A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet

NCAA National Office
Indianapolis, Indiana

June 10-11, 2009

1. Opening remarks and review of schedule. (Grace Calhoun) [**No action anticipated**.]

2. Approval of minutes from February 5-6 meeting. (Calhoun) **[Action anticipated.]**

   Background: *The NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet will need to approve the minutes from its last meeting as distributed via e-mail following the meeting.*

3. Discussion on cabinet's priorities.

   a. Current financial aid model. [Supplement No. 1 to be distributed at a later date and Supplement No. 2] (Calhoun)

      (1) Focus group feedback on surveys.

      (2) Focus group videoconferences.

      Background: *The cabinet will review the focus group's results of the same survey it completed in January. Further, the cabinet will engage the focus group in discussions via videoconference related to the items it identified for further discussion at its February meeting.*

   b. Financial aid hearings. [Supplement No. 3] (Calhoun)

      Background: *The cabinet will review the latest draft of the best practices document. The cabinet will also receive an update on discussions with NCAA staff involved with athletics certification and compliance reviews related to this topic.*

   c. Outreach to financial aid community. [Supplement No. 4] (Calhoun)

      Background: *The cabinet will discuss a draft strategic plan for the outreach efforts it would like to undertake.*

4. NCAA Division I Legislative Review and Interpretations Committee referral. [Supplement No. 5] (Richardson) **[Action anticipated.]**

   Background: *During its review of staff interpretations, the Legislative Review and Interpretations Committee requested that the cabinet review the issue of calculating equivalencies when an institution awards financial aid in terms of dollars not assigned to any element of financial aid (i.e., lump sum amount), as opposed to awarding it in terms of dollars assigned to a specific element (e.g., tuition and fees). The cabinet will review the issue, provide feedback to the committee and decide whether legislation should be sponsored.*

5. Discussion on sand volleyball financial aid team limits. [Supplement No. 6] (Calhoun/ Richardson) **[Action anticipated.]**

   Background: *NCAA Proposal No. 2008-59 was adopted in April, establishing sand volleyball as an emerging sport for women. According to the timetable for such a designation, the cabinet will need to propose team financial aid limits for the 2009-10 legislative cycle.*

6. Directive to review NCAA Division I bylaws. [Supplement No. 7] (Hostetter) **[Action possible.]**

   Background: *Given the economic climate, the cabinet is being asked by the NCAA Division I Board of Directors to review NCAA rules that may be appropriate to be revised. The cabinet should discuss this topic with both the short term and long term in mind.*

7. Update on the work of the Policies and Practices Task Force. [Supplement No. 8 to be distributed at a later date] (Hostetter) **[No action anticipated.]**

   Background: *The Policies and Practices Task Force has been asked to review whether certain rules and the rationale for those rules remain applicable. The cabinet is being asked to review the work of the task force to date and offer additional rationale for the rules and/or thoughts that the task force may use in its review.*

8. Discussion on exceptions to NCAA Bylaw 16.8.1.2. [Supplement No. 9] (Hostetter) **[Action possible.]**

Background: *Based on the cabinet's referral of this item to June 2009, the cabinet will discuss whether it is supportive of legislative change in the area of departure/return restrictions or whether maintaining the status quo is more appropriate.*

9. Report from NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC). (Julie Rubenstein) **[No action anticipated.]**

   Background: *Julie will provide an update on recent and upcoming SAAC activities.*

10. Report from the April 2009 governance meetings. (Beth DeBauche/Calhoun) [**No action anticipated**.]

    Background: *NCAA staff will provide an update on the activities from the April 2009 governance meetings and Grace will discuss the latest work of the NCAA Division I Communications and Coordination Committee.*

11. Review of activity on the 2008-09 legislative proposals reviewed by the cabinet in September 2008 and February 2009. [Supplement No. 10] (Kris Richardson) [**No action anticipated.]**

    Background: *The staff will review the actions taken on proposals for which the cabinet provided comment at its September 2008 meeting. If requested by the governance structure, the cabinet will provide further comments on proposals remaining in the legislative cycle.*

12. Review of items submitted by cabinet members. [Supplement No. 11] (Richard Carmichael) **[Action possible.]**

    a. Review of meal plan issues and Bylaw 15.2.2;

    b. Review of graduate exception to Bylaw 15.3.3.1.1; and

    c. Review of book value for equivalency computations.

13. Summary of key items discussed and next steps. (Calhoun) [**No action anticipated**.]

14. Future meeting dates and sites.

    a. September 17-18, 2009; Indianapolis, Indiana;

    b. February 2010; Indianapolis, Indiana; and

    c. June 2010; Indianapolis, Indiana.

15. Other business.

16. Adjournment.

NCAA Division I Financial Aid Survey Results

NCAA Research

June 2009

NCAA Research

Overview

- The slides that follow represent data from 25 institutions.

- Staff initially requested members of the *Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet* complete the questionnaire. In total, we received 17 responses from cabinet members, which were reviewed at the February meeting.

- In order to reinforce what was learned from the cabinet responses, staff made a special request to 11 institutions with a goal of ensuring representation of the subdivisions, public/private status and varying levels of resource. Of these, eight returned completed questionnaires and one replied with comment. One institution, however, submitted a questionnaire that includes information from multiple institutions in the conference. In order to not unduly weight the data, the conference data is counted as a response from one institution but noted with an * to indicate multiple institutions weighed-in on that response.

- Combining these responses with those provided by the Cabinet, we have data from a total 25 institutions to review.

