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Abstract

Jeremy Dewayne Boyce: An Analysis of the Division III Football Playoff Structure and Its Use of the Geographic Proximity Rule
(Under the direction of Dr. Nathan Tomasini)

The Division III Football Championship Committee uses a geographic proximity rule when seeding the playoff bracket. Cost prevention and missed class time have been cited as reasons for the rule’s implementation. Two sets of paired-samples t-tests compared the travel costs and travel distances of the first round 2002–2006 playoff competitions to re-seeded brackets not implementing the rule. Tests of travel cost were not statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. Tests of travel distance were not statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. The mean point differentials of each contest during the first three rounds of the playoffs from 2002 – 2006 were calculated. Comparisons made between the average margin of victory for the playoffs as a whole, unaffected brackets, and affected brackets found the average margin of victory steadily decreased each round for the affected brackets and decreased then increased for the unaffected and overall brackets.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Division III athletics is regarded by many as the most amateur and pure form of college sport. To some, it represents what college sport is ideally meant to be. At the Division III level, there are no scholarships awarded for athletic ability. There are no huge stadiums with luxury boxes. There is no motivation to play for anything but the love of the sport and the experience it adds to the student-athlete’s educational development. For football players at this level, the pinnacle of success in their sport is the Amos Alonzo Stagg Bowl which is the Division III football national championship. According to Robert Turner, Ph.D., a University of McMurray Board of Trustees member, the opportunity to achieve this goal and gain this experience is hampered in some ways by the National Collegiate Athletic Association’s (NCAA) rules for the Division III playoffs (personal communication, April 11, 2007). Specifically, the use of the NCAA’s geographic proximity rule when seeding teams for the playoffs can adversely affect the higher seeded teams who are located near each other as well as degrade the quality of the playoff competitions (Robert Turner, personal communication, April 11, 2007).

The 2006 NCAA Division III Football Championship Handbook states that once the representatives for the automatic-qualifying conferences pool, the independent institutions pool, and the at-large bid pool are determined, the following guidelines should be used in determining pairings and site selection:
“Once selected, teams will be grouped in clusters according to natural geographic proximity. Teams will then be paired according geographic proximity. A team may be moved to numerically balance the bracket, if geographic proximity is maintained. Teams should be paired and eligible sites should be selected according to geographic proximity (within 500 miles). Teams may be seeded on a regional basis using the regional selection criteria. However, geographic proximity takes precedence over seeding. Teams from the same conference do not have to play one another in the first round, as long as geographic proximity is maintained.
The highest-seeded team that meets all selection criteria will be selected as the host institution provided geographic proximity is maintained”.
(NCAA Division III Championships Handbook, 2006, p. 13)

In each of these guidelines, geographic proximity is the most important requirement. Over the past five seasons (2002 to 2006), there have been several instances where teams ranked in the top ten in the nation play each other in the first round of the playoffs. During the 2006 season, two teams who were members of the same conference and ranked in the top five nationally were forced to compete against each other in the first round (D3Football.com, 2006).

In each of the seasons from 2002 to 2006 there was at least one regional bracket affected by this rule (D3football.com, 2002; D3football.com, 2003; D3football.com, 2004; D3football.com, 2005; NCAAsports.com, 2006). In 2002, the rule forced Trinity University, then ranked second in their region and fourth nationally, to compete against the University of Mary Hardin-Baylor who was ranked third in the region and fifth nationally. In the 2006 season, the same scenario forced the University of Mary Hardin-Baylor, ranked second in their region and fourth nationally, and Hardin-Simmons University, ranked third in the same region and fifth nationally, to compete against each other in the first round of the playoffs (D3football.com). Forcing such highly ranked teams to play each other early in the playoffs may destroy these teams’ opportunity to progress as deeply into the playoffs as they possibly could and fully gain the athletic experience they earned (Keith McMillan, personal
communication, March 22, 2007). It may also degrade the quality of the Division III playoffs by allowing less talented teams into later rounds of the playoffs resulting in uncompetitive second and third round contests.

The NCAA Division III Football Committee has started to recognize the system needs to be changed. In their January 2007 meeting, the committee recommended to the Division III Championships Committee that measures be taken to allow the geographic proximity rule to be broken to protect the higher seeds (NCAA News, 2007). With forums for fan postings on sites such as D3football.com and D3sports.com, there are several outlets that allow those who care about the future of Division III football to voice their opinion on this issue. One such person, University of McMurray Board of Trustees member Robert Turner, Ph.D., is a strong opponent of the geographic proximity rule. He feels the rule lessens the quality of the playoffs and lessens student athlete participation and experience (Robert Turner, personal communication, April 11, 2007). Turner also believes the use of geographic location as a major factor in determining playoff team selection and bracket seeding often prevents deserving student-athletes from having the opportunity to participate in post-season play and can prevent highly seeded teams from going as deeply into the playoffs as they should (Robert Turner, personal communication April 11, 2007). Other critics, such as D3football.com, D3hoops.com, and D3baseball.com editor and publisher Pat Coleman and national columnist Keith McMillan, argue the current structure of the Division III playoffs often conflicts with the student-athletes gaining the collegiate experience they have earned (Keith McMillan & Pat Coleman, personal communication, March 22, 2007).

While the current playoff structure may seem unbalanced and unfair, there are reasons behind the NCAA’s use of this rule in Division III football as well as all non-
Football Bowl Subdivision championships. The Division III section of the NCAA website states, “Division III athletics encourages participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities available to student-athletes, placing primary emphasis on regional in-season and conference competition” (NCAA.org, 2007, para. #6). The philosophy of Division III athletics is on participation and in-season competition. The goal of the Division III Championships Committee is to provide opportunity and the current structure does just that. The NCAA is focused on Division III athletics providing regional competition. The current structure of the playoff system provides the opportunity for teams in close geographical proximity of each other to compete against each other.

These geographic proximity rules affect Division III football, but they also impact other Division III sports. In the 2007 Division III women’s basketball championship tournament, number one seeded Bowdoin College was forced to travel away for their sectional tournament because they were the farthest geographical outlier when compared to the other three teams in their sectional (Collins, 2007). The NCAA is obligated to pay for flights for teams traveling over 500 miles for playoff competition (Wayne Burrow, personal communication, March 22, 2007). Therefore, playing the sectional at one of the other team’s institutions allowed for there to be zero flights necessary and caused Bowdoin College to lose their well earned home court advantage (Collins, 2007). The NCAA implements and follows Bylaw 31.1.3.2.1 of the 2006-07 Division III manual which determines that when selecting sites for tournament games, the criteria are quality of the facility, geographic location of the city, seeding of the team and the attendance history and potential revenue. This rule gives the NCAA the ability to choose the playoff site that will produce the least amount of expenses and the most revenue. The reasoning for the rule is to avoid as many flights as
possible during the preliminary rounds. The use of the geographic proximity rule in football is another way of accomplishing this goal and saving revenue for the NCAA.

The current playoff system also signifies the traditional Division III schools’ desire for less emphasis on national championships. Swarthmore College’s former athletic director Robert E. Williams stated, “…The greatest fear is that the arms race… has the potential to pull athletics away from the central mission” (Suggs, 2003, para. #10). He also expressed his belief that having a growing number of colleges that are focused on national titles creates many problems for colleges similar to Swarthmore. Institutions putting a greater emphasis on national championships make conference-level competition insignificant and also create a divide between athletics and academics at Division III institutions (Malekoff, 2005).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the current Division III football playoff structure to determine what differences can be expected between a traditional playoff seeding process and Division III football’s playoff seeding process which involves using the geographic proximity rule. Differences between the two seeding methods will be examined in the areas of travel cost per game and miles traveled during the first rounds of the 2002 through 2006 seasons. The study will also examine the point differentials to examine for differences by round.

Research Questions

A. What differences are there between the mock first round Division III playoff brackets, which do not use the geographic proximity rule, and the actual first round Division III playoff brackets from the 2002-2006 seasons when examining travel cost per game?
B. What differences are there between the mock first round Division III playoff brackets, which do not use the geographic proximity rule, and the actual first round Division III playoff brackets from the 2002-2006 seasons when examining distance traveled?

C. Does Division III football’s use of the geographic proximity rule have any effect on the point differential during each round of the playoffs?

Statement of the Null Hypothesis

The following null hypotheses were examined:

A. There will be no difference in travel cost per game between the first round brackets when compared to the first rounds of the mock bracket.

B. There will be no difference in miles traveled between the first round brackets when compared to the first rounds of the mock bracket.

C. The geographic proximity rule has no effect on the point differential during each round of the NCAA Division III football playoffs.

Limitations

A. There could be new roads built or route changes since these games were played that would change the distance from one school to its competitor.

B. The cost of travel has increased during the five years this study is examining, which would change the difference in cost per mile during each Division III football playoff season.

C. NCAA travel could not provide the actual travel costs for each first round Division III football playoff game for the 2002-2006 seasons. The study was only provided the total ground and air transportation costs.
Delimitations

A. This study was delimited to Division III football teams who made the playoffs during the 2002 through 2006 seasons.

Assumptions

A. The information provided by the NCAA on the Division III first round playoff transportation costs is accurate.

B. The travel distance provided by the Mappoint.com program is accurate and has not changed since the Division III Football Committee ran the queries.

Definitions

**Division III:** The category of the NCAA consisting 437 institutions participating in non-scholarship, regional, student-athlete focused athletic competition. These institutions place highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students’ academic programs.

**Playoff Selection Process:** The Division III method of selecting which teams are to be chosen to participate in football post-season play.

**Pool A:** The group of 21 conferences with automatic bids to the Division III football playoffs. The conference champion from each of these conferences receives that conference’s automatic bid.

**Pool B:** The designation for schools that are apart of conferences without automatic bids and schools who are truly independent (not affiliated with any conference).

**Pool C:** The pool composed of teams receiving at-large bids. These schools are members of conferences with automatic bids, but did not win their conference’s automatic bid.
**At-large Bid:** Playoff seeds awarded to teams that are members of Pool A conferences but are not the conference champions.

**NCAA Division III Football Committee:** A committee of Division III leaders who make administrative decisions dealing with Division III football.

**Geographic Proximity Rule:** The seeding rule that states if two of the teams in the playoffs are within 500 miles of each other and can create a pairing where a flight can be avoided, those two teams are paired regardless of how they are seeded.

**Seeding:** The process of placing the playoff qualifying teams into the bracket according to their ranking against the rest of the field.

