



National Collegiate Dodgeball Association Nationals 2016

April 16-17, 2016

Hosted by Bowling Green State University Dodgeball Club

Captains' Meeting Itinerary

Introduction of Administration - Felix Perrone

Felix Perrone - League President
Mike McNicholas - League Treasurer
Zigmas Maloni - Director of Officiating (and Records)
Kevin Bailey - Chief of Content
Dylan Fettig - Director of League Expansion
Chris Hess - Director of Relations
Tyrell Smith - Director of Nationals 2016

Roll Call - Felix Perrone

Present Member Teams: Akron, BGSU, BW, CMU, DePaul, GVSU, JMU, Kent, MSU, Ohio, OSU, PSU, SVSU, Towson, UK, UWP, VCU, WKU
Non-present Members: SU, UMD, UNL, UNT, UVA

Saturday Results, Sunday's Seeding and Schedule - Tyrell Smith & Zigmas Maloni

Present Seedings and [Schedule](#)

Host Bids for Nationals 2017 - Tyrell Smith

Presentations/Bids from interested parties: UK, CMU

Summer Events:

May Day Dodgeball Rally - DePaul - A post season hat tournament tradition, alumni and current players welcome!

Kent Summer Dodgeball - Kent Officers

Administrative Announcements - Zigmas Maloni and Felix Perrone

Constitution to be updated September 1, 2016.
Treasury report filed at the end of each fiscal year.
League internship opportunities.
Communication and Marketing
Designing, Development, and Programming
Ambassadors for Director of League Expansion

League Growth - Dylan Fettig

Discuss teams interested in joining the league.
Efforts to promote the league.
Coordination with Member Teams

Nominations for NCDAA Officer Positions - Felix Perrone & Tyrell Smith

We will now accept nominations for these positions. Each team is to vote for one nominee per position. A Preferential Vote will take place between June 1st-5th. Elected officers will take their position starting at the beginning of the fiscal year (July 1st). Officers currently in position will stay on until August 1st as advisors.

- 5.4.4 Chief of Content - [See Constitution](#) for more full description

5.4.4.1 *Responsibilities* - The Chief of Content ("CoC") is responsible for the media presence of the Organization, both online and in print. Directs different teams consisting of multiple people.

5.4.4.2 *Term* - The CoC's term shall be for the duration of two fiscal years.

- 5.4.5 *Director of League Expansion* & 5.4.6 *Director of Relations (Combined Position Name TBD)*

5.4.5.1 *Responsibilities* - The Director of League Expansion ("DoLE") is responsible for acting as the liaison between prospective Member Teams and the Organization.

5.4.6.1 *Responsibilities* - The Director of Relations ("DoR") is responsible for building and maintaining relationships with the community, charitable organizations, and Alumni.

5.4.6.2 *Term* - The term shall be for the duration of two fiscal years.

Summer Events:

May Day Dodgeball Rally - DePaul - A post season hat tournament tradition, alumni and current players welcome!

Kent Summer Dodgeball - Kent Officers

Rankings/Standings Changes - Zigmars Maloni & Felix Perrone

- Champ System (NHL Points awards)
- Lieblich System (NCAA Rating Percentage Index)
- Perrone System (Quality Win Component)
- Gonzalez System (World Rugby Ratings Exchange based on ELO)
- NCDA Ranking Algorithm (the average placing Rank on the above four systems)

Rule Changes - Zigmars Maloni & Felix Perrone

Review and Consensus of Rule Changes Made at 2015 Meeting

- [3.3.3.3.1] Substitutions may be made by either team during either a Team Timeout or an Officials' Timeout.
- [3.3.3.3.3] Once a Player is substituted off the Court, they cannot be substituted back into play during that same Point.
- [3.3.4.3.3] Direct Catch Reset - A Direct Catch made by a Team with a Ten (10) Second Shot Clock will result in the Shot Clock resetting for the Catching Team. [3.3.4.6 Five Man Rule] or [3.1.4.3.4 Overtime Shot Clock]
- [3.3.4.5.2] Officials' Timeouts - If an Official calls an Officials' Timeout, both team's Shot Clock counts are reset to zero.

