institutional profile among competitive peer institutions" (Weaver, 2007, p.1). A 1989 study by Chu understates the reasoning for wanting to ensure that Roberts is joining like-minded institutions:

Of primary significance to the organization are the resources and the institutional survival they serve. Money, students, and prestige are of utmost importance to educational institution leaders. In order to attract these survival necessities, the organization develops programs that serve to lure support from the task environment. Initial education objectives are modified to rationalize and legitimize new programs...Programs that attract resources, if they are in philosophical conflict with originally stated education goals, may dictate a modification of those original goals (p.33).

If Roberts was to reposition itself with schools that were much larger, or put a much greater emphasis on athletics, it could strain the resources that Roberts has, and create a tension between the athletic department and the faculty and other departments. Problems could also result if Roberts was to join a conference that was very liberal or composed of many state schools or schools whose characteristics were inconsistent with Roberts' philosophy.

The details about the conferences that are being evaluated as potential suitors are summarized below, and these characteristics should factor greatly into the decision on reclassification (see Table 22). The average enrollment varies widely across the five

Table 22
Demographics of Schools Comprising Potential Conferences

Conference	Average Enrollment	Christian Schools in Conference	Description of Schools
AMC	1,637	Cedarville University Houghton College Malone University Mount Vernon Nazarene	5 Christian Schools, Remainder are Franciscan or Catholic
AMCC	2,039	None	State, Franciscan and Catholic schools
CACC	1,866	Concordia College-NY NYACK College	2 Christian schools, remainder are Franciscan, Catholic, or non-affiliated
ECC	8,443	None	Franciscan schools
Empire 8	3,372	None	Franciscan, Catholic or non-affiliated schools

conferences. The average enrollment at schools in the ECC is much larger than those of the other conferences. The Empire 8 is also larger, but if you remove Rochester Institute

of Technology, the conference average would be 1,697, which is similar to that of the other conferences. The number of schools that define themselves as Christian or Christ-like also varies with a range from four (five if you include Roberts) to zero. The AMCC, ECC and Empire 8 all have no Christian schools. The majority of the schools in all five conferences are Franciscan or Catholic, and the AMCC is the only conference to have multiple state schools.

Roberts' leadership is also interested in marketing and growing the school into a niche or area that is lacking Christ-centered colleges and universities. The leadership believes that downstate and New York City are good opportunities, as the market is much more competitive in Ohio and western Pennsylvania. That belief seems to be supported by the findings of this study. There are no Christian schools in the AMCC (Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio), the ECC (New York metropolitan area), or the Empire 8 (New York and New Jersey). Although these particular conferences do not have any Christian colleges, Christian colleges exist in the areas in which these schools are located. It does present an opportunity for Roberts Wesleyan to position itself to become known in markets in which it currently is not.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Roberts Wesleyan College's athletics department is in a very pivotal time. A proactive decision on reclassification is preferred because more change is likely imminent within the NAIA and the AMC. However, if the current landscape of the NAIA and the AMC is sustained for several years, no change would be immediately necessary. To assist this decision, a thorough analysis has been performed, and data from this study will be used to recommend a course of action.

The task force's executive summary emphasizes certain aspects that must be weighted more heavily in making a recommendation. This study has examined conferences and divisions. Each potential new alignment through reclassification has advantages and disadvantages, and an NCAA division and conference must fit the philosophy of Roberts. A synopsis of the study recommendations will determine what division and conference is the best fit and then analyze the sports to be added.

Reclassification

Determining which conference and division to join, if Roberts was to leave the AMC, is a very serious decision. The costs and time associated with reclassification are substantial and should reflect the level of commitment required to be successful. The need for presidential involvement and support is restated frequently in the reclassification literature for both NCAA DII and DIII. Therefore, Roberts' President, Dr. John Martin, must support whatever decision is made, and this decision must account for costs,

geography and philosophy. First, the study will recommend an association to join and suggest divisional and conference alignments, as well as new sport sponsorship.