*Significance of the Study*

This study of the Division III playoff structure may provide an in depth examination of the effects of the geographic proximity rule on the Division III playoff system. The NCAA Division III Football Championship Committee has put forth the recommendation to adjust the use of this rule, but this study gives evidence on whether or not that change is necessary. This study could assist the committee in their decision making process because it provides concrete statistical information on cost, travel distance, and margin of victory during later rounds of the playoffs.
CHAPTER II
Review of Literature

This review of literature consists of an extensive examination of current literature related to Division III football and the geographic proximity rule. The first section examines the history of college football including the development of the sport of football, the establishment of the NCAA, and the division of the NCAA. The chapter also gives a description of each level and subdivision of the NCAA. Finally, the chapter examines the issues concerning the current state of Division III football and the effects of the geographic proximity rule on the Division III football playoffs.

History of College Football

In the fall of 1869, the first college football competition was played between Rutgers and Princeton (Watterson, 2000). American football was nothing more than a modified version of rugby at the time resembling a soccer game more than what is known as American football in 2007. The sport quickly gained popularity and support amongst the major collegiate institutions of the era. Harvard, Yale, and Pennsylvania are just a few of the schools that adopted the primitive and often extremely brutal sport (Crowley, 2006).

As the game evolved, it grew in popularity as well as gained more rules. The Intercollegiate Football Association (IFA) was formed in 1873 to bring some structure and rules to the ever growing sport (Crowley, 2006). The IFA consisted of four members: Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and Columbia. The organization changed some of the rules of
football in 1876, which helped the sport move further away from its soccer tendencies more so towards a form of rugby. For the most part, their efforts were ineffective because of the inability to agree on changes and the long-standing principle that home team rules would prevail. When Harvard and Columbia left the organization in the early 1890’s the IFA dismantled (Crowley, 2006).

Walter Camp, who is known as the “Father of American Football,” was a critical figure in the development of the game as it currently exists (Watterson, 2000). He helped to establish the downs system, five yard intervals on the field, and a more precise scoring system (Watterson, 2000). As his rules developed, teams began to figure out the most effective way to play the game with the new restrictions. Although the new rules gave structure and organization to the sport, the brutality escalated as new methods developed. Teams used tactics such as the bone-breaking wedge and gang tackling to plow through opponents (Byers, 1995). A hurdle play was introduced, which involved two players throwing a smaller player feet-first over the defensive line. These tactics often produced devastating injuries and sometimes were fatal. In the 1905 season, 18 boys were killed and 149 were seriously hurt playing college football. The President at the time, Theodore Roosevelt, had a strong affinity towards college football, but recognized that the brutality of the sport could not be allowed to continue (Watterson, 2000).

Birth of the NCAA

In October of 1905, President Roosevelt called representatives of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton to the White House to discuss the brutality and lack of sportsmanship in college football and how to eliminate it (Byers, 1995). This meeting led to one of the largest reforms in college football and the development of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the
United States (IAAUS). The IAAUS was established in 1906 as a means to put an end to the brutal and sometimes deadly violence plaguing college football by providing a governance structure for college sports. In 1910, the organization changed its name to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). Since its establishment as the main governing body of college sports, the organization has been instrumental to the evolution of the game of football as it is known it in 2007 (Crowley, 2006).

Before 1973, the NCAA governed college sports as one unified entity (Watterson, 2000). During this 67 year time span, the NCAA’s membership grew to a difficult to manage size of over 660 institutions. Each of these institutions varied in size, academic focus, and in their view of the role of collegiate sport in academia. Diversity of the institutions had grown to a point where financial and legislative decisions made for one group of institutions may adversely affect the other groups. For example, the NCAA’s proposal to limit the number of scholarships as a cost-cutting measure in 1971, would have allowed the medium and small programs to compete for some of the talented freshmen recruits available each year (Watterson, 2000). The larger, big-time programs, such as Texas and Southern Methodist University, could afford to bring in over forty freshmen each year, while small programs could not afford the cost. There was no limit on the number of recruits that could be brought in during a single year, therefore the smaller programs were often left to pick from what the big-time programs had not recruited (Crowley, 2006). The proposal met strong opposition from the larger programs even though it would have benefited the small and medium programs.

The inflation of the American economy, caused by the Vietnam War and huge government deficits, set into effect a ripple effect for college sports and helped to expand the
rift forming between the larger programs and the smaller ones (Watterson, 2000). Tuition raised an average of 30 percent between 1968 and 1972 causing many institutions to drop certain sports and scholarships for other sports. Some institutions were forced to cut sports such as track and swimming to handle the expenses caused by maintaining their other sports. In spite of inflation, the large programs generated large amounts of revenue from their football programs and could afford the changes, but the smaller institutions could not keep up and demanded cost-cutting measures (Watterson, 2000).

Scholarships and the Freshman Rule

Other major issues causing discord between the various institutions of the NCAA were the number of scholarships a team could award its players and the freshman rule, which prevented the larger, big time programs from allowing freshmen to play varsity football (Watterson, 2000). These larger programs felt cutting scholarships down from an unlimited number to 30 per year would reduce the size and scale of their programs. They also felt the freshman rule prevented their programs from immediately benefiting from the talented freshmen who could start immediately or at least gain a head start by scrimmaging against the varsity (Watterson, 2000). The rule had been in place since 1905 when three of the Ivies- Harvard, Yale, and Princeton- agreed not to play freshmen on varsity teams and it became apart of subsequent NCAA eligibility standards (Byers, 1995). The other side of the argument, mainly led by the Ivy Leagues and the NCAA, felt keeping freshmen ineligible allowed for the marginal or unprepared high school seniors to acclimate themselves to the college environment during their first year (Byers, 1995). These groups also believed it deterred coaches from looking for the “quick fix” by incessantly searching for the high school senior to fill in voids on their teams. In order to appease the larger state schools, the
NCAA Council repealed the freshman rule in 1972, but this did nothing to quell the much larger issue of further limiting scholarships. The larger state programs, such as the University of Texas, warned that if the big powers didn’t have their way, they would secede from the NCAA (Watterson, 2000).

Most of the other problems facing the NCAA membership were direct results of the sheer magnitude of the NCAA. With 664 members varying in enrollment size, athletic focus, institutional missions and level of play, the current structure of the NCAA could not reasonably handle all of their needs. The voting process of the NCAA at the time gave one vote to each member institution. Legislation benefiting the larger, big-time football programs was repeatedly voted against because they did not meet the needs of the smaller institutions, which easily made up the majority of the membership (Watterson, 2000). The opportunity to participate in post-season play was also scarce for all NCAA member institutions. The large number of schools prevented students from having fair access to post-season play opportunities, and also made it extremely difficult to maintain a level playing field. Programs with larger budgets were able to afford the necessities to improve their facilities, fund scholarships, and recruit the top athletes while the smaller programs struggled to stay afloat (Watterson, 2000).

The Separation into NCAA Divisions I, II, and III

In 1972, financial issues, size of the NCAA, and the continued pressure from the big time programs led to the discussion of reorganization of the NCAA (Watterson, 2000). The big time programs demanded the NCAA be divided into categories that would definitively reflect the size, scale, and focus of their football programs. NCAA proposed dividing the organization into two divisions, but that proposal failed because too many institutions felt
dividing the NCAA into two divisions did not adequately address the growing needs of the organization (Crowley, 2006).

In 1973, a reorganization of the NCAA was proposed again at the Association’s first Special Convention (Crowley, 2006). This time, the proposal recommended dividing the organization into three divisions based on the size, scale, and focus of their football programs. The Association approved the new proposal and this initial reorganization established the three major divisions of collegiate sports: Divisions I, II, and III. Out of the 664 NCAA institutions 237 would elect to be categorized as Division I, 194 decided to be part of Division II, and 233 opted for Division III (Crowley, 2006).

In 1978, Division I split into three subdivisions, Division I-A, I-AA, and I-AAA (NCAA.org, 2007i). The main distinction between I-A and I-AA is the level of football participation (NCAA.org, 2007i). Division I-A schools must meet several NCAA membership requirements. The 119 institutions (as of March of 2007) participating at the Division I-A level are major football programs that have to meet minimum attendance requirements (average 15,000 people in actual or paid attendance per home game) once in a rolling two-year period (NCAA.org, 2007h). They must also sponsor sixteen varsity sports including football with a minimum of six male/mixed sports and a minimum of eight all female sports. At least 60 percent of their football team’s competitions must be against other Division I-A teams with a minimum of four home contests against Division I-A teams. They may compete against one Division I-AA school as long as that program maintains an average of 90 percent of the maximum grant in aid over a rolling two-year period. Institutions in this subdivision must also provide an average of at least 90 percent of football maximum grants over a rolling two-year period, and annually provide a minimum of 200 athletics grants in aid.
or $4 million total (NCAA.org, 2007h). The national champion for football at this level is determined by the Bowl Championship Series (BCS). The BCS attempts to match up the top Division I-A teams for the bowl games that decide the national champion (Wills, 2005). When Division I was subdivided, members of the CFA and other big time football schools became members of Division I-A, which allowed them to adequately distinguish themselves from the rest of the NCAA division as the top-tier of college football (Watterson, 2000). It is the level of the NCAA that attracts the most attention from the public because visibility is the highest and the stakes are highest (Crowley, 2006).

Programs in Division I-AA have slightly less extensive football programs that have to meet a different set of criteria than the Division I-A programs. The athletic programs at this level must maintain at least seven male/mixed and at least seven female sports including two team sports per gender and not more than two emerging sports (NCAA.org, 2007h). There is not a minimum football attendance requirement at this level, but at least 50 percent of their games must be scheduled and played against other Division I teams. Financially, these programs must at least 50 percent of the maximum grants in fourteen sports or maintain an aggregate expenditure of $964,700 ($482,350 for women) on 38 full grants (19 being for women) exclusive of football and basketball (NCAA.org, 2007h). As of March of 2007, 116 schools made up this subdivision which determines its national champion by a 16 team playoff system (NCAA.org, 2007b) (NCAA, 2006c).

The third subdivision is I-AAA and its membership is composed of those Division I level institutions that do not participate in football (NCAA, 2007h). These programs must maintain seven male/mixed and seven female sports with at least 2 team sports per gender. Their financial aid requirements are the same as the Football Championships Subdivision.
This is the smallest subdivision with 91 schools categorized into this classification as March of 2007 (NCAA, 2007b).

In an effort to unify Division I and not falsely create division between the other NCAA sponsored sports, the labels for the Division I subdivisions has changed. In August of 2006, the NCAA Division I Board of directors approved a name change of Division I-A and I-AA (Brown, 2006). The name change went into effect December of 2006. Division I-A is now known as Football Bowl Subdivision and Division I-AA is now known as NCAA Football Championship Subdivision. The level that was known as Division I-AAA has no distinguishing label because these labels are only pertinent to Division I football. These labels clearly define the difference between levels of football competition within Division I athletics without allowing the distinction to be transferred to the other sports (Brown, 2006). Members felt the old nomenclature inaccurately “tiered” all sports within Division I when the old labels were only intended to reflect the level of football competition.