Newly Proposed Rules/Policies

- Listed on adjoining page.

Thanks & Accolades - Felix Perrone

2017 Proposed Changes for NCDA Rulebook

- DC: As of right now there is not a clear statement as to what the shot clock should be for the team that receives all the balls on a balls over.
 - *Editor's Note: This was discussed in the 2015 Captains' Meeting. It was not voted on last year for a rule change. This should be general practice though. If there is a shot clock violation, both teams' shot clocks shall be reset to '0'. It will be added to the 2017 Rulebook. This will be the practice at Nationals 2016.*
- AP: Rebound Catch - A Thrower makes a Direct Throw, hits a Target, then Catches the ball before it becomes dead. The Target is out and the one player comes in on a Direct Catch.
- This would be mostly on the rush due to close quarters. This would give teams more incentive to throw on the rush and get teammates back in that got caught or thrown out right away. It would also encourage teams to throw at a target (a real person) more than just throwing a step and lunge away throw to restart their shot clock. Again I just feel like it's another aspect of the game that would not drastically change it, but would add another element to game strategy.
- ZM: Even Numbers Sub Rule of 2.3.1.2 Low numbers – Players on the court at the start of a point must match the maximum capability of the opponent.
 - If a team can only bring 12 players to an event, their opponent must play 12 players in the point.
 - No change to Rosters: this opponent matches 12 players in the point but can keep 20 players on the Roster.
 - Maximum capability: A team must play the max amount of valid players they have. The team with the smaller roster can't play 13 if they still have a 17 player roster.
 - Meant to keep the game fair for teams that do not have the ability to bring a full 15 player roster, most often newly formed organizations, far flung teams, and less well off clubs.
- ZM: Similar to rule 3.1.4.2 Early Halftime, if a point has been scored with less than 4:00 minutes remaining in the second half, Overtime [3.1.4.3] will go into effect.
 - Officially and currently, teams must play out this remaining time and I always set up for the next regular point. However, I see this overridden a lot, so let's go with the more natural thing?
- DF: Clean Blocking: Thrown balls are live off of an opponent's blocking ball.
 - All other rules would remain the same (ie thrown balls only have the potential to eliminate one player, team catches stay the same, etc.)
 - RATIONALE:
 - There are many reasons this rule needs to change.
 - Refing becomes much easier with this rule. If a player is ever hit with a ball before it hits the ground they are out and traps no longer exist since you can catch with a held ball.
 - Blocking as a skill becomes more valuable. It takes more concentration to block a ball away from yourself, and other teammates, than it does to just get a piece of the ball.
 - Speed of the game will be increased. Since a higher skill of blocking is required, more people will be getting out and games won't be finishing 1-0 like they have been.
- WP: NOTE: This is a proposition to change the same rule that Dylan Fettig has proposed above, only slightly different.
 - Thrown balls are live off an opponent's blocking ball. However, only the initial target who blocks the ball has the potential to be called out (Besides the original thrower if it is ruled a catch).
 - Should the blocked ball deflect off the initial blocker and hit the ground, any other surface, ball, or player and not be caught by a teammate, the initial blocker is out.
 - Should the ball be blocked by the initial blocker (touching the initial blocker or not), then subsequently caught by the initial blocker in any manner without the blocked ball touching any other surface, ball, or player, or caught simultaneously using their blocking ball(s), the catching team is awarded a catch and the original thrower is out.
 - Should the blocked ball deflect off the initial blocker or not, and is caught by a teammate, the

