



REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I MEN'S AND WOMEN'S TENNIS COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 9, 2024, VIDEOCONFERENCE

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative items.

- **Selection penalty for exceeding countable contest limits.**

- (1) Recommendation. Implement a penalty to a team at selection for exceeding the legislated countable contest limits. The proposed penalty is to remove the highest ITA-ranked win per match exceeding the limit and replace with its next best ranked win (for selection purposes only, not for seeding purposes); assess a \$2,500 fine per match exceeding the limit; suspension of the head coach for the first two rounds; and losing the opportunity to host the first two rounds if seeding earned that opportunity. There will be additional penalties for repeat offenders.
- (2) Effective date. 2024-25 academic year.
- (3) Rationale. The selection process for Division I tennis is a highly transparent and objective process based on the defined selection criteria – ITA rankings, head-to-head results, wins vs. in and results vs. common opponents. With mathematical and objective selection, coaches have figured out how to calculate the impact of a win or loss on their team's position in relation to selection.

During this recent season, a team was reported to have exceeded the legislated number of countable contests for Division I tennis. For Division I, this is an enforcement issue with no impact on selection that provides for a penalty to be carried out next season. In the other two divisions, there are statistical penalties that directly impact selection to stand as a deterrent. In the case of Division I tennis, a team can exceed the number of countable contests to gain an advantage at selection with no enforceable penalty for the season the advantage is gained.

The committee notes this is a serious issue that can negatively impact teams that play by the rules by potentially being left out of the field. The proposed penalty of removing the violating team's highest-ranked ITA win from its resume (replacing it with its next best ranked win) for selection purposes would be a serious deterrent with a measurable impact. A \$2,500 fine per match exceeding the maximum contest limit

and head coach suspension for the first two rounds would also demonstrate the seriousness of the infraction and place responsibility on the head coach.

The committee also emphasizes that the penalty should impact only the team that exceeded the limit and not the teams that played the offending team. For example, if the offending team had a final ITA ranking of 25 but the penalty of removing its highest-ranked win dropped its ranking to 32, the teams that played the offending team would still be credited with beating the number 25 ranked team. The committee also agreed that team seeding should not be impacted by this penalty since that would negatively impact other teams in the tournament; however, the penalty to lose the ability to host should deter teams already in the field from attempting to exceed the limits to earn the right to host.

The committee expects this process to continue operating through the enforcement staff, as it does in the other two divisions. An issue would need to be reported to the enforcement staff as usual, not to the championships staff. The penalty would be calculated manually by the ITA staff who manages the selection data and rankings once the enforcement staff has made a decision.

The challenge to this is timing of any such report before selection. The committee would implement an attestation at the start of each conference tournament for each head coach to confirm that they did not exceed the countable contest limit. Failure to complete the attestation would result in a \$500 fine.

Penalty Chart

	ITA Ranking - Remove top ranked win per match exceeding	Do not complete attestation - \$500 fine	Exceed countable contest limit - \$2,500 fine per match over limit	Head coach suspension - first two rounds	Not permitted to host - first two rounds
At-large not in contention for selection	X	X			
At-large removed from selection by	X	X	X		

ITA ranking penalty					
At-large still selected after ITA ranking penalty	X	X	X	X	X
Conference AQ		X	X	X	X

The chart above details the proscribed selection penalties for the infraction based on the team's selection status. The committee provided rationale for the penalty structure:

- A team not in contention for selection can be penalized for not completing the attestation and can have its ranking penalized for selection purposes. No further selection penalties would be needed since there is no impact on selection.
- A team that is removed from selection by applying the penalty on the ranking would be subject to the fines associated with the attestation and exceeding the countable limits. The committee supports the monetary penalty as an additional deterrent, to provide accountability to the head coach for exceeding the limit and to be consistent with penalties for those teams remaining in the field despite the ranking penalty. The most severe penalty is the ranking penalty leading to removal from selection, which should deter any team from trying to exceed the maximum contest limits to improve its ranking for selection.
- Those teams that are still in the field despite the ranking penalty are at-large and automatic qualifying teams. The additional penalties include a head coach suspension for the first two rounds and losing the ability to host the first two rounds. These penalties should be consistent regardless of at-large or automatic qualifying status. The committee supports these penalties as additional deterrents to a team trying to improve its chance to host and to provide accountability on the head coach for attempting to gain an unfair advantage at selection.
- An automatic qualifying team does not require a penalty on its ranking since it is already in the field via automatic qualification. However, the committee believes the other penalties should still be levied as a team would have already exceeded the limits before the conference tournament and should not be exempt from the penalties simply by obtaining its conference automatic qualifier spot. There are still advantages to be gained to improve its ranking for hosting, and all other consequences should stand as a strong deterrent to the undesired behavior.

Should any team be a repeat offender, the head coach will be suspended from the full tournament, fines will be doubled and the offending institution will not be permitted to host any round of the tournament in the offending year.

All typical enforcement penalties would still be available via the standard enforcement process.

(4) Estimated budget impact. None.

(5) Student-athlete impact. This will help deter a team from exceeding the countable contest limit to gain an advantage at selection or to host and, thus, ensuring the integrity of selection process.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Broadcast update.** NCAA staff provided an update on plans with ESPN+ and Cracked Racquets for the individual championships this fall. The committee emphasized the importance of having individual court streams available for all courts.
2. **Strategic plan.** The committee reviewed as information its strategic plan for the new committee members. The strategic plan is set for the next academic year at the preceding annual meeting.
3. **Competition Oversight Committee update.** The committee reviewed actions the Competition Oversight Committee took at its recent meetings related to the tennis committee's June annual meeting report. The COC approved the automatic qualifiers for the 2025 championships, tabled the request for seeding 50% of the bracket, and asked the tennis committee to revise the proposal to implement a penalty for exceeding countable contests at selection to consider the impact on student-athletes and team seeding along with reviewing for any other penalties to consider. The committee revised the recommendation with those considerations in mind. (See Action Item.)
4. **Fall individual championships.**
 - a. **Qualifiers and alternates.** The committee agreed to post the singles and doubles qualifiers on ncaa.org after the ITA All-American Championships and after the ITA Regional Championships.
 - b. **Evaluation.** The committee reviewed options for evaluation of the fall singles and doubles championships with the new committee members.
5. **Annual meeting follow-up items.**
 - a. **Committee responsibilities.** The committee reviewed and approved its responsibilities at the fall singles and doubles championships.

- b. Practice and prematch parameters.** The committee reviewed and made no changes to the practice and prematch parameters for the preliminary rounds and final site.
- 6. Other business.** The committee reviewed and approved the banquet menu for the fall singles and doubles championships at Baylor University.
- 7. Future meetings.** The committee will meet Sunday, Nov. 10, for the singles and doubles selection process.

Committee Chair: Chris Young, Oklahoma State University, Big 12 Conference
Staff Liaisons: John E. Bugner, Championships and Alliances
Jennifer Mervar, Championships and Alliances

NCAA Division I Men's and Women's Tennis Committee October 9, 2024, Videoconference	
Attendees:	
Vince Baldemor, University of Hawaii, Manoa.	
Jimmy Borendame, Middle Tennessee State University.	
Leslie Chang, University of the Pacific.	
Rochelle Houston, Florida A&M University.	
Courtney Nagle, University of Oregon.	
Peter Pilling, Columbia University-Barnard College.	
Alison Silverio, Notre Dame University.	
Taylor Stapleton, DePaul University.	
Paul Wardlaw, University of Denver.	
Jason Yaman, Southern Conference.	
Chris Young, Oklahoma State University.	
Absentees:	
George Husack, University of Alabama.	
Guests in Attendance:	
None.	
NCAA Staff Liaisons in Attendance:	
John E. Bugner, Championships and Alliances.	
Jennifer Mervar, Championships and Alliances.	
Other NCAA Staff Members in Attendance:	
Antonio Cannavaro, Kerstin Hunter, Kristen Jacob Smith.	