Association Reclassification. Roberts will not realign in a new NAIA conference; a decision to leave the AMC would also mean a departure from the NAIA. Membership in the AMC has dropped from a high of eighteen to fourteen with more intending to leave soon, and a pattern is developing that makes the conference seem vulnerable. NAIA membership does not compare favorably to the NCAA, and thus, the NCAA is a stronger association and a more viable option. Based on these factors, Roberts Wesleyan College should join the NCAA. This decision may be earlier than Roberts had planned, but it will be proactive rather than reactive.

Divisional Reclassification. Determining which division fits best with Roberts' philosophy is central to the decision-making process. Roberts' philosophy resembles a Division II institution in some characteristics, but seems to align with Division III's philosophy in others. This program-directing decision must be made for Roberts as a whole. The decision can not focus solely on the coaches, be made to maintain rivalries, or merely facilitate recruiting because of athletic scholarship availability. The decision must help align Roberts' athletics with the rest of the institution.

Division II may be the best fit for Roberts because Division II allows Roberts to continue offering athletic scholarships. The biggest differentiating factor between Division II and Division III is the ability to award scholarship money for athletic participation (Division III Philosophy Statement, 2010). Roberts' ability to award athletic scholarship money is a major advantage over other area schools. However, no Division II conferences are geographically convenient for Roberts. Table 19 demonstrates the

distance to the nearest Division II conferences. The average distance from Roberts to a member of the CACC is 354 and to the average ECC members is 372 miles, much further than the nearest DIII (121 for the Empire 8).

Roberts has been an NAIA member for years, and losing scholarships may give rival schools like Houghton a decided advantage in recruiting Christian student-athletes in western New York and the northeast. Roberts has concerns about not being able to compete with its rival school for those Christian student-athletes (Barry Smith, personal interview, March 2010). However, many teams in Division II fund athletics with much more money than Roberts does. The average Division II school without football spends \$3,362,750, nearly double what Roberts currently spends. In a time of reduced spending, Roberts may be reluctant to spend more than they have historically.

In many ways, Roberts and the DIII philosophy align. Roberts is focused on the development of the whole student, and Roberts' athletic expenditures are closer to the Division III range. The average Division III athletic department without football spends \$1,872,000, an amount similar to that of Roberts. Expenses would decrease, but programs may falter if Roberts stopped giving scholarships. However, if the money currently spent on scholarships is put into the programs, staff and other resources, competitive programs can be sustained. Division III stresses student-athlete involvement, and many student-athletes at Roberts enjoy getting to compete at the college level.

A move to either NCAA division would present challenges. If Roberts was to join Division II and match the average spending of a Division II school, Roberts may be forced to divert dollars from current programs or increase revenues to cover expenses. Roberts currently does not spend the money that this study suggests is required to make a

successful move to Division II (\$1,971,058 spent by Roberts annually versus \$3,362,750 for DII without football) and sustain competitive teams. Many involved want the exposure and athletic scholarships DII offers, but DII does not align with Roberts' historical behavior. Based on this analysis and Roberts' values, Roberts should target Division III for potential reclassification.

Conference Alignment. With a recommendation rendered concerning Divisional reclassification, the research will now examine the conference decision. Since Division III is the targeted division, two conferences remain options—the AMCC and the Empire 8. An examination of conference expenses, sports sponsored and distances to the conference's member-institutions will differentiate the two conferences. None of these comparisons can individually determine the conference that best fits, but the data can collectively produce a sound recommendation.

The conference expenses for the AMCC and the Empire 8 allow for a comparison of the dollars that Roberts would need to spend on athletics in a new Division III conference and what they currently spend. After factoring out football from each conference, the average AMCC member-institution spends \$1,003,376 and the average Empire 8 spends \$2,641,156 to sponsor all teams. Membership fees are paid to the conference from each member-institution for the rights and privileges of competing in that conference. For the 2009-2010 academic year, membership fees for the Empire 8 were \$17,814 (Joe Venniro, RIT Sports Information Director, personal interview, April 24, 2010), fees were \$9,000 for the AMCC (Ms. Donna Ledwin, AMCC Conference Commissioner, personal interview, April 30, 2010), and the AMC fees were \$8,000 (Mike Faro, personal interview, March 15, 2010). Both the new conferences have a higher fee,

but when analyzing that fee in the scope of a million dollar budget, the increase is not significant.