- catching team is awarded a team catch.
 - Should the blocked ball deflect off the initial blocker, hits a teammate and they FAIL to catch it, the initial blocker is still out.
 - Should the next thing the blocked ball hit be a teammate of the initial blocker but it is not caught, nobody is out, the ball is simply dead. (In this scenario, the ball is cleanly blocked into a teammate, without touching the player who originally blocked the ball)
 - RATIONALE:
 - I feel as though Dylan's proposition is too broad, and can be left up too much for interpretation, as well as still a little difficult to referee and leaves room for a lot of potential arguing.
 - Furthermore, I do not think many people would be a fan of a pinball scenario of your teammate blocking it into you, and you being subsequently called out, potentially without having a chance to react.
 - With those things said, this rule still accomplishes the main goals of the original proposition, which are to speed up the game, increase the value of blocking, and make the game easier to officiate.
 - And to clarify what we mean by "speed up the game", we mean that people will not be as difficult to hit out when they have a ball in their hand, so people will get out more frequently, and scores will (on average) be higher than they previously were. (Aka you'll actually have a chance to get people like Kevin Bailey out when he has a ball in his hand)
- ZB: Change the definition of the Legitimate Attempt Zone (LAZ).
 - From: "a step and a lunge in any of the 3 dimensions."
 - To: "The current catching player's maximum fullbody reach at the time of the ball's arrival." ...essentially, a circle around the catching player with a radius of roughly 3 feet.
 - Reason:
 - There have been many around the league proposing new rules to speed up the pace of the game. Nothing slows the game down more than when both teams continuously solo throw just to kill the clock. This rule would require stronger and more precise throws or else there would be an opportunity for a catch by the opposing team.
 - This rule would present more opportunities for catchers and throwers to shine, resulting in a more enjoyable game to play and watch. There is also a likely possibility that this rule can cause games to have a higher point total on average. We could see exciting games ending in a score of 5-4 rather than 1-0.
- KB: Attack line needs to decrease from 30 ft. to 25 ft.
 - In the current NCDA ruleset, the throwline is designated as 30 ft. from the back line: I propose that this be changed to 25 ft.
 - First off, the most obvious reason: speed of the game. I have played in dodgeball formats where the throw line is closer than the NCDA (as low as 20 ft), and let me tell you, it makes games much faster. Having the throw line move up 5 ft. will generate higher thrown out percentages, causing points to be won at a faster rate. People would much rather see a 5-4 game than a 1-0 game. If the throw line is closer, more people will get hit, and points will be quicker.
 - On top of this, the shorter throw line will also decrease stall ball. I have noticed first hand that teams like to throw one ball per shot clock, and throw it where it is not catchable at all, then they back up and wait for their opponents to make a throw. This style of play is very common in close matches when a team is up by one. With no need to score anymore, they can just sit on their lead and stall the rest of the game.
 - With a closer throw line, that is less likely to occur. The reason for this is because teams can't rely on just staying in anymore. The throw line is 5 ft. closer, so they are far more likely to get hit by throws. This will force teams to continue to play to win rather than to stall, and cause them to make purposeful throws instead of stall ball throws that are always out of reach.
 - In Elite Dodgeball, the throw line is 20 ft. for Open Division and 25 for Pinch Division. In this style of dodgeball, you almost never see a throw that isn't meant to hit someone. In other words,

there is basically never a throw that is intended just to reset the shot-clock and force the other team to throw.

