

Minutes

Sport Committee Conference Call Monday, September 26th

Vision: CIS is the destination of choice for Canadian student-athletes to pursue excellence in academics and athletics, CIS is recognized as one of the influential leaders in sport in Canada.

In attendance: Diane St-Denis (Chair), Tony Addona, Ken Schildroth, Ross Wilson, Pat Murray, Sheila-Ann Newton

Regrets: Al Scott, Kelly Matheson, Finance Committee Rep

1. Approval of the agenda

**Motion 1 (T. Addona/K. Schildroth)
To approve the agenda as amended.**

Carried

2. Completed Action Items following June Meeting:

D. St-Denis briefly reviewed the items that had been completed since the Sport Committee's last meeting in June.

a) Field Hockey Championship Format

Annex A

b) University of Alberta date change request – University of Alberta confirmed via email that they will not be requesting a date change for the 2006 University Cup.

c) Set 05-06 Committee meeting schedule – Sent via email.

Chair received a request to have the conference calls scheduled earlier in the day. S. Newton will review to determine if this can be accommodated by all.

d) Playing Regulations completed by end of July

3. Business Arising:

a) Officials fees

Annex B

Committee reviewed Annex B,

Motion 2 (R. Wilson/K. Schildroth)

Carried

That CIS increase the following officials fees for implementation in the 2006-07 season:

- Men's and Women's Basketball to \$110.00 plus \$38.50 for standby (amounts to a 10% increase).

- Football to \$126.50 and \$115.50 for Vanier Cup and \$115.50 and \$104.50 for the two Bowl games.

ACTION: S. Newton to prepare a schedule for additional increases over the next three years including another scheduled increase for Basketball in 2009.

b) Women's Ice Hockey Motion from QSSF

It was reported that in lieu of not receiving any feedback/recommendation from the Coaches Association this item will be placed on the agenda for the next Coaches Association meeting.

ACTION: S. Newton to ensure this item is placed on the Coaches Association meeting agenda.

c) COMSID to provide definitions for exhibition play, regular season, etc.

A meeting is scheduled for November and this item will be on the agenda.

ACTION: S. Newton to ensure this items is on the COMSID meeting agenda.

d) COMSID to provide recommendation re what teams would be required to provide to the Host.

COMSID is finalizing a document that will expand on the materials required from teams participating in a national championship. This information will be distributed to all SIDs by the end of September and will be included as an annex to the Championship Information Bulletin #2.

ACTION: S. Newton to ensure document is circulated to the Sport Committee before sending it out to the membership.

e) Women's Soccer Stats

It was reported that COMSID supported the recommendation. CIS has moved ahead with a pilot project for the 2005-06 season (men's and women's) with the intention for full implementation in 2006-07.

f) Women's Soccer to review the berth rotation – what happens to skipped years?

Will be on the agenda for the upcoming Coaches Association meeting.

ACTION: S. Newton to ensure this item is on the Coaches Association agenda.

3. Cross Country Travel Pool

Annex C

Committee reviewed Annex C. It was agreed that with so much time having passed since the original motion, the secondary motion prepared by Tom Huisman and Dan Henniger, the contre motion from the AUS and the closeness of the vote (AD's 10 for, 10 against) the motion should be sent back to the Coaches Association.

ACTION: S. Newton to request the Cross Country Coaches Association confirm the wording of their motion, taking into considering the information provided by Tom Huisman/Dan Hennigar, the AUS and the financial pictures provided by the CIS Office. Motion must clearly articulate their request and include how they would identify the 7th team.

4. Women's Basketball Proposal

It was reported that there has been no movement on the proposal. D. St-Denis to convene a conference call with the President of Coaches Association and CIS Sport Coordinator within the next few weeks.

ACTION: S. Newton to ensure a conference call is scheduled prior to October 30th.

5. Next Steps: October Conference Call

The next Sport Committee conference call was confirmed for Wednesday, October 12th at 1:30 pm EST. This call is to review the recommendation from the NABCC re the 8-team format for the Men's Basketball Championship.

At that time, Sport Committee will also address the women's soccer proposal coming forward from the University of Alberta.