Neither the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference, nor the Empire 8 offers only the sports that Roberts currently sponsors. The AMCC offers four sports that Roberts does not currently sponsor: baseball, softball, and men's and women's swimming. Additionally, Roberts currently sponsors men's and women's indoor and outdoor track and field, but the AMCC does not. Thus, a disadvantage to joining the AMCC would be the lack of indoor and outdoor track and field. The facilities that Roberts has for track and field—including the regionally-superior Super-Mondo track—are excellent, and not sponsoring those sports, or having to go out of conference to do so, must be considered a negative. Unlike the AMCC, the Empire 8 offers every sport that Roberts does, and the conference offers many sports that Roberts does not. Thus, joining the Empire 8 gives Roberts an opportunity to sponsor new sports that could compete within conference. Additionally, the Empire 8 does not require teams to sponsor every sport that the conference does, and thus, joining the Empire 8 gives Roberts more flexibility.

The distances to the member-institutions of the two conferences help differentiate the conferences as well. Calculated using the IRS rate for 2010, the average cost per trip to AMCC schools is \$258.10, and the average cost per trip to the Empire 8 is \$120.80. This difference is substantial because of the number of sports sponsored and schools traveled to. Assuming fourteen sports will be sponsored and using the IRS rate for mileage, the difference between travel to the Empire 8 and the AMCC would be

approximately \$17,066 per year. However, both conferences represent a significant drop from Roberts' current travel expenses.

Based on all data gathered and analyzed, the researcher would recommend a move to the Empire 8. The fact that member-institutions are not required to sponsor every sport that the conference does is important. The average expenses in the Empire 8 for the 14 sports that Roberts currently sponsors is \$749,522, which is well below the average for all sports sponsored by members of the Empire 8. Not only is this amount less than Roberts currently spends on athletics, but also this amount could be assumed to place Roberts competitively even with the average member-institution in the Empire 8. Furthermore, the Empire 8's flexibility would allow Roberts to add certain sports, yet not be forced to add others. The Empire 8 is the best geographic fit as well, with only one member located more than five hours from Roberts. Considering all factors, the Empire 8 is the recommended conference.

Sports to Add

This study assessed five sports—baseball, men's lacrosse, women's lacrosse, softball, and men's volleyball—that Roberts could sponsor. The Empire 8 sponsors all the sports analyzed as well as others that the research does not. The study has provided significant background information and has recommendations on what sports should be added.

Baseball and Softball. Associated costs and weather are the main reasons to not add baseball or softball. The need for facilities and a coaching staff requires significant spending before a team could compete. The unpredictability of the weather and its potential impact on scheduling also adds to cost. The average first home date for baseball

in the Empire 8 is March 23, and for softball, it is March 30. The average Empire 8 baseball team plays 12 home games and 21 road games, and the average softball team plays 14 home and 22 on the road. Both baseball and softball play more than sixty percent of their contests on the road. This type of scheduling will create higher travel expenses and more missed class time for the student-athletes involved. The schedule can also be heavily impacted by the spring weather in the northeast, which would lead to schedule adjustments and further complicate operations. Based on the research and these factors, the recommendation is not to add baseball or softball.

Men's Volleyball. Men's volleyball is the least expensive sport being examined because no new facilities are required. The comparison between the costs and the addition of the new student-athletes seems to suggest that net revenue could be produced. The Empire 8 has three teams that currently sponsor men's volleyball, all of whom compete in the North East Collegiate Volleyball Association (North East Collegiate, 2010). Travel is typically regional and fits with the thought process throughout this recommendation. Based on the limited costs and additional opportunities for student-athletes to participate, the recommendation is to add men's volleyball.

Men's and Women's Lacrosse. The most difficult decision is whether to add men's and women's lacrosse. The costs of developing an appropriate field for practice or competition, as well as equipment and additional salaries for coaches, makes adding lacrosse for either gender difficult. The \$800,000 expense of a new turf field is the largest component of those costs, and indubitably, this cost will require the most discussion and consideration. However, Roberts' leadership previously has expressed an interest in

resurfacing one or both outdoor fields. These previous discussions may help alleviate any concern about this large expense.