*History of Football Divisions*

Division I was designated as the home for programs featuring extensive sports sponsorship and scholarship numbers. These schools focused on national and regional recruitment and competition (Crowley, 2006). They also concentrated on establishing intra-division competition, increased attendance, and a self-sufficient financial structure (NCAA.org, 2007b). Discord remained at the Division I level even after the NCAA’s restructuring. The big-time Division I programs now demanded their own division (Watterson, 2000). They felt the number of schools in Division I was unworkable and there needed to be further distinction between the top football programs and the rest of the division. It quickly became apparent Division I needed further restructuring to accommodate
the variety of institutions within that division and subdivisions were the solution. In 1977, several of the big time college football institutions joined together to create the College Football Association to address this issue, as well as many others directly effecting their programs and the others like theirs (Dienhart & Huguenin, 1997).

*The College Football Association*

In 1977, the College Football Association was formed with the initial purpose of coordinating internal NCAA lobbying efforts on behalf of the big time college football programs (Dienhart & Huguenin, 1997). It was comprised of 62 of the largest college football programs in the country. Each institution was also a member of the NCAA. The organization intended to increase the demand for college football and to make sure the larger programs’ interests were always addressed (Siegfried & Burba, 2004). These interests included making sure their schools received a larger share of the revenues from the football television broadcasts (Siegfried & Burba, 2004).

There were several other troublesome matters that continued affecting the NCAA as a whole. The distribution of television wealth, disparate institutional size, decreasing commonality of the institutions’ missions, equitability of access to championships, and maintaining a level playing field were the most significant (Siegfried & Burba, 2004). Television revenue was one of the forefront issues the CFA was trying to resolve. The first live college football game was broadcast in 1938 to only six viewers. As households with televisions became more common, more and more football teams started to broadcast their games (Siegfried & Burba, 2004). Eventually, these broadcasts that were arranged by the individual institutions began to conflict with the other games being played at the same time. Several universities began to complain that their gate receipts were being lessened because of
the broadcasting of other live games in their region. In 1950, the NCAA commissioned the National Opinion Research Center to investigate the extent to which these broadcasts were directly affecting live attendance. In the 1951 convention, the NCAA took motions that led to the prohibition of games broadcasted into areas where other NCAA games were being held (Siegfried & Burba, 2004). In 1952, the NCAA signed a contract with NBC worth $1.14 million in which one game was shown per week and NBC had assurance no games would appear on a competitive network (Siegfried & Burba, 2004). The CFA tried for several years to gain control of their institutions’ broadcasting rights so they could gain a larger share of the revenue. Institutions regained control over their football broadcast rights in 1984 when the universities of Oklahoma and Georgia on behalf of the CFA, sued the NCAA alleging the collective sale of football broadcast rights constituted a violation of the Sherman Anti-trust act (Mawson & Bowler, 1989) (Siegfried & Burba, 2004). In *NCAA v. Board of Regents of the Univ. of Oklahoma & Univ. of Georgia Athletic Ass’n.* (1984), the Supreme Court ruled the NCAA was in violation of the Sherman Anti-trust Act and ended its control of college football television broadcasting rights (Siegfried & Burba, 2004).

Division II was established with a regional competition focus (Crowley, 2006). The institutions have fewer sports, major institutional funding, and their athlete recruitment is primarily in-state and regional. The Division II programs must sponsor five male/mixed sports and five female sports with at least two team sports for each sex (NCAA.org, 2007b). Programs at this level have the second option of providing four male/mixed sports and six female sports with two being team sports for each gender. Students at this level pay a significant portion of their educational costs. There are maximum financial aid awards in which the schools cannot exceed (NCAA, 2007h). These student athletes will pay for college
through a combination of scholarship, loans, grants and money earned from employment. Fifty percent of maximum equivalencies in four sports (at least two women’s), a minimum total expenditure of $250,000 with half going to women’s sports, or twenty full equivalency grants with at least half going to women’s sports must be awarded at the Division II level. The football teams are required to play at least fifty percent of their games against other Division II, Football Bowl Subdivision, or Football Championship institutions, but there are no attendance requirements at this level. As of March of 2007, Division II had 281 active member institutions (NCAA.org, 2007b).

Division III makes up the third tier of NCAA intercollegiate athletics. Institutions at this level must sponsor at least five male/mixed sports and five female sports including at least three team sports for each gender (NCAA.org, 2007h). There must also be at least one sport per gender per season. This sponsorship rule will change in August of 2010 to increase the number of sponsored sports to six male/mixed and six female teams for institutions with more than 1,000 students. The rule will remain the same for institutions with 1,000 students or less. Division III schools have no scheduling requirements, attendance requirements, or financial aid minimums (NCAA.org, 2007i). As of March of 2007, this level contained the most institutions with 420 active members (NCAA.org, 2007b).

**NCAA Governance Structure**

The NCAA is a voluntary organization through which all of its member institutions govern their athletic programs (NCAA.org, 2007a). It is structured to allow each division of the NCAA to determine rules and regulations for their particular division of sports while maintaining an overall goal of providing the best education and athletics participation for student-athletes. The governance structure consists of several legislative bodies all overseen
by the Executive Committee, which serves as the highest governing body of the NCAA (NCAA.org, 2007f). Its membership is composed of institutional chief executive officers (CEO’s) from member institutions who oversee association-wide issues. There are eight Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) members, two NCAA Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) members, and two Division I members each from the Division I Board of Directors. There are also two members from each the Division II Presidents Council and the Division III Presidents Council. The committee is completed with an ex officio NCAA President and the ex officio chairs of Division I, II, III Management Councils. They are responsible for making sure each division operates within the basic principles and policies of the NCAA (NCAA.org, 2007e).

Division I’s highest governing body is the Division I Board of Directors and is composed of 18 institutional CEO’s from Division I institutions which votes on all of the division’s legislation (NCAA.org, 2007e). All eleven FBS conferences have a permanent seat while seven FCS and Division I conference rotate seats. The next level down is the Division I Management Council. It is composed of forty-nine members comprised of athletic administrators, faculty athletics representatives, and institutional administrators who have a significant role in athletics (NCAA.org, 2007c). The Management Council oversees the rest of the division’s committees and cabinets.

Division II’s highest governing body is the Division II Presidents Council which is composed of one CEO per Division II region for every 22 institutions in that region (NCAA.org, 2007). Division II Management Council is composed of one administrator from each of the Division II multi-sport voting conferences, one administrator from an
independent institution and to “at-large” positions. The Management Council oversees the rest of the division’s committees and cabinets.

The Division III Presidents Council heads the governance structure for its division. Like Division II, this council is composed of 15 institutional CEO’s from colleges and universities throughout the division who set policy for the division (NCAA.org, 2007d). It oversees the Division III management council, which is composed of nineteen institutional CEO’s, athletics administrators, faculty athletics representatives, and student athletes.

*Division III*

The mission of NCAA Division III athletics is to enhance the overall academic experience of its athletes. Athletically based scholarships are not awarded to students participating in Division III sports, nor is there a focus on the experience of the spectators of the sporting events (NCAA.org, 2007d). The primary intent of Division III athletics is to enhance the experience of the participant and to provide opportunity for students to continue their passion for sports while maintaining a strong academic focus. One of the views of Division III is that it is doing things right. It is a “sanctuary for all that’s right with college athletics” because it is devoid of the pressures of big time sports and its philosophy preserves the amateur ideal of schools first, sports second (Ewers, 2003, p. 27). One point of view is the division maintains these amateur ideals because of the lack of athletic scholarships (Gerdy, 2006). His belief is that the athletic scholarship is the biggest barrier preventing athletes from getting a genuine educational opportunity and that is what truly separates Division III athletics from the other divisions (Gerdy, 2006). Gerdy (2006) expressed this by stating, “When students are playing for financial gain, whether that is in the form of scholarship or payment, everything takes a back seat to athletic performance” (p. B13). The
Division III governing philosophy also distinctly separates it from the other divisions. It is grounded in the precepts cherished by the NCAA’s founders in having no athletic grant-in-aid, no distinctions between student-athletes and other students, and sports programs conducted not for the general public but for the competitors and the campus community (Crowley, 2006).

Athletic departments within this division are staffed and funded just as any other department of the institution. The experience of each student-athlete is the main focus of the athletic events (NCAA.org, 2007d). The student-athlete experience is the most important concern to Division III athletics and primary emphasis of the athletic competitions is on regional and in-conference competition. This division of NCAA athletics also seeks to provide students the opportunity to be well rounded individuals by successfully integrating athletics into academic programs and student life. “Division III athletics contributes more, in some ways, to institutional culture and ethos than in Division I,” (p. A32) stated Robert Malekoff, who is a former coach and athletics director and is currently a professor of sports studies at Guilford College (Suggs, 2005). One point of view of those who are proponents of reform for Division I athletics propose that Division III athletics be a model for standards of the college and the academic philosophy of collegiate sports (Miller & Fennell, 2006).

The rapid growth of the number of NCAA Division III institutions has created financial challenges for the division. When the NCAA split into three divisions in 1977, 233 schools decided to become apart of Division III, comprising 35 percent of the Association (Crowley, 2006). As of March of 2007, there were 420 Division III school comprising 41 percent of the NCAA and ranging in enrollment size from 400 to 40,000 (Pennington, 2007). While the number of Division III member institutions has grown rapidly since the
establishment of the NCAA’s three-tiered structure, the funding for Division III athletics on
the part of the NCAA has not (Wolverton, 2006). During the 2006-07 academic year, NCAA
allocated 3.18 percent of its total budget to Division III which totaled $17,935,200. Division
I and II received 69.11 percent ($389,776,600) and 4.37 percent ($24,646,800) respectively
(NCAA.org, 2007g). A split at the Division III level may have financial implications for all
divisions of the NCAA (Wolverton, 2007). Ideas on how to fund the divide include raising
dues for all NCAA institutions, increasing dues only for those institutions that decide to join
the new division, or reallocating revenue from the current NCAA budget.

