

## 2021 Ohio Valley Conference Team Statistics Through games of Dec 04, 2021

SCORING OFFENSE	G	TD	FG	XPT	2XP	DXP	Saf	Pts	Avg/G
1. Austin Peay	11	46	14	36	2	0	0	358	32.5
2. UT Martin	13	53	7	49	0	0	1	390	30.0
3. Southeast Missouri	11	37	13	36	0	0	0	297	27.0
4. Murray State	11	29	12	25	0	1	0	237	21.5
5. Tennessee State	11	27	10	21	2	0	0	217	19.7
6. Tennessee Tech	11	26	7	25	0	0	0	202	18.4
7. Eastern Illinois	11	20	8	14	1	0	0	160	14.5

PASS DEFENSE	G	Comp-Att-Int	Pct.	Yds	Avg/A	TD	Avg/G
1. Eastern Illinois	11	153-261-4	58.6	1870	7.2	14	170.0
2. Murray State	11	174-311-6	55.9	2045	6.6	10	185.9
3. Tennessee State	11	182-337-7	54.0	2285	6.8	16	207.7
4. Austin Peay	11	199-394-19	50.5	2304	5.8	20	209.5
5. UT Martin	13	236-420-17	56.2	2750	6.5	23	211.5
6. Tennessee Tech	11	216-357-3	60.5	2454	6.9	21	223.1
7. Southeast Missouri	11	198-347-11	57.1	2830	8.2	20	257.3

SCORING DEFENSE	G	TD	FG	XPT	2XP	DXP	Saf	Pts	Avg/G
1. Austin Peay	11	36	9	27	1	0	1	274	24.9
2. UT Martin	13	39	18	37	0	0	0	325	25.0
3. Murray State	11	38	6	32	0	0	0	278	25.3
4. Tennessee State	11	36	16	32	0	0	0	296	26.9
5. Eastern Illinois	11	40	10	38	1	0	1	312	28.4
6. Southeast Missouri	11	46	8	37	2	0	0	341	31.0
7. Tennessee Tech	11	44	14	40	1	1	0	350	31.8

PASS EFFICIENCY	G	Comp-Att-Int	Pct.	Yds	Avg/G	TD	Effic.
1. Austin Peay	11	227-416-9	54.6	3010	273.6	23	129.3
2. Tennessee State	11	179-320-6	55.9	2240	203.6	13	124.4
3. UT Martin	13	208-362-10	57.5	2316	178.2	17	121.2
4. Southeast Missouri	11	138-278-9	49.6	1821	165.5	14	114.8
5. Murray State	11	147-277-15	53.1	1775	161.4	5	102.0
6. Tennessee Tech	11	164-311-19	52.7	1760	160.0	10	98.7
7. Eastern Illinois	11	189-397-17	47.6	2143	194.8	8	91.0

TOTAL OFFENSE	G	Rush	Pass	Plays	Yards	Avg/P	TD	Avg/G
1. Austin Peay	11	1613	3010	831	4623	5.6	42	420.3
2. UT Martin	13	2692	2316	868	5008	5.8	49	385.2
3. Southeast Missouri	11	2146	1821	718	3967	5.5	35	360.6
4. Murray State	11	2034	1775	730	3809	5.2	27	346.3
5. Tennessee State	11	1262	2240	684	3502	5.1	26	318.4
6. Tennessee Tech	11	1554	1760	714	3314	4.6	25	301.3
7. Eastern Illinois	11	998	2143	732	3141	4.3	17	285.5

PASS DEFENSE EFFIC.	G	Comp-Att-Int	Pct.	Yds	Avg/G	TD	Effic.
1. Austin Peay	11	199-394-19	50.5	2304	209.5	20	106.7
2. Murray State	11	174-311-6	55.9	2045	185.9	10	117.9
3. UT Martin	13	236-420-17	56.2	2750	211.5	23	121.2
4. Tennessee State	11	182-337-7	54.0	2285	207.7	16	122.5
5. Eastern Illinois	11	153-261-4	58.6	1870	170.0	14	133.4
6. Tennessee Tech	11	216-357-3	60.5	2454	223.1	21	136.0
7. Southeast Missouri	11	198-347-11	57.1	2830	257.3	20	138.2

TOTAL DEFENSE	G	Rush	Pass	Plays	Yards	Avg/P	TD	Avg/G
1. Murray State	11	1742	2045	706	3787	5.4	37	344.3
2. Eastern Illinois	11	1987	1870	723	3857	5.3	35	350.6
3. Austin Peay	11	1633	2304	814	3937	4.8	33	357.9
4. UT Martin	13	1931	2750	852	4681	5.5	35	360.1
5. Tennessee State	11	1727	2285	743	4012	5.4	33	364.7
6. Tennessee Tech	11	1570	2454	724	4024	5.6	39	365.8
7. Southeast Missouri	11	1906	2830	742	4736	6.4	43	430.5

