

9-1997

The New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association

Edward D. O'Gorman
The College at Brockport

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/pes_theses



Part of the [Sports Sciences Commons](#), and the [Sports Studies Commons](#)

Repository Citation

O'Gorman, Edward D., "The New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association" (1997). *Kinesiology, Sport Studies, and Physical Education Master's Theses*. 39.

https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/pes_theses/39

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Kinesiology, Sport Studies and Physical Education at Digital Commons @Brockport. It has been accepted for inclusion in Kinesiology, Sport Studies, and Physical Education Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @Brockport. For more information, please contact kmyers@brockport.edu.

The New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association

A Master's Thesis Presented to
the Department of Physical Education and Sport
State University of New York
Brockport, New York

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science in Education

Edward D. O'Gorman

September 1997

State University of New York
College at Brockport
Brockport, New York
Department of Physical Education

Title of Thesis: A Descriptive History of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association

Author: Edward D. O'Gorman

Read and Approved by: Francis X. Shit
Dr. Lynn O'Connell

Date Submitted to the Department of Physical Education and Sport: Sept 1997

Accepted by the Department of Physical Education and Sport, State University of New York, College at Brockport, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Science in Education (Athletic Administration).

Date: 9/22/97

Chairperson, Department of Physical Education and Sport: Francis X. Shit

Abstract

The purpose of this research was to describe in detail the history of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. The sources of data used for analysis were the oral histories of 12 current and former (retired) coaches of the Association, meeting minutes and the constitution of the Association, as well as any available correspondence between athletic directors and coaches. There were 25 questions asked during the interviews conducted of the coaches ranging from philosophical problems to general administrative problems the Association may have encountered over the past 47 years. The researcher verified statements made by former and current coaches by cross-referencing statements made during interviews with those appearing in meeting minutes and other references made in interviews. This approach yielded an historical narrative that describes the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association.

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to thank some very good people. I would like to thank my committee members, Dr Francis X. Short and Dr. Eugene Orbaker, for their support on this project. I would like to thank Jenny Racho. Her constructive criticisms and editorial skills were a great help.

I would like to thank Barb Hartwig and Tim Hale. They each took a chance by letting me coach with them and I thank them for that opportunity.

Finally, to my family, friends and the gang at Carm's. You were all a source of encouragement and I admire all of you for that.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I	Introduction	1
Introduction		1
Statement of The Problem		2
Significance of Study		3
Limitations		4
Definitions		4
CHAPTER II	Methodology	5
Sources of Data		5
Procedures		6
Design and Analysis		8
CHAPTER III	1949 - 1959	10
Collegiate Track and Field in Upstate New York		10
Formation of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.		12
Philosophical Foundations of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.		15
Standards of Membership		16
Freshmen Eligibility		20

CHAPTER IV	1960 - 1969	26
Commercialism		26
Athletic Directors		27
The Roots of a Two-Day Championship Meet		29
The Questionnaire of 1967 and "Power Blocks"		30
1968 and Qualifying Standards		34
CHAPTER V	1970 - 1979	38
Membership Criteria		39
The Canadian Meet		41
The Two-Day Championship		42
Financial Aid		43
CHAPTER VI	1980 - 1995	48
Commercialism of 1981		49
Honest Effort Rule		51
The Philosophy Papers of 1984		56
The Constitutional Changes of 1985		60
The Advent of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference		62
1990 - 1995		63
CHAPTER VII		65
Summary and Conclusions		65

References	70
Appendixes	77
Appendix A: A Timeline of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A..	77
Appendix B: N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. Outdoor Track Champions	82
Appendix C: N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. Indoor Track Champions	85
Appendix D: N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. Cross Country Champions	87
Appendix E: N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. Presidents	89

CHAPTER I

On June 13, 1996 the track coaches of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A) merged with women's track coaches of the New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Association (N.Y.S.W.C.A.A.) and became the New York State Collegiate Track Conference (N.Y.S.C.T.C.). Previous to this merger, the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. consisted of 15 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division III colleges and universities. The institutions that made up this men's athletic association were: Alfred University, Hamilton College, Hartwick College, Ithaca College, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (R.P.I.), Saint Lawrence University, State University of New York at Binghamton, State University of New York at Brockport, State University of New York at Buffalo, State University of New York at Cortland, State University of New York at Fredonia, State University of New York at Geneseo, State University of New York at Plattsburgh, Union College and the University of Rochester. The purpose of this association was to offer male athletes five championship meets per year in cross country, indoor track, indoor pentathlon, outdoor track, and outdoor decathlon. The Association also encouraged dual and triangular meets between members during the cross country, indoor and outdoor track seasons.

Previous to this association, collegiate track and field in New York state consisted of dual and triangular meets between schools with no final state championship. The N.C.A.A.

sponsored a track and field championship, and there were the Penn Relays, Drake Relays and the Intercollegiate Association of Amateur Athletes of America (I.C.A.A.A.A.) track championships. Large and small colleges and universities could compete at these track meets if they had an athlete or athletes meet the qualifying standards for each event contested. The problem, however, was that schools from these large athletic conferences, such as the Ivy League and Big Ten, were dominating the track meet over much smaller schools. James McLane from Alfred University, Henry Kumpf from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and Wilford Ketz from Union College wanted a track championship that would serve the skill level of their athletes (Hale, 1996).

On May 22, 1948, R.P.I. hosted the Rensselaer Polytechnic Invitational Track and Field meet for New York state colleges and universities. This was the forerunner of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association championship. Even though this meet had occurred in 1948, the first organizational meeting was not held until 1949. On November 28, 1949, Henry Kumpf of R.P.I., called to order the organizational meeting of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. at the Onondaga Savings Bank Building in Syracuse, New York (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1976). Even though much of the history of the Association is considered common knowledge, much of this information is unrecorded, unsubstantiated and unclear.

Statement of the Problem

The real reasons why the Association was formed, how it was formed and what were the philosophy and goals of the Association, are unclear. From the information stated in the preceding paragraphs, it would seem that there is a history of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association, but much of it is unsubstantiated. It was proposed that a descriptive history of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association be researched to better understand the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. and its influence on collegiate track and field in New York State.

Significance of Study

There were three reasons to conduct an historical study of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. First, no descriptive history had ever been conducted over the past 47 years to understand what kind of influence the Association has made on track and field in Upstate New York, or for that matter what track and field was like for small colleges and universities in Upstate New York.

Second, the coaches of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A merged with track coaches of the N.Y.S.W.C.A.A. on June 13, 1996 to become one combined track and field coaches association. The name of the new association is the New York State Collegiate Track Conference. Since both organizations have combined, an historical study of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. and the problems encountered over the years might help solve future problems of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference (N.Y.S.C.T.C.).

The third reason was that many of the original coaches of the Association were either deceased or retired. Due to death or aging of some of the pioneers of this association, historians interested in the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association have lost, and stood to lose more information, if the oral histories of the Association were not recorded. Wilford Ketz, James McLane and Henry Kumpf are deceased, and probably a significant part of the Association's history died with them. Men who were young and coached in the Association in the 1950's are now retired. As time passes by, even their own recollections become vague. As these retired coaches pass on, the historian has only to rely on a paper trail and second hand accounts of the early history of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. Obviously time was of critical importance.

Limitation

A limitation of this study is that there exists no previously written histories on the Association or on the history of collegiate track and field in Upstate New York. However, this limitation was offset by the existence of considerable primary sources, namely oral histories.

Definitions

For purposes of this study, it is necessary to understand the meaning of the word "association". The New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association was an association of colleges and universities that paid membership dues and abided by the rules and laws set down in the Association's constitution. The payment of dues allowed for men's teams to compete in the respective championships. This association was not a league per se. In that sense, there was no association schedule, nor were team standings kept for Association purposes. However, schools were encouraged to schedule dual or triangular meets against other members. This made scheduling track meets easier and developed rivalries within the Association.

CHAPTER II

Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to explain how the historical study was conducted. This chapter will include the sources of data, procedures used, the design and the analysis of the historical study.

Sources of Data

The sources of information used in the study include the accounts of retired and current coaches of the former association. These men were chosen because they were still alive and available. Furthermore, the coaches were involved with the Association through a broad range of time periods. Thus allowing for a diverse and descriptive oration of the Association. The list of coaches (subjects) whom agreed to be interviewed for an oral history of the Association were as follows: John Hudson and Warren Lutes, current track coaches at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; Dr. Everett Phillips, retired cross country and track coach from the University of Rochester and State University of New York at Fredonia; Bob Boozer and James Fulton, retired cross country and track coaches from State University of New York at Brockport; Eugene Long, retired cross country and track coach from Hamilton College; Clifford DuBreuil, retired track coach from Alfred University; Dr. Verne Rockcastle, former volunteer track coach at State University of New York at Brockport, and now a retired professor from Cornell University; Dave Miller, retired track coach from State University of

New York at Cortland; James Ulrich, current track coach at the State University of New York at Fredonia; Timothy Hale, current cross country and track coach at the University of Rochester and John Izzo, current cross country and track coach at the State University of New York at Brockport. Other sources of information researched were the Association's constitution, by-laws, and meeting minutes. Newspaper articles were reviewed, as well as any available personal correspondence between coaches and athletic directors.

Procedures

Interviews were conducted with the subjects in order to obtain oral historical data. Since permission was granted, these interviews were tape recorded and the information gathered was transcribed. The Association's records consist of meeting minutes, constitutions and by-laws, letters from coaches and athletic directors, meet results, and newspaper clippings. Coaches from the current association agreed to let the researcher keep these records in order to conduct research and write this thesis. The researcher also obtained notes and meeting minutes from Cliff DuBreuil and Tim Hale

The questions asked in the interviews were as follows: What was collegiate track and field like nationally in the 1940's? What was collegiate track and field like in New York state, in the 1940's before the Association was formed? Who had the original idea and initiated discussions about the New York Collegiate Track and Field Association? Why was there a feeling among these small college and university coaches that a track and field meet was needed? Was it really because of the larger championships (i.e. Penn Relays, I.C.A.A.A.A., etc.)? At the organizational meeting of 1949, Dr. Isadore Yavits presented some "logical reason" to have an association. Can you recall what those reasons were? Why was there a limit to the number of schools invited to the Association's first meeting in November of 1949? In the mid fifties, the Association limited athletes to three years of eligibility. Why was there a freshman eligibility rule? At the annual meeting in 1955, the eligibility committee composed

of Bill Ketz, Dr. Yavits and Gene Long proposed five possible solutions to the freshman eligibility problem, can you recall what those five solutions were? The original constitution refers to standards of membership. Some are stated in the constitution, such as, freshmen eligibility and the requirement that members be four-year degree-granting institutions. What other "unwritten standards" were applied when reviewing a college's application to the Association? Why did the Association initiate into the applicant review process the stipulation that teams who awarded financial aid based on athletic performance were not to be admitted into the Association? The original constitution states nothing about qualifying standards, why did the Association adopt qualifying standards when there was originally none? Why and when was the rule that schools lying west of an imaginary boundary line stretching from roughly the Troy-Albany area to the Binghamton area were only to be included in the Association? Why were petitions to join the Association turned down? From meeting minutes of 1967, and from a questionnaire distributed to all coaches, there was a concern over enlargement of the Association, geographical limits of the Association, and the issue of a two-day meet. What do you recall of these issues? Was there a "power block", in terms of political and team strength in 1967? Was there a "power block" in the 1970's, 1980's, and 1990's? In 1981 Gene Long proposed an honest effort rule to the constitution, why did this come about? Did this precede any such N.C.A.A. rule? In 1975 and 1976, the Association athletes competed in Canada for a track meet. Who came up with the idea for a Canadian meet? Did athletic directors take an interest in the development of the Association throughout its years of existence? In 1961, 1965, and in 1981, the Association voted that host schools could charge admission to the championship meets. Did this not contradict the "unwritten" philosophy to avoid commercialism that was prevalent in collegiate athletics? What were the advantages and disadvantages of a two-day meet? Did the ideas of qualifying standards, enlargement of the Association and a two-day meet coincide? What were the goals and philosophy of the Association throughout its existence?

Design and Analysis

The evaluation of evidence in any historical study is of critical importance. This evaluation phase is a two step process. The first phase, external criticism determines the form of evidence. Is the given document or papers really a source of evidence, is it authentic? The second phase, is internal criticism. This examination deals with the nature of the source, specifically the credibility of that specific source of information. Internal criticism thus involves matters of consistency and accuracy (Struna, 1990). In order to achieve this end, the researcher wrote notes and tape recorded the interviews. In order to develop data trustworthiness, the researcher repeated back to the subject what was written in the notes of that interview. This allowed for clarification of ideas or concepts, and it allowed the researcher to analyze data inductively by making comparisons from notes, tape recordings and by comparing notes and transcriptions from other interviews. After this, the researcher assigned conceptual labels to statements that expressed similar points of view or depicted similar events or occurrences. This allowed for a more general categorization of data. The researcher verified statements made by former and current coaches by cross-referencing those statements with those written down in meeting minutes and other references made in interviews. This approach is designed to yield an historical narrative that describes and chronicles, in detail, the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association's history.

In order to appreciate the use of oral history in this thesis, the researcher believed that the reader should understand the value and use interviews have when writing history. Michael Frisch, in his book, A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History, stated that oral history does one of two things. First, oral history serves as a source of information that can be used when one formulates historical generalizations. Oral history tends to shed light on an unknowable area, where no previous histories were kept or written. The second use, is that oral history can be understood as a method of by-passing previous historical interpretations (Frisch, 1990). Oral history can provide a way to communicate with the past

more directly. It can provide an exact image of direct or shared experiences. The researcher and reader, should keep in mind that oral history forces us to view what the interviews actually represent, a unique level of experience, that is selectively remembered. While writing history, in which oral history is one of the primary sources, questions that emerge go beyond whom, what, why, and how. Frisch encourages the researcher and reader to ask, "what happens to experience on the way to becoming memory? What happens to experience on the way to becoming history? As an individual's experience recedes into the past, what is the relationship of memory to historical generalization" (Frisch, 1990).

CHAPTER III

1949 - 1959

From the information previously stated, we know why the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association was formed, who formed it and what purpose it would serve. In order to understand the nature of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association, it is important to briefly write about the history of collegiate track and field on the national and New York state levels. Furthermore, the 1950's were also a period of foundational work for the Association. From 1949 to 1959, the Association membership built its philosophical foundations and added new members to make the Association a viable collegiate track and field association within New York State.

Collegiate Track and Field in Upstate New York

Nationally, collegiate track and field was organized among the larger schools. In June of 1921, the National Collegiate Athletic Association sponsored the first true national championship, of any sport, in track and field at the University of Chicago. Outdoor track and field is the oldest of the N.C.A.A. championships, and in 1921, Illinois defeated Notre Dame, 20 - 16, for the first team title. In 1963 the first Division II outdoor track championship occurred, and in 1976, the first Division III outdoor track championship occurred (Falla, 1981). Along with the national championship, there was also large relay carnivals, such as, the

Drake Relays, the Penn Relays, and the Intercollegiate Association of Amateur Athletes of America track championship, better known as the I.C.A.A.A.A..