The following Sport Committee conference call (December 2005) will deal with the National Championship Dates Report (follow-up on ad-hoc committee work). Will include recommendation from Men's Volleyball Coaches Association for a date change.

6. Any other items.

- a) Soccer Proposal from the University of Alberta

S. Newton referred to the proposal received from the 2005 Women's Soccer Championship host, the University of Alberta.

The committee felt they need more information prior to making a decision.

ACTION: S. Newton to request the University of Alberta resubmit a proposal taking into consideration the following items:

- a) must make every effort to use a consistent playing surface (all grass or all field turf or all astro turf)***
 - b) must clearly articulate why the televised football game can not be moved***
 - c) confirm they wish to change the championship format. If so this will result in initiating the notwithstanding policy. This requires an email vote to all soccer schools for approval.***
 - d) if recommending two different venues they must confirm the size/dimensions of each field.***
- New proposal will be forwarded to Sport Committee members for an email vote.***

ANNEX A

Following the approval of a 4-team, round robin championship for the 2005 CIS Women's Field Hockey Championship, the playing regulations were redrafted to accommodate the changes.

A copy of the updated regulations were distributed to Sport Committee for approval. All members supported the change. One comment was received questioning the match-up in Game 1 of the top seeded team against the 2nd highest seeded team. An attempt was made to discuss this with Beth Ali, as the writer of the updated regs, unfortunately due to the summer vacation period and the deadline for the final production of the regs we were unsuccessful.

The updated regs were posted on the CIS website by the end of July. Highlights of the new schedule are included below.

C.1 TEAMS

The participating teams shall be as follows:

- **Canada West Representative**
- **OUA Representative**
- **Host (University of British Columbia)**
- **1 assigned berth OUA**

(Refer to Policy 20.20.4.4 for more details.)

D.3 FORMULA AND FORMAT

Round Robin Format:

Friday	Game 1	1 vs. 2
	Game 2	3 vs. 4
	Game 3	1 vs. 4
	Game 4	2 vs. 3

Saturday	Game 5	1 vs. 3
	Game 6	2 vs. 4

Medal Round:

Sunday	Game 7	Bronze Medal
	Game 8	Gold Medal

D.5 SCHEDULE OR ORDER OF EVENTS

Thursday	10:00 am – 3:00 pm	Practise Time
	3:30 pm – 4:00 pm	Media Conference
	5:30 pm	Technical Meeting
	6:30 pm	Banquet

Friday	9:30 am	Game 1	1 vs. 2
	11:30 am	Game 2	3 vs. 4
	3:30 pm	Game 3	1 vs. 4

	5:30 pm	Game 4	2 vs. 3
Saturday	12:00 pm	Game 5	1 vs. 3
	2:00 pm	Game 6	2 vs. 4
Sunday	10:00 am	Game 7	Bronze Medal
	1:00 pm	Game 8	Gold Medal

LIGHTS

For any games that have the potential of going into darkness, the lights shall be turned on prior to the warm-up to the game.

ANNEX B

**Backgrounder – Officials Fees
Sport Committee
September 26, 2005**

Desired outcome: To provide additional information re officials fees per Regional Association and to approve the first set increases for implementation in the 2006-2007 season.

Details: The following two motions and action items were passed by Sport Committee.

(February 28, 2005) MOTION 9 (P. Murray/J. Jeffrey) Carried

That CIS will only consider the increase in officials fees every 3 years. Any increases can only be to the maximum of 10% at any one time. A schedule should be developed to ensure increases in officials fees do not happen all in one given year.

(June 2005) MOTION 25 (P. Murray/B. Mullaly) Carried

To adjust previous motion to read ...A request for an increase shall be no more than the average CPI rate over the last 3 years to a maximum of a 10% overall increase.

ACTION: S. Newton to conduct an audit with all the regional associations. DEADLINE: September 2005.

The attached document highlights information received from the Regional Associations.
An average of the last 3 years CPI rate would come to 2.27.