KICKOFF RETURNS	G	No.	Yards	TD	Long	Avg.
1. Southeast Missouri	11	26	669	1	86	25.7
2. Tennessee State	11	37	731	1	90	19.8
3. Murray State	11	28	504	0	40	18.0
4. Eastern Illinois	11	12	205	0	27	17.1
5. Austin Peay	11	28	448	0	60	16.0
6. UT Martin	13	12	181	0	27	15.1
7. Tennessee Tech	11	23	279	0	28	12.1

RUSHING OFFENSE	G	Att.	Yards	Avg/A	Long	TD	Avg/G
1. UT Martin	13	506	2692	5.3	75	32	207.1
2. Southeast Missouri	11	440	2146	4.9	75	21	195.1
3. Murray State	11	453	2034	4.5	69	22	184.9
4. Austin Peay	11	415	1613	3.9	66	19	146.6
5. Tennessee Tech	11	403	1554	3.9	46	15	141.3
6. Tennessee State	11	364	1262	3.5	65	13	114.7
7. Eastern Illinois	11	335	998	3.0	50	9	90.7

PUNT RETURN AVG	G	No.	Yards	TD	Long	Avg.
1. Tennessee State	11	20	213	0	47	10.6
2. Murray State	11	19	182	1	52	9.6
3. Tennessee Tech	11	20	176	0	25	8.8
4. Eastern Illinois	11	7	58	1	18	8.3
5. Austin Peay	11	27	176	1	41	6.5
6. Southeast Missouri	11	18	116	0	16	6.4
7. UT Martin	13	9	51	1	34	5.7

RUSHING DEFENSE	G	Att.	Yards	Avg/A	Long	TD	Avg/G
1. Tennessee Tech	11	367	1570	4.3	57	18	142.7
2. Austin Peay	11	420	1633	3.9	48	13	148.5
3. UT Martin	13	432	1931	4.5	73	12	148.5
4. Tennessee State	11	406	1727	4.3	66	17	157.0
5. Murray State	11	395	1742	4.4	65	27	158.4
6. Southeast Missouri	11	395	1906	4.8	77	23	173.3
7. Eastern Illinois	11	462	1987	4.3	63	21	180.6

INTERCEPTIONS	G	No.	Yards	TD	Long	Avg.
1. Austin Peay	11	19	245	3	75	12.9
2. UT Martin	13	17	294	2	75	17.3
3. Southeast Missouri	11	10	82	1	31	8.2
4. Tennessee State	11	7	57	0	47	8.1
5. Murray State	11	6	166	1	90	27.7
6. Eastern Illinois	11	4	29	1	29	7.2
7. Tennessee Tech	11	3	26	0	15	8.7

PASS OFFENSE	G	Comp-Att-Int	Pct.	Yds	Avg/A	TD	Avg/G
1. Austin Peay	11	227-416-9	54.6	3010	7.2	23	273.6
2. Tennessee State	11	179-320-6	55.9	2240	7.0	13	203.6
3. Eastern Illinois	11	189-397-17	47.6	2143	5.4	8	194.8
4. UT Martin	13	208-362-10	57.5	2316	6.4	17	178.2
5. Southeast Missouri	11	138-278-9	49.6	1821	6.6	14	165.5
6. Murray State	11	147-277-15	53.1	1775	6.4	5	161.4
7. Tennessee Tech	11	164-311-19	52.7	1760	5.7	10	160.0

PUNTING	G	No.	Yards	Avg/P	Ret.	Avg/R	TB	Net/P
1. Austin Peay	11	58	2359	40.7	49	0.8	3	38.8
2. Southeast Missouri	11	66	2716	41.2	118	1.8	2	38.8
3. UT Martin	13	60	2398	40.0	214	3.6	2	35.7
4. Murray State	11	52	1902	36.6	69	1.3	0	35.2
5. Eastern Illinois	11	62	2449	39.5	207	3.3	4	34.9
6. Tennessee Tech	11	57	2140	37.5	128	2.2	2	34.6
7. Tennessee State	11	65	2590	39.8	316	4.9	4	33.8