As this division of the NCAA has grown, the interpretation of the mission and
philosophy has varied. Many Division III institutions are aggressively pursuing national
championships and nationally prominent, winning athletic programs (Pennington, 2007).
Kevin McHugh, athletic director of the College of New Jersey, is a proponent of pursing
championships at the Division III level and wants his athletics program to pursue national
championships year after year (Pennington, 2007). When asked about his perspective he
stated, “Our fundamental philosophy is that kids who come here are not coming here because
of a scholarship. They’re coming here because of a love of the sport, and they want to play
to the best level possible” (Suggs, 2003, para. #15). During the January 2007 Division III
National Convention the division’s leadership recognized the movement towards reformation
and put together a committee to investigate models for a split. The chairman of the Division
III President’s Council, John Fry, recognized the need stating, “We must have a fundamental
change in the structure of the division. The tent has been stretched far enough” (Pennington,
2007, p. D1).
Division III institutions such as Williams College and its fellow New England Small Colleges Athletic Conference (NESCAC) members represent the traditional, purist form of Division III intercollegiate athletics. The conference was founded in 1977 out of the concern for the direction of sports in higher education (NESCAC.com, 2007). The purpose of this conference was and remains keeping a proper perspective on the role of sport in higher education. The conference has restrictive rules in place in regard to length of playing season, number of contests, and post-season opportunities (NESCAC.com, 2007). It is these rules that in 1993 prevented their undefeated, nationally second ranked women’s lacrosse team from being able to compete in the NCAA Division III Women’s Lacrosse Championship Tournament (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). Because the tournament was scheduled during exams, Williams University did not allow the team to enter the tournament. Despite petitions and letters from the players and assurance from each player’s professor that the exam times would be rescheduled, Williams’s President Harry Payne and the faculty committee on educational values refused to allow the team to ask the conference for a waiver to participate in the tournament (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). This conflict represents the division exists in Division III sports on the role in athletics. While institutions such as the NESCAC schools side with the traditionalist point of view, the University Athletic Association conference (UAA) and its member institutions believe student athletes should be given a chance to prove themselves against the best Division III has to offer (Brandeis.edu, 2004). It has been shown athletic participation at this level does not impair students’ academic performance and the graduation rates are higher for Division III student-athletes than those students who aren’t athletes (Robst & Keil, 2000).
The idea of a split is not appealing to all members of Division III, nor is there a clear cut way to split the division (Pennington, 2007). The most obvious division existed between the older, usually liberal-arts colleges and research universities and newer, public members of Division III because of their views on the role of sports in academia. The older institutions have held on to the founding principles, while the newer ones have taken a more progressive view of the role of intercollegiate athletics seeing a need for red-shirting and athletically related scholarships (Pennington, 2007). Robert E. Williams, retired athletic director after 16 years at Swarthmore, is on the side of the older, more traditional institutions. He feels, “Part of the membership is pushing for more, more, more, and more. There are groups of us who are feeling very strongly that we’re going too fast, trying to do too much. … The greatest fear is that the arms race – the expansion of championships and playing seasons and nontraditional season – has the potential to pull athletics away from the central mission” (Suggs, 2003, para. #11).

A divide between public and private institutions has developed because of the greater emphasis being put on recruiting and high-level sports by the public schools. This divide in ideology has become a possible method for subdividing Division III (Suggs, 2003). Many public institutions are putting more money into their athletic departments and being more aggressive about promoting high-level sports and recruiting. Even this idea for division does not work on in all cases. Many of the private schools with top, nationally ranked athletic programs are also amongst the top academic institutions, while there are only a handful of public schools ranked in the top of Division III athletics (Suggs, 2003).

A recent NCAA survey of Division III presidents demonstrated overwhelming support in staying together as one body as well as support for the Division III mission
(Suggs, 2003). There has also been very little support for how the divide would affect championships. Three-quarters of the survey respondents stated they were in favor of the current structure and half were in opposition having two sub-divisional national championships or abandoning national championships in favor of regional championships (Suggs, 2003).

During the January 2007 NCAA Convention, a working group was put together consisting of people from all three of the NCAA’s levels to examine the possibility of creating a fourth NCAA division or a Division III subdivision (Wolverton, 2007). The NCAA will vote on any expansion of Division III during the 2009 NCAA Convention.

**Division III Football Playoffs**

In December of 1973, the first NCAA Division III National Football Championship was played in the Amos Alonzo Stagg Bowl held in Phoenix City, Alabama. Wittenberg University became the first Division III national champions by defeating Juniata College 41-0 (NCAA, 1974). During the first two seasons, the Division III playoffs consisted of two semifinal games and a national championship. During the 1975 season, the number of playoff teams doubled to eight only to be expanded again to 16 teams during the 1985 season (D3football.com, 1985). The next expansion of the playoff brackets occurred in 1999 and it reached its current number of 32 during the 2005 football season (NCAA, 2006b). The Stagg Bowl, which is now held in Salem, Virginia and is considered to be the most genuine bowl game in college football, awaits the two teams that win their brackets (Weiner, 2002).

The thirty-two Division III football teams are selected for the playoffs according to the established Division III football championship selection process which consists of a three pool system (NCAA, 2006b). The first pool, Pool A, consists of twenty-one teams that are
conference champions of automatic-qualifying conferences. The second pool, Pool B, is composed of teams that are truly independent or not apart of automatic bid conferences. The number of berths assigned to Pool B is determined by dividing the number of institutions eligible in Pool B by the access ratio for Pool A (total number of institutions in conferences with automatic qualification divided by the number of Division III conferences with automatic qualification). The third and final pool, Pool C, is composed of teams that are apart of automatic-qualifying conferences but did not win their conference’s bid. Pool C bids are commonly known as “at large” bids. The number of berths allotted for Pool C is the number of playoff seeds remaining after pools A and B have been determined (NCAA, 2006b). Seven berths were allotted for Pool C during the 2006 season.

On the NCAA Division III website, several principles are stated following the Division III philosophy statement that support the objectives of that philosophy. One of which states colleges and universities in Division III will:

“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” (NCAA.org, 2007d, para. #2).

Providing opportunities to well deserving student-athletes is a key component of the mission of Division III athletics. When examining the structure Division III Football Championship in the championships handbook, the one rule that is repeatedly stressed is “geographic proximity takes precedence over seed when playing teams on the bracket” (Division III Football Championship Handbook, 2006, p.13). The implementation of the geographic
proximity rule can often hamper the appropriateness of the competitive opportunity the higher seeded teams during the playoffs by forcing them to compete against other highly seeded teams in the first round.

The NCAA Division III Football Championships Handbook determines geographic proximity to be the distance from one playoff institution to the other within 500 miles. Any playoff teams which are located within 500 miles of each other, and can prevent the NCAA from needing to purchase a flight will be seeded against each other in the first round of the playoffs (Wayne Burrow, personal communication, March 22, 2007). This rule takes precedence over seeding on a regional basis, teams from the same conference, and highest seeds (NCAA, 2007b). Dr. Ralph Turner, a Board of Trustees member at McMurray University who is conducting a study on the impact of football on McMurray University, is under the understanding that the Division III Football Committee is allowed to do this order to save money (personal communication, April 11, 2007). The result of this rule is an unbalanced playoff bracket where higher quality programs are often forced to eliminate each other in the opening rounds and lower quality programs will advance further than they would in a bracket created with normal seeding rules (Ralph Turner, personal communication, April 11, 2007). When these programs eventually meet in later rounds of the playoff, the lesser team is often no match for the higher quality program, therefore the playoffs have a heightened possibility of having second and possibly third round uncompetitive competitions (Ralph Turner, personal communication, April 11, 2007).

The Division III football playoff uses a single-elimination tournament system. The main principle when seeding for an elimination tournament is that the top two entries should meet in the final game, therefore the higher a seed, the closer it should come to the final
game before being eliminated (Byl, 2005). In order to accomplish this, the highest seed (the team with the highest relative ability) should play the lowest seed (the team with the lowest relative ability) and the second highest team should play the team with the second lowest team and so on and so forth. This playoff system is designed to adjust the balance to favor the teams that have performed the best during the regular season by awarding them the highest rankings and home field advantage (Byl, 2005; Sanderson, 2002).

A traditional playoff bracket is designed to give the seeding advantage to the teams that perform best during the regular season. With the current structure of the Division III playoff, higher seeded teams may lose the opportunity to host home games and not receive that advantage. In certain situations, highly seeded teams are forced to play even higher seeded teams. Texas teams are almost always highly ranked and seeded. Because of the geographic proximity rule, these teams are often matched up against each other. For instance, in the 2006 season regionally ranked No. 2 University of Mary Hardin-Baylor and regionally ranked No. 3 Hardin-Simmons University met in the first round (D3football.com, 2002). That was especially controversial because there were logical places for the other seeds to go (Keith McMillan, personal communication, March 22, 2007). For example, Washington & Lee University could have gone to Christopher Newport University and Carnegie Mellon and Washington & Jefferson College are both in Pittsburgh and could have competed against each other. Millsaps College is 491 miles from UMHB going by the NCAA's approved software for determining mileage, Microsoft MapPoint. Because the distance between Millsaps College and the University of Mary Hardin-Baylor is less than 500 miles, these two teams should have played against each other in the first round of the playoffs (Keith McMillan, personal communication, March 22, 2007). If this scenario had
been followed, the bracket would have been able to be seeded properly according to regional ranking (Ralph Turner, personal communication, April 11, 2007). In an appropriately seeded bracket, Hardin Simmons University would get to host at least one home game. They were forced to play an away game and were eliminated before getting to play a home game. Forcing this situation to occur can be detrimental to teams as they try to further develop their football programs. The programs lose the ability to recruit with the enticement of playing for a team that has hosted and possibly won a playoff game (Ralph Turner, personal communication, April 11, 2007).

The opposition to the continued use of the geographic proximity rule is a reflection of the shift in interpretation of the role of athletics at the Division III level. Division III athletics seeks to provide an opportunity for students to continue to play sports while maintaining a well-rounded academic environment and a balance between athletics and academics (NCAA.org, 2007d). Its focus is meant to be completely on participation. But with the recent shift to more of an emphasis on recruiting and pursuing national championships by many athletic programs, Division III sports is becoming less of a venue for those who want to participate and more so a venue for those who are selected to play (Malekoff, 2005). Even though this rule is one that was implemented by Division III institutions with the intent of providing more opportunity with a playoff while increasing cost as little as possible, the continual growth and change in philosophy interpretation by Division III institutions has caused the geographic proximity rule to become a hindrance to some institutions. In a letter written to the Division III championships committee chairs, conference commissioner Amy Carlton she stated: “Student-athletes… deserve to play in a postseason tournament whose bracket and subsequent site selection is determined by season-
long play (i.e., seeding) and not by cost-saving prompted by geography.” She continued with, “The message now being sent to a student-athlete seems to be cost-savings are more important than competing in a fairly bracketed tournament” (D3hoops.com, 2007).