According to Gene Long, retired coach from Hamilton College, the reason for an association was that there was a need for a terminal season competition. In his interview, Long stated "there were many track championships around that were out of the realistic reach in terms of ability of most of us at the time. The Penn Relays and IC4A's were generally too tough and only a few of the small colleges participated" (Long, 1996). Dr. Verne Rockcastle, former coach at Brockport State confirms that one of the reasons the Association formed was because the "IC4A's and the Penn Relays was too competitive, but also because the only way you went to these meets was by invitation, or you were a representative of a large school, like Syracuse, or you were a member of a conference, such as the Big Ten or Ivy League" (Rockcastle, 1996). David Miller, former coach at Cortland State, and one of the founding fathers of the Association, has suggested that the "germ" of the idea for a small track association may have sprung from the larger track championships, such as the Penn Relays, IC4A's and Drake Relays. Miller thinks the big reason for an association was that all the coaches involved had similar philosophies about collegiate athletics. Another possible reason to why the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. formed was that a track season in the 1940's for small colleges in New York state consisted of only dual meets with no regular season track championship. According to Miller, track and field in New York state in the 1940's consisted of "mostly dual meets with colleges, where overnight stays were not required" (Miller, 1996). Long had even stated that there was an emphasis on dual meet competition with no big invitationals scheduled. The collegiate track season consisted of no more than eight to 10 dual meets scheduled on consecutive Saturdays. Furthermore, it was common policy to avoid track meets during the week to avoid academic conflicts (Long, 1996).

Another possible reason for the formation of the Association was that it was difficult to develop a set schedule between teams and it was difficult to develop rivalries. Rockcastle

suggested that it would be easier to form a schedule if an association existed. Rockcastle pointed out that the Association provided for the development of rivalries and a chance for terminal competition. Rockcastle stated:

It wasn't the terminal championship meet that was the impetus, it was the chance for dual competition year after year with a known set of rivals. It is pretty hard to work up a schedule if you are not a member of an association. If you are in an association, you can schedule years in advance and know what your schedule is going to be. I don't think it's the terminal Association meet. I think it's more of the chance for dual competition on a regular basis year after year (Rockcastle, 1996).

Rockcastle stated that being in an association gave teams a schedule against known opponents in which to prepare for and look forward to competing against week after week.

From meeting minutes kept in their archives, the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association was an outgrowth of the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Invitational. This invitational was for small New York colleges only and was held in 1948 and in 1949. Many of the teams that attended this meet became charter members of the Association. For two years this invitational served as the terminal championship for many schools. Henry Kumpf, who was head track coach at R.P.I., helped plan and organize the formation of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association.

Formation of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.

On November 28, 1949, Henry Kumpf called to order the organizational meeting of the Association at the Onondaga Savings Bank in Syracuse, New York (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1949). The coaches and athletic directors of the schools who attended this first meeting were as follows: James McLane, athletic director and head track coach and assistant track coach Alex Yunevich of Alfred University; Henry Kumpf, track coach, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; Ben Light, athletic director and Isadore Yavits, track coach, from Ithaca College;

James Liebertz, athletic director and track coach, United States Merchant Marine Academy; Donovan Moffet, athletic director, and David Miller, track coach, State University of New York at Cortland; Gene Welborn, athletic director, Triple Cities College (which subsequently became Harpur College and then State University of New York at Binghamton.); and Wilford Ketz, track coach, Union College. Until that association was formed, it was agreed upon, by these men that Kumpf would act as President, McLane as Vice President and Miller as Secretary-Treasurer (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A, 1949). According to the meeting minutes, Kumpf not only planned this meeting, but he also explained the background of the movement to organize small colleges in New York state. Kumpf stated:

At present there is no small college championship meet in this area. The R.P.I. Invitational Meet, held for the past two years, has partially fulfilled this need and rendered a tremendous service to small colleges interested in championship competition. At a meeting of the coaches at the R.P.I meet last year, the idea was suggested for the formation of an association for the purposes stated above (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1949).

During the course of the meeting, Kumpf was asked to whom should membership be extended and his reply was, "that the original idea was to keep out bigger colleges for whom championship meets are now scheduled" (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1949). Furthermore, Kumpf emphasized this view in a press release written by Troy Bridwell. "The whole purpose of the association is to give outstanding trackmen of smaller schools a chance to compete in a championship at their own level...big schools participate in national championship meets, such as the IC4A, in which the competition is so stiff that smaller colleges rarely bother to enter or almost never win" (Bridwell, 1949). No one recalls who Troy Bridwell was. He might have been a reporter for a newspaper in Troy, New York, or he might have worked for R.P.I..

Interestingly, Association minutes indicate that Dr. Isadore Yavits presented some logical reasons to have an association at the organizational meeting. There is an undated,

two-page essay detailing reasons to have an association. Unfortunately the author of this essay is unknown. The researcher has reason to believe that this might be Dr. Yavit's "logical reasons" because the document was found within dated material from the years 1949 - 1950. Second, the document begins by stating "The popularity of this track meet during the two years of its existence indicates a favorable attitude on the part of most of the small colleges of New York state toward an annual conference meet to be held about the same time every year" (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1949). The R.P.I. Invitational was held two years previous to the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. forming. The date of the Association championships was held on the same date as the R.P.I. Invitational, as stated above. Furthermore, the last sentence of the first paragraph states: "Such a conference might provide some distinct advantages" (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1949). David Miller, who was secretary-treasurer of the Association and kept meeting minutes at the organizational meeting had typed that "Mr. Yavits presented some sound and logical reasons for such an organization and stressed the impetus which would be given to track throughout the state as a result of annual championship competition" (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1949). These advantages, as stated in the essay might be similar to the "logical reasons" presented by Yavits.

The reasons expressed in the essay are interesting. The writer of the document expressed some logical possibilities if a conference were to be formed. The unknown author states that an association would generate more interest in track and field for contestants and the colleges. Furthermore, this meet would be the highlight of the team's season and it would compare, in small ways, to the Penn Relays. The author stressed it might be an impetus for prospective college students with an interest in track to enroll at small colleges within New York state. The essay also stated that an association would improve scheduling for dual meets and improve friendly rivalries among member colleges and it lists who some of the potential members might be (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1949).

Five months later, the first annual meeting of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association was called to order on the evening of May 20, 1950 at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York. The charter members of the Association were Alfred University, Champlain College (subsequently known as State University of New York at Plattsburgh), Hartwick College, Ithaca College, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, State University of New York at Cortland, Triple Cities College, and the United States Merchant Marine Academy. State University of New York at Brockport and Union College were not represented at the first meeting but did become charter members and did compete in the championship meet the following day. Hamilton College, State University of New York at Oswego and the University of Rochester had been extended invitations at the time to be charter members, but turned down the invitations for unknown reasons. (For further information about membership, see Appendix A for a timeline of the Association).

The Philosophical Foundations of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.

The constitution of the Association was adopted and ratified on May 20, 1950. Article II, Section I states the Association's purpose and philosophy. The constitution stated, " The purpose of this association shall be to foster and maintain intercollegiate competition in track and field athletics and in cross country running, and to promote a high level of sportsmanship and friendly relations among its members" (Constitution, 1950). Keep in mind that not only did the original founding fathers want to have an association that developed dual meets, rivalries and have three terminal championships, but they also wanted to develop an association that offered social camaraderie for themselves as well as their student-athletes. The original coaches of this association wanted to develop track and field and cross country through a competitive spirit of honesty, sportsmanship and integrity. According to Rockcastle, all of the coaches he remembers were friendly and had an honest competitive spirit. Rockcastle said, "You couldn't ask for a friendlier bunch of coaches. No back-biting, no trying

to take advantage of you. The major focus was to make competition fair and honest" (Rockcastle, 1996).

Cliff DuBreuil, retired head coach from Alfred University, remembers coaches meetings that were also social gatherings for the coaches. DuBreuil recalls that, "these coaches were gentlemen. They wanted to beat each other, but they were friends before and after the meet. They were honest and believed in fair play" (DuBreuil, 1996). Dr. Everett Phillips, retired coach from Fredonia State, elaborated on the socialization point. "It was an association of schools who wanted to be together and coaches could be together and enjoyed each others company and had friendly competition together" (Phillips, 1996). Sportsmanship and friendly competition are excellent qualities for any sport team or athletic conference. Throughout the history of the Association, these ideals have been applied as a litmus test for colleges or universities seeking admission into the Association. However, how does one apply principals that every coach in the Association seemed in congruence with, to other teams seeking admission to the Association? What other standards were applied to teams seeking admission?

Standards of Membership

According to Article IV, of the constitution, Sections I through VIII provide the rules for membership. All these rules are straightforward. For example, membership was limited to four-year degree-granting institutions in New York state. New members were only accepted by a two-thirds vote of all members of the Association. Upon acceptance, members agreed to abide by all the rules expressed in the constitution and by-laws of the Association or they could be expelled. Expulsion or suspension from the Association was caused "through any such change in the standards or conduct as shall be deemed incompatible with the standards of membership in the Association..." (Constitution, 1950). However, these were not the only

rules that were used to assess a schools application to the Association. According to all the coaches interviewed, there were some "unwritten standards" as well.

These "unwritten standards" were: Who was the coach? Did other coaches already in the Association get along with the coach from the school seeking admission? Was the head coach full-time or part-time? Did the school offer both cross country and track? Did the institution have a similar academic and admission philosophy as did members of the Association? Could the applicant host one of the three championships, either in cross country, indoor or outdoor track. Probably the biggest criteria was honesty. Could the members of the association trust the coach of the school seeking admission?

Bob Boozer, retired head coach from Brockport State, recalled that the bottom line to him was, " Do we like this guy, do we want to work with him?" (Boozer, 1996). DuBreuil (1996) also believed it came down to a coaches personality and Phillips responded by stating:

The school had to sponsor both cross country and track, and to some degree because it was a coaches association rather than an administrative association, I would have to say compatibility and ethical conduct of the coach would influence the decision to invite people into the Association. I believe, even though it wasn't written, I think it played a factor on who was invited (Phillips, 1996).

Tim Hale, current head coach at the University of Rochester, agreed that even today within the new conference honesty and integrity are still valued assets for a potential member. Hale responded by saying, "I think things which were discussed at length in many institutions was the integrity of the coach, his reputation in terms of playing by the rules, being honest and up-front and playing according to hoyle..." (Hale, 1996).

Honesty and integrity were not the only "unwritten standards" that were used to assess an applicant's merits. According to some of the retired coaches, many of the founding coaches of this association were provincial, meaning that the original coaches did not want to spend too much money for travel, meals and overnight stays. Furthermore, Kumpf, Ketz, Miller and

McLane did not want to work with coaches with whom they were not familiar. These coaches preferred to maintain the status-quo of an eight-to 10-team association; they did not envision the association any larger than that. James Fulton, retired coach from Brockport State recalled that there was a feeling against New York city schools (Fulton, 1996). Material found in the Association's archives indicate that a possible "unwritten standard" was geography. Geography may have been a standard simply because of economical reasons due to the cost of travel. Many teams could not afford to spend money for more than one overnight stay.

However, if travel was a problem how come the United States Merchant Marine Academy, located at Kings Point, New York on Long Island was in the Association, and why did they host the 1952 championship? The researcher thinks there are two reasons. First, Commander James Liebertz, track coach of the U.S.M.M.A. was well liked by Kumpf and the rest of the coaches of the Association. Second, according to meeting minutes, the U.S.M.M.A. had no other conference championship to prepare for or compete in. On May 19, 1955, the U.S.M.M.A. withdrew from the Association to join another conference that was organized in the New York City metropolitan area. According to meeting minutes, this new conference fulfilled the needs of a final championship meet for them (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1955). The researcher thinks that out of respect, friendship and similar philosophic views, James Liebertz and the U.S.M.M.A. was allowed to be in the Association. Interestingly, Commander Liebertz served as president of the Association during the 1952 - 1953 school year. He also served as Chairman of the Membership Committee in 1951. During his chairmanship, Liebertz recommended that Adelphi College, located in New York City be denied membership into the Association because of their recruiting of athletes. He believed that their calibre of competition in the near future would hurt the nature of the Association (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1951). Nothing is stated in the meeting minutes that Adelphi College was located out of any geographical range, or that the school was located in New York City.

If geographic location had a role in determining a school's chances of being accepted into the Association, it certainly helped the State University of New York at Buffalo, (Buffalo State). In 1951, Buffalo State applied for membership to the Association. In a letter to Dave Miller, Henry Kumpf expressed some logic into allowing Buffalo State membership. Kumpf stated:

Their membership is desirable, since it would create an interest in that part of the state as well as at their school. Also, it would give us an opportunity to hold the meet in the western part of the state, which is in line with our policy of holding the meet in three sections of the state in different years (Kumpf, 1951).

Buffalo State was probably accepted for more than its location. Their application did receive strong support from other coaches in the Association. In a letter to other Association coaches, Rockcastle lobbied his support and stated, "We at Brockport have met the cross country and track teams annually for the past several years and found them to be of good N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. caliber, and not star studded with scholarship men. My personal view is that it would be nice to have them compete with us..." (Rockcastle, 1950). On November 11, 1950 Buffalo State was admitted to the Association. Integrity of the coach and location of the school were two unwritten standards, but there was one more, and Liebertz applied it when he assessed Adelphi's application for membership in 1951. The third "unwritten standard" was that of recruiting and offering financial aid to students based on athletic ability.

Nothing is stated in the original constitution of the Association about financial aid based on athletic ability. The constitution does state rules regarding entries into the championship meet, but it does not specifically address the issue of athletic scholarships. The constitution does have eligibility standards in its by-laws section. An athlete was eligible to compete if he was an amateur at his respective school and in good academic standing. Athletes had to be residents of their respective schools for at least one year. Furthermore, undergraduates with no degree and who had not competed in the championships for more than

three years in the aggregate, were eligible (Constitution, 1950). Remember, Adelphi was turned down because of potential recruiting problems. Did Liebertz believe that Adelphi would become too competitive and dominate the Association year after year? In 1953, Colgate was turned down for similar reasons. Meeting minutes from that year stated, "it was the consensus of those present that Colgate was and would be consistently out of our class" (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1953). What this means is unclear, but many of the men interviewed believed that schools were turned down because of a fear that scholarship athletes from other sports would participate in track and field and give those programs, such as Colgate or Adelphi, a distinct advantage. Miller stated that this standard was applied "to keep the competition even" (Miller, 1996). He even elaborated more and stated that most coaches in the Association did not have time to recruit athletes. Long recalls that "recruiting was nowhere as near as important as it got in the following decades,... and you kind of looked forward to what the ability level of your athletes were in the spring" (Long, 1996). The "unwritten standard" of financial aid to athletes would later return to the association in the 1960's, 1970's and 1980's.