**2021 Ohio Valley Conference  
Team Statistics Through games of Dec 04, 2021**

<b>KICKOFF COVERAGE</b>								<b>3RD-DOWN CONVERSIONS</b>				
	G	No.	Yards	Avg.	Ret.	TB	NetAvg	G	Conv.	Att.	Pct.	
1. Tennessee State	11	46	2771	60.2	581	13	40.5	1. Murray State	11	63	151	41.7
2. Murray State	11	47	2673	56.9	201	24	39.8	2. UT Martin	13	77	187	41.2
3. Austin Peay	11	72	4045	56.2	406	34	38.7	3. Austin Peay	11	78	195	40.0
4. Tennessee Tech	11	44	2386	54.2	468	9	38.5	4. Tennessee State	11	54	149	36.2
5. UT Martin	13	72	3854	53.5	642	18	38.4	5. Tennessee Tech	11	55	154	35.7
6. Southeast Missouri	11	59	2971	50.4	485	11	37.5	6. Southeast Missouri	11	51	158	32.3
7. Eastern Illinois	11	38	1917	50.4	296	8	37.4	7. Eastern Illinois	11	40	163	24.5

<b>FIELD GOALS</b>					<b>OPP 3RD-DN CONVERT</b>				
	G	Made	Att	Pct.	G	Conv.	Att.	Pct.	
1. Austin Peay	11	14	18	.778	1. Tennessee Tech	11	50	151	33.1
2. Tennessee Tech	11	7	10	.700	2. Austin Peay	11	59	174	33.9
3. Murray State	11	12	18	.667	3. Murray State	11	51	145	35.2
4. Southeast Missouri	11	13	20	.650	4. Eastern Illinois	11	55	149	36.9
5. Eastern Illinois	11	8	13	.615	5. Tennessee State	11	61	162	37.7
6. Tennessee State	11	10	18	.556	6. UT Martin	13	66	175	37.7
7. UT Martin	13	7	15	.467	7. Southeast Missouri	11	59	152	38.8

<b>PAT KICKING</b>					<b>4TH-DOWN CONVERSIONS</b>				
	G	Made	Att	Pct.	G	Conv.	Att.	Pct.	
1. Tennessee Tech	11	25	25	1.000	1. Southeast Missouri	11	10	15	66.7
2. Southeast Missouri	11	36	37	.973	2. Austin Peay	11	16	32	50.0
3. Murray State	11	25	26	.962	UT Martin	13	11	22	50.0
4. UT Martin	13	49	51	.961	4. Murray State	11	8	17	47.1
5. Austin Peay	11	36	38	.947	5. Eastern Illinois	11	16	35	45.7
6. Eastern Illinois	11	14	15	.933	6. Tennessee State	11	5	12	41.7
7. Tennessee State	11	21	24	.875	7. Tennessee Tech	11	6	16	37.5

<b>SACKS BY</b>					<b>OPP 4TH-DN CONVERT</b>				
	G	No.	Yards	Avg/G	G	Conv.	Att.	Pct.	
1. UT Martin	13	21	120	1.62	1. Southeast Missouri	11	10	23	43.5
2. Austin Peay	11	18	154	1.64	2. UT Martin	13	12	27	44.4
Murray State	11	18	116	1.64	3. Austin Peay	11	12	25	48.0
Tennessee State	11	18	118	1.64	4. Tennessee State	11	10	19	52.6
5. Eastern Illinois	11	16	111	1.45	5. Murray State	11	12	19	63.2
Southeast Missouri	11	16	140	1.45	6. Tennessee Tech	11	15	23	65.2
Tennessee Tech	11	16	98	1.45	7. Eastern Illinois	11	15	19	78.9

<b>SACKS AGAINST</b>					<b>PENALTIES</b>				
	G	No.	Yards	Avg/G	G	No.	Yards	Avg/G	
1. UT Martin	13	15	102	1.15	1. Eastern Illinois	11	65	572	52.0
2. Murray State	11	16	111	1.45	2. UT Martin	13	78	684	52.6
3. Southeast Missouri	11	18	108	1.64	3. Austin Peay	11	76	604	54.9
4. Tennessee Tech	11	21	156	1.91	4. Southeast Missouri	11	67	623	56.6
5. Austin Peay	11	27	162	2.45	5. Murray State	11	62	640	58.2
6. Eastern Illinois	11	28	196	2.55	6. Tennessee Tech	11	67	656	59.6
Tennessee State	11	28	184	2.55	7. Tennessee State	11	92	755	68.6

<b>FIRST DOWNS</b>							<b>OPPONENT PENALTIES</b>				
	G	Rush	Pass	Pen	Total	Avg/G	G	No.	Yards	Avg/G	
1. UT Martin	13	131	95	21	248	19.1	1. Murray State	11	77	722	65.6
2. Austin Peay	11	86	112	26	224	20.4	2. Austin Peay	11	86	717	65.2
3. Murray State	11	108	82	23	213	19.4	3. Eastern Illinois	11	71	703	63.9
4. Tennessee State	11	79	97	17	193	17.5	4. Tennessee Tech	11	53	534	48.5
5. Southeast Missouri	11	96	76	15	187	17.0	5. Southeast Missouri	11	60	528	48.0
6. Tennessee Tech	11	85	81	18	184	16.7	6. UT Martin	13	59	575	44.2
7. Eastern Illinois	11	58	88	29	175	15.9	7. Tennessee State	11	57	482	43.8