June 2003 – 2.6
June 2004 – 2.5
June 2005 – 1.7

Based on this information, below is a chart with the calculated increases:

Sport	Current Fee	CPI Increase	10% Increase	Last Increase	The Ask
Basketball	\$100/referee	\$102.30	\$110	Prior to 97-98	\$110 (06) to 120 (07)
	\$35/stand by	\$35.80	\$38.50		\$50
Football	\$115 – Vanier	\$117.60	\$126.50	97-98 by \$10	\$165
	\$105 – Vanier	\$107.38	\$115.50		\$135
	\$105 – Bowl	\$107.38	\$115.50		97-98 by \$5
Ice Hockey (M)	\$95 – Bowl	\$97.15	\$104.50	2004-05	\$110
	\$120/referee	\$122.72	\$132.00		None
Ice Hockey (W)	\$60/linesmen	\$61.36	\$66.00	Never	None
	\$70/referee	\$71.60	\$77.00		None
Rugby (W)	\$35/linesmen	\$35.80	\$38.50	Never	None
	\$40/referee	\$40.91	\$44.00		None
Soccer	\$20/touch judge	\$20.45	\$22.00	Prior to 97-98	None
	\$80/referee	\$81.81	\$88.00		None
	\$40/linesmen	\$40.91	\$44.00		None

Volleyball	\$60/match	\$61.36	\$66.00	2003-04 by\$10	Not from officials
Wrestling	\$65/official	\$66.47	\$71.50	Prior to 97-98	None

Recommendation#1:

That CIS increase the following officials fees for implementation in the 2006-07 season:

- Men's & Women's Basketball to \$110.00 plus \$38.50 for standby (amounts to a 10% increase)
- Football to \$126.50 and \$115.50 for Vanier and \$115.50 and \$104.50 for the two Bowl games.

Recommendation #2:

That CIS increase the following officials fees for implementation in the 2007-08 season:

- Basketball to \$120.00 plus \$50 for standby (10% increase) (as committed to in the MOU)

ANNEX C

Cross Country Travel Pool

Excerpt from June Sport Committee Meeting:

C. Cross Country Funding

A. Scott expressed concern from an AUS perspective that the travel pool for cross country is inequitable.

AUS has 5 compulsory meets then the conference championship. The problem is in addition to the top 3 individual qualifiers from each Regional Association championships OUA has 2 teams, CW gets 2 teams, QSSF gets 1 team and AUS gets 1. CW does not have a championship at all yet they get 2 teams to the championship. Compare this to what AUS is doing and this is unacceptable. Absolutely not in favour of the original motion from the Cross Country Coaches Association.

R. Wilson provided some additional comments. There was a time when CW had a championship but yet the CIS Championships were always held in the Eastern part of Canada so with that and the cost of sending teams we started to see a loss of teams in CW. Thus the change. Since the change CW has now increased in the number of teams participating in the sport of Cross Country.

ACTION: Sport Committee to revisit. Need to be clear what our current practice is in regards to travel pool. What would the financial ramifications be. DEADLINE: Fall Committee meeting.

We have attached for your review additional information on the subject including the motion from the coaches association, excerpts from Board minutes and correspondence from Al Scott.

Also enclosed are two documents from Tanya which provides with a break down of the math when adding a CW team. In the London example, the CIS had a surplus of 5,847.70 which was redirected to the operating budget. The addition of a CW would eliminate the surplus and see each team charged an extra \$15. In the Guelph example, the CIS had a surplus of 17,458.90 which was redirected to the operating budget. The addition of a CW would reduce the surplus to 13,259.00. Tanya confirmed that the operating budget does not include projections for surplus in the travel pool area.

I'm not sure how much more information you wish to have folks to make a decision on whether or not to add a seventh teams to the cross country funding formula - with the additional team coming from Ontario when the championships is held outside the corridor and from CanWest when the meet is held inside the corridor.

I have asked Sheila-Ann to ensure this item in placed on our September 26th conference call agenda.

Diane St-Denis
Vice President Sport

Original Motion November 2002

Motion 2 (B. Vigars, B. Fougner):

Seven teams be funded to the CIS championships with the additional team coming from Ontario when the championships is held outside the corridor and from CanWest when the meet is held inside the corridor.

Rationale

1. Prior to funding cuts to CIS Cross Country Championships after the 1994 season, traditionally 7 teams were funded per men and women plus the gold and silver medal runners from each of the respective conferences (Atlantic, Quebec, Ontario, Canada West). The 7 teams per sex were as follows: top 2 from Canada West, top 2 from Ontario, winner of Quebec championship, winner of Atlantic championship, and 1 Wild Card team from anywhere.