- I think what it all boils down to is that with a closer throw line, the throwing team is at an advantage. The offensive team has the advantage. In our current NCDA, if your team just stays back and plays conservative, that is all they have to do, because from 30 ft. away they can dodge or catch most throws. The defensive team holds the advantage in our current NCDA ruleset.
 - I'm not saying that I want to take away the catching in the game of dodgeball. In fact, in Elite Dodgeball, skilled catchers are even more valuable because catching is tougher from closer quarters. This rule change will benefit strong throwers, but it will also make good catchers more valuable. As a whole it will just make dodgeball games more dodgeball, and less stall-ball.
 - I'll conclude by saying this: Our league right now is in a unique situation. When top level teams play each other, the games tend to be slower and lower scoring. This is the exact opposite of what it should be. Big time matchups cause teams to play with more strategy that will help them win. That strategy too often is to stall. The rule change that will have the most positive effect on the NCDA and will eliminate stall-ball is to change the attack line distance from 30 to 25 ft. from the baseline.
- JS: Roster size down from 20 to 13, teams from 15v15 to 10v10. Legitimate JV league.
 - RATIONALE:
 - Decreases game times, friendly to both large and small teams.
 - When there are 10 people on the court the game is simply going to take less time than 15.
 - Larger teams would be able to travel with a JV team, total of 26 players max which is more than what we have now. This way freshman can get a chance to play at tournaments and have incentive to try to make it to the Varsity team. Small teams would need to bring 10 players to field an entire team and not play at any disadvantage. Let's say 8 was the minimum, still easier for teams to come to tournaments. Newer teams would it be as discouraged from going to tournaments because instead of OU facing GVSU they could face the JV GVSU team and they might have a chance.
 - OTHER OUTCOMES:
 - There are certain other things that would probably would/need to come along with this change:
 - CONSTANT 10 SECOND SHOT CLOCK
 - With the shot clock staying the same all game it would be easier for new guys to shot clock in tournaments. We could also move to a real 15 second shot clock using the scoreboards, when the buzzer goes off it is a shot clock violation if a throw is made all that you need to do as a shot clock is press a button. This would remove the humor error in counting and make the shot clock consistent. Personally one of the things that makes me the maddest is when 2 shot clocks count differently so this could be moving to solve that.
 - RANKINGS: Somehow integrating JV teams into nationals/rankings. (Probably a separate set of rankings and bracket at nationals)
 - DOWNSIZING OF COURT: Running up and down the courts might be too much with smaller team sizes so we may need to decrease the size of the court in order to keep the game fun and interesting
 - SHORTER GAME TIMES: Instead of 50 min games, maybe just 30 min into 2 15-minute halves.
 - MW: Rule proposal: 12 balls instead of 10.
 - Rationale: more incentive to make throws, less on ball control. We have seen the game pace go down as talent increases.
 - CA: Extend the half time length to 10 minutes, run the clock through balls over, make a strict 1 minute break between each point with the clock running through that as well. For the half time extension to 10 minutes, this gives teams more of a time to rest, grab some water, tape fingers, etc. I know that a lot of

proposals have been made to shorten game times but the next 2 adjustments will help that. A lot of time is wasted with random things happening between points (team discussion, grabbing water, peeing, etc.). Also, it shouldn't take 2 referees and 2 timekeepers more than 1 minute to place 10 balls in their respective locations on the court with the help of some team members. Through team discussion may be cut, the extra 5 minutes during half time could allow for more team discussion for a strong second half.

- With balls over, a lot of slacking and playing around again wastes time. I've seen it take 2 minutes or so for teams to get 10 balls on one side and to finally start. For example, one of the longest games I was a part of was the Kent State/Baldwin Wallace game at Ohio Dodgeball Cup this year. I was the referee and an irregular amount of balls over happened. Though I was the referee and I take partial blame on this, the balls over constituted a lot of time.
 - If instead the clock ran through this, the referee should make teams quit playing around and get ready. That or make a 30 second stop for balls over but it shouldn't take as long as it does most of the time. With this being said, if referees stuck to these strict timing rules, games shouldn't have to take up an hour and fifteen or twenty minutes.
 - For example, let's say a game goes to a total of 6 points with both teams using all of their allowed timeouts and 6 balls over happening, with the running clock through balls over, the game should take no more than 64 minutes to finish up if the referees stick to the strict timing rules. Even if you stopped the clock for 30 seconds for the balls over and the 1 minute break after each point, the game should still take no more than 73 minutes. Teams are scheduling tournaments for 75 minutes or more a game. If the strict timing rules were followed, teams wouldn't have to worry about running through to other games.
 - Pros:
 - Games will end quicker like people want and a longer half time makes for a less daunting second half for some teams that take little to no substitutes.
 - Time won't be wasted on random things during events like after point breaks and balls over breaks.
 - Cons:
 - This does make games 60 minutes instead of 55 minutes but with the things proposed along with it, games shouldn't take as long as they have been.
- CA: I say we incorporate something like a run rule in baseball. If a team is up by four or more points by the time the second half of play begins or any time through the second half, that the team up by four is considered the winner. From much experience with this, I know that after going down by three or four points, most of the time the second half is played with random teams and what not so we might as well make it official. With that being said, this would be an easy rule to incorporate because it doesn't change anything with the game play and doesn't change much with what already happens.
 - Pros:
 - On big days like Nationals or four game events, if a team goes up 4-0 against a team where the final could be 6-0 or something higher, those games past four games wouldn't need to be wasting the arms of players just to prove that they could tack more points on to the board.
 - This could also help with shortening game times like everyone has requested multiple times.
 - Cons:
 - A team that goes with let's say 10 players that plays a team with a full roster and that goes down by 4 points in the first half every game would only play essentially 3 out of 6 halves on the day.
 - WP: Catches bring two players in.
 - Team catches now only save the player who was originally hit, and nobody comes in for the team catching team. Honestly, if you wanna make the second part of this its own proposal too, that might not be half bad.
 - RATIONALE:
 - Catches aren't valuable enough, and team catches (let's assume that my version of the