Freshman Eligibility

The first constitutional problem the Association encountered began in 1951 because members allowed freshmen to compete in the Association's track championships. The exception to the rule was that any freshmen who competed in the freshman medley relay were not eligible for varsity events. The confusion may have started through a misinterpretation of the Association's constitution. According to the constitution, all the championship meets were to be governed by the rules of the I.C.A.A.A.A. Many coaches may have assumed that the I.C.A.A.A.A. rules governing eligibility were the same as the Eastern Colleges Athletic Conferences (E.C.A.C.) rule. Unfortunately, the researcher had no way of knowing what the E.C.A.C. rules were regarding eligibility. According to Larry Byrne, I.C.A.A.A.A. historian, E.C.A.C. offices were in various hotels in New York City. When the E.C.A.C. would move to

a new location, records were either thrown out or misplaced (Byrne, 1996). However, from the interviews the researcher can determine what the issue was concerning the freshman eligibility problem. What was at issue from 1951 to 1954 was that the smaller colleges of the Association seemed to be in favor of a resolution whereby freshman would be eligible to compete in the varsity championship under the waiver provision of the E.C.A.C.. Furthermore, this waiver would allow an athlete's eligibility to extend over four full years of residency at the member college. However, larger schools in the Association seemed to be opposed to this rule because their school's enrollment was too large, and the E.C.A.C. waiver would not apply. Thus the school with an enrollment larger than provided by in the waiver clause, would not be able to use freshmen in the championship meet. E.C.A.C rules were based upon male enrollment. Through meeting minutes and from letters, the researcher can clarify some of the confusion. In a letter from Donovan Moffet to James Mclane in 1952, we get an idea of what the E.C.A.C. rule might have been. Moffet wrote,

Because of the wide variance in male enrollment of those colleges making up our membership, I believe that we should adopt the same principle as is applied by the E.C.A.C., namely that those colleges who have an enrollment of less than one thousand men be permitted to use freshman [sic] in our annual meet, and those colleges who have an enrollment of more than one thousand men not be permitted to use freshmen for the annual meets. I believe that if the freshman rule is forced upon the small colleges it will mean eventually that interest in track will decline in those instances. I also believe that it would make for more equal competition among the colleges in the annual meet to adopt this rule" (Moffet, 1952).

Interestingly, Moffett's proposal became an amendment to the constitution on May 17, 1952. The amendment read: "Those colleges having a male enrollment of less than one thousand (1000) shall be permitted to use freshmen in the annual championship meets. Those colleges

who have a male enrollment of one thousand (1000) or more shall not use freshman in the annual championship meets" (Constitution, 1952).

However the problem did not go away. In December of 1952, the E.C.A.C revised its waiver policy. The new policy stated that "the rules of eligibility granted only (a) to member colleges with registration of 500 or fewer male undergraduates, and (b) to member colleges with registration of 750 or fewer male undergraduates which support an intercollegiate athletic program of at least two fall sports, three winter sports and three spring sports (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1953). This meant that the 1952 amendment to the Association's constitution was not consistent with the new E.C.A.C policy. To indicate the problems coaches were having, Wilford Ketz track coach at Union College wrote a letter to Patrick Carolan of Harpur College on October 22, 1953. In his last paragraph, Ketz wrote,

It seems to me as though we have worked ourselves into a very difficult situation but on the other hand, the spirit of the meeting at the time of our passing the 1000 rule was that we were conforming to general practice. The general picture has now changed and it seems that we should again conform to the larger organizations (Ketz, 1953).

From the meeting minutes of 1954, the coaches of the Association tried to solve the problem of the E.C.A.C.'s 1953 rule change. Ketz, who was president of the Association believed there were two points to consider. The first point was, whether freshmen were to compete in 1955? The second point was whether freshmen were to compete henceforth for four years or three years? McLane moved that any ruling made at that meeting should not be retroactive, that seniors in their fourth year of competition be allowed to compete in 1954. McLane's motion was voted upon and accepted. Rockcastle moved that freshman henceforth shall compete for more than three years in the aggregate. McLane then motioned that freshman used in the 1954 track championship be permitted to have four years of competition. This motion was unanimously passed. Furthermore, Kumpf motioned that the Association conform

to E.C.A.C. policy on the freshman waiver rule which was unanimously approved (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1954). However, the confusion did not subside.

In 1955, when David Miller was president of the Association, he wrote a letter to all track coaches and athletic directors concerning the freshmen eligibility problem. In the letter he reiterated what was agreed upon at the annual meeting of 1954 and stressed that freshmen entries would be accepted for varsity competition but it would count as a year of competition. This meant that a student could not compete for more than three years (Miller, 1955). In an undated letter from the same year, Miller stated that the Association had four questions to consider if this problem was to cease. His first question was: Should freshmen compete in any varsity championship? Second, should competition be limited to three years if freshmen did compete? Third, Miller believed that the Association should adopt either the I.C.A.A.A.A, N.C.A.A. or E.C.A.C. rules, but they should not try to follow all three which was causing all the confusion. The fourth question Miller presented was that the members of the Association should adopt "what is best for the Association and not what is best for individual members" (Miller, 1955). No other letters were present in Association files to determine a reaction to Miller's proposals. However at the annual meeting in the Spring of 1955, the eligibility committee proposed five solutions.

The Eligibility Committee composed of Ketz, Yavits and Long proposed five possible solutions to the freshman eligibility problem. Unfortunately, the five solutions that were recommended by the committee were not listed in the meeting minutes, nor could any of the former coaches interviewed recall what was proposed. Long, who was interviewed had no recall. The one problem that was encountered over the course of the research was that information from certain meeting minutes was not copious. Information from some years was better than others, and the researcher thinks that this depended on whom the Association secretary was and how meticulous they were.

From the meeting minutes the researcher does know that Kumpf made a motion that the Association follow E.C.A.C rules with residence and status rule to include special waivers. From the meeting minutes, this motion was unanimously passed by all schools. Also from the meeting minutes, the motion by Kumpf eliminated proposals one and two proposed by the eligibility committee. Ketz then moved that the Association not consider proposal three, and this was agreed upon by the Association. Proposal four was voted down six to four, thus proposal five was their solution. This proposal became Article VI in the constitution and it read: "That freshman eligible for competition at the member institutions under the waiver provisions of the E.C.A.C. shall be eligible to compete in the championship meets of our association and their competition may extend over the full four years of residency at the member institutions" (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1955).

The Association stood by the 1955 decision for the next sixteen years. In 1971, the Association dropped its freshman eligibility rule simply because the N.C.A.A. dropped its freshman eligibility rule on January 13, 1971, at its sixty-fifth annual convention. This rule change allowed freshman to compete in all N.C.A.A. championships except University Division basketball and football (Falla, 1981). The freshman eligibility problem was significant to the development of the Association. Remember, the Association was made up of private and public schools with varying enrollments and similar academic missions. Consequently, these coaches had to take their own philosophies and make them mesh with all the other coaching philosophies, in order to make the Association viable. This is significant because the freshman eligibility problem was the first problem the young Association addressed, and it is indicative of how these coaches would handle future problems and philosophical issues. Even though there were preexisting standards on the Association's constitution, these coaches were not hesitant to form their own rules to fit their particular situations. Throughout the next three decades, issues arose over enlargement of the Association, geographical limits, a two-day championship, qualifying standards,

commercialism and financial aid based on athletic ability. Most of the issues took form in the 1960's, and would not be resolved until the 1970's or 1980's.

CHAPTER IV

1960 - 1969

By 1960, the Association had expanded from 10 teams to 13 teams. These teams were Alfred University, Hamilton College, Ithaca College, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Roberts Wesleyan College, State University of New York at Buffalo, State University of New York at Brockport, State University of New York at Cortland, State University of New York at Oswego, Triple Cities, University of Buffalo, Union College, and the University of Rochester. Champlain College, Hartwick College and the United States Merchant Marine Academy resigned from the conference. (See Appendix A for a timeline of the Association). The Sixties were a period of growth for the Association. The Association membership addressed such issues as commercialism, a two-day championship and the use of qualifying standards to control the size and number of participants in the championship.

Commercialism

In 1960 the Association had a financial crisis. The cost of operating two championships, one in cross country and the other in outdoor track was depleting their financial resources. (The Association held its first indoor championship in 1966). This was

further exasperated by the costs of trophies and awards that were distributed at the championship meets.

At their annual meeting on May 13, 1960, the coaches of the Association debated on how to handle the problem of escalating costs. It was suggested by one coach, who is not named in the meeting minutes, that additional income could be generated from the sale of advertisements in the meet program and by selling tickets for admission to the meet. Many coaches did not like this idea simply because of the hint of commercialism that was presented within those alternatives. The Association voted to have an additional \$10.00 assessment to defray the costs of the meet and to raise annual dues from \$25.00 to \$35.00, for the 1961 school year (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1960). However, this assessment and increase in dues did not prevent any commercial ideas from arising again.

At the next annual meeting in 1961, Miller moved that the host school be allowed to charge admission for spectators at the annual championships of the Association. He explained that the admission charge would help defray the cost of hosting the meet because the customary \$75.00 given to host schools was not enough to cover all meet expenses. Miller's motion was defeated, but the Association allowed host schools to sell meet programs (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1961). In May of 1965, the issue of charging admission arose again. After some discussion, the coaches voted 12 - 0 to amend the constitution to state in Section II, of Article VIII of the By-laws, was that admission could not be charged at any of the championship meets (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1965). For the next 16 years the issue of commercialism would not be addressed. In 1981, the issue of commercialism was raised again when the Association was in financial trouble.

Athletic Directors

Throughout this discussion of commercialism and finance, there has been no mention of the influence of athletic directors. During the formation of the Association, athletic directors

who were track coaches did take a vested interest in the Association. However, as the Association grew the only time athletic directors became interested in the Association was when membership dues were raised. According to the coaches interviewed, this was a conference administered by track coaches. They felt that in very few instances were athletic directors involved in the operations of the Association. DuBreuil recalls that athletic directors only became interested when financial problems occurred and dues had to be raised. He stated, "athletic directors were interested but they didn't control any of the governing functions and they didn't have to do any work" (DuBreuil, 1996). Boozer responded, "they had the purse strings" (Boozer, 1996). Hale recalls that in his 30 years of involvement that "athletic directors have had and demonstrated almost no interest in the Association. On some sides that is good, because the beauty of that is it's run by coaches whose primary interest is track athletes..." (Hale, 1996). However, Long takes an opposite view. He stated:

Athletic directors who were also track coaches were the back bone of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. high percentage of athletic directors have been directly involved in the annual meetings of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.. I think it started from the respect original athletic directors had for their colleagues who were founders of the Association. This respect for the administration of track and field carried over and long has been a tradition of the Association. Other athletic directors have sensed a high degree of confidence in the administrative ability of all the coaches in the conference...(Long, 1996).

Most meeting minutes indicate that athletic directors had very little say in the operations of the Association. In many instances, attendance lists from meeting minutes indicate that only coaches attended the annual meetings. In some instances an athletic director may have been present, to cover for an excused coach, or they were present to answer questions about their track program if they had applied for admission. Another factor that needs to be mentioned was that this was an association that served two sports, cross country

and track. This Association was administered by track coaches and athletic directors did not have to spend any time with the operations of the Association. This conference, did not need the level of administration like a University Athletic Association or the State University of New York Athletic Conference. The N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. was not on that administrative level, so athletic directors might not have been interested in it that much.

The Roots of a Two-Day Championship Meet

As the Association grew, one of the solutions to an ever-growing championship meet was to develop qualifying standards or administer a two-day championship meet. In 1966, DuBreuil first suggested the idea for a two-day outdoor championship meet. Dubreuil spoke about the disadvantages and advantages of a two-day championship but they were not recorded in the meeting minutes. However, DuBreuil was candid on why he believed in and kept pushing for a two-day championship. His comment was:

I had seen the benefits of a two-day meet while I was an athlete at Indiana. The Big Ten championship was a two-day meet and the athletes were not forced to run trials, semi-finals and final races in one day. It was a lot easier on the athletes (Dubreuil, 1996).

Izzo was an athlete at Brockport State who competed in one-day championships. He recalls the effect competing in two or three races had on an athlete. Izzo stated:

Everyone had their "stud" athletes and everyone kept bringing them back again and again. Right across the board all of them had better times in dual meets. While here was the culminating experience of the year and in reality someone would be crowned champion, but often times it was a matter of attrition (Izzo, 1996).

What Izzo meant was that sometimes the fastest athletes did not win but rather the strongest. He pointed out that some athletes would have these great seed times coming into the meet, but would not achieve that fast time because the athlete was competing in a trial,

semi-final and final race. By the time the athlete made it to finals, he was exhausted. The obvious advantage of a two-day championship was to the athlete. By spreading out trials and semi-finals on one day, and having finals on the second day, the athletes tended to have better performances for this culminating championship. The disadvantages of a two-day meet were costs, travel time, skipped classes, and the extra time needed to run the meet.

On May 19, 1967, Dubreuil once again reiterated the inequities of competing three times in one day. However, this time, some coaches were more apt to speak out against a two-day championship meet. Boozer stated that he would be reluctant to take students away from classes and Phillips spoke that it might be difficult to secure officials for two days. Furthermore, for the first time, Dubreuil suggested the use of qualifying standards to reduce the number of competitors in an one-day meet (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1967).

The Questionnaire of 1967 and "Power Blocks"

After the championship meet in 1967, Dick Marsh track coach at Buffalo State, wrote a letter to Association president DuBreuil. In his letter Marsh expressed concern about expansion and believed there were four factors that needed to be addressed if the Association kept expanding. Marsh's concerns were: What were the intentions of all the schools involved in the Association and how would the Association fill voids in potential membership? His second concern was what kind of institutions did the Association desire? Marsh wondered if the Association desired competitive, high caliber teams, or teams with no proven record of competitiveness? His third concern was what should the size of the Association be? His fourth concern was how should the Association handle the matter of financial aid to athletes (Marsh, 1967)? Interestingly, this is the first time since 1953 that someone had addressed the issue of financial aid to athletes. Previously, Adelphi and Colgate were not admitted to the Association because of the fear of athletic scholarships. DuBreuil responded by stating, "... as we decided that sixteen be the maximum number of colleges in the Association...as we discussed this

matter much was said. I personally stated that if we had more schools we would need a two-day meet" (DuBreuil, 1967a).