The central and western New York area is a hotbed for high school lacrosse, and whether any reclassification is made or not, adding lacrosse may be a decision that helps attract students that would not have considered Roberts otherwise. The recommendation would be to add lacrosse for both genders and resurface both outdoor fields. The addition of student-athletes and hosting sporting events for outside groups would be a way to help offset the costs associated with this decision.

Contrasting Now and the Future

The recommendations for Roberts' reclassification have been made based upon careful analysis of large amounts of data. A move from the NAIA and its unsettled future is proactive and advised. When compared to the expenses of Division II and Division III schools, Roberts' historical spending suggests that the school is a better fit for Division III, in spite of the loss of athletic scholarships. A move that results in less travel and missed class time for student-athletes also aligns with Roberts' values and view of athletics as part of the educational process.

As previously mentioned, the average Empire 8 school spends \$749,522 for the fourteen sports that Roberts currently sponsors. Sponsoring men's volleyball and men's and women's lacrosse, as is recommended, would add \$330,883, bringing total expenses to \$1,080,405 to sponsor seventeen sports. Those expenses represent a 45.2% reduction of Roberts' current expenses as a member of the AMC. If Roberts added the same number of participants as other schools in the Empire 8 or the NEAC, based on the averages of the teams in the leagues, volleyball would add 18 student-athletes and each

lacrosse team would add 25. Thus, these changes would potentially attract 68 new student-athletes to Roberts. 68 new students paying full tuition (\$33,186) at Roberts in 2009-2010 would have produced \$2,256,648 in revenue. Additional utilization of the Roberts' facilities would also help provide more opportunities for coaches to see and recruit prospective student-athletes, as well as producing additional revenue.

Future Research

The research did reveal opportunities for future research. Trends in reclassification would suggest that more schools may be reclassifying and a shortage of information exists on reclassification to the lower divisions. Potential areas for future research include:

1. Success factors for reclassifications from the NAIA to Division II or Division III.
2. The accuracy of the EADA, and potential ways to improve the report.

Improvements may include a comparison to changes to commonly accepted reporting principles that were initiated and now enforced through the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.

3. The success of teams at institutions that have reclassified as a function of the increase or decrease in spending on that team. Do teams that move from NAIA to Division III and can no longer give scholarships win or lose more depending on the way the finances are handled? Do teams that continue to maintain the same total expenses win more than those that decrease the money spent on the sport?

Appendix A: Executive Summary from Task Force

Roberts Institutional Identity and Philosophy

- Maintaining RWC core values through an analysis of potential new conference affiliations
- Supporting the College strategic plan
- Role as a Christian College in Rochester, WNY, the Northeast
- Alignment with philosophy of student development and purpose of school spirit/identity
- Institutional philosophy for intercollegiate athletics
- Positive and negative impact on campus culture of inter-collegiate athletics

Costs/Additional Revenues

- Cost of going through the application process
- Cost of adding new sports to match up with potential new conference supported sports
 - Baseball
 - Softball
 - M & W Lacrosse
 - M Volleyball
 - Football
- Cost of scholarships to meet NCAA requirements (DII or DIII)
- Membership costs of NAIA versus NCAA, along with membership benefits (post-season expenses, student insurance, etc.)
- Cost/Revenues of adding sports
 - Playing fields/facilities
 - Equipment
 - Coaches and student-athlete scholarships
 - Additional enrolled students per new sport roster
- Costs associated with travel
 - Distance from new schools and costs of hotel and transportation
- Study of recent colleges who transitioned from NAIA to NCAAII
 - Reasons pursued and lessons learned
 - Mistakes/missteps to avoid
 - Long term advantages

Potential New Conferences

- Sports offered and minimum requirements
- Philosophies – Are they a match to RWC
- Geographic location and existing territories
- RWC's niche in new conference and ability to attract student-athletes (potential growth through student recruitment).