- Clean Blocking rule passes) are now going to be way too frequent.
 - Encourages better throws since you know the penalty for throwing a catch is now doubled.
 - Speeds up the pace of the game when coupled with clean blocking.
- DF: Burden Throw - The game is played with 9 balls
 - The team that has more than 4 balls (majority) has 15 seconds to make throws until they rid themselves of the original number of balls that was >4.
 - So if team A has 6 balls they will have 15 seconds to throw at least two balls from their possession.
 - SITUATION: Team B throws 2 more balls at Team A after the count has started. Now Team A has 8, but they still only have to throw 3 because that was the original burden when the count started.
 - RATIONALE:
 - This rule would completely eliminate ball control focused stalling which is, in my opinion, the plague of the current Rulebook. With this rule you can expect to have at least 5 balls on your side of the court every other 15 seconds so there is no longer any reason to throw balls at the wall to try and get the bounce back.
 - Also, get ready for it, the dreaded LAZ would no longer be necessary! As long as you are giving the opposite team a majority of the balls you would reset the count.
 - It removes the need for two counters because only one side has a shot clock at a time (and we all know how people shy away from counting)

2017 Proposed Policies for NCDA Constitution

- MR: **Consecutive Match Limit** - During any official NCDA tournament, no team may be allowed to play no more than 3 consecutive matches without at least a 30 minute break.
 - The point of this rule is to protect the safety of players and to allow them a chance to recover from previous games.
 - This also makes sure that a home team won't create a tournament schedule that may benefit them from playing a team that has played multiple consecutive matches; thus giving them an advantage over the tired road team
 - If in the case where a team drops out on a late notice and a round in the tournament can be skip, (potentially taking away a team's break slot) it is the requirement of the hosting team to make sure that round is not completely skipped if the round consist of a team's break and forcing them to play more than 3 consecutive matches.
 - This does not put a limit on how many matches a team can play in one tournament.
 - *Debate:* Should home/away teams be allowed to play more consecutive matches if they want?
- JL: Rule/Policy Change Suggestions:
 - 1. Rule and Policy Proposals need to be submitted a week prior to nationals.
 - 2. Only one Rule and Policy Proposal can be submitted per team.
- ZM: **2 Games on Saturday**. Nationals is two things: the National Tournament (Section 4.3.4.6) and the extra-strength Non-Bracket Matches (Section 4.3.4.5). I propose a less stringent definition of Saturday's required games, a minimum of two.
 - In a 16 team bracket, Sunday's bracket will result in the two Championship teams playing four games on Sunday, meaning they could play **Seven** 50 minute games in 45 hours over the event. That's insane and dangerous. At least four teams will play three matches on Sunday, totaling **Six** games in 43 hours.
 - There have been 176 events this season. The average games played per attending team is anticipated to be 17.6 after this weekend. The median is about 15 games. We don't need 3 games on Saturday to boost team's match counts and give a more accurate seeding for Sunday's bracket. That's already been done to good effect in the regular season.
 - Some teams with light regular season schedules (less than five) would benefit from a third game

to help boost the accuracy of their ranking. We could still schedule an extra game exclusively for these competitors. As far as the remaining 15 teams, they have played more than enough games to determine good seeds.

- This frees up a great deal of time. Instead of needing to schedule 9.5 hours for **27 games and 7 heats** on Saturday, we only need to schedule 7.5 hours for **18 games and 5 heats**. Maybe 20 matches to give PSU a games played adjustment. This also saves us about \$388 in officiating costs.
- This extra two hours gives us some serious advantages. We have actual time to host the All Star Game, Ladies Match and Alumni games. We can hold a decent Fastest Throw comp, and other amenities for team players. Gladiatorial series? Continuous / last man standing? We can schedule an hour for the entire Executive Board to meet and do work. We have extra time for a Captains' Meeting where everyone's not grossly tired and cranky. I think this is going to be more fun, more healthy for our organization, more healthy for our collegiate athletes, and more fun.