Recently, the NCAA News reported the Division III Football Committee is recommending that the geographic proximity principle be broken to protect highly seeded teams (NCAA, 2007). If approved, the changes would take effect with the 2008 championship. The recommendation must be approved by the Division III Championships Committee in order for this to change to happen.

The literature discussed that directly addresses the Division III Football playoffs comes mainly from NCAA manuals, the NCAA website, the Chronicle of Higher Education, and personal communication from those directly involved with Division III sports. Although this division is not in the limelight like some Division I sports, it has far more institutions affected by its rules. With its 420 active institutions, 235 of which sponsor football (NCAA.org, 2007b), Division III athletics cannot be neglected from proper academic study. This study will help determine the effects of geographic proximity seeding on the Division III playoff. It compares the actual seeding of Division III football playoff brackets from the past five years to the reseeded brackets not using geographic proximity as a factor. It also examines the margin of victory from round to round for the playoffs from 2002-2006.
CHAPTER III

Methodology

This chapter will discuss how the research was done and where the information was obtained. It also discusses the statistical procedures used to examine travel cost, distance traveled, and margin of error trends.

Purpose

This study of the Division III playoff structure provides an in depth examination of the effects of the geographic proximity rule on the Division III playoff system. The NCAA Division III Football Championship Committee has put forth the recommendation to adjust the use of this rule, but this study gives evidence on whether or not that change is necessary.

Participants

The population of this study consisted of the football teams for Division III colleges and universities whom participated in the Division III playoffs from the 2002 season through the 2006 season. Those participants are listed, along with their participation years, in Appendix A.

Procedure

The data necessary to complete the study was collected from a number of reliable sources. Data was collected for each institution on their seeding, travel costs, travel distance, play-off wins and losses, as well as the point differential for each playoff game.

NCAASports.com and D3football.com, an internet source of almost all major news involving Division III football, provided the information on brackets and rankings (See Appendixes B
through F for complete brackets). The scores for each season were acquired from the
NCAA.org website. Data on the point differentials for each game was also gathered from the
site. The NCAA’s travel department provided the total travel costs the first round of each
playoff season (See Appendix G for complete cost information). The information provided
was broken down into ground travel and air travel. Travel distances between competing
institutions were calculated using the instrumentation utilized by the NCAA when
determining the distance from visiting institution to the host institution. The Division III
Football Committee uses Mappoint.com to determine the distance from one institution to the
other (Wayne Burrow, personal communication, March 28, 2007). This information was
gathered for each year’s first round competitions.

A second bracket was created for the first round of each playoff season. Within this
new, mock bracket, first round teams were reseeded according to the traditional playoff
seeding process (i.e. 1 vs. 8, 2 vs. 7, 3 vs. 6, and 4 vs. 5). This process was repeated for each
region’s first round bracket for each year (See Appendixes H through L for a complete listing
of the mock first round competitions and travel distances).

Because the NCAA could not provide the exact costs of travel for each competition,
the cost per game for the actual bracket had to be calculated from what the NCAA could
provide. The NCAA was able provide the total cost for ground and air travel for the first
round of each season. When comparing the total cost per game, the research was restricted to
the first round of the playoffs because this was the only round in which an accurate, properly
reseeded bracket could be created for each year. The travel cost per game for the original
brackets were calculated by dividing the total cost for first round travel provided by the
NCAA by the total mileage for each year’s first round competitions. By multiplying this
number, the average cost per mile, by each game’s travel mileage the cost per game was
determined. This procedure was conducted for the each season’s actual brackets and the
mock brackets for each season. Paired-samples t-tests were used to compare the averages
for each year’s actual first round travel and cost per game to the averages for the first round
brackets not using the geographic proximity rule.

The study also examined the margin of victory from round to round for the playoffs
from 2002-2006. The sectional brackets affected by the geographic proximity rule were
separated from the sectional brackets unaffected by the rule. Comparisons were made
between the average margin of victory for the playoffs as a whole, the unaffected brackets,
and the affected brackets. In a traditional bracket set up, the margin of victory should
theoretically decrease in the later rounds as the games increase in competitiveness. This test
determines if the current Division III playoff structure allows for the level of competitiveness
to increase during the later rounds.
CHAPTER IV

Presentation and Analysis of Data

This chapter presents the data that was received from the NCAA and D3football.com. It also provides the statistical processes used to analyze the data with the results of the analysis. This chapter has been divided into two sections. The first section is a description of the sample and the secondary sources used to collect the data. The second section is a review of the research questions and a description of the findings.

Participants and Sources

The participants of this study are the teams who made the Division III football playoffs during the 2002 through 2006 seasons. During the 2002, 2003, and 2004 seasons, 28 teams made the playoffs. During the 2005 and 2006 seasons, 32 teams made the playoffs. Seventy-three different institutions participated in the Division III playoffs during this five year time span. The teams and the years they were participants in the playoffs are listed in Appendix A. Melissa Montgomery from NCAA travel provided information on travel costs and the seedings and results from the 2006 playoff season were retrieved from NCAAsports.com. The travel costs provided by the NCAA are in Appendix G, and the information from the playoff bracket is shown in Appendix F. D3football.com provided the bracket seedings and scores from the 2002-2005 playoff seasons. Those brackets are in Appendixes B through E.
**Research Question 1**

What differences are there between the mock first round Division III playoff brackets, which do not use the geographic proximity rule, and the actual first round Division III playoff brackets from the 2002-2006 seasons when examining travel cost per game?

The first research question examined the total costs associated with travel for each of the twelve teams from the 2002-2004 seasons and the sixteen teams from the 2005 and 2006 seasons that traveled to their first round Division III football playoff games. For each season (2002-2006), the mean calculated travel cost for each first round playoff game was totaled and examined for differences with the calculated travel cost for each first round playoff game of that season’s mock bracket utilizing a paired-samples t-tests. The total travel cost for the mock bracket was calculated by determining the average cost per mile for the actual bracket, then multiplying that amount by the miles that would have been traveled for each competition had the brackets been seeded in the traditional method. The descriptive statistics for the total travel costs are presented in Table 4.1. One characteristic that should be observed is the wide variability of the values within brackets. For example, the 61511 mile difference between the minimum and maximum values of the 2006 season brackets A & B. This wide variability coupled with the low value of N can reduce the reliability of the statistical findings. When examining for differences of travel costs per game between the actual bracket and the mock brackets from 2002 - 2006, the analysis revealed no significant differences at the p < .05 level of significance. Table 4.2 demonstrates the results. These results signify that there is no statistically significant difference between the cost of travel in the A brackets, which use the geographic proximity rule, and the cost of travel in the B
brackets, which do not use the geographic proximity rule. While there were no significant
differences between the two groups during any of the years examined, the difference between
mean travel cost per game approached significance in 2005 (p = .057).

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002 Season Bracket A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7964</td>
<td>105633</td>
<td>21847</td>
<td>26760</td>
<td>7725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Season Bracket A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2707</td>
<td>15444</td>
<td>5369</td>
<td>3506</td>
<td>1012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Season Bracket A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3967</td>
<td>26769</td>
<td>9200</td>
<td>6072</td>
<td>1752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Season Bracket A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>33833</td>
<td>11138</td>
<td>7179</td>
<td>1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Season Bracket A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2281</td>
<td>54385</td>
<td>15044</td>
<td>14204</td>
<td>3551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Season Bracket B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6191</td>
<td>75158</td>
<td>24808</td>
<td>25351</td>
<td>7318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Season Bracket B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>24714</td>
<td>7497</td>
<td>7505</td>
<td>2166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Season Bracket B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3967</td>
<td>56256</td>
<td>14285</td>
<td>17058</td>
<td>4924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Season Bracket B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>65635</td>
<td>20972</td>
<td>22541</td>
<td>5635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Season Bracket B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2281</td>
<td>63792</td>
<td>16971</td>
<td>17467</td>
<td>4366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brackets</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Standard error mean</th>
<th>Minimum value</th>
<th>Maximum value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 Season A &amp; B</td>
<td>-2960.62</td>
<td>22284.0</td>
<td>6433.01</td>
<td>6191.68</td>
<td>75158.48</td>
<td>0.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 Season A &amp; B</td>
<td>-2127.94</td>
<td>6770.6</td>
<td>1954.51</td>
<td>1743.49</td>
<td>24714.82</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Season A &amp; B</td>
<td>-5084.74</td>
<td>12031.7</td>
<td>3473.24</td>
<td>3967.09</td>
<td>56256.82</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Season A &amp; B</td>
<td>-9834.00</td>
<td>19111.3</td>
<td>4777.81</td>
<td>2140.47</td>
<td>65635.23</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Season A &amp; B</td>
<td>-1927.12</td>
<td>13939.3</td>
<td>3484.83</td>
<td>2281.41</td>
<td>63792.02</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, two-tailed

Research Question 2

What differences are there between the mock first round Division III playoff brackets,
which do not use the geographic proximity rule, and the actual first round Division
III playoff brackets from the 2002-2006 seasons when examining distance traveled?
This second research question examined the actual mean miles traveled to their first round Division III football playoff games by the twelve teams from the 2002-2004 seasons and the sixteen teams from the 2005 and 2006 seasons. It examined the differences between the mean miles actually traveled by the away teams and the mean miles they would have had to travel in the traditionally seeded brackets. The descriptive statistics for the miles traveled is displayed in Table 4.3. The table shows these numbers also have high variability and low N values. Paired-samples t-tests were also used to examine this portion of the study. None of the differences between the five paired-samples t-tests were statistically significant at the p < .05 level of significance. Table 4.2 displays the results of the statistical tests. While there were no significant differences between the two groups during any of the years examined, the difference between mean miles traveled approached significance in 2005 (p = .058).