According to meeting minutes, in 1963, Warren Lutes of R.P.I and Harry Anderson of Roberts Wesleyan had motioned that 16 teams be the Association's permanent size. This had been voted upon and ratified into the constitution (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1963). Furthermore, DuBreuil commissioned Gene Long, of Hamilton College, Harry Anderson, of Roberts Wesleyan College and Emery Fisher of the University of Buffalo to study the problems of expansion. In order to gather opinions about expansion from coaches, the committee mailed out a questionnaire to the members of the conference. The questions were:

Are you personally in favor of enlarging the conference? Is your director for or against same? Will your director increase his conference fees? Do you have the facilities to host the present: CHAMPION [sic] track and field meet, cross country meet, indoor meet? If we increase in size, can you host: CHAMPION [sic] track and field meet, cross country meet, indoor meet? Does your college plan to stay in the NYSCT&FA? Should we increase our geographical limits? Are you in favor of a two day NYSCT&FA Track Championship. Do you regularly participate in: NYSCT&FA track and field championship, cross country championship, indoor championship? Do you feel that there is any real "power block" issue involved in the size of our conference? (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1967).

Most of the questions were answered with a "yes" or "no" response, and comments often revolved around the issue of a two-day meet and enlargement. For example, Jim Newman, coach at R.P.I. responded, "I feel if the conference is enlarged we will have to go to a two day meet. If we remain at the present sixteen team level, I think a one day meet is perfectly adequate" (Newman, 1967). Boozer wrote on his questionnaire, "It is felt that the limiting factor is the championship meet in indoor and outdoor track with the necessity of

having a two day meet and that involves problems in obtaining qualified officials to cover both days" (Boozer, 1967).

One of the other questions expressed concerns over the issue of a "power block". A "power block" is when schools vote in groups to have provisions made or rules passed. There seems to have been a feeling among coaches that members of the public schools were voting against the private institutions. Another form of a "power block" is a team or teams dominating the championship meets year after year. From the 13 responses taken from the records of the Association, seven coaches responded that there was no power block, two responded yes, and four had no comment. Dave See, track coach at Oswego State wrote a letter to Long in response to the "power block" question. He stated:

I wouldn't blame the private colleges if they had the feeling that they should want more support to balance the strength voting-wise, of the State University colleges. This would be well justified, and I for one would not vote against adding colleges because of any fear of a private college "power block". Again, I feel that the main problem is sheer size-numbers (See, 1967).

DuBreuil wrote a letter to Long in October of 1967 and responded to the power block issue by stating:

In regard to your term "power block", it was thought of in two ways. One, political and the second, performance or standard wise of the various institutions. If the state schools or the I.C.A.C. schools have any political thoughts it is not shown by my being elected president.

In regard to the other the chain of power schools of our association in the past has seemed to run in cycles. I feel there is no power block in our conference (Dubreuil, 1967b).

When asked if there was ever any power blocks, Long stated that "coaches made contributions that might be defined as a power block, but were in fact coaches interested in

There has always been blocks of power. Not necessarily aligned along private school lines or state school lines. The power block has always been the people who are willing to do the work... Their names keep cropping up as officers and heads of committees as the people who are giving reports. I don't think there is any doubt that a group of people forms a power block and really has taken the association from where it was to where it is today. I think there has always been a power block over the last 30 years. It has existed simply because those four to six people who are willing to do the work have fairly similar outlooks on things and have fairly strong agreement on what should be done (Hale, 1996).

A possible example of a "power block" may have occurred indirectly when the Association was in the process of combining with the women's teams of the N.Y.S.W.C.A.A. in 1995 and 1996. Warren Lutes, who is head coach for both men's and women's track and cross country at R.P.I. stated that coaches who worked with both men's and women's teams may have voted in favor of the N.Y.S.C.T.C. based upon what was logistically easier for their teams. Lutes stated that "co-coaches for both programs, not voting as a block, but voting what was best for both programs. Because as much as possible we wanted to be at the same place at the same time" (Lutes, 1996). What Lutes meant was that it is very difficult to be a head coach for both programs and be at two different track meets in different parts of the state. What happens in these cases is that the head coach goes with one team and the assistant goes with the other team. Lutes also stated that it is not easy on the athletes if the head coach is not around, regardless of how competent the assistant coach was (Lutes, 1996). In an indirect sense, it may have appeared that head coaches for both programs voted as a "power block" when in reality there was never any intent to do this.

1968 and Qualifying Standards

In 1968, at the annual meeting Long presented the results of the survey. Long pointed out that there appeared to be an agreement among the coaches to retain a one-day track championship, and that most of the coaches were against expansion. After studying the results, the researcher found that many believed the Association would become too cumbersome to conduct an effective championship in cross country, indoor and outdoor track. Long also commented about the possibility of expelling teams as provided in the constitution. Long believed expulsion was necessary for schools who failed to accept responsibility for hosting meets, and for schools who failed to attend championships or who missed dues payments. This is the first time that someone had suggested using the expulsion provision in the constitution to remove members who were not accepting the rules as written in the constitution. In this case, specific reference was made to Plattsburgh State because of their failure to participate in Association championships (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1968).

The issue of a two-day meet arose once again at the 1968 meeting. Its champion, Cliff DuBreuil, further commented that the cost increase for a two-day meet would only be one additional meal for member schools. Again DuBreuil reiterated that by holding qualifying heats on the first day competitors would have a better chance for improved performance and once again, opposition was based upon the problems of finding officials for two days and taking students away from classes earlier. DuBreuil's motion to have a two-day meet was defeated by nine in opposition, and to four in favor (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1968). Even though a two-day meet was not ratified something good did come of this, and that was the foundation for developing qualifying standards.

Everett Phillips, who was coaching at the University of Rochester at this time, proposed that a committee be established to develop qualifying standards for both the indoor and outdoor championships. These standards were to be developed with a proviso that if an institution did not have an entry who met the standards, that the institution be allowed to enter

one competitor who did not meet the standards. However, if that institution entered two or more competitors in that event, they all had to meet the standard. The proviso also allowed an athlete to petition the executive committee in case of hardship (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1968).

In December of 1968, at a special meeting of the Association, Bob Boozer of the Committee on Meet Standards, presented qualifying standards for the outdoor track and field championships. The committee did not present standards for the indoor meet because of the variances in size of some of the indoor tracks in the Association. The committee's presentation included stipulations that were similar to those presented by Phillips' at the spring meeting in 1968. The committee's stipulation was that "regardless of the qualifying standard for each event, each member will be permitted to enter one individual in each event regardless of his level of performance" (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1968). Furthermore at this meeting, the Association decided to postpone any further proposals about a two-day championship. The members did this because they wanted to evaluate the success of the proposed qualifying standards within a one-day championship (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1968). Even though the Association used qualifying standards from 1969 onward, the Association did not actually ratify into the constitution the use of qualifying standards for the indoor and outdoor championships until 1973.

Boozer recalls why qualifying standards were finally adopted. He stated, "it was done to limit entries, and establish quality into the meet" (Boozer, 1996). DuBreuil believed that "qualifying standards were adopted because field sizes were becoming too cumbersome, and it took out of the hands of coaches the decision to leave an athlete at home" (DuBreuil, 1996). Long stated:

That as the league got more proficient, the field was crowded and you needed qualifying procedures and standards... The establishment of the standard did tend to motivate improvement by all the athletes in our Association. You could use them to keep fields to a workable size and they did make a one-day championship possible (Long, 1996).

Phillips proposed a different interpretation to why qualifying standards were adopted. Furthermore, he even goes into some of the problems that he feels have hurt track and field. Phillips thought that it was a combination of the establishment of an N.C.A.A. Division III championship and the growth of Association members that led to the establishment of qualifying standards for Association championships. He believed that the development of qualifying standards has led to a demise in the scheduling of dual meets which has hindered the development of track athletes. He stated:

As the N.C.A.A. developed so did the Association. It was a knee-jerk reaction, so you have the best performance qualifying for the N.C.A.A. Unfortunately, this produced a knee-jerk reaction down to whom you schedule and where you schedule for a fast track. This leads to a demise of sensible scheduling because other conferences, other impingements have come in...and it leads to the demise of the dual meet. There is a restriction on dual meets and the development of people. Coaches can't find out about athletes. Instead of developing athletes, we try to qualify instead (Phillips, 1996).

When asked if qualifying standards were good or bad, Phillips responded:

For the benefit of track and field, it is bad. S.U.N.Y.A.C.'s have standards, this Association does, coaches have to lie in some cases to get athletes into big invitationals. Where you develop track athletes, and the same in cross country is at a dual meet. We don't develop athletes, we go to big invitationals to qualify. Nobody has dual or triangular meets. Why do we have to get our athletes ready for nationals or a national qualifier? (Phillips, 1996).

The 1960's were a time of growth for the Association. The Association addressed the issues of commercialism, a two-day championship and qualifying standards. The Association chose to avoid commercialism for philosophic and practical reasons. Many coaches viewed small collegiate athletics as part of the student-athletes overall education. They believed that

an education, both athletic and academic should not be compromised for commercial interests. Members knew that if they charged admission to championship meets, that very few spectators would appear. Those who did attend the championship meets were mostly family and friends of competing athletes. It would not have made sense to drive away what support the athletes would receive.

The Association implemented qualifying standards in 1968 as a response to the growth in membership and the number of athletes competing in the championship meet. By implementing qualifying standards, members postponed any further discussions about a two-day championship. This was done to assess the impact qualifying standards had on the operation and results of the championship meet.

CHAPTER V

1970 - 1979

The 1970's brought along further expansion of the Association and some more philosophical issues. The Association not only grew in size, but it also began to expel members for a lack of participation in Association championships. Due to expansion and the advent of an N.C.A.A. Division III championship, the Association finally adopted a two-day championship. Once the N.C.A.A. developed a Division III championship in 1976, some coaches within the Association viewed the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A championship meets differently. A dichotomy developed, some coaches still viewed the Association championships as a competitive terminal team championship meet. However, some coaches began to view it as a highly competitive meet in order to qualify athletes for Division III nationals, instead of a terminal team championship meet.

At the annual meeting of 1970, two interesting things occurred. First, Dubreuil proposed that the constitution be amended to limit membership to 20 teams. The Association still had a 16-team limit which was ratified into the constitution in 1963. But, Dubreuil withdrew his motion for unknown reasons. What is significant is that for the first time someone actually proposed that the Association should be allowed to expand beyond 16 teams. The second significant occurrence, was that Plattsburgh State was removed from the

Association for failure to participate in championship meets. This was the first time a team was removed from the Association as prescribed by the constitution. Even though Long suggested the use of expulsion as prescribed in the constitution in 1968, no team had ever been removed. Furthermore, Ithaca was granted an indefinite leave of absence because its spring semester had ended before the scheduled outdoor championship. Ithaca would be allowed to return if their school calendar allowed for them to compete in the championships. To replace the loss of these two teams, the Association granted admission to Saint Lawrence University and the State University of New York at Fredonia.

In 1971, Hartwick was dismissed from the Association for a lack of participation in Association championships. Colgate was admitted into the Association. What is interesting about Colgate's admittance is that they still were a Division I school in all sports. Did their admittance not contradict the standards of membership previously stated in this thesis? A possible reason for Colgate's acceptance was that Association members were familiar with their head coach Robert Milner, so members may have trusted him. With their admittance, the Association still remained at 16 teams. The membership included: Alfred University, Colgate University, Hamilton College, LeMoyne College, Roberts Wesleyan College, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Saint Lawrence University, State University of New York at Binghamton, State University of New York at Brockport, State University of New York at Buffalo, State University of New York at Cortland, State University of New York at Fredonia, State University of New York at Oswego, Union College, University of Buffalo, and the University of Rochester. (See Appendix A for a timeline of the Association).

Membership Criteria

In 1973, for unknown reasons, members discussed the criteria for membership into the Association. For the first time, members decided to put the criteria into writing. Prior to this, the criteria were that an applicant must be a four-year degree granting institution in New York

state, and an applicant must be able to host two of the three championships and have adequate facilities to do so. The other standards previously discussed in this thesis were honesty and integrity of the coach and school. What is interesting, is that the Association put into writing criteria that was previously considered as "unwritten standards". For example, it was written that an applicant must be "upstate", in an area which was "approximately the triangle, from Binghamton to the Troy - Albany area to Buffalo. Applicants had to have a full-fledged track program under the guidance of a full-time faculty member (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1973). Furthermore, the Association established steps to clarify the issue of financial aid to athletes. For example, applicants could not offer grant-in-aid programs, and could only provide scholarships based upon need and academic ability.

For example, in 1977, Saint John Fisher College was denied membership because they were in violation of three specific rules for membership. Their track program was not under the direction of a full-time faculty member. Their program did not have an outdoor track, and they were administering financial aid above need (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1977). In 1978, Saint John Fisher was granted membership because they met the financial aid requirements. Fisher chose to be an N.C.A.A. Division III member and they would no longer be administering aid above a student's need. Furthermore, Fisher broke ground for an indoor track facility, which would allow the school to host two of three championships. One for cross country and the other for the indoor championships (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1978). The researcher does not know why the issue of membership criteria arose in 1973. Nothing was indicated in the meeting minutes that the Association was having a problem philosophically with its membership criteria, nor was any explanation given during the interviews.

The mid 1970's were relatively quiet in terms of development. Between 1973 and 1976, the Association voted down any proposals to have a two-day meet. However in 1975 and 1976 Association athletes competed against Canadian athletes at Queens University in Kingston, Ontario.

The Canadian Meet

In 1975 and 1976, the Association allowed its athletes or all-stars to compete against some Canadian schools. The Association all-stars were the top three finishers in each event contested at the championships. These individuals could, if they wanted to, compete in this track meet. The meet was a joint effort of members of the Association and Queens University in Kingston, Ontario. In a letter from Rolf Lund track coach at Queens to Dick Daymont of Hartwick College, the meet seems to have been a successful venture for both sides involved. Lund stated, "It was a pleasure to host the meet and to have your team take part. We were most impressed by their performances, competitive spirit and sportmanship" (Lund, 1975). Lund also expressed an interest in developing future meets in cross country and indoor track. Lund went on to state that "competition in the U.S. one year and Canada the next might prove interesting, even if it was late in the year such as a post conference exchange" (Lund, 1975). This is the only letter on file covering the meet. From meeting minutes, the meet was organized by Jan Hunsinger of Colgate University, and Dick Daymont of Hartwick College. Neither of the two men are presently involved in coaching. Unfortunately, Jan Hunsinger never responded to the researchers request for an interview. However, Hale does recall the meet having been a successful venture.

In 1980, Hunsinger tried to get the meet reinstated, but according to the meeting minutes, it was not possible because it conflicted with N.C.A.A. rules which prohibited competition for anyone other than the athlete's school before the N.C.A.A. championship (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1980). According to Hale, the meet was possible because Queens University competed regularly with New York state teams.

We saw Queens quite often and they had a coach named Rolf Lund and he was a very friendly, open, easy guy to get along with. I went to one of the competitions in Ontario and again my recollection is that it was a great experience for our kids; our

kids loved it. The reaction from the New York athletes was positive, reactions from Canadian athletes was positive (Hale, 1996).