2. Over the last 7 CIS Championships (1995 to 2002 inclusive), there has always been a minimum of 3 teams from either Canada West or Ontario finish in the top 7 - again a testament to the depth of those conferences.

3. The motion addresses the fact that for almost any venue for the CIS Championships, Canada West teams must use air transportation whereas when the Championships are in the Montreal to Windsor corridor, most if not all Ontario teams can use much cheaper ground transportation.

4. Since historically the relative strengths of the two above conferences is fairly equal, it is reasonable to fund a 3rd team from Canada West when the CIS Championships are in the corridor and that a 3rd Ontario team would be funded when the venue is outside the corridor requiring air transportation.

Athletic Director	For - 10	Against - 10	Abstain - 1
Head Coach	For - 16	Against - 4	Abstain - 1

Board of Directors Meeting August 2003.

1. CROSS COUNTRY TRAVEL POOL FUNDING

S. Newton provided an overview of the process relative to the motion from the Cross Country Coaches Association to increase the number of athletes eligible to share in the travel pool (Annex 1).

T. Huisman noted that in light of the information and arguments stated by the AUS in response to the Coaches Association motion, the following revised motion is being proposed for the 2003 Championship that is to be hosted in Moncton:

That a 7th team be provided travel pool funding, and that the determination of which Conference receives this additional funding be determined by a 3-year rolling average of the final team standings at the CIS Championship. For 2003, this would be Canada West on the men's side and OUA on the women's side.

He also indicated that the Coaches Association will undertake a review of the above recommendation and the AUS proposal in conjunction with its 2003 annual meeting, with the intent of forwarding any other modifications to the 2004 CIS AGM.

The Board discussed the pros and cons of this proposal, the impact to other teams, and how it fits within the principles of the CIS Travel Pool Policy.

The Board agreed to defer consideration of the motion until the 2004-05 season. It was noted that the existing Travel Pool principles must be clarified, as they do not articulate the basis upon which the existing pool funds are distributed within each sport.

ACTION: T. Huisman to inform the Cross Country Coaches Association of the Board's decision.

ACTION: During the next review of the National Championship Principles, the distribution of travel pool funds within each sport should be considered.

ANNEX 1 (Backgrounder prepared for Board Call)

Desired Outcome: for the board to render a decision on the funding format for the Cross Country Championships.

Overview of the process of how the motion ended up before the Board today:

1. The following motion was circulated on the Cross Country Coaches Association vote sheet:
Motion 2 (B. Vigars, B. Fougner): Carried 16-2
Seven teams be funded to the CIS championships with the additional team coming from Ontario when the championships is held outside the corridor and from CanWest when the meet is held inside the corridor.
AD: For – 10, Against - 10 Abstain – 1, Head Coach For – 16, Against - 4 Abstain - 1
2. Program Committee received it and forwarded it to the Finance Committee at the end of the June 2003 AGM as a motion dealing with funding. At the June 2003 Program Committee meeting Al Scott expressed concern with the motion. Al was instructed to forward any concerns in writing to the Finance Committee Chair.
- 3 Through discussions with staff and the Finance Chair it was agreed that as this motion stems from the original National Championship Task Force principles (i.e. formats and berths for National Championships) that this was a Board of Directors issue.
- 4 Prior to the June 25th Board of Directors conference call, Al Scott circulated some documentation that had been supported by the AUS membership. It was decided that since this information had not yet been forwarded to all of the Cross Country coaches that any discussion by the Board should be delayed until the next scheduled conference call to allow for more time for the Coaches Association to react to Al's proposal.
- 5 As Sport Coordinator for Cross Country, Tom Huisman worked with the President of the Coaches Association to bring forward the following proposal to try and address the intent of the original motion as well as the concerns expressed by Al Scott.