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N Value</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002 Season Bracket A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>3607.6</td>
<td>747.23</td>
<td>913.31</td>
<td>0.6373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Season Bracket A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>218.8</td>
<td>1938.2</td>
<td>627.96</td>
<td>457.56</td>
<td>0.6373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Season Bracket A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1835.4</td>
<td>608.48</td>
<td>427.57</td>
<td>0.6373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Season Bracket A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1928.4</td>
<td>624.70</td>
<td>416.43</td>
<td>0.5643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Season Bracket A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2360.0</td>
<td>643.62</td>
<td>614.60</td>
<td>0.5643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Season Bracket B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>297.2</td>
<td>3607.6</td>
<td>1190.78</td>
<td>1216.86</td>
<td>0.6373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Season Bracket B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>218.8</td>
<td>3101.6</td>
<td>940.85</td>
<td>941.86</td>
<td>0.6373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Season Bracket B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>3857.2</td>
<td>979.45</td>
<td>1169.58</td>
<td>0.6373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Season Bracket B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3741.0</td>
<td>1195.34</td>
<td>1284.79</td>
<td>0.5643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Season Bracket B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2768.2</td>
<td>736.46</td>
<td>757.98</td>
<td>0.5643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4

Paired-samples T-Test of Travel Distances Between Brackets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brackets</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Standard error mean</th>
<th>Minimum value</th>
<th>Maximum value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 Season A &amp; B</td>
<td>-443.55</td>
<td>950.60</td>
<td>274.41</td>
<td>272.2</td>
<td>3607.6</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 Season A &amp; B</td>
<td>-312.88</td>
<td>815.75</td>
<td>235.48</td>
<td>218.8</td>
<td>3101.6</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Season A &amp; B</td>
<td>-370.96</td>
<td>810.22</td>
<td>233.89</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>3857.2</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Season A &amp; B</td>
<td>-570.63</td>
<td>1112.25</td>
<td>278.06</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3741.0</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Season A &amp; B</td>
<td>-92.83</td>
<td>602.24</td>
<td>150.56</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2768.2</td>
<td>.547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, two-tailed

For this paired-sample t-test, the means for bracket A are actual means. They are the actual mean miles the teams traveled for their competitions. For bracket B, although the distance is not what the teams actually traveled, they are what the teams would have traveled if the brackets were seeded according to the traditional method. In running both sets of paired-samples t-tests, the data was treated as a sample of different possible combinations of teams that could have been selected for the playoffs.

Research Question 3

Does Division III football’s use of the geographic proximity rule have any effect on the point differential during each round of the playoffs?

This research question examined mean point differential of each contest during each round of the playoffs from 2002 – 2006. It is posited that with each playoff round the level of competition should increase and the point differential of the two teams competing should be closer than each previous round. Of the five rounds of the Division III football playoff, the first three rounds were chosen because the affect of the geographic proximity rule was eliminated by the fourth round for each of the five seasons examined. The sectional brackets affected by the geographic proximity rule were separated from the sectional brackets.
unaffected by the rule. Comparisons were made between the average margin of victory for
the playoffs as a whole, the unaffected brackets, and the affected brackets.

Overall, from 2002 – 2006, the average margin of victory decreased as the
competition went deeper into the playoffs (round 1 = 12.72 points per game, round 2 = 8.65
points per game, and round 3 = 11.1 points per game). When examining the margin of
victory for the brackets unaffected by the geographic proximity rule, the average margin of
victory decreased from 13.39 points per game during the first round to 7.58 points per game
in the second round and then increased to 11.75 points per game for the third round. The
affected brackets decreased in average margin of victory each round. The average point
margin went from 11.70 points per game in the first round to 10.25 points per game in the
second round before dropping drastically in the third round to 10.12 points per game. A
graph of the results is displayed below in Graph 4.1.

Graph 4.1
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter has been divided into three sections. The first section consists of the summary of the problem, procedures of the study, and results. The second section examines the conclusions and implications of the study through a discussion format. The third section presents recommendations for future study.

Participants

The population of this study consisted of the football teams for Division III colleges and universities whom participated in the Division III playoffs from the 2002 season through the 2006 season.

Research Question 1

What differences are there between the mock first round Division III playoff brackets, which do not use the geographic proximity rule, and the actual first round Division III playoff brackets from the 2002-2006 seasons when examining travel cost per game?

The cost per game was examined for each of the five playoff seasons from 2002 through 2006. The purpose of this portion of the study was to determine if there is a statistically significant difference in cost per game when comparing the playoff brackets using the geographic proximity rule (A brackets) to the brackets not using the rule (B brackets). Because the NCAA could not provide the exact costs of travel for each
competition, the cost per game for the A brackets is not exact. The NCAA did provide the total cost for ground and air travel for the first round of each season. This portion of the research was restricted to the first round of the playoffs because this was the only round in which an accurate, properly seeded bracket could be created for each year. The travel cost per game for the A brackets were calculated by determining the total cost for first round travel provided by the NCAA and dividing that by the total mileage for each year’s first round competitions. By multiplying this number, the average cost per mile, by each game’s travel mileage, the cost per game was determined. This procedure was conducted for the A brackets and the B brackets for each season.

Utilizing paired-samples t-tests, there was no significant difference between each year’s bracket A and bracket B (2002 – 2006) in travel cost at the p < .05 level of significance. Only the 2005 season neared statistical significance with p = 0.057 (two-tailed), with a difference of $160,187.87. One factor that may influence the 2005 season’s approaching statistical significance in travel cost per game is the large difference in totals between the actual bracket and the mock bracket. The total from the B brackets nearly doubled that of the A bracket. The 2005 A bracket’s total for travel cost increased from $175,364.15 to $335,552.02 in 2005’s B bracket, a 91 percent increase. For all five years, although there were no significant differences demonstrated, the total cost for the A brackets’ first round competitions for all five seasons is less than the total cost for the B brackets (2002-2006 A brackets = $766,028.66, 2002-2006 B brackets = $1,166,178.94, a difference of $400,150.28). During the 2002-2006 seasons, not using the geographic proximity rule would have cost the NCAA $400,150.28 more than what it actually cost for first round competition. That is an average of $5,884.56 per first round game.
This difference in cost may not be statistically significant, but the difference in cost may be noteworthy to the NCAA Division III Championships Committee. Division III President Robert E. Williams believes NCAA Division III sports are moving away from the central mission of athletics because of an arms race (Suggs, 2003). The continued push by many institutions for championship, regular season, and non-traditional season expansion are a few examples of what he feels are examples of an arms race. Continuing to have cost cutting measures in Division III championships supports the principles of Division III sports by focusing on conference competition and not over emphasizing post-season play.

While the attention to spending on championships at the Division III level is in following of the Division III principles, it may beg the question of when are the cost cutting measures becoming detrimental to athletic opportunity and participation. It also may warrant Division III American Southwest Conference commissioner Amy Carlton’s questioning of what messages are being sent to the Division III student-athletes when it seems cost-savings are more important than competing in a properly structured tournament (D3hoops.com, 2007).

Research Question 2

What differences are there between the mock first round Division III playoff brackets, which do not use the geographic proximity rule, and the actual first round Division III playoff brackets from the 2002-2006 seasons when examining distance traveled?

The results for this research question were similar to the results from research question one. When examining the difference in mean miles traveled between each year’s bracket A and bracket B, the analysis determined there were no significant differences at the p < 0.05 level. Again, only the 2005 season approached statistical significance with a p-
value of .058 (two-tailed) and a difference of 9,130.2 miles. One factor that may influence the 2005 season’s approaching statistical significance is the large difference in totals between the actual brackets and the mock brackets. The total from the B brackets nearly doubled that of the A bracket. The 2005 A bracket’s total travel distance increased from 9,995.2 miles to 19,125.4 miles in 2005’s B bracket, a 91 percent increase.

Although the differences are not statistically significant, the total mean travel distance for the A brackets’ first round competitions for all five seasons is less than the total mean travel distance for the B brackets (2002-2006 A brackets = 44,097.4 miles, 2002-2006 B brackets = 68,241.8 miles, a difference of 24,144.4 miles). From 2002-2006, teams would have had to travel 24,144.4 miles further if the brackets were seeded without use of the geographic proximity rule. That is an extra 355.06 miles per first round game.

The reason there is no statistically significant difference could have to do with the low value of N (N being the total number of games for the five year period, N = 68) and the wide variability of the values causing the test to have a low amount of statistical Power. Having a low statistical Power increases the possibility of making a Type II error or failing to reject the null when it is actually false (Trochim, 2006). Because the null in this research question and the previous research question is there will be no significant difference between the actual brackets and the brackets not using the geographic proximity rule, a Type II error would determine there is no significant difference when there actually is one. When examining the real-world numerical results from the total cost per game and miles traveled per game, the amounts seem large enough to influence a decision based on that information.

The actual difference in miles may also be of concern to the Division III Championships Committee because of the implications the added travel time has on missed
class time. Part of the Division III championship philosophy is to field the most competitive
teams possible while minimizing missed class time (NCAA, 2006a). The further teams have
to travel for games, the greater the potential for missed class time. Division III athletics
emphasizes athletics being a means of enhancing the overall academic experience of its
athletes, therefore any unnecessary intrusion upon the academic experience is prevented
(NCAA.org, 2007b). The geographic proximity rule allows the committee to have teams
located near each other compete against each other in the first round of the playoffs and
therefore prevent excessive loss of class time.

This being said, competitions between schools which are near 500 miles apart, such
as the one between Coe College and Concordia-Moorhead which was 481 miles apart (See
Appendix E), can cause more missed class time than many flights. That trip, taken during
the 2005 Division III playoff, took seven hours and forty-seven minutes one way according
to Mappoint.com (2007). A commercial flight with one layover would have taken
approximately three hours and thirty minutes according to Orbitz.com (2007). When
examining the mock brackets’ first round competitions, the longest flight would have been
between Linfield College and Capital College. That commercial flight, with a two hour and
thirty-five minute layover would have taken seven hours and forty minutes according to
Orbitz.com (2007). This information may demonstrate that although the distances may be
longer for competitions when the geographic proximity rule is not being used, the amount of
travel time may not increase.

Research Question 3

Does Division III football’s use of the geographic proximity rule have any effect on
the point differential during each round of the playoffs?
This research question examined mean point differential of each contest during each round of the playoffs from 2002 – 2006. It is posited that with each playoff round the level of competition should increase and the point differential of the two teams competing should be closer than each previous round. Because the brackets are designed to give an advantage to the highest rated teams by allowing them to face the lower rated teams, the level of competition should increase as the lower rated teams are eliminated. The effect of that increase in parity is a decrease in margin of victory as the playoff rounds progress.

In this portion of the study, round one, two, and three of the playoffs for all five seasons were separated and the average margin of victory was determined. Of the five rounds of the Division III football playoff, the first three rounds were chosen because the affect of the geographic proximity rule was eliminated by the fourth round for each of the five seasons examined. The sectional brackets affected by the geographic proximity rule were separated from the sectional brackets unaffected by the rule. Comparisons were made between the average margin of victory for the playoffs as a whole, the unaffected brackets, and the affected brackets.