Changing Sunday's Bracket Format:

- AH: I would like to propose that championship Sunday be broken into two different tourneys. One tourney for the higher seeded teams and one for the lower seeded teams. I do believe this would bring out the best competition in all teams on Sunday instead of waiting till the second or third round before competition heats up.
 - I also believe this would lead more teams coming to nationals, make teams strive to get into the tourney for the best teams only and like stated before, better competition all around. I hope this gets discussed more at the captains meeting. Thank you.
- JS: Top 8 teams compete for the cup at nationals, the other teams would play round robin games on Sunday.
 - RATIONALE:
 - The high seed must go through the motions of playing a game which adds more games to the total over the weekend. Playing a total of 7 if you go to the championship must be completely brutal for any thrower out there and eliminating one game that is going to be a blowout would make it easier on them.
 - The lower ranked teams would be able to play more dodgeball. Instead of being knocked out 1st round in a blowout they could play more teams and more importantly more teams that they could have a close games with.
 - I don't believe any team below a 4 rank has ever won it all at nationals and I don't see that changing anytime soon, so including the top 8 teams would be more than enough
- DF: Similarly to Jeff's proposal I suggest that Sunday of nationals should be two separate brackets. However I think we should do it like world cup groupings for soccer.
 - Teams from each region are randomly split into 4 groups, the teams in each group all play each other and the top two move onto the championship bracket Sunday while the rest compete in the secondary bracket. That way every single game would matter, every team has a chance to play for the title, and teams would be able to play more even competition throughout the weekend.
- DF: In addition to the national champion trophy, I propose that the NCDA issues two new yearly trophies. The first to the team who finishes the regular season as the #1 overall ranked team and the second to the team that plays the most games during the season.
 - Since we do not currently have playoff positions to fight for to get into the national tournament, experience and tournament seeding are the only real things that motivate teams to play more games. I believe these awards will encourage teams to play more games and will produce higher quality games during the season.
- ZM: Move to exclusively using the Gonzalez system to rank teams, but adjust the season to season

carry-over, involving reverting to the mean.

- I propose that we nix the other three formulas in the ranking system and just go with the Gonzalez formula.
- Or keep Champ, but have Perrone/Lieblisch absorbed by Gonzalez. 75% Gonzalez, 25% Champ.
- Rationale:
 - Our current Algorithm is very and explicitly complicated. Each system takes direct reasons people consider important to a team's performance, then spits out an ordered set. This ordered set is then averaged between the other three ordered sets, to produce a new ordered set which we consider our NCDA Algorithm Average. We use this for Nationals seeds. The problem with this is that it actually provides less predictive energy than some of the better systems, compromising the ideal predictability we seek in assigning fair seeds for the Nationals bracket or even the non-bracket play of Saturday.
 - The success of a ranking system is determined by how often it predicts the correct outcome, given two teams. This is what we are striving for. I think the Gonzalez system is the best case for this. At current, there are only 171 upsets of 920 ranked matches, resulting in a **81.4% success** in predicting the correct winner.
 - The Gonzalez system will simplify our approach to ranking and most importantly setting accurate seeds for Nationals. Using one system, it will be easier and more intuitive to determine what a team needs to do to move into a certain placing. Lastly, the benefits of the other systems carry into the Gonzalez exchanges, but are not diluted or lost when translated into an averaging algorithm.
- **How Reverting to the Mean works:**
 - This is a solution to our issue with how teams evolve from the last game of Nationals to the opening match of the next season. Players graduate, players are recruited, rosters change. Currently, the Gonzalez system does not actively account for any teams possible different in rating in the off season. Since the system is reactive, it relies on future match exchanges to move the rating where it needs to be.
 - My proposal involves reverting a team's Gonzalez ranking to the mean after Nationals. Teams will retain about 75% or 50% of their rating and the remaining percentage is applied to the League mean rating. Say a (super) team's rating after Nationals is 55.400 and the League average rating is 40.500. $(.75 * 55.400) + (.25 * 40.500) = 51.675$