CIS Cross-Country Travel Pool Proposal, prepared by Tom Huisman and Dan Hennigar

The following factors were considered by the CIS Cross-Country Coaches Association at its 2002 AGM in determining that one additional team (both men and women) should be included within the travel pool funding model:

- a historical review of the final individual athlete and team placings at the CIS Cross-Country Championship
- a review of the current travel pool funding model over the past two years since it was reinstated for the sport of cross-country
- the desire to further promote team participation
- to increase the competitiveness of the Championship by ensuring the best teams are in attendance at the Championship

In light of the information and arguments stated by the AUS in response to the Coaches Association motion, the following revised motion is being proposed for the 2003 Championship that is to be hosted in Moncton:

That a 7th team be provided travel pool funding, and that the determination of which Conference receives this additional funding be determined by a 3-year rolling average of the final team standings at the CIS Championship. For 2003, this would be Canada West on the men's side and OUA on the women's side.

Also, the Coaches Association will undertake a review of the above recommendation and the AUS proposal in conjunction with its 2003 annual meeting, with the intent of forwarding any other modifications to the 2004 CIS AGM.

Rationale: The above motion assists in the planning and budgeting for schools / teams by identifying in advance of the Championship, the number of teams from each Conference that will receive travel pool funding. Beyond Canada West, the majority of participating schools have indicated that they would not send a team to a National Championship hosted outside of its Regional boundaries if it did not qualify for travel pool funding.

Although the AUS proposal recommends that only the respective Conference Champions receive automatic travel pool funding, and the remaining funding be allocated on the basis of performance at the Championship, the above motion addresses the original intent of the Coaches Association to fund one additional team to the Championship. The Coaches Association will consider the AUS recommendation at its November 2003 AGM.

With respect to the three-year rolling average that has been chosen within the motion, this was selected for the following reasons:

- it recognizes and rewards consistency of depth within a Conference
- it recognizes the performance of the current pool of athletes, many of whom are still competing since the rolling average is less than the five years of eligibility available to student-athletes
- it reduces the effect of single year anomalies which may occur
- it avoids an over-emphasis on historical results (beyond three years) as most of the athletes who would have participated in the Championship beyond three years would no longer be competing

The 3-year rolling average of the final standings was calculated using two different methods, both of which produced the same final result as noted below:

Men's Cross Country		Women's Cross-Country	
Conference	3-year average number of Top 7's	Conference	3-year average number of Top 7's
CW	3.3	OUA	3.7
OUA	2.7	CW	2.3
QSSF	0.7	QSSF	0.7
AUS	0.3	AUS	0.3



Men's Cross Country		Women's Cross-Country	
Conference	3-year average placing	Conference	3-year average placing
CW 1	3.0	CW 1	1.3
CW 2	4.7	CW 2	4.0
CW 3	6.0	CW 3	8.7
OUA 1	1.0	OUA 1	1.7
OUA 2	2.7	OUA 2	3.7
OUA 3	7.3	OUA 3	5.7
QSSF 1	5.7	QSSF 1	5.3
QSSF 2	n/a	QSSF 2	n/a
AUS 1	9.3	AUS 1	9.3
AUS 2	n/a	AUS 2	n/a

As for the financial impact:

- the average travel cost of the 108 funded athletes to attend the 2002 Championship hosted in London Ontario was approximately \$360 / athlete
- the 2002 travel pool covered 100% of the funded teams / athletes travel costs
- spreading the average cost for 14 additional spots over 122 funded athletes would result in an average increase in cost of approximately \$40 per funded athlete, which would still place the cross-country travel pool funding model as one of the most effective (in terms of percentage of travel costs covered) of all CIS sports.

The above motion and rationale is being forwarded to all CIS Cross-Country schools for their consideration (straw vote sheet indicating "support" / "no support" from both the coach and athletic director), with the intent to provide a response from all institutions in time for the August 11, 2003 CIS Board of Director's meeting where this issue will be discussed.

To: Members of the CIS Finance Committee

From: Al Scott, Dalhousie University. Representing the AUS Cross Country Schools

Date: July 10, 2003

Re: CIS Cross Country Coaches Association Motion Regarding Travel Pool

On behalf of Dalhousie University and indeed the 7 Atlantic University Sport members who compete in the sport of Cross Country please consider this letter with reference to the following motion which advanced from the 2002 CIS Cross Country Coaches Association and subsequently to the vote sheet process:

"Seven teams be funded to the CIS Championships with the additional team coming from Ontario when the championships is held outside the corridor and from Canada West when the meet is held inside the corridor."