Overall, from 2002 – 2006, the average margin of victory decreased as the competition went from round one (12.7206) to round two (8.65), but it increased in round three (11.1). This decrease in margin of victory from round one to round two follows the pattern that is expected of a traditional bracket seeding, but the increase to round three does not. In a traditional bracket, as the playoffs progress and the lower ranked teams are expected to be eliminated, the level of competitiveness is expected to increase and the average margin of victory is expected to decrease. In the Division III football examined for this study, the brackets overall do not follow this theory.
When examining the unaffected brackets (brackets utilized without the geographic proximity rule), the average margin of victory decreased from round one (13.39) to round two (7.58), but then increased from round two to round three (11.75). This was also unexpected due to the fact these brackets were correctly seeded, therefore they were expected to decrease in average margin of victory as the playoffs progressed. A reason for the increase in margin of victory from the second round to the third round could be the low N value, or number of teams in the brackets. There is a very low N value for the third round competitions (N = 12). With N being so low, multiple games with large margins of victory will greatly raise the average. Within these five seasons, there were five victories by the higher seeded team of twenty-nine or more points and only two games with a margin of victory in that range won by the lower seed. The margin of victory for all but two of the other games were 8 points or less. This fact seems to be what causes the unaffected bracket’s third round margin of victory to increase.

Because the geographic proximity rule causes the Division III playoff bracket to violate the rules of traditional bracket seeding, the brackets affected by the geographic proximity rule were not expected to decrease in margin of victory as the rounds progressed. However, the average margin of victory did decrease as the playoffs progressed for the affected brackets. The average margin of victory decreased from 11.70 in round one to 10.25 in round two then to 10.12 in round three. The N value for these affected brackets is extremely low for the third round competitions (N = 8). One of the arguments in favor of discontinuing the use of the geographic proximity rule is that it decreases the level of competitiveness of the second and third round games (Ralph Turner, personal communication, April 11, 2007). Although the findings in this study show slow decrease in
average margin of victory between rounds for the affected brackets, it does not show evidence to support that claim.

The results of this research show that, as a whole, the Division III football brackets do not follow the margin of victory trend that is theoretically expected when using the traditional seeding method. This being stated, Graph 4.1 does not give any evidence of that being caused by the affect of the geographic proximity rule on the brackets. The increase in margin of victory by the unaffected brackets increases the overall average margin of victory.

**Conclusion and Discussion**

The research in this study addressed three of the major issues pertaining to the Division III football playoffs structure. It examined the issue of cost of travel, miles traveled, and the playoff margin of victory between the first three rounds. When examining the cost and travel distance issues, there was no significant statistical evidence supporting the need to use the geographic proximity rule. While there was no significant statistical evidence supporting the need for the rule, there was a substantial increase in cost of over $80,030.06 per season associated with not using the rule. When the NCAA has a $564,000,000 budget (NCAA.org, 2007c), the extra $80,030.06 on average per year that it would cost to seed the Division III brackets correctly could be perceived as a miniscule cost. Per year, the increase in cost for the Division III football playoffs due to discontinuing the use of geographic proximity rule is .014 percent of the NCAA 2006-2007 budget (NCAA, 2007c). Although that amount is miniscule compared to the overall NCAA budget, the allocation of the NCAA budget to Division III is only $17,935, 200 (3.18 percent). This increase in cost would be .45 percent of the total 2006-2007 Division III budget. Minimizing costs has been identified as a reason for the implementation of the geographic proximity rule (D3hoops.com, 2007).
Although the statistics from this study state there is no statistical significance difference in cost per game when using the geographic proximity rule and not using it, there is a substantial monetary increase in cost of 52% over a five year time period associated with not using the geographic proximity rule. The cost associated with not using the rule could prove to be a major barrier in dropping the geographic proximity rule.

When the study examined the difference in travel between using the rule and not using it, it also found there to be no statistically significant difference in miles traveled between the two brackets. This being stated, there was an increase associated with the brackets not using the geographic proximity rule of 24,144.4 miles over the five year period this study investigated. Part of the Division III philosophy is not allowing sports to interfere with academics as much as possible. An increase in travel time can be associated with an increase in class time missed. The Division III Championships Committee would like to prevent this as much as possible, therefore completely discontinuing the use of the geographic proximity rule is not likely to be approved. The possibility of following the recommendation of the Division III Football Championships Committee would be a compromise that could reduce the increase in cost and miles traveled. Their recommendation is to be able to break the geographic proximity rule in order to protect the higher seeded team (NCAA, 2007).

The average margin of victory research question examined the Division III football playoff bracket structure’s affect on the level of competition in each round of the playoff. Because a traditional bracket is designed to eliminate the lower ranked teams earlier in the playoffs, the margin of victory should theoretically decrease as the playoffs continue into deeper rounds. The geographic proximity rule often causes higher ranked teams to be
matched against each other during the early rounds of the playoff, therefore changing the
trend in margin of victory. Although this idea worked in theory, the average margin of
victory decreased for the brackets affected by the geographic proximity rule and for the
overall brackets and does not provide evidence of any effect on the margin of victory for the
brackets using the geographic proximity rule.

The promotion of championships and post-season play is becoming more prominent
in Division III and is part of the motivation for the split (Suggs, 2003). As the division
continues to grow and different ideologies are brought forth by Division III administrators,
the desire to keep in place some of the restrictive but purposeful rules of Division III are
being challenged. Athletic directors and conferences are pushing students to not only excel
academically, but athletically also (Brandeis.edu, 2004). Part of that athletic pursuit of
excellence is winning conference championships and also winning national championships.
As more conferences and institutions allow their athletic programs to focus on playing for
national championships, the traditional rules that make that goal more difficult, like the
geographic proximity rule, will be challenged more and more often.

Recommendations

The research conducted in this study is just the beginning of what can be completed
on this topic. The geographic proximity rule is used in all Division III championships and
the effects of that rule on the other sports playoffs and championships should be investigated.
Because the NCAA could not provide all of the actual costs for each first round competition,
the Division III Championships Committee could put together a study that examines the
exact cost effects of using the geographic proximity rule. Further research should examine
the possibility of increasing the allotment of the NCAA budget that goes to Division III
championships. If more funds are allocated to the largest but least funded division of NCAA sports, the seemingly prohibitive cost of conducting these playoffs and championships without cost-cutting rules could be eliminated. While this study found no statistically significant differences in any of the areas most often cited for eliminating the geographic proximity rule, Division III must decide on whether or not eliminating the negative perception of unfairness in seeding by disregarding the rule is worth the additional costs required.
## Appendix A

### Divisions III Football Playoff Participants from the 2002-2006 Seasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Playoff Participation Season</th>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Playoff Participation Season</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albion College</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Millsaps College</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny College</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Monmouth College</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma College</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Montclair State University</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustana College</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Mount Union College</td>
<td>2002 2003 2004 2005 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora University</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Muhlenberg College</td>
<td>2002 2003 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin-Wallace College</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>North Central College</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel University</td>
<td>2003 2006</td>
<td>Occidental College</td>
<td>2004 2005 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital University</td>
<td>2005 2006</td>
<td>Saint John Fisher College</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Saint Johns University (MD)</td>
<td>2002 2003 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthage College</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Saint Norbert College</td>
<td>2003 2004 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central College</td>
<td>2003 2006</td>
<td>Salisbury University</td>
<td>2002 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Newport University</td>
<td>2002 2003 2004 2006</td>
<td>Shenandoah University</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cee College</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Simpson College</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia College ( Moorhead, MN)</td>
<td>2004 2005</td>
<td>The College of Wooster</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia University (WI)</td>
<td>2003 2006</td>
<td>Thiel College</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortland State University</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Trinity University (DC)</td>
<td>2002 2003 2004 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry College</td>
<td>2003 2004 2005 2006</td>
<td>Union College</td>
<td>2005 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Valley College</td>
<td>2004 2005</td>
<td>University of Mary Hardin-Baylor</td>
<td>2002 2004 2005 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson College</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts (Dartmouth)</td>
<td>2002 2003 2004 2005 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Texas Baptist University</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>University of Redlands</td>
<td>2002 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrum College</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin at La Crosse</td>
<td>2002 2003 2004 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover College</td>
<td>2002 2003</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin at Whitewater</td>
<td>2000 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardin-Simmons University</td>
<td>2004 2006</td>
<td>Wabash College</td>
<td>2002 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope College</td>
<td>2003 2006</td>
<td>Washington &amp; Lee University</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinios College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carroll University</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Wayne College</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Wesley College</td>
<td>2002 2003 2004 2005 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings’ College</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
<td>2002 2003 2004 2005 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest College</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Whitworth College</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland College</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Wilkes University</td>
<td>2005 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linfield College</td>
<td>2002 2003 2004 2005</td>
<td>Williams College</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycoming College</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Wittenberg College</td>
<td>2002 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacMurray College</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

2002 Division III Playoff Bracket

North Bracket

1. Mount Union 42
   Mount Union 45

2. Wheaton 42
   Wheaton 21

3. Union 42
   Wheaton 21

4. Alma 42
   Mount Union 57

5. Hamline 39
   Wittenberg 14

6. Wittenberg 34
   Wabash 16

7. MacMurray 3
   Wabash 21

8. WashU 34
   Mount Union 43

9. WashU 23
   Mount Union

West Bracket

10. Carleton 13
    at 1. Linfield 52

11. Augsburg 14
    273 0

12. St. John's 24
    371 8

13. Wartburg 45
    4. Wartburg 45

14. Carleton 21
    at 3. Coe 21

15. St. John's 21
    151 7

    4. King's 26

17. Bridgewater 32
    231 7

18. Bridgewater 19

East Bracket

1. Brown 12
   Brown 12

2. Wheaton 42
   Wheaton 21

3. Union 42
   Wheaton 21

4. Alma 42
   Mount Union 57

5. Hamline 39
   Wittenberg 14

6. Wittenberg 34
   Wabash 16

7. MacMurray 3
   Wabash 21

8. WashU 34
   Mount Union 43

9. WashU 23
   Mount Union

South Bracket

10. Carleton 13
    at 1. Linfield 52

11. Augsburg 14
    273 0

12. St. John's 24
    371 8

13. Wartburg 45
    4. Wartburg 45

14. Carleton 21
    at 3. Coe 21

15. St. John's 21
    151 7

    4. King's 26

17. Bridgewater 32
    231 7

18. Bridgewater 19

*Games affected by the geographic proximity rule
Appendix C

2003 Division III Playoff Bracket

(One Way)  Second Round Nov. 29  6  13  20  13  6  Second Round Nov. 29  (One Way)  First Round Nov. 22