Current Faculty attitudes and values regarding Inter-Collegiate Athletics (factors for analysis and consideration)

- Limited class absences
- Recognizable rivalries and establishing traditions
- Broader campus support, both student and faculty/staff

Appendix B: Conferences and Members

NAIA
American Mideast Conference
Carlow University
Cedarville University
Daeman College
Houghton College
Malone University
Mount Vernon Nazarene University
University of Northwestern Ohio
Notre Dame College
Point Park University
Roberts Wesleyan College
Shawnee State University
Ursuline College
Walsh University
Wilberforce University

NCAA Division II	
CACC	ECC
Bloomfield College	University of Bridgeport
Calwell College	C.W.Post/Long Island University
Chestnut Hill College	Dowling College
Concordia College	Mercy College
Dominican College	Molloy College
Felician College	New York Institute of Technology
Georgian Court University	Queens College
Goldey-Beacom College	St. Thomas Aquinas College
Holy Family University	
Nyack College	
Philadelphia University	
Post University	
University of the Sciences	
Wilmington University	

NCAA Division III	
AMCC	Empire 8
D'Youville College	Alfred University
Franciscan University	Elmira College
Frostburg State University	Hartwick College
Hilbert College	Ithaca College
La Roche College	Nazareth College
Medaille College	Rochester Institute of Technology
Mt. Aloysius College	St. John Fisher College
Penn State Behrend	Stevens Institute of Technology
Penn State Altoona	Utica College
Pitt Bradford	
Pitt Greensburg	

References

- 2008-2009 NCAA Annual Report. (2009). The Online Resource of the NCAA. Retrieved April 23, 2010, from:
<https://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/7863ce804e0b36b8bb79fb1ad6fc8b25/Annual+Report+2008-2009+Final.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=7863ce804e0b36b8bb79fb1ad6fc8b25>
- American Midwest Conference Athletics. (2009). The Official Site of the American Midwest Conference. Retrieved April 6, 2010, from: <http://www.amcsports.com>.
- AMCC Sports Archive. (2010). AMCC Sportsmanship: Be Loud, Be Proud, Be Positive. Retrieved April 17, 2010, from: http://www.amcconf.org/sports_archive.htm.
- Application for NCAA Division III Membership. (2010). The Online Resource of the NCAA. Retrieved April 17, 2010, from:
http://web1.ncaa.org/web_files/AMA/DIII%20Membership/Provisional-Reclass%20Application.pdf
- Brown, G. (2009). Data show how Division II identity is taking hold. The Online Resource for the NCAA. Retrieved April 19, 2010, from:
http://web1.ncaa.org/web_files/NCAANewsArchive/2009/Division+II/data%2Bshow%2Bhow%2Bdivision%2Bii%2Bidentity%2Bis%2Btaking%2Bhold%2B-1-16-09%2B-%2Bncaa%2Bnews.html
- Brown, G. (2010). DII Membership Committee OKs Lake Erie as active member. The Online Resource for the NCAA. Retrieved April 17, 2010, from:
http://www.ncaa.org/wps/portal/ncaahome?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/ncaa/ncaa/ncaa+news/ncaa+news+online/2009/division+ii/dii+membership+committee+oks+lake+erie+as+active+member_07_10_09_ncaa_news
- BSN Sports. (2010). Retrieved April 19, 2010, from:
http://www.ssgecom.com/ssgpartner/associate_entry.asp?&ID=A11
- CACC Athletics. (2010). Retrieved April 17, 2010, from:
<http://www.caccathletics.org/sports/mbkb/2008-09/standings>.
- Championship Sports. (2010). The Official Site of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics. Retrieved April 17, 2010, from:
<http://naia.cstv.com/member-services/championships/>
- Chu, D. (1989). *The Character of American Higher Education and Intercollegiate Sport*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Composition & Sport Sponsorship of the NCAA. (2010). The Online Resource of the