Rationale Provided For Motion:

1. Prior to funding cuts to CIS Cross Country Championships after the 1994 season, traditionally 7 teams were funded per men and women plus the gold and silver medal winners from each of the respective conferences (Atlantic, Quebec, Ontario, Canada West). The 7 teams per gender were as follows: top 2 from Canada West, top 2 from Ontario, winner of Quebec championship, winner of Atlantic championship, and one Wild Card team from anywhere.
2. Over the last 7 CIS Championships, there has always been a minimum of 3 teams from either Canada West or Ontario finish in the Top 7 - again a testament to the depth of those conferences.
3. The motion addresses the fact that for almost any venue for the CIS Championships, Canada West teams must use air transportation whereas when the Championships are in the Montreal to Windsor corridor, most if not all Ontario teams can use much cheaper ground transportation.
4. Since historically the relative strengths of the two above conferences is fairly equal, it is reasonable to fund a 3rd team from Canada West when the CIS Championships are in the corridor and that a 3rd Ontario team would be funded when the venue is outside the corridor requiring air transportation.

Vote Sheet Results (21/30 Schools Voting)

AD Vote: 10 In Favour, 10 Against, 1-Abstain

Coach Vote: 16 In Favour, 4 Against, 1-Abstain

Hold Your Breath

Before reading further, it is important to establish the fact that what follows may appear to be targeted towards one or two regional associations. This definitely not the case. Some of the commentary is quite simply an expression of philosophical difference with the current and proposed travel pool funding formula. Please consider this as you read further.

AUS Position On This Motion

Upon careful review of this motion, all AUS Cross Country Coaches and all AUS AD's do not support this motion. Many of us were already uncomfortable with the current travel pool funding formula that emanated from the National Championship Task Force just a couple of years ago. Our concerns:

1. The current travel pool formula for Cross Country is questionable from Atlantic University Sport's perspective with respect to:
 - a. the provision of guaranteed funding to a regional association that does not have a conference championship meet, in this case Canada West. The travel pool funding formulas do not provide this option in any other CIS sport. While the CIS Championship meet is unique in that it is an open meet for all CIS schools, there is definitely one line of thinking that consistent with other sports, guaranteed travel pool funding should go only to teams that have qualified though winning their conference's championship meet.
 - b. the provision of additional or supplementary team funding to **named** regional associations, Canada West and Ontario, based on "**strong historical performance**" at the CIS Championships. And again in the case of Canada West to a regional association without a conference championship meet.
2. The motion suggests provision of additional team funding (above the basis one funded team per regional association) based on strong historical performance by Canada West and Ontario. Our position is that these two regional association are already rewarded for their "strong historical performance" in the current travel pool

formula with assigned supplementary berths for the travel pool funding. Current travel pool funding provides funding for one QSSF team, one AUS team, two teams from Ontario and two teams from Canada West.

3. One of the points in the supplied rationale speaks only to the fact that Canada West must use air travel. Is or has this ever been a travel pool funding consideration? No mention is made of the air travel requirements by QSSF or AUS.

Alternative Cross Country Travel Pool Solution

It is one thing to be critical, yet another to present a reasonable alternative. Atlantic University Sport firmly believes that an opportunity exists, because of the unique nature of the “open” CIS Cross Country Championships, to adopt a travel pool formula that is fair and equitable to all four regional associations while also providing immediate rewards for the changing strengths of these regional associations. While the travel pool funding formula for some of our other CIS sports has moved away from a direct performance orientation, we have a model for Cross Country that we feel will stand the test of time and will annually reward the top performing teams while also honouring the tradition of guaranteed regional representation for conference champions.

The AUS Proposal For Travel Pool Funding For Cross Country

***Guaranteed funding for the conference championships teams from OUA, QSSF and AUS.**

***Guaranteed funding for the highest placing team in the CIS Championships from Canada West. Status quo, but this is a compromise in philosophy for AUS.**

***Team funding for the next two highest placing teams from any regional association at the current CIS Championship Meet, after the above allocations have been determined. This would be for the current 6 team travel funding model. Add a third next highest placing team for the 7 team model if adopted.**

What Does The AUS Proposal Achieve?