North Bracket

5. Concordia (Wis.) 13
at Mt. Union 19
at UW-La Crosse 14

at 4. UW-La Crosse 52
Mount Union 66

6. Hanover 35
Baldwin-Wallace 12

at 3. Baldwin-Wallace 52
Wheaton 16

7. Hope 45
Wheaton 16

at 2. Wheaton 55

St John’s

East Bracket

at 1. Springfield 34

at 5. Ephrata 34

EP 10

at Ephrata 40
169.9

West Bracket

at 1. Springfield 34

at 5. Ephrata 34

EP 10

at Ephrata 40
169.9

South Bracket

*6. Muhlenberg 20
at Christopher Newport 3

at 2. Christopher Newport 330.5
Bridgewater 13

at 3. Bridgewater (Va.) 29
Bridgewater 26

*5. Wayne State 24
Bridgewater 26

at 4. East Texas Baptist 42
at 1. Lycoming 9

1. Lycoming 13

West Bracket

at 4. East Texas Baptist 42
at 1. Lycoming 9

1. St John’s 39

*games affected by geographic proximity rule
Appendix E

2005 Division III Playoff Bracket

West Bracket

North Bracket

Mount Union

*Games affected by geographic proximity rule
## Appendix F

### 2006 Division III Playoff Bracket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team 1</th>
<th>Team 2</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Team 3</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Team 4</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Team 5</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Team 6</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>33-0</td>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>17-0</td>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>26-0</td>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>14-0</td>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>32-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>7-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittenberg</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>14-1</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>13-2</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>12-3</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>11-4</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>10-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>14-1</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>13-2</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>12-3</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>11-4</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>10-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>15-1</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>14-2</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>13-3</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>12-4</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>11-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>18-1</td>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>17-2</td>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>16-3</td>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>15-4</td>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>14-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington &amp; Lee</td>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>42-0</td>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>41-1</td>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>40-2</td>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>39-3</td>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>38-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**West Bracket**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team 1</th>
<th>Team 2</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Team 3</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Team 4</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Team 5</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Team 6</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wesley</td>
<td>Wesley</td>
<td>33-7</td>
<td>Wesley</td>
<td>32-8</td>
<td>Wesley</td>
<td>31-9</td>
<td>Wesley</td>
<td>30-10</td>
<td>Wesley</td>
<td>29-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage Mill</td>
<td>Milligan</td>
<td>20-0</td>
<td>Milligan</td>
<td>19-1</td>
<td>Milligan</td>
<td>18-2</td>
<td>Milligan</td>
<td>17-3</td>
<td>Milligan</td>
<td>16-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hardin-Baylor</td>
<td>Mary Hardin-Baylor</td>
<td>10-9</td>
<td>Mary Hardin-Baylor</td>
<td>9-8</td>
<td>Mary Hardin-Baylor</td>
<td>8-7</td>
<td>Mary Hardin-Baylor</td>
<td>7-6</td>
<td>Mary Hardin-Baylor</td>
<td>6-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW-La Crosse</td>
<td>UW-La Crosse</td>
<td>49-48</td>
<td>UW-La Crosse</td>
<td>48-47</td>
<td>UW-La Crosse</td>
<td>47-46</td>
<td>UW-La Crosse</td>
<td>46-45</td>
<td>UW-La Crosse</td>
<td>45-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>14-13</td>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>13-12</td>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>12-11</td>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>11-10</td>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>10-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW-Whitewater</td>
<td>UW-Whitewater</td>
<td>11-10</td>
<td>UW-Whitewater</td>
<td>10-9</td>
<td>UW-Whitewater</td>
<td>9-8</td>
<td>UW-Whitewater</td>
<td>8-7</td>
<td>UW-Whitewater</td>
<td>7-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**East Bracket**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team 1</th>
<th>Team 2</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Team 3</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Team 4</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Team 5</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Team 6</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>33-0</td>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>17-0</td>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>26-0</td>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>14-0</td>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>32-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>7-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittenberg</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>14-1</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>13-2</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>12-3</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>11-4</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>10-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>14-1</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>13-2</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>12-3</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>11-4</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>10-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>15-1</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>14-2</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>13-3</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>12-4</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>11-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>18-1</td>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>17-2</td>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>16-3</td>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>15-4</td>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>14-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington &amp; Lee</td>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>42-0</td>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>41-1</td>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>40-2</td>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>39-3</td>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>38-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**North Bracket**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team 1</th>
<th>Team 2</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Team 3</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Team 4</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Team 5</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Team 6</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>33-0</td>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>17-0</td>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>26-0</td>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>14-0</td>
<td>Mount Union</td>
<td>32-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>7-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittenberg</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>14-1</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>13-2</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>12-3</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>11-4</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>10-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>14-1</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>13-2</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>12-3</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>11-4</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>10-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>15-1</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>14-2</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>13-3</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>12-4</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>11-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>18-1</td>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>17-2</td>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>16-3</td>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>15-4</td>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>14-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington &amp; Lee</td>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>42-0</td>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>41-1</td>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>40-2</td>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>39-3</td>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>38-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Division III Football Playoff First Round Travel Costs for the 2002-2006 Seasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>02-03</th>
<th>03-04</th>
<th>04-05</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Championship Year</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Teams</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Airfare For 1st Round</td>
<td>$147,526.52</td>
<td>$14,132.22</td>
<td>$59,261.50</td>
<td>$69,099.15</td>
<td>$162,905.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ground For 1st Round</td>
<td>$39,282.18</td>
<td>$45,914.54</td>
<td>$47,234.41</td>
<td>$106,265.00</td>
<td>$74,407.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Air includes commercial and charter
Total Ground includes ground allotment and mileage
### 2002 Division III Playoff Mock First Round Competitions and Travel Distances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Round Nov. 23</th>
<th>Miles Traveled (One Way)</th>
<th>Miles Traveled (One Way)</th>
<th>First Round Nov. 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Bracket</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>West Bracket</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wheaton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Lake Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 4. Alma</td>
<td>273.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Wartburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Wittenberg</td>
<td>148.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6. UW-La Crosse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MacMurray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Redlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 2. Wabash</td>
<td>194.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1803.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **East Bracket**    |                          |                          | **South Bracket**   |
| *at 2. Mass-Dartmouth|                          |                          | *7. Christopher Newport|
| *7. John Carroll    | 639.9                    |                          | *at 2. Trinity (Texas)|
| 5. Springfield      |                          |                          | 5. Salisbury        |
| at 4. Brockport State| 321.4                   |                          | 231.7              |

*games that would have affected by the geographic proximity rule
## 2003 Division III Playoff Mock First Round Competitions and Travel Distances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Round Nov. 22</th>
<th>Miles Traveled (One Way)</th>
<th>Miles Traveled (One Way)</th>
<th>First Round Nov. 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Bracket</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>East Bracket</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Concordia (Wis.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Curry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 4. UW-La Crosse</td>
<td>202.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>169.9 at 5. RPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hanover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Ithaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 2. Wheaton</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td>362.6 at 2. Montclair State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Bracket</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>West Bracket</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*7. Trinity (Texas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Redlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*at 2. Christopher Newport</td>
<td>1550.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>969.1 at 2. Linfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*6. Muhlenberg</td>
<td>268.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>134.2 *at 3. Wartburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5. Waynesburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*at 4. St. Norbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*at 4. East Texas Baptist</td>
<td>1114.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>282.2 *5. Bethel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*games that would have affected by the geographic proximity rule*
### Appendix J

#### 2004 Division III Playoff Mock First Round Competitions and Travel Distances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Round Nov. 20</th>
<th>Miles Traveled (One Way)</th>
<th>Miles Traveled (One Way)</th>
<th>First Round Nov. 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Bracket</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>South Bracket</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5. St. Norbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Mary Hardin-Baylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*at 4. Wartburg</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>303.4</td>
<td>at 4. Trinity (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*at 3. UW-La Crosse</td>
<td>1928.6</td>
<td>145.7</td>
<td>at 6. Christopher Newport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*7. Willamette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Bridgewater, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*at 2. Concordia-Moorhead</td>
<td>1501.9</td>
<td>198.2</td>
<td>at 2. Washington &amp; Jefferson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Bracket</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>North Bracket</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Shenandoah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Aurora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 2. Delaware Valley</td>
<td>166.4</td>
<td>368.7</td>
<td>at 2. Wooster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Muhlenberg</td>
<td>254.1</td>
<td>207.4</td>
<td>at 6. Alma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 4. Hobart</td>
<td>345.3</td>
<td>302.2</td>
<td>at 4. Wheaton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*games that would have affected by the geographic proximity rule
### 2005 Division III Playoff Mock First Round Competitions and Travel Distances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Round Nov. 19</th>
<th>Miles Traveled (One Way)</th>
<th>Miles Traveled (One Way)</th>
<th>First Round Nov. 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Bracket</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>North Bracket</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*at 1. Linfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at 1. Wabash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*8. Central</td>
<td>1870.5</td>
<td>231.9</td>
<td>8. Albion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4. Occidental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*at 5. Concordia-Moorhead</td>
<td>1788.1</td>
<td>336.5</td>
<td>at 4. North Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*at 3. St. John's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at 3. Augustana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*6. Coe</td>
<td>327.1</td>
<td>279.4</td>
<td>7. Lakeland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*at 2. UW-Whitewater</td>
<td>205.4</td>
<td>250.6</td>
<td>at 2. Mount Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Bracket</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>East Bracket</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*7. Ferrum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Ithaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*at 2. Thiel</td>
<td>418.2</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>at 2. Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*at 3. Mary Hardin-Baylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at 3. Rowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*6. Washington &amp; Jeff.</td>
<td>1330.9</td>
<td>129.9</td>
<td>6. Wilkes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5. Bridgewater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Cortland State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*at 4. Wesley</td>
<td>226.1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>at 4. Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*at 1. Trinity (Texas)</td>
<td>1629.6</td>
<td>372.1</td>
<td>at 1. Delaware Valley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*games that would have affected by the geographic proximity rule
Appendix L

2006 Division III Playoff Mock First Round Competitions and Travel Distances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Round Nov. 18</th>
<th>Miles Traveled (One Way)</th>
<th>Miles Traveled (One Way)</th>
<th>First Round Nov. 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Bracket</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>South Bracket</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 1. Mount Union</td>
<td>8. Hope</td>
<td>at 1. Wesley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>379.4</td>
<td>142.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 4. Wheaton</td>
<td>303.4</td>
<td>*5. Christopher Newport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*at 4. Carnegie Mellon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Concordia, Wis.</td>
<td>vs. 6. North Central</td>
<td>*at 3. Hardin-Simmons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>*6. Washington and Jefferson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>*at 2. Mary Hardin-Baylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Bracket</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>West Bracket</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>348.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at 3. St. John Fisher</td>
<td>at 2. Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Union</td>
<td>203.6</td>
<td>1180.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at 1. Wilkes</td>
<td>6. Occidental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>285.7</td>
<td>147.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at 1. Wilkes</td>
<td>at 4. UW-La Crosse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>132.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*games that would have affected by the geographic proximity rule*
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