Hale thinks the meet was discontinued for two reasons. At the time, the N.C.A.A. had regulations about all-star teams competing in meets, other than for their respective institution. Furthermore, Hale thinks that coaches did not want their athletes competing in more meets before the national championships. At this time period the N.C.A.A. had just gone to a Division III system, so coaches wanted their athletes to stay home and train instead of competing in another meet (Hale, 1996).

The Two-Day Championship

There are a number of reasons why a two-day meet was finally ratified. Many of the men interviewed believed a big impetus was that the Association wanted to develop better performances so athletes would qualify for the N.C.A.A. Division III nationals. Long recalled that an individual could be entered in more events, which helped the team be more competitive. According to Long, the disadvantages were that athletes may be entered in too many events. Travel could be expensive and that student athletes were away from classes longer at a very critical time of year in the spring. (Long, 1996). Izzo believed the only reason a two-day meet was adopted was because of N.C.A.A. qualifying standards and the desire to have athletes perform better.

Under the old circumstance, it was almost impossible to qualify for nationals in the state meet unless you were a sprinter and you did it early. If you were a 400 meter or 800 meter runner, or any place where you had to run trials, just doing it on the same day was ridiculous. That was the basic reason; no reason other than that and the fact they thought they could do a better job and not have to grind people so much (Izzo, 1996).

Hale confirmed Izzo's and Long's points of view and added:

I think one of the keys was Division II and Division III being formed and all of a sudden there was greater opportunity for us to get athletes to nationals. You get to the point where you have a quality athlete who is going to get to go to nationals and you don't want to kill him in one day. Or if he is within a few seconds of qualifying maybe we shouldn't have him do seven events. As soon as we went to a two-day meet, we immediately saw those results. Our performances of kids in finals was vastly superior to what it had been before (Hale, 1996).

Hudson stated that "the point of a two-day meet was to allow people to use their good athletes in more events than to excessively abuse them" (Hudson, 1996).

Financial Aid

The debate over financial aid to athletes was the second development the Association addressed in the Seventies. The issue of financial aid to athletes was not new to the Association. One of the founding principals was to have an Association of coaches and athletes who competed and participated for the sake of competition in a friendly environment. Many of the founding fathers did not want an Association contaminated with scholarship athletes and teams. Recall that Adelphi and Colgate were turned down for admission in the mid-Fifties because they were recruiting and offering scholarships based on athletic ability. No one interviewed knew why the issue arose in the 1970's. According to the men interviewed for this thesis, the issue was always there although it was never discussed. According to Hudson, there were coaches who were suspicious that scholarship athletes from other sports were competing in the Association. "I suspect there were cases where there were scholarship athletes from other sports competing in the Association. There has always been a feeling that we don't want schools that have a program with scholarship athletes. That goes the whole way back" (Hudson, 1996).

In 1969, the Association voted that financial aid provided to student athletes by their respective institutions be awarded in compliance with N.C.A.A. and E.C.A.C. regulations. Much discussion in the Seventies revolved around terms such as "grants-in-aid", "academic scholarship", and "special need". Furthermore, the only time financial aid was ever discussed at length was when a team was applying for admission to the Association. (Remember the example of Saint John Fisher College in 1977 and 1978.) Another more pointed example of the admission criteria of financial aid, comes from 1983 when Canisius College applied for admission.

According to the meeting minutes, a number of coaches took issue with Canisius giving aid to athletes. Joe Pierson, of Cortland State, asked "how many athletes were getting financial aid in track?" Dave Rapple, the Canisius track coach responded that "the financial aid department decided who receives aid." Pierson then inquired as to how many freshmen would receive financial aid and Rapple did not know. Hale then asked if Canisius would stop giving financial grants if it meant that Canisius would get into the Association. Rapple's response was, "Can't answer." Izzo then asked about recruiting, and Rapple stated that much of that information "he did not know." (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1983). After Rapple left the meeting, much discussion centered on Rapple's inability to answer questions about financial aid completely. Due to Rapple's responses, Canisius was denied membership by a vote of 10 in favor, seven against and one abstention. Due to constitutional requirements a two-thirds vote was required in order to be accepted into the Association (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1983). Long's hand written note to DuBreuil, provides a candid example of how philosophically divisive this issue was. In his note Long wrote:

In principle I am opposed to Canisius' membership in the NYSCT & FA. In the practical aspect I have no objections. Membership should not be based on a programs demise but on the nature of the program. Will the NCAA allow Canisius to participate in the Division three [sic] nationals because they don't have a quality

Division one [sic] program? It is their choice to run a division I [sic] program including aid. Canisius and others are running Division I programs in "other" sports to maintain their Division I Basketball status. They should know that the conscious decision to do that may affect their ability to participate at a lower level.

Also if any Div. III school can acknowledge they have lost athletes to a Division I NYSCTFA member because of aid it becomes even more of a reason to not allow their Div. III participation. Wouldn't you like to give some awards at 1/3 tuition !!?

P.S. All the above goes for Colgate also.

I'll get off my Division III soap box now.

Please feel free to vote as you see fit.

Just thought I'd let off some steam (Long, 1984).

Many of the coaches recall the feeling that Roberts Wesleyan College and Colgate had scholarship athletes on squads. Izzo stated in his interview:

That over the course of time, some schools, especially Colgate got caught in a dilemma. Some of their star athletes were football players who ran track. The question became, "we know they were recruited as a football player but we also know they are helping your team..." When Jan was coaching, it wasn't enforced because Colgate was already in the Association and it wasn't against the rules yet (Izzo, 1996). Lutes felt that the issue was never addressed in the case of Roberts Wesleyan or Colgate simply because of the "gentlemanly spirit" among the coaches. Lutes responded:

I think for a long time people closed a blind eye to Roberts Wesleyan because of Harry Anderson. Harry was a gentleman, they might have been aware that some of the athletes at Roberts Wesleyan were getting financial aid but because of the type of guy Harry was...other coaches didn't say anything (Lutes, 1996).

When asked about Colgate and Hunsinger, Lutes responded, "I think if Colgate or another school started to dominate people might try to blow the whistle. As long as they were competitive and as long as it was a gentlemanly friend, it would not be condoned but overlooked" (Lutes, 1996).

The hard part about having a financial aid rule such as this, was that the Association did not have any policing powers to enforce it. DuBreuil responded it was "one of those rules that looked good on paper, but was poorly enforced" (DuBreuil, 1996). If it was such a good rule in theory, then why was it never enforced? Hale and Phillips shed some light on this question. Phillips stated that the Association had "no eligibility board, no forms for which athletes could be certified that they weren't receiving financial aid to compete. It would have put the Association on an administrative level that they were not prepared to do, nor had the resources to do" (Phillips, 1996). What Phillips meant by this was that it takes time, energy and money on an administrative level to help enforce such a rule and the Association was not prepared to do it. Hale agreed with Phillips' observation and believed the lack of any policing power hurt the Association. Hale stated:

The Association has never had any policing powers. The one bad side of this organization and it has always been a weak point of the organization is that we are extremely strong among the coaches. I think we have very little strength when you get to the AD's level at these schools...When it comes down to enforcing things like our financial aid rule we have no muscle at all, we never did. This whole rule was enforced between gentleman, we accepted your word for it (Hale, 1996).

The Association may not have had any policing powers but in 1993, Roberts Wesleyan was removed because their coach, Paul Kurtz unwittingly admitted to members of the Association that his institution gave scholarships to athletes. Hale recalls the incident.

Paul Kurtz was the poor guinea pig, who was the test case for the whole thing, and I feel sorry for the guy because had he not blurted out in a meeting that they had

been giving athletic scholarships, they would still be in the Association. Roberts Wesleyan from my point of view should still be in the Association. Granted, I know they are violating the rules and the spirit and intent of the rules, but the fact of the matter is, even with the limited money they give, can never be a factor in the Association... Colgate on the other hand, with athletic aid available to them could dominate the Association and could turn the Association into a non-championship. That's never going to happen at Roberts Wesleyan, its awfully difficult to make rules that fit those circumstances (Hale, 1996).

The 1970's was a period of growth and definition for the Association. It grew from 16 teams to 20 teams by the end of 1979. The Association further defined itself by addressing such issues as: Association size, a two-day championship meet, financial aid to athletes, and developing admissions criteria that were previously "unwritten standards". However, due to this expansion and some philosophical differences, the members of the Association would find themselves redefining the purpose of the Association by the mid-Eighties. Furthermore, as the Eighties wore into the Nineties, the Association would find itself considering a combined track meet of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association and the New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Association.

CHAPTER VI

1980 - 1995

By 1980, the Association was comprised of 24 teams. These teams were: Alfred University, Colgate University, Hamilton College, Hartwick College, Ithaca College, LeMoyne College, Marist College, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Roberts Wesleyan College, Saint Lawrence University, Saint John Fisher College, Siena College, State University of New York at Binghamton, State University of New York at Brockport, State University of New York at Buffalo, State University of New York at Cortland, State University of New York at Fredonia, State University of New York at Geneseo, State University of New York at Oswego, State University of New York at Plattsburgh, Union College, University of Buffalo, and the University of Rochester. (See Appendix A for a timeline of the Association).

The 1980's could possibly be defined as a period of solidification for the Association. The Association once again confronted the issue of commercialism when it faced a financial crisis. Furthermore, as the N.C.A.A. developed a Division III championship and its popularity grew, so did the stature of the Association championships. Many coaches of the Association approached the championships differently. Some coaches viewed the Association championships as a highly competitive meet to qualify individuals for nationals, rather than a

terminal season team championship. These diverging and conflicting philosophies forced the Association to address its purpose with the writing of the position papers of 1984 and the subsequent constitutional convention of 1985. The writing of the papers and the convention solidified the purpose the Association championship was to have in each member's season and the role coaches were to take in making the Association a viable part of their championship season.

The Association can be seen in a more progressive light with the implementation of an honest effort rule, which was proposed to be more comprehensive than the honest effort rule the N.C.A.A. track and field rules committee was following in 1980 and 1981. As the 1980's progressed into the 1990's, the Association further defined itself by seeking out methods and finally combining with the women's teams of the N.Y.S.W.C.A.A. in 1996 to become the New York State Collegiate Track Conference.

Commercialism of 1981

By 1981, the Association consisted of 23 teams and it was again in a state of financial trouble. At the annual meeting, in December of 1981, suggestions to generate revenue again revolved around the ideas of charging admission to the meets and selling meet programs. The proposal to raise dues from \$60.00 per team to \$75.00 was also suggested (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. 1981). At this point, schools were receiving \$100.00 if they hosted an indoor championship, \$150.00 if they hosted an outdoor championship, and \$50.00 for hosting the cross country championship. According to John Izzo, current head coach at Brockport State, as the Association grew it failed to adjust to inflation and the rising costs of medals. Izzo recalls that the crisis of 1981 was caused primarily by two things.

One, medal costs sky rocketed. It was the demise of the wonderful medals that were in existence since when I was in it. They went to a cheaper medal. They were beginning to scale back because of inflation...in the Sixties and Seventies kept eating

into funds. They were reticent to change and therefore this reluctance ultimately ended up causing the treasury almost not to be able to be solvent (Izzo, 1996).

In response to this dilemma, the Committee on Admission Charges made the following recommendations. They recommended that members hosting an Association championship be permitted to charge admission and that the revenue generated from admission sales would be split evenly between the host school and the Association. The proceeds from the sale of T-shirts, meet programs and any other ancillary income would belong to the host school (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1981). What is interesting about all this is that the coaches interviewed cannot recall any host institution ever charging admission. The coaches interviewed for this thesis have some very interesting answers why the issue of commercialism kept arising. Some reasons are very practical and some are very philosophical.

Miller believed that the reason the issue came up every so often was because host schools needed "to have funds to meet expenses. Track and field is not self-supporting" (Miller, 1996). John Hudson, of R.P.I, remarked by stating that track is "... not a big money maker. I think its the kind of thing where they'd like to have some people in the stands. They were probably worried that if they charged admission that attendance would be even smaller" (Hudson, 1996). Phillips said that it was worthwhile to host the championship meet simply because it was the school's contribution to the Association. Phillips elaborated more as to why the issue arose.

Some schools were finding it difficult to host the meet. It costs money to host the meet, but it was your donation to the Association to host, regardless of the money received. Union, Cortland, and R.P.I., for example, were schools with the only indoor tracks for a while, so they were hosts every other year. It was the school's donation to the well being of the Association to pay for the rest of it (Phillips, 1996).

Long and Hale recalled that there were philosophical discussions throughout the 1970's and 1980's about commercialism and the escalating costs of medals and hosting championship

meets. Their responses were philosophical and complete opposite in nature. Long responded by stating:

The Association went through a bigger commercial crisis, and sponsorship was considered at one time. Fortunately it didn't go too far, no educational activity should be beholden to commercial interests. Originally, the [admissions] charge was to help cover administrative costs... Traditionally these costs were born by the host college and many of the participating association colleges could not afford the luxury of these costs (Long, 1996).

Hale recalled the problem, and stated a different view.

I know my position at the time was for us to join the real world and get with what was happening in the Eighties. I think it is one of the things that has hurt our sport, if you don't charge for someone to come and see it the public perceives it as having no value, and if it has no value they don't come...

Over the years things change, people who run professional sports have learned very quickly, that if you assign a value to something, a monetary cost to something, it has value, and the public endorses that value. I'm not saying that it is right or wrong, but we need to get into the Twentieth century (Hale, 1996).

Honest Effort Rule

The annual meeting of 1981 brought about an interesting rule change to the Association's constitution. What changed was that DuBreuil and Long proposed an honest effort rule be added to the constitution. Their proposed rule was this. "Finally declared contestants must honestly participate in the events in which they are declared, or be barred from all remaining events in the current meet" (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1981). According to the coaches interviewed, the reason the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. adopted such a stringent rule was because coaches would declare their athletes then pull them out of certain events if the event field was

too competitive. This by-law change was significant, for the researcher has proposed that the Association's honest effort rule may have been more comprehensive in scope than the honest effort rule the N.C.A.A. was using at the time. Furthermore, the only discussion that occurred over the proposed by-law was how to define "honestly participate." The members finally agreed that this would involve judgement on the part of the meet officials.

The N.C.A.A. rule applied only to running events with trial and semi-final events. Furthermore, the N.C.A.A. rule did not apply to field events. Whereas the Association's rule applied to all running and field events. The N.C.A.A. rule stated this:

Runners legally declared in running events which have qualifying heats must honestly participate. The runner must run with maximum effort, or qualify or place, and not intentionally take a false start, in all heats and finals, or be barred from all remaining running events in the current meet. An athlete who hopes to compete in a later round but is scratched because of injury or illness may be withdrawn from the competition when the reason is substantiated in writing to the referee by the meet physician. He may return to competition when the meet physician reports subsequent recovery to the referee in writing (Howard, 1981).

Hudson stated there were three reasons why the Association developed such a stringent rule.