*It eliminates the perception that there are really only exists two regional associations from a performance perspective.

*It allows for, and immediately rewards changes in performance by the 4 regional associations. For example, this formula affords the opportunity to provide all of the supplementary team funding to a single conference if performance merits. Imagine how QSSF or AUS would feel if they had two teams place in the top five in the Championships, yet travel pool funding went to a lower placing non conference champion.

This would be the best performance based travel pool funding formula for our CIS sports. And Cross Country is to be complimented for never mentioning awarding non performance travel pool funding based on number of teams. Philosophically, the national championships are about performance.

Comparison: Current and AUS Proposal Applied to 2002 Travel Pool Funding

Men - 6 Team Travel Pool Funding Model

<u>Finish</u>	<u>Team</u>	<u>Current TP Funding</u>	<u>AUS TP Funding Proposal</u>
1	Guelph	As OUA Champion	As OUA Champion
2	Windsor	As Assigned Berth-OUA#2	As 1st Next Highest Placing Team
3	Alberta	As Highest Placing-CW	As Highest Placing CW
4	Manitoba	As Assigned Berth-CW#2	As 2nd Next Highest Placing Team
7	Dalhousie	As AUS Champion	As AUS Champion
11	McGill	As QSSF Champion	As QSSF Champion

Men - 7 Team Travel Pool Funding Model, Same as above but add

5	Saskatchewan	N/A	As 3rd Next Highest Placing Team
---	--------------	-----	--

Net Effect: Same teams funded via the travel pool, but supplementary team funding, after regional assignments, is 100% based on “current performance”. An important distinction, at least in terms of the perception regarding lack of regional bias.

Women - 6 Team Travel Pool Funding Model

1	Toronto	As OUA Champion	As OUA Champion
2	Manitoba	As Highest Placing-CW	As Highest Placing-CW
3	Victoria	As Assigned Berth-CW#2	As 1st Next Highest Placing Team
4	Waterloo	As Assigned Berth-OUA#2	As 2nd Next Highest Placing Team
8	McGill	As QSSF Champion	As QSSF Champion
11	STFX	As AUS Champion	As AUS Champion

Women - 7 Team Travel Pool Funding Model, Same as above but add

5	Queen's	N/A	As 3rd Next Highest Placing Team
---	---------	-----	--

Net Effect. Same and same comment as men's.

Can Travel Pool Funding Exceed 50% For One Regional Association?

There exists a regulation for CIS Championship tournament sports that one regional association cannot have more than 50% of the spaces available in the tournament. For example, a regional association cannot have more than 3 teams in the 6 team hockey championship format. Would this concept be extended to travel pool funding? Our proposal and hope is that it would not. Teams would "earn" travel pool funding with the potential to merit up to 4 of the 7 allocations, again based on performance.

Quick Review Of The Merits Of The AUS Proposal

- The proposal is in reality an extension of the current method used by Canada West to determine their travel pool funded teams using the existing formula
- 2. Fairness and equality to all regional associations
- 3. No need to adjust formula, on a year to year basis, as performance strengths of regional associations occur in the short and long term
- 4. Absence of semantic negative stigma attached to QSSF and AUS. Weak sister syndrome.
- 5. A great performance based model for the funding of the CIS Travel Pool. A performance based model that achieves what it states it is trying to achieve.

Current CIS Travel Pool Funding Formula

*the conference championship teams from AUS & QSSF (7 athletes for men and 7 for women)

*the top two teams from Ontario (assume that this is their top two championship teams, total 14 athletes for men and 14 for women) plus the top two teams from Canada West in the National Championship meet (14 men, 14 women)

*the top 3 individuals from each of the 4 RA not on an automatically qualify team as above.

*total funding is for 54 student athletes.

Number Of CIS Teams In Each Regional Association

The number of CIS registered teams this past season were: Canada West: M-6, W-6, Ontario: M-13, W-14, QSSF: M-3, W-3, AUS: M-6, W-7.

League Structure AUS. Four compulsory league meets plus the AUS Championship meet.

QSSF. Exhibition meets during the season plus the QSSF Championship meet.

Ontario. Exhibition meets during the season plus the OUA Championship meet.

Canada West. Exhibition meets during the season. No Canada West Championship meet.