- NCAA. Retrieved April 16, 2010, from:
http://ncaa.org/wps/portal/ncaahome?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/ncaa/NCAA/About%20The%20NCAA/Membership/membership_breakdown.html#active.
- Division II Strategic Planning. (2009). The Online Resource of the NCAA. Retrieved April 19, 2010, from:
http://www.diicommunity.org/uploads/documents/SP_Platform_31938.pdf
- Division III Facts & Figures. (2009). The Online Resource of the NCAA. Retrieved April 19, 2010, from:
<http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/c97ebd004e0b36cebc25fc1ad6fc8b25/Facts+and+Figures+2009.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=c97ebd004e0b36cebc25fc1ad6fc8b25>
- Division III Philosophy Statement. (2010). The Online Resource of the NCAA. Retrieved April 19, 2010, from:
<http://www.ncaapublications.com/productdownloads/D310.pdf>
- EADA Website. (2010). The Equity in Athletics Data Analysis Cutting Tool. Retrieved April 17, 2010, from: <http://ope.ed.gov/athletics>.
- ECC Sports. (2009). The Official Website of the East Coast Conference. Retrieved April 17, 2010, from: <http://www.eccsports.org/landing/index>
- Empire 8 Athletics. (2010). Retrieved April 17, 2010, from: <http://empire8.com/>
- Facts and Figures. (2009). The Online Resource of the NCAA. Retrieved April 19, 2010, from:
<http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/2797ee004008dd5db4a6fe1e1074f752/2009-10+Facts+and+Figures+10-8-09.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=2797ee004008dd5db4a6fe1e1074f752>
- Field Turf. (2010). Retrieved April 19, 2010, from: <http://www.fieldturf.com/artificial-turf-benefits/>
- History of the NAIA. The Official Site of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics. Retrieved April 17, 2010, from:
<http://naia.cstv.com/genrel/090905aai.html>
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. (1990). *Designing qualitative research* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Member Institutions. The Official Site of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics. Retrieved April 17, 2010 from: <http://naia.cstv.com/member-services/about/members.htm>

- NAIA Mission. (2010). The Official Site of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics. Retrieved April 22, 2010 from:
<http://naia.cstv.com/genrel/062408aab.html>
- NCAA Division II Membership Report. (2010). The Online Resource of the NCAA. Retrieved April 19, 2010, from:
<http://catalog.proemags.com/publication/561dc229#/561dc229/1>
- NCAA Membership Application Forms. (2010). The Online Resource of the NCAA. Retrieved April 13, 2010, from:
http://www.ncaa.org/wps/portal/ncaahome?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/ncaa/NCAA/About+The+NCAA/Membership/Membership+Applications/index.html
- North East Collegiate Volleyball Association. (2010). Retrieved April 22, 2010, from:
<http://www.necva.org/index.aspx>
- Raider Athletics. (2010). Retrieved April 19, 2010, from: <http://roberts.edu/athletics/>
- Roberts Wesleyan College. (2008). Retrieved April 19, 2010, from:
http://den-oweb.petersons.com/ccc92/display_pdf?p_instance_id=183326.pdf
- Roberts Wesleyan History. Retrieved April 17, 2010, from:
<http://roberts.edu/About/AtAGlance/History>
- Schramm, W. and Roberts, D. (1971). *The Process and Effects of Mass Communication*, University of Illinois Press, 1954. Revised Edition.
- Schwarz, E. (1998). An analysis of the factors determining the feasibility of upward reclassification within the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Ed.D. dissertation, United States Sports Academy, United States -- Alabama. Retrieved January 13, 2010, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text. (Publication No. AAT 9903661).
- The History of the NCAA. (2010). The Online Resource of the NCAA. Retrieved April 19, 2010, from:
http://ncaa.org/wps/portal/ncaahome?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/ncaa/ncaa/about+the+ncaa/overview/history.html
- The Safest Turf on Earth. (2010). Retrieved April 19, 2010, from:
<http://www.fieldturf.com/football-turf/safety/>
- University of Rio Grande Joins Mid-South Conference. (2009). The Official Site of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics. Retrieved April 19, 2010, from: <http://naia.cstv.com/genrel/031109aab.html>
- Weaver, A. G. (2007). Upward reclassification of intercollegiate athletic departments to

Division I: A case study approach. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, United States -- North Carolina. Retrieved January 13, 2010, from ProQuest Direct Complete. (Publication No. AAT 3273323).
<http://libres.uncg.edu/edocs/etd/1422/umi-uncg-1422.pdf>

68Wilson, R. M. (2005). *The History of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics*.