One, game playing on the part of coaches when they declared athletes. They would declare somebody in two or three events, then look to see who else was entered and scratch out at the last minute. Two, there were some athletes entered in both sprinting events then purposely false start then run later on. Three, in some cases athletes were playing games. A coach would enter an athlete in an event they really didn't want to run in and then they would false start (Hudson, 1996).

Long stated:

The New York state rule did precede any N.C.A.A. rule. It prevented the contriving coach from entering athletes in many events, and loafing through and not

competing in a particular event to be strong in another... It also forced an honest declaration of events prior to the start of the meet. It tended to increase participation and proficiency and certainly was a long step in the direction of integrity (Long, 1996). Izzo was not sure if the rule preceded any N.C.A.A. rule but could recall the heated debates that occurred over the definition of "honest effort". He believed it came down to where an athlete had to race in that event in which they were declared, and then the athlete had to make an attempt to place or score (Izzo, 1996). Jim Ulrich, of Fredonia State, vividly recalled why the state adopted an honest effort rule and also believed the Association's rule was developed before the N.C.A.A. adopted a similar rule. Ulrich stated:

Tim Hale used to enter distance runners in every race and on the day of the meet he would decide what they would run. Because there was no honest effort, he could pull them out, so he would enter his runners in the 1500, 3000, and 5000. The day of the meet you didn't know who would show up where, and there was no accounting for it because there was no rule against it... Tim would put a key runner in every distance race that didn't have a trial. So we wouldn't know who was honestly going to be there, so they could skip the earlier race. I don't mean to point the finger at him, but he was only doing what was smart, he could make his decision after he saw who was running everything so we put a stop to that (Ulrich, 1996).

Hale agreed with Ulrich's assessment and admitted that he would enter all his distance runners and subsequent to final declarations, would pull them out. Hale defended his reasoning by stating:

My purposes were twofold. One to score the most points we could score and two, to show people that the rule needed to be changed. It was as unfair of me to do that as it was the coach to multiply enter their kid in the field events and then pull them out and change the way flights were comprised... Jim Ulrich may recall the things I did with the distance runners and he may very well be right. I think the whole

underlying problem was that coaches weren't being realistic and entering kids where they could compete...(Hale, 1996).

Long, Hale and a few other coaches composed the Association's honest effort rule. Unfortunately, neither Hale nor Long could recall who helped compose the rule. Hale even agreed that the Association's rule did precede any N.C.A.A. rule. Furthermore, Hale was a member of the N.C.A.A. Track and Field committee from 1983 to 1989 that adopted a version of the Association's rule. Hale recalled being at one of the committee meetings, when a discussion arose over the honest effort rule.

We went through the honest effort rule and I basically said "here is what we do in New York state, and why we do it." My suggestion was we change the N.C.A.A. rule to read the way our New York state rule read. I don't believe it went through the first time I suggested it, but I think in that next year went through easily and it became the national standard. Again it is a good rule. If a coach enters you, he should be entering you because you are able to do it, not because you might do it (Hale, 1996).

It was not until 1988, that the N.C.A.A. Track and Field Committee changed their honest effort rule for the 1989 track and cross country seasons. The N.C.A.A. rule, which is very similar to the Association's read:

Athletes legally declared in all events must participate honestly in all trials and finals or be barred from all remaining events in the current meet, including field events and multiple events. Athletes must compete with maximum effort and/or qualify from trials into the finals (Simmons, 1989).

The evidence exists that the Association's honest effort rule was more comprehensive than the N.C.A.A. track and field rule. Furthermore, evidence exists that members of the Association may have influenced the N.C.A.A. track committees to adopt an honest effort rule similar to the one the Association was using.

At the annual meeting of 1980, DuBreuil addressed the issues that would become big questions by the mid-Eighties. DuBreuil felt there was a need to make institutions more responsible to the Association. He also felt a sense of lost fellowship among the coaches (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1980). This issue carried over to 1981, when the Association once again addressed the issue of responsibility by associate members. According to meeting minutes, many institutions were lax in fulfilling their obligations to the Association (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1981). However, no institutions were named in the meeting minutes. Hudson recalls that the Association went away from carefully scrutinizing programs and ignored the membership criteria that programs have a full-time coach and participate in all the championship meets. Hudson stated:

We admitted into the Association a lot of people with marginal programs. I think again this relates to the business of the part-time coach and had realized after we let in some teams, that were not going to participate to the extent that people felt they should participate. Marist is a case and point. They had a very strong cross country team, but never made much of a point to go to the indoor or outdoor meet (Hudson, 1996).

Hale recalled this time period of the mid-Eighties and thinks the problems occurred because the Association became too large.

Because we went to 24 schools, and because for the most part, those 24 schools had good track programs, we had to develop a mentality that our track standard had to be so tough. We had to limit the field or else we had to go to four rounds of competition and that would be counterproductive and so we developed this elitist attitude, and as Doc Phillips has said over years and years, we have eliminated the middle of the meet. All we had was the front end of the meet, we had almost like a small national level competition. The qualifying standards were such, where you could get only one athlete in an event... The meet went from being the season end and team

championship for your school to the season end and elite invitational for your school.

There was really very little semblance of a true team championship (Hale, 1996).

The Philosophy Papers of 1984

In December of 1984, the Association chose to address the issue of philosophy, and the coaches from Saint Lawrence University, Cortland State, Siena College and Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute volunteered to submit position papers on the philosophy of the Association by January of 1985.

Ron Hoffman and Bob Goodwin of Saint Lawrence wrote about five points the Association should try to embody. They felt that the philosophy of athletes being students first was paramount, as embodied in the N.C.A.A. Division III philosophy. Goodwin and Hoffman stated that since most of the Association schools were Division III members that the Association schools consider financial and recruiting practices very carefully. Furthermore, they emphasized that all financial aid should be based upon need and should not exceed the limits as stipulated by the member college and the college Scholarship service. Their second point was that in order to be a member, schools should take an active part in its organization. Both coaches felt member schools should participate in two of three championships. If a school failed to do this, the consequence would be probation for a year. If a school failed to participate in two of three championship meets during their probationary period, they would be expelled. Their third point was to allow for the continued use of wild cards for athletes who failed to make an event standard for the track championships. Their fourth point was that the Association should provide the best possible chances for good performances at the best meet sites. They suggested that a Games Committee should be set up in order to ensure proper rotation of meet sites and their final point was to develop a system where the annual meeting would be less cumbersome. Goodwin and Hoffman believed that the annual meetings were becoming too long because coaches kept debating philosophical or constitutional issues,

which was delaying the financial or business issues the Association needed to address (Goodwin and Hoffman, 1984).

The Cortland State coaches, Joe Pierson and Tom Steele, wrote on seven points. They first addressed the philosophy of the Association. They agreed with the Association's original intent to foster and develop a competitive championship meet with a high level of sportsmanship. They reiterated that the constitution needed to be strengthened and enforced to be sure that the original intent of the Association was upheld, but nothing specific was ever stated.

The second issue for them was membership criteria. They stated that no college should be admitted that gave aid for athletic ability. They wanted potential members to have varsity or club status in all three sports. They wrote that all members must compete in all three championship meets, unless excused by the procedures written in the constitution. They also stressed that potential members should be able to host at least one championship meet.

The third issue was criteria for dismissal from the Association. They felt that members had been lax in enforcing this rule as proscribed by Article VIII of the constitution. Their fourth point was that a site selection criteria should be added to the constitution. They proposed that guidelines should be used for future meet sites. Their proposal for site selection was that if a school was interested in hosting a championship meet, they would have to submit a proposal to the site selection committee. The site selection committee would then review the proposal and inspect the proposed site before granting approval.

The fifth issue Pierson and Steele addressed was that of governance. They believed that the system of executive committee governance was effective for the size of the Association in 1984. They proposed that the executive committee should meet in September of each year and plan for that particular year's operations. They also proposed that executive committee officers would serve two years except for the treasurer, who would serve one. Their reasoning for this proposal was that this would lend to more continuity for the Association. At this point in 1984,

the Association voted new officers in every year, which meant a constant turnover in leadership.

The sixth issue addressed by Pierson and Steele was to change the annual meeting from December to the last Sunday in September. They justified this by stating that the new date would allow for part-time coaches to attend the meeting without taking a personal day from their other jobs. Furthermore, they felt it would be easier on coaches who were involved in final exams during December. They also stressed that travel would be easier in September. Their final point was that member schools should be allowed to have affiliations with other conferences as long as the member institution met the Association's requirements and obligations toward championship meets (Pierson and Steele, 1984).

The third position paper was written by Bob Reilly of Siena College. He believed that the Association should be open to all New York State colleges and universities which desire to share in the Association's rules and by-laws. At this point, Association membership was comprised of 24 schools, four of which competed in Division III track and field but competed in Division I football and basketball. These four schools were Siena, LeMoyne, Marist and Colgate. Reilly believed that the philosophy of the institution, not the N.C.A.A. division designation, should be a factor in membership criteria. Reilly also stated that members were now placing a different priority on the Association championships which was previously the role of the Association. He felt that the N.C.A.A. championship had become the primary terminal championship taking the place of the Association championships. However, he believed that association members could participate in other leagues as long as they fulfilled the obligations of attending all championship meets (Reilly, 1984).

The fourth position paper was written by R.P.I.'s John Hudson. Hudson believed a major problem in the years previous to 1984 was the criteria for membership, which was very informal. Hudson proposed that there be two classes of membership. Full-members would be required to have a full-time coach and must be able to host and participate in at least two

Association championships. Hudson's second class of members or associate members would be required to adhere to the philosophical guidelines of the Association, but would not have to fulfill the obligations of a full-time member. According to Hudson, this two-tiered distinction would have eliminated one of the objections to admission of schools with limited programs, and would provide an alternative for schools which do not meet criteria to remain. Hudson also pointed out that this would result in a change of governance.

Hudson wrote that the Association should be guided by an executive board, which would consist of Association officers and chairmen of the various committees. The executive board would meet several times a year and arrange for championships and conduct business. In this scheme, only full-time members of the Association would be allowed to hold membership on the executive board and cast votes. Associate members would be allowed to discuss business, but would not be permitted to vote. Hudson believed that most of the schools that participated in only two championships, were also the same schools that did not attend the annual meetings. This biased the voting requirements. As stated in the Association's constitution, an affirmative change in policy was required by two-thirds of the membership. In some cases, not enough schools were present to have a quorum as stated in the constitution. Hudson believed that an executive board would allow for greater time to deal with more pressing problems of general concern, not waste time on administrative issues that dealt with operations (Hudson, 1984).

After these position papers were written, each member received a copy which he reviewed. Unfortunately, much is not known after this. Hale thinks members voted on the position paper they philosophically believed in (Hale, 1996). Nothing is stated in the meeting minutes of what became of these papers or what discussions occurred as a result of the papers. From meeting minutes the researcher can discern that the Association did hold a constitutional convention in May of 1985, during which changes were made, some of which seem similar to the changes written in the position papers.

The Constitutional Changes of 1985

On May 11, 1985, the Association held a constitutional convention at Hamilton College to address the philosophical issues within the constitution. The Association did not change the original philosophy, as stated in the constitution. What is important is that the members chose to change the governance of the Association. Previously, the Association was governed by an executive committee consisting of the officers of the Association, which were the president, vice president, secretary and treasurer. The new governance of the Association was entrusted to an executive committee, which consisted of officers of the Association and the chairmen of standing committees.

The new changes to Article III, section IV of the constitution read: "The immediate management of this Association shall be entrusted to an Executive Committee consisting of the officers of the Association and the Chairmen of standing committees. No college shall have more than one representative on the executive committee" (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1985).

Furthermore, the members added two new sections to Article III of the constitution. The Association was to have two standing committees. One would be a "competition committee" and the other a "constitution - long range planning committee." The second new section stated that for the annual meetings of the Association only, there was to be an audit committee and a nominating committee (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1985). These new sections of the constitution placed governance on the executive committee. However, these changes should not be interpreted to mean that all decision-making power rested in the hands of the executive committee. Active leadership had always been sought on the part of all coaches involved on the previous executive committees and standing committees. If a coach was not a member of the executive committee, this should not have prohibited the coach from being proactive in other areas. Involvement was encouraged in all areas of governance of the Association. This was viewed as a coach's contribution to the functioning and well-being of the Association.

Another significant change that occurred was that the Association finally formalized the geographic aspects of its membership criteria. Article IV, section I originally read: "Membership in this Association shall be limited to four-year degree-granting colleges and universities located in New York state" (Constitution, 1984). The new Article IV, section I read: "Membership in this association shall be limited to four year degree-granting colleges and universities located in New York state, north of Westchester county" (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1985). What is significant is that the Association finally formalized a boundary. Previously, although it was not written into the constitution, the applicant school must have come north of Westchester county.

The second section added to Article IV addressed the issue of financial aid. Previous to this, no section was ever devoted to the issue of financial aid to athletes. The new section II read:

Membership shall be limited to those schools who award financial aid based entirely on demonstrated need. Talent grants based on athletic ability are not permitted. The presidents of each member school must submit an annual statement of compliance to this effect. Athletic grant recipients in other sports will not be eligible for Association championships (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1985).

The membership also added section III of Article IV. Section III provided stipulations that all members must abide by. The new section III stated that all members must attend the annual meetings, pay all financial obligations, meet all participation standards or be expelled from the Association as written in the constitution, Members must manage or host a championship meet and grant financial aid based on need, not athletic ability. Furthermore, members were to participate in cross country, indoor and outdoor track on the club or varsity level (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1985).

The next area the Association addressed was that of expulsion and probation. Any member could be expelled, suspended or placed on probation "through any change in

standards or conduct as shall be deemed incompatible with the best interest of, and standards of membership in the Association, or failure to meet obligations referred to..." (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1985). Probation was to be for a period of one year. Suspension would not last for more than one year, and any member could appeal their suspension at any regular or special meeting of the Association. Suspended members could not participate in championship meets and failure to pay dues would be the penalty of expulsion (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1985). The difference between probation and suspension was that a probationary member could partake in the championships, whereas a suspended member could not, even though that suspended member still paid dues.

These changes were significant because now there were written standards and clauses within the Association's constitution. Now that these "unwritten standards" were ratified into the constitution, they were no longer topics for philosophic debate. In essence, these philosophic points could be argued but only changed through the formal procedures specified by the constitution. These changes also solidified the philosophy of the Association, and set forth the principles and foundation upon which the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Conference would be set.

The Advent of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference

During its history there were times when the Association did address the issue of women competing within the Association, however no serious consideration was ever given until the late 1980's and early 1990's. Before an analysis can begin of the merger between organizations, it is interesting to read about the times when considerations were given to allow women to compete in the Association's championships.

In 1976 the Long Range Planning Committee led by DuBreuil stated that women could compete in the Association championships if they met the qualifying standards.

Furthermore, the committee also felt it was not possible to have separate championship events for women because of a lack of time (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1976).