HF: Reset all Gonzalez rankings at the beginning of the year to the baseline average of 40.000

Rationale:

- Obviously the biggest event of the season is Nationals, however that does not take away from the importance of the regular season as a whole. One of the things I have found an issue with this year is the ranking system which can determine seeding for Nationals, and more specifically the Gonzalez ranking system. In general I do find that it is an effective power rating system except on one front, the fact that it takes historical data into account.
- As an example, my team, VCU, has historically not been a very strong team. This year we are by no means a powerhouse, but we are definitely better this year than what our history would suggest. So to start the season, our Gonzalez rating was around 32 points, carried over from the previous season, and we have clawed our way up to where we are now at 38.097. Another team like Maryland started the season at 41 because they have historically been better than average. However, to end the year their Gonzalez rating is 39.006 because they did not have a strong season.
- For the year, VCU's record is 5-9, and Maryland's record is 5-10-2, giving each team a winning percentage of 0.357 and 0.333 respectively. In that time span, VCU has won the overall series between the two schools 3-2.
 - So in this scenario, the team that has 1) played the better season and 2) won more games head to head is ranked lower. This should not be the case. This is the only league where a team's record/ranking from previous seasons has an effect on the ranking of the current team, and it can

- adversely affect teams or make teams ranked higher than they should be.
- As an alternative, each team should start the year at the same Gonzalez rating, 40.000, and then move up or down relative to how that team plays throughout the year. This gives a much better estimate for how strong a team is during the current year. Additionally, if a new team is introduced to the league, they will start at the same rating, 40.000. This will actually help newer teams for when they play against weaker teams, because those weaker teams will not have incredibly low ratings which swing more points overall.
- To illustrate this point, I bring up the example from UVA, a brand new team this year whose inaugural match this year was against us, VCU. UVA comes in with a 40.000 rating because they are a new team, but our rating going into that game was about a 34. Even though UVA is the statistical favorite, the reality is that brand new teams struggle against relatively experienced teams. So by losing to us, they lost more Gonzalez points than they should have, around 1.600, and we gained more Gonzalez points than we should have. If we started the year at a 40.000 rating, and lost/gained points progressively, this huge swing would not have occurred because we would not have been at such a low rating.
- This would give much more accurate rankings going into Nationals, and make setting up schedules and overall rankings much easier. If not just for the points factor, consider this. College athletics, and especially dodgeball, have very high turnover rates in terms of players who graduate or leave the team. One team that exists one year, almost certainly will not have the same team 4 years from now, so the fact that a team of current players can be affected by a team 4 years ago is a little bit absurd, and doesn't accurately measure the quality of the current team.

Presidential Suggestions for the Future of the Organization

- FP: Sponsorship Opportunities - Savage, Champion
- FP: Reducing the Executive Board to 5.
 - Combining the Director of League Expansion and Director of Relations to create the role of 'Director of Relations'.
 - Make the Director of Nationals a non-voting member of the Executive Board. They are not an elected position, the institution is elected and the position is appointed.
- FP: New Divisions in the NCDA
 - 6v6
 - Best 2 of 3 - 25 minute time limit
 - 8.5" Rubber
 - Half basketball court, side-to-side rather than end-to-end, no neutral zone
 - 7 balls - each side starts with two balls, three on the mid line.
 - NCDA OT Rules - 10 second shot clock or burden ball rule
 - Minimum of 5 players to play
 - Up-to 8 players per roster
 - Two teams per school may attend an Event (A & B Team)
 - This will be a great recruitment tool for new schools.
 - It's easier to get five friends together to go to a dodgeball tournament a couple hours away rather than recruiting an entire club.
 - Potential SkyZone partnership for trampoline division
 - Best 2 of 3 - 30 minute time limit
 - 8.5" Rubber
 - 6v6
 - NCDA OT Rules - 10 second shot clock or burden ball rule
 - Minimum of 5 players to play
 - Up-to 8 players per roster
 - This will be a great recruitment tool for new schools.