<b>OPPONENT 1ST DOWNS</b>							<b>TIME OF POSSESSION</b>			
	G	Rush	Pass	Pen	Total	Avg/G	G	Total possession	Avg/G	
1. Murray State	11	86	91	15	192	17.5	1. Tennessee Tech	11	357:08	32:28
2. Tennessee State	11	89	91	22	202	18.4	2. UT Martin	13	414:01	31:50
3. Eastern Illinois	11	102	86	18	206	18.7	3. Murray State	11	344:30	31:19
4. Tennessee Tech	11	91	99	20	210	19.1	4. Southeast Missouri	11	337:27	30:40
5. Austin Peay	11	85	104	22	211	19.2	5. Tennessee State	11	330:45	30:04
6. Southeast Missouri	11	91	116	14	221	20.1	6. Eastern Illinois	11	313:03	28:27
7. UT Martin	13	96	122	23	241	18.5	7. Austin Peay	11	304:54	27:43

**2021 Ohio Valley Conference  
Team Statistics Through games of Dec 04, 2021**

TURNOVER MARGIN		Gained			Lost			Margin	Per/G	
		Fum	Int	Tot	Fum	Int	Tot			
1.	Austin Peay	11	7	19	26	9	9	18	+8	0.73
2.	Southeast Missouri	11	9	11	20	5	9	14	+6	0.55
3.	UT Martin	13	8	17	25	10	10	20	+5	0.38
4.	Tennessee State	11	5	7	12	8	6	14	-2	-0.18
5.	Eastern Illinois	11	14	4	18	6	17	23	-5	-0.45
6.	Murray State	11	5	6	11	8	15	23	-12	-1.09
7.	Tennessee Tech	11	6	3	9	8	19	27	-18	-1.64

RED ZONE OFFENSE	G	Scores	Pct.	TDs	(R-P)	FGs	TurnO	
1.	Southeast Missouri	11	33-33	100.0	23	15-8	10-10	0
2.	Austin Peay	11	28-30	93.3	17	12-5	11-12	0
3.	Tennessee Tech	11	25-30	83.3	20	15-5	5-6	4
4.	UT Martin	13	39-47	83.0	34	24-10	5-9	3
5.	Tennessee State	11	27-36	75.0	18	11-7	9-12	3
6.	Murray State	11	26-36	72.2	22	19-3	4-8	4
7.	Eastern Illinois	11	20-31	64.5	15	8-7	5-7	3

RED ZONE DEFENSE	G	Scores	Pct.	TDs	(R-P)	FGs	TurnO	
1.	Southeast Missouri	11	31-40	77.5	25	14-11	6-9	3
2.	Eastern Illinois	11	28-36	77.8	24	17-7	4-8	2
3.	Austin Peay	11	32-40	80.0	25	12-13	7-8	5
4.	Murray State	11	33-39	84.6	28	23-5	5-8	1
5.	UT Martin	13	37-43	86.0	21	9-12	16-18	1
6.	Tennessee State	11	31-36	86.1	19	11-8	12-15	2
7.	Tennessee Tech	11	34-38	89.5	24	13-11	10-12	1

ON-SIDE KICKS BY	G	Recovered	Attempts	Success%	
1.	Southeast Missouri	11	2	2	100.0
	UT Martin	13	1	1	100.0
3.	Murray State	11	1	2	50.0
4.	Eastern Illinois	11	0	1	0.0
	Tennessee State	11	0	1	0.0
	Tennessee Tech	11	0	0	0.0
	Austin Peay	11	0	0	0.0

ON-SIDE KICKS AGAINST	G	Recovered	Attempts	Success%	
1.	Southeast Missouri	11	0	1	0.0
	Tennessee State	11	0	0	0.0
	Murray State	11	0	0	0.0
	Austin Peay	11	0	0	0.0
5.	UT Martin	13	1	3	33.3
6.	Tennessee Tech	11	2	2	100.0
	Eastern Illinois	11	1	1	100.0

ATTENDANCE	Home	Away	Neutral	Total
Austin Peay	5-5617	6-13952	0-0	11-10164
Eastern Illinois	4-4441	7-13272	0-0	11-10061
Murray State	5-7844	6-12478	0-0	11-10371
Southeast Missouri	5-3729	6-12209	0-0	11-8354
Tennessee State	4-4023	5-13578	2-30426	11-13167
Tennessee Tech	5-5756	6-16700	0-0	11-11726
UT Martin	5-4208	8-10055	0-0	13-7806
Totals	33-5140	44-13029	2-30426	79-10174