In 1982 the Long Range Planning Committee led by Hunsinger considered having a combined men's and women's meet. The reasoning given by Hunsinger was that other conferences, such as the Ivy League schools, were having one championship track meet for men and women, instead of separate ones at different locations (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1982).

In 1988 the issue of a combined men's and women's cross country championship was discussed. However, there was apparently no way for the two organizations, the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. and the New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Association, to agree to a set date. According to meeting minutes, neither organization was willing to move the date of their respective championships. Furthermore, it was stated in the minutes that the women's organization was "willing to accept men in their meet, but not move their date" (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1988).

1990 - 1995

In 1992 the Long Range Planning Committee presented some benefits of a combined organization to the members of the Association. The first reason given was political strength. Since the Association was governed by track and cross country coaches, combined membership would give more prestige and political power in terms of Title IX and in general with athletic directors. The second reason was that a united conference would put men and women on an even championship format. The third reason was in terms of handling problems in both cross country and track. These problems faced all coaches regardless of gender and it was felt that unity would help solve them. The fourth reason was to make the meet more exciting. At championship meets there is a lot of time between some events. The Association noted that the inclusion of women's events would eliminate these gaps and provide excitement for the athletes and fans. The fifth reason was that it would increase championship

opportunities of varsity and club track teams. The sixth reason was that since most coaches had dual responsibility and it would be logical to include women in the membership. With a combined organization, these coaches would not have to split teams and coaching staffs on a championship date. Furthermore, it also was proposed that athletes would get the best advice and team support if the meet was combined. The seventh reason was that economically, it was less expensive for an institution to have both programs belong to a united track conference. The final reason was that by adding women's teams, the Association would save money and time in trying to recruit new members who might not be desirable. Furthermore, it was also stated that most of the teams in the N.Y.S.W.C.A.A. were upstate colleges like those in the Association, it would seem practical to combine those colleges into one conference (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1992). After 1992, meeting minutes and information on the evolution of the new conference are lacking. However, when the coaches from both athletic associations did agree to merge in 1996, some constitutional changes were made.

The membership clauses in the constitution were redefined. The 1985 change to section I of Article IV stated that membership would be limited to "four-year degree granting colleges in New York State north of Westchester County" (N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., 1985). The membership clause of the new constitution of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference reads: "Membership in this association shall be limited to N.C.A.A. Division III, four- year degree granting colleges and universities in New York State" (N.Y.S.C.T.C., 1996). The new constitution strengthened section II of Article IV by stating that "Membership shall be limited to those schools who adhere to N.C.A.A. Division III financial aid regulations..." (N.Y.S.C.T.C., 1996). This change eliminated any questions that may arise about a schools financial aid practices. Furthermore, section III of article IV remained the same, thus keeping the stringent membership criteria that was established in 1985, to ensure stability within the new conference.

CHAPTER VII

Summary and Conclusions

From the research analyzed throughout this thesis, this Association was a response to the need of small colleges and athletes for a terminal season championship that served their respective skill levels. Since the I.C.A.A.A.A., Drake relays, Penn relays and the National championships were too competitive, coaches from these upstate New York schools created an athletic association that would serve their respective team needs and goals. Henry Kumpf, James McLane, Dave Miller, Wilford Ketz, and Verne Rockcastle, to name a few, were pioneers for collegiate track and field in upstate New York. They created and developed an Association based upon sportsmanship, honesty, integrity and friendship. Some might view the Association as an "old boys" network, where if a coach knew another coach in the Association, he could get his team into the Association. However, as times changed, the Association found itself integrating with the women's coaches of the N.Y.S.W.C.A.A. to form a new conference. What may have been perceived as an "old boys" club, now became a fully integrating track conference for male and female athletes and coaches. The words mentioned in the previous sentences should not be construed to mean that the coaches of this Association lacked any integrity or competitive spirit, for they did exhibit those ideals throughout the Association's history. An indirect consequence of those ideals was the development of a

terminal season championship and the development of local and state rivalries that still exist today within the new conference.

As the Association grew, it addressed many issues such as, membership criteria, qualifying standards, a two-day championship and financial aid for athletes. Many of the issues came about because for a long time the Association had no clear policy, as was the case with financial aid to athletes and the "unwritten standards" of membership. The researcher believes that as the Association grew, it became better organized and had better policy structure. From material researched, many of the "unwritten standards" of membership were poorly defined in the Fifties and Sixties. However, as the Association evolved these "unwritten standards" became defined and written within the Association's constitution and by-laws during the Seventies and Eighties. For example, the Association created a problem for itself by granting membership to marginal teams with part-time coaches, which originally was contrary to Association standards. In some cases these new members, such as Siena and Marist only went to certain championships depending on where the championship meet was held within the state. By granting membership to marginal track teams with part-time coaches, the Association created some of its own problems by not adhering to its policies. However, the Association did not create all of the problems it faced. Many of the problems mentioned throughout this thesis were the result of loose interpretation of the constitution and by-laws, or the result of "unwritten standards". The Association also confronted problems created by the indirect influence of the N.C.A.A..

As the N.C.A.A. kept growing in power and stature, the Association responded by adopting N.C.A.A. track and field rules and policies for its championships. As the N.C.A.A. developed a Division III championship, the Association indirectly adopted those N.C.A.A. rules governing financial aid to student athletes. Eventually this rule was adopted as part of the Association's membership criteria. As the popularity and stature of the N.C.A.A. sponsored national championships grew, so did the stature of the Association championships. Many

coaches of the Association approached the championships differently. Some coaches viewed the Association championships as a highly competitive meet to qualify individuals for nationals, rather than a team championship, as was the original intent of the founding members. In essence, what was a terminal meet for some athletes became a warm-up for nationals for others. This indirect influence is like a malaise, it has affected not only this Association, but collegiate track in general.

Furthermore, there seems to be prevalent feeling by some that a successful season can only be measured by how far a team advances in its national tournaments. Administrators, coaches, athletes, parents and spectators seem to have lost the notion that Division III collegiate athletics serves as primarily an educational endeavor, where winning is not the main goal but education, participation and competition take precedence.

When asked the final interview question, "what were the goals and philosophy of the Association in the 1950's, 1960's 1970's 1980's and 1990's?" people will read many diverse answers that the Association was to provide a competitive terminal season team championship in cross country, indoor and outdoor track. DuBreuil responded by stating:

In the Fifties, it was a terminal championship for athletes and also fellowship of coaches. In the Sixties and Seventies, there was no clear purpose, no stated goals, which lead to problems with expansion, qualifying standards, dues increases and a two- day meet. In 1984, the purpose shifted back to a terminal meet for some and a warm up for nationals for others (DuBreuil, 1996).

Ulrich approached the Association championships as being the most important meet of the season, more important than the State University of New York Athletic Conference Championship. His philosophy was and still is:

An attitude toward the Association as being a very important factor in our program or the most important factor in our program. I think our team doing well at the State meet is more important than nationals. Not that I don't think nationals is not

[sic] important for the individual, but as a team aspect, I have always felt toward the state meet (Ulrich, 1996).

Izzo responded to the final question by stating that the Association has always tried to provide the best competition in a fair and equitable situation. He stated:

In a way it's one of the most unique conferences I have been associated with any way, shape or form, simply because you have some very small colleges, public colleges, very prestigious private colleges. I have never felt, ever, snootiness, that it was beneath the University of Rochester to invite Brockport to a dual meet, or Hamilton or visa versa. It has been an "us" thing, and our kids, you see them talking all the time. It's a very friendly rivalry and everybody wants to beat everyone for bragging rights (Izzo, 1996).

Hale believed there have been times where the coaches have "stretched" the philosophy and constitution of the Association to its limits, but each time as a philosophical problem began the coaches came back to those early objectives. Hale stated:

I think from day one, the objective of this Association has been to have good friendly competition among schools, to promote friendly relations among colleges, and to conduct high level, competitive championships. I think over the years we have had to step back and examine our goals, but at least we keep coming back to those same things which are expressed in the constitution, by laws and philosophy of the Association... we may stretch those to the limits sometimes, but the bottom line is we keep coming back (Hale, 1996).

As people and organizations grow, it is not uncommon for them to assess their respective philosophies and goals from time to time. The same is true for athletic teams and athletic conferences as well. From time to time it is necessary to address and clear up issues that can impinge upon the development and mission of any organization. The coaches of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association were never immune from this

process. As written throughout this thesis, the members of this Association were progressive and had addressed issues over the years that caused division among them. Throughout it all, has been the fact that the Association had always offered a competitive, friendly, terminal season team championship for all members involved.

References

- Boozer, Robert, (1996). Retired track coach from Brockport State. Interview by author.
September 9, 1996. Transcribed tape recording.
- Boozer, Robert, (1967). Undated letter to Gene Long, 1967. Manuscript in possession of the
New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- Bridwell, Troy, (1949). Undated press release. Transcript in possession of the New York State
Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- Byrne, Larry, (1996). Telephone conversation in November of 1996.
- Constitution, (1950). The New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association Constitution.
Transcript in possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- Constitution, (1952). The New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association Constitution.
Transcript in possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- Constitution, (1984). The New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association Constitution.
Transcript in possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- DuBreuil, Clifford, (1996). Retired track coach from Alfred University. Interview by author.
September 16, 1996. Transcribed tape recording.
- DuBreuil, Clifford, (1967a). Letter to Dick Marsh, May 29, 1967. Manuscript in possession of the
New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- DuBreuil, Clifford, (1967b). Letter to Gene Long, October 6, 1967. Manuscript in the possession
of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- Falla, J., (1981). NCAA: The Voice of College Sports, A Diamond Anniversary History 1906 -
1981. Mission, Kansas. Published by the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

- Falla, J., (1981). NCAA: The Voice of College Sports, A Diamond Anniversary History 1906 - 1981. Mission, Kansas. Published by the National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Frisch, M., (1990). A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History. (pp. 5 - 13). Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.
- Fulton, James, (1996). Retired track coach from Brockport State. Interview by author. September 9, 1996. Transcribed tape recording.
- Goodwin, R., & Hoffman, R. (1984, December). Philosophy Paper of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- Hale, Timothy, (1996). Head track coach at the University of Rochester. Interview by author. November 25, 1996. Transcribed tape recording.
- Howard, Bruce, (Ed.) (1981). NCAA Men's and Women's Cross Country and Track and Field Rules. Mission, Kansas.
- Hudson, John, (1996). Track coach at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. Interview by author. October 8, 1996. Transcribed tape recording.
- Hudson, John, (1984, December). Philosophy paper of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. Paper presented at annual meeting of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- Izzo, John, (1996). Track coach at Brockport State. Interview by author. October 24, 1996. Transcribed tape recording.
- Ketz, Wilford, (1953). Letter to Patrick Carolan, October 22, 1953. Manuscript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- Kumpf, Henry, (1951). Letter to Dave Miller, October 17, 1951. Manuscript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

- Long, Eugene, (1996). Retired track coach from Hamilton College. Interview by author. October 3, 1996. Transcribed tape recording.
- Long, Eugene, (1984). Undated letter to Cliff DuBreuil in the Cliff DuBreuil file. Manuscript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- Lund, Rolf, (1975). Letter to Dick Daymont, July 11, 1975. Manuscript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- Lutes, Warren, (1996). Track coach at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. Interview by author. October 8, 1996. Transcribed tape recording.
- Marsh, Richard, (1967). Letter to Clifford DuBreuil, May 22, 1967. Manuscript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- Miller, David, (1996). Retired track coach from Cortland State. Interview by author. November 27, 1996. Transcribed tape recording.
- Miller, David, (1955). Letter to all N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. coaches, May 9, 1955. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- Moffet, Donovan, (1952). Letter to James McLane, May 14, 1952. Manuscript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- Newman, Jim, (1967). Undated letter to Eugene Long. Manuscript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1949). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. November 28, 1949. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1951). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. May 18, 1951. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1953). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. May 20, 1953. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1954). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. May 21, 1954. Manuscript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference archives.

N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1955). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. May 20, 1955. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1960). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. May 13, 1960. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1961). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. May 18, 1961. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1963). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. May 10, 1963. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1965). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. May 14, 1965. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1967). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. May 19, 1967. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

- N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1968). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. May 17, 1968. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1973). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. May 11, 1973. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1976a). A timeline found in the meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. December 9, 1976. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1976b). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. December 9, 1976. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1977). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. December 12, 1977. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1978). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. December 14, 1978. Transcript in the possession the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1980). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. December 11, 1980. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.
- N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1981). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. December 10, 1981. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1982). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. December 9, 1982. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1983). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. December 9, 1983. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1985). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. December 10, 1985. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1988). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. December 12, 1988. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., (1992). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. December 12, 1992. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

N.Y.S.C.T.C., (1996). Meeting minutes of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference. June 13, 1996. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

Pierson J., & Steele, T. (December, 1984). Philosophy Paper of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

Phillips, Everett, (1996). Retired track coach from Fredonia State. Interview by author. September 29, 1996. Transcribed tape recording.

Reilly, Robert, (December, 1984). Philosophy Paper of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association.

Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

Rockcastle, Verne, (1996). Retired track coach from Brockport State. Interview by author. October 7, 1996. Transcribed tape recording.

Rockcastle, Verne, (1950). Undated letter to all members of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association. Transcript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

See, David, (1967). Letter to Gene Long, June 23, 1967. Manuscript in the possession of the New York State Collegiate Track Conference Archives.

Simmons, Margaret, (Ed.). (1988). NCAA Men's and Women's Cross Country and Track and Field Rules. Mission, Kansas.

Struna, Nancy L. (1990). Historical Research in J.R. Thomas & J.K. Nelson (Eds.) Research Methods in Physical Activity, 2nd ed. (pp. 201 - 227). Champaign, Ill., Human Kinetics Books.

Ulrich, James, (1996). Head track coach at Fredonia State. Interview by author. September 29, 1996. Transcribed tape recording.

Appendix A

A timeline of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.

- May 22, 1948: The first R.P.I. Invitational Track and Field Meet for New York State colleges. This was the forerunner of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. championships.
- November 28, 1949: Organizational meeting of the New York State Collegiate Track and Field Association held at the Onondaga Savings Bank Building, Syracuse, New York.
- The following colleges and universities accepted charter membership on these dates.
- December 17, 1949: Triple Cities College, subsequently Harpur College and then Binghamton State.
- December 21, 1949: Cortland State.
- January 3, 1950: Hartwick College.
- January 16, 1950: United States Merchant Marine Academy.
- January 20, 1950: Ithaca College.
- January 23, 1950: Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.
- February 28, 1950: Alfred University.
- March 7, 1950: Union College.

- March 22, 1950: Champlain College, subsequently Plattsburgh State.
- March 23, 1950: Brockport State.
- May 21, 1950: The first annual N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. championships held at R.P.I.
The events contested at the first meet were: 100 yard dash, 220 yard dash, one mile run, 440 yard dash, two mile run, 220 yard low hurdles, 880 yard run, shot put, pole vault, high jump, javelin throw, running broad jump, and discus.
- November 11, 1950: The first N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. cross country championship held at Cortland State.
Buffalo State admitted to the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A..
- September 25, 1951: The University of Rochester admitted to the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A..
1953: Champlain College is terminated, they resign from the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A..
- May 22, 1953: Hamilton College admitted to the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.
- October 27, 1953: Oswego State admitted to the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A..
- May 19, 1955: The United States Merchant Marine Academy resigns from the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A., because of the formation of a metropolitan New York city league that met its terminal season needs.
- May 20, 1955: Roberts Wesleyan College admitted to the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.
- November 4, 1955: The University of Buffalo admitted to the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.
- May 17, 1957: Hartwick College resigns from the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.
- May 19, 1961: Hartwick College rejoins the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.
- May 18, 1962: Plattsburgh State admitted to the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.
- May 10, 1963: LeMoyne College admitted to the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.

Association members vote to replace the 220 yard low hurdles with the 330 yard low hurdles. Members also vote in the Hop - Step - Jump (Triple Jump) into the order of events.

- May 14, 1965: Association members vote to replace the 330 yard intermediate hurdles with the 440 yard intermediate hurdles for the outdoor championships.
- March 19, 1966: The first N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. indoor championships held at Union College. The events contested at this indoor championships were: One mile run, A Dash, which was determined by the length of the facility. 600 yard run, high hurdles, two mile run, 1000 yard run, two mile relay, one mile relay, and freshman medley relay.
- December 8, 1968: Association members adopt qualifying standards for the outdoor championship meet.
- December 14, 1969: Association members vote to replace two mile run with the three mile run for the outdoor championships.
- December 10, 1970: Plattsburgh State is dismissed from the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.. Ithaca College is granted an indefinite leave of absence from the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.. Fredonia State and Saint Lawrence University are admitted to the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A..
- Association members vote to add the steeplechase to the outdoor order of events. However, due to a lack of facilities at certain institutions, members make it a nonscoring event to be used at the meet directors discretion.
- December 9, 1971: Hartwick College dismissed from the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.. Colgate University admitted to the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.
- December 7, 1972: Hartwick College reinstated to the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A..

- December 13, 1973: Association members vote to add the 35lb weight throw to the order of events indoor championships.
- December 12, 1974: Association members vote to add the six mile run and the hammer throw to the outdoor order of events for the outdoor championships.
- May 5, 1975: Association all-stars compete at Queens College in Ontario, Canada. This meet also occurred in 1976, but was dropped due to conflicts with N.C.A.A rules.
- December 11, 1975: Association members vote to add the 440 yard dash and the Distance Medley Relay to the order of events at the 1976 indoor championships. Members also vote to add the three mile run and 880 yard run to the order of events for the 1977 indoor championships.
- May 14 and 15, 1976: The first N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. Decathlon is held at Alfred University.
- December 9, 1976: Marist College and Albany State are admitted to the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A..
- December 14, 1978: Siena College and Saint John Fisher College are admitted to the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A..
- December 17, 1979: All qualifying standards are changed to metric measurements.
- March 3, 1980: Ithaca College is reinstated, and Geneseo State is admitted to the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.
- December 11, 1980: Plattsburgh State is reinstated to the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. Members also vote to the Pentathlon as a nonscoring indoor event.
- March 11, 1984: Association members vote to make the pentathlon an indoor scoring event.
- December 10, 1987: Buffalo State suspended for one year.

- October 13, 1988: Oswego State withdraws from the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A..
- December 8, 1988: LeMoyne College is expelled from the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A..
- December 14, 1989: Saint John Fisher College is expelled from the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A..
- December 13, 1990: Marist College withdraws from the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A..
- December 12, 1991: Colgate University withdraws from the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A..
- December 1992: Siena College withdraws from the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A..
- December 1993: Roberts Wesleyan dismissed from the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A.
- June 13, 1996: Members of the N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. and the N.Y.S.W.C.A.A. vote to combine their respective championship meets.

Appendix B

N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. Outdoor Track Champions

<u>Year</u>	<u>Champion</u>	<u>Points</u>	<u>Runner-up</u>	<u>Points</u>	<u>Host</u>
1950	R.P.I	44.75	Alfred	38.5	R.P.I
1951	Alfred	51.7	R.P.I.	33.7	Harpur
1952	Alfred	52.33	Union	47.5	U.S.M.M.A.
1953	Union	67.5	R.P.I	55	Union
1954	Alfred	42.5	Rochester	35.25	Brockport State
1955	Cortland	63.5	Rochester	50.5	R.P.I
1956	Hamilton	44.25	R.P.I.	35	Hamilton College
1957	Union	53	Alfred	46	Rochester
1958	Alfred	56.2	Union	54	Union
1959	Alfred	48.79	Hamilton	48.6	R.P.I.
1960	Hamilton	43.8	Union	36.3	U.B.
1961	Alfred	56.5	Cortland	35	Cortland State
1962	Cortland	58	Hamilton	39.25	Hamilton College
1963	Rochester	54	Cortland	43	Rochester
1964	U.B.	33	Rochester	32.5	Union College
1965	Rochester	49	Hamilton	36	Cortland State
1966	Rochester	58	R.P.I.	47	R.P.I.
1967	Rochester	53	Brockport	43	Brockport State
1968	R.P.I.	50	Brockport	42.5	Hamilton College
1969	Rochester	52	Cortland	39	Alfred
1970	Cortland	65	Rochester	52	Cortland State

1971	Buffalo State	48	Union	36.5	Buffalo State
1972	Colgate	57.5	Cortland	40	Rochester
1973	Brockport	54	Colgate	47	Binghamton State
1974	Colgate	44	Union	42	Colgate
1975	Cortland	54.5	R.P.I.	42	Brockport State
1976	R.P.I.	89	Union	85	Hartwick College
1977	Fredonia	119	Colgate	85	Oswego State
1978	Fredonia	156	Colgate	89	Fredonia State
1979	Colgate	115	Fredonia	111.5	Colgate
1980	Fredonia	150	Buffalo State	81	Colgate
1981	Fredonia	137	Buffalo State	127	Rochester
1982	Fredonia	117	Cortland	102	Union College
1983	Fredonia	143	Buffalo State	62	Colgate
1984	Fredonia	133	Ithaca	83	Hartwick College
1985	Fredonia	164	Ithaca	79	Fredonia State
1986	Fredonia	103	Ithaca	94	Rochester
1987	St. Lawrence	145	Ithaca	128	U.B.
1988	St. Lawrence	121	Fredonia	100	Rochester
1989	Rochester	119	Fredonia	103	U.B.
1990	Albany State	126.75	Ithaca	110.75	Hartwick
1991	Albany State	144	Ithaca	117	U.B.
1992	Albany State	137	Rochester	120	Rochester
			Fredonia	120	
1993	Fredonia	156	Albany	123	Albany State
1994	Fredonia	167	St. Lawrence	82	Brockport State
1995	Rochester	112	Fredonia	110.5	Rochester

1996 Fredonia 105 Rochester 83 R.P.I.

Appendix C

N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. Indoor Champions

<u>Year</u>	<u>Champions</u>	<u>Points</u>	<u>Runner-up</u>	<u>Points</u>	<u>Host</u>
1966	Rochester	35	LeMoyne	32	Union
1967	Rochester	38	LeMoyne	36	Union
1968	Cortland	25	Alfred	24.5	Union
1969	Cortland	48.5	Alfred	32	Cortland
1970	Cortland	42.5	Buffalo State	42	Union
1971	Cortland	59	Union	24.5	Cortland
1972	Cortland	39.5	Colgate	35	Union
1973	Colgate	42	Union	35	St. Lawrence
1974	Cortland	33	Rochester	32	Cortland
1975	Cortland	48	Union	30.5	Union
1976	Union	81.5	Cortland	67	R.P.I.
1977	Fredonia	86	Union	70	St. Lawrence
1978	Colgate	92	Fredonia	89	Cortland
1979	Fredonia	78.5	Buffalo State	77	Union
1980	Fredonia	131.5	Colgate	67	R.P.I.
1981	Buffalo State	133	Fredonia	111	Hamilton
1982	Fredonia	118.5	Colgate	107.5	St. Lawrence
1983	Fredonia	144.5	Cortland	68.5	Fredonia
1984	Fredonia	129	Buffalo State	52	Hamilton
1985	Fredonia	151	St. Lawrence	64	Fredonia
1986	St. Lawrence	87	Ithaca	78	Hamilton

1987	St. Lawrence	167	Ithaca	94	St. Lawrence
1988	St. Lawrence	126	Fredonia	80	Colgate
1989	Fredonia	106	Colgate	80	Colgate
1990	Colgate	162.2	Albany	127	Colgate
1991	Albany	134	Fredonia	104	Colgate
1992	Fredonia	104	Albany	85	Colgate
1993	Fredonia	171	Albany	62	Fredonia
1994	Fredonia	153	Roberts Wes.	90	St. Lawrence
1995	Fredonia	169.5	R.P.I.	95	Plattsburgh
1996	Fredonia	101	Cortland	78	Hamilton

Appendix D

N.Y.S.C.T.F.A. Cross Country Champions

<u>Year</u>	<u>Champion</u>	<u>Points</u>	<u>Runner-up</u>	<u>Points</u>	<u>Host</u>
1950	R.P.I.	38	Alfred	39	Cortland
1951	Alfred	46	Buffalo State	63	Alfred
1952	Buffalo State	53	Union	77	Ithaca
1953	Buffalo State	15	R.P.I.	60	Buffalo State
1954	Buffalo State	59	Union	91	Hartwick
1955	Buffalo State	49	Hamilton	58	Harpur College
1956	Alfred	58	Buffalo State	81	Hamilton
1957	Hamilton	51	U.B.	65	Buffalo State
1958	Hamilton	60	Roberts Wes.	81	R.P.I.
1959	Alfred	20	Hamilton	63	Alfred
1960	Alfred	41	Buffalo State	52	Roberts Wes.
1961	Alfred	43	Roberts Wes.	49	Harpur College
1962	Roberts Wes.	61	Buffalo State	63	Ithaca
1963	Roberts Wes.	46	Alfred	85	U.B.
1964	Roberts Wes.	80	Cortland	108	Oswego
1965	Roberts Wes.	57	Hartwick	69	Roberts Wes.
1966	Roberts Wes.	72	Buffalo State	96	Alfred
1967	Buffalo State	83	LeMoyne	91	LeMoyne
1968	Brockport	77	Hamilton	100	Oswego
1969	Buffalo State	65	Brockport	73	Binghamton
1970	Brockport	56	Roberts Wes.	95	U.B.

1971	Hamilton	85	Union	94	R.P.I.
1972	Colgate	49	Rochester	79	Roberts Wes.
1973	Colgate	39	Hamilton	62	Fredonia
1974	Colgate	50	Hamilton	62	LeMoyne
1975	Hamilton	92	Buffalo State	96	Hamilton
1976	Rochester	64	Brockport	84	Colgate
1977	Rochester	43	Fredonia	91	Rochester
1978	Fredonia	58	Albany	115	R.P.I.
1979	Fredonia	52	Marist	104	Binghamton
1980	Siena	63	Fredonia	65	Fredonia
1981	Fredonia	46	Siena	76	Albany
1982	Siena	54	Fredonia	62	LeMoyne
1983	Siena	31	Fredonia	81	Buffalo State
1984	Siena	72	St. Lawrence	76	Siena
1985	St. Lawrence	84	Ithaca	90	Rochester
1986	Siena	58	St. Lawrence	72	Geneseo
1987	Rochester	32	St. Lawrence	121	Union
1988	Rochester	27	Hamilton	93	Binghamton
1989	Rochester	35	St. Lawrence	79	Roberts Wes.
1990	Rochester	39	Colgate	85	Union
1991	Rochester	31	Albany	74	Union
1992	Rochester	36	Albany	78	Fredonia
1993	Rochester	34	Ithaca	67	Binghamton
1994	Rochester	23	St. Lawrence	66	Union
1995	Rochester	25	St. Lawrence	82	St. Lawrence

Appendix E

N.Y.S.C.T.F.A Presidents

<u>Year</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Institution</u>
1950 - 1951:	Henry Kumpf	R.P.I.
1951 - 1952:	James McLane	Alfred University
1952 - 1953:	James Liebertz	U.S.M.M.A.
1953 - 1954:	Wilford Ketz	Union College
1954 - 1955:	David Miller	Cortland State
1955 - 1956:	Roman Speagle	University of Rochester
1956 - 1957:	Isadore Yavits	Ithaca College
1957 - 1958:	Robert Murray	Buffalo State
1958 - 1959:	Eugene Long	Hamilton College
1959 - 1960:	Dave Henderson	Harpur College
1960 - 1961:	Harry Anderson	Roberts Wesleyan
1961 - 1962:	David Miller	Cortland State
1962 - 1963:	Eugene Long	Hamilton College
1963 - 1964:	Everett Phillips	University of Rochester
1964 - 1965:	Wilford Ketz	Union College
1965 - 1966:	Warren Lutes	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
1966 - 1967:	Robert Boozer	Brockport State
1967 - 1968:	Cliff DuBreuil	Alfred University
1968 - 1969:	Richard Marsh	Buffalo State
1969 - 1970:	Ron Coleman	Union College
1970 - 1971:	Joe Pierson	Cortland State

1971 - 1972:	Emery Fisher	University of Buffalo
1972 - 1973:	Eugene Long	Hamilton College
1973 - 1974:	Jan Hunsinger	Colgate University
1974 - 1975:	Cliff DuBreuil	Alfred University
1975 - 1976:	Clarence Lephart	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
1976 - 1977:	Gary Truce	Binghamton State
	Everett Phillips	Fredonia State
1977 - 1978:	John Hudson	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
1978 - 1979:	Timothy Hale	University of Rochester
1979 - 1980:	Eugene Long	Hamilton College
	Jan Hunsinger	Colgate University
1980 - 1981:	Cliff DuBreuil	Alfred University
1981 - 1982:	Tom Steele	Cortland State
1982 - 1983:	James Ulrich	Fredonia State
1983 - 1984:	Joe Pierson	Cortland State
1984 - 1985:	Dick Fisher	Geneseo State
1985 - 1986:	Everett Phillips	Fredonia State
1986 - 1987:	Bob Goodwin	Saint Lawrence University
1987 - 1988:	Eugene Long	Hamilton College
1988 - 1989:	James Nichols	Ithaca College
1989 - 1990:	Roberto Vives	Albany State
1990 - 1991:	Warren Lutes	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
1991 - 1992:	Art McKinnon	Colgate University
	Everett Phillips	Fredonia State
1992 - 1993:	Joe Fisher	Geneseo State
1993 - 1994:	John Izzo	Brockport State