NCAA Research

Overview

- The goal in the following slides is to illustrate where common themes emerged and highlight situations that seem to be having an effect division-wide. Given the unique parameters surrounding not only financial need determination at many institutions, but also awarding practices, legislation will undoubtedly affect institutions in distinctive ways. We did find, however, that in spite of their diverse institutional characteristics, the responding institutions found a great deal of common ground in how their student-athletes are affected by certain rules. The closing slides present ways in which we might be able to learn more about these common trends.

PART I: Determining the Impact of NCAA Rules on Unmet Need for Student-Athletes in Equivalency Sports

NCAA Research

How does your institution define need among your general student population (non-athletes) (e.g., federal methodology, institutional methodology, combination of the two)?

- Of the 25 respondents:
  - 20 indicated Federal Methodology
  - 4 indicated a combination of Federal Methodology and Institutional Methodology
  - 1 indicated Institutional Methodology for the “vast majority of students”

NCAA Research

How does your institution define need among student-athletes (e.g., federal methodology, institutional methodology, combination of the two)?

- All of the respondents indicated that their institution uses the same methodology for student-athletes as it does for non-athletes.

How does your institution define and identify a student-athlete with unmet need?

- For the most part, this question went unanswered.
- Of the comments received:
  - Several institutions provided the following definition for unmet need. It is defined for student-athletes as it is for the general student population at most institutions:

    Unmet Need = Need – Aid
  - Some do not attempt to identify student-athletes with unmet need.
  - Student-athletes with unmet need can be identified by the financial aid office at the request of the athletics department for potential NCAA Special Assistance Fund requests.
  - A few institutions commented that their student-athletes are flagged in their computer systems, and several mentioned that their student-athletes are packaged manually on an individual basis, allowing them to identify those who may have unmet need.

NCAA Research

What NCAA bylaws most restrict/limit a student-athlete's ability to receive/accept financial aid to meet their needs? Why?

- In total, respondents listed 14 different bylaws they felt to be the most restrictive. They are listed on the following slide. Four additional responses were more general and referenced any bylaws that apply need-based aid toward limits were the most restrictive.

- They all, however, took on a central theme: These various restrictions limit a student-athlete's ability to accept legitimate, need-based aid due to team limits, and ultimately put student-athletes at a disadvantage when compared with their non-athlete peers.
  - One California institution provided the following comment: *"Under the legislation, university systems not unlike the California State University system provide institutional grants that student-athletes have to turn away if they are recruited and the team has met the NCAA limit….The discussion needs to surround how the NCAA legislation can provide need-based aid at the institutional level that student-athletes do not have to turn away while their non-student-athlete counter parts receive such aid.*

NCAA Research

What NCAA bylaws most restrict/limit a student-athlete's ability to receive/accept financial aid to meet their needs? Why? (cont.)

- An additional concern was raised regarding the new rule that countable aid in baseball must total at least a 25% equivalency. Concern was raised that coaches may not have the ability within the team limits to allow an outside scholarship valued at less than 25% of a full grant-in-aid and provide enough other countable aid to get the student-athlete up to 25%. For example, if a recruited SA receives outside aid that has athletics participation as a major criterion (countable aid) valued at 20% of a full grant in aid, but the team does not have room within its maximum equivalency limit~~s~~ for the SA to be a counter, the SA faces two issues…(1) is not satisfying the minimum 25% requirement and (2) because the team has reached its maximum equivalency limit, it cannot provide other countable aid (e.g., athletics aid) to get the SA to the required 25%. In this situation, the SA faces the situation of having to decline the outside aid due to team limits.

- One institution recommended a solution to deregulate outside awards, *"If the award/scholarship is not restricted to a particular school or conference then allow the student-athlete to have the outside awards up to the individual limit without counting against team limits and deleting the Recruited/Non-Recruited status from the equation."*

NCAA Research

What NCAA bylaws most restrict/limit a student-athlete's ability to receive/accept financial aid to meet their need? Why? (cont.)

List of Bylaws	# inst
15.02.4.1 (Institutional Financial Aid)	9
15.2.6.4 (Athletics Participation as a Major Criterion)	8*
15.1.2 (Types of Aid Included in Limit)	3
15.5.3.2.1.1 (Academic Honor Awards)	2
15.5.3.2 (Equivalency Computations)	2
15.2.6.3 (Athletics Participation Not Major Criterion) **Institution mentioned criteria was too broad)*	2
15.02.5 (Full Grant-in-Aid) **Institutions would like the GIA to be equivalent to full Cost of Attendance*	2
15.5.1(b) (Athletics Participation as Major Criterion)	2

NCAA Research

What NCAA bylaws most restrict/limit a student-athlete's ability to receive/accept financial aid to meet their need? Why? (cont.)

List of Bylaws	# inst
15.1 (Maximum Limit on Financial Aid)	1
15.2.2 (Room and Board)	1
15.2.3 (Books)	1
15.2.5 (Government Grants)	1
15.5 (Maximum institutional GIA Limitations by Sport)	1
15.5.1.2 (Football or Basketball, varsity competition)	1

NCAA Research

What types of institutional need-based financial aid should not be subject to equivalency limitations? Why? What would be some suggested parameters for exempting such aid?

- In response to types of need-based aid that should not be subject to equivalency limitations:

Type of Aid	Number in Support
Any need-based aid	8
Institutional need-based aid (awarded in same manner to all students on campus)	7*
Supplemental Education Opportunity Grant	5*
Academic aid / Merit aid (non-athletic criteria)	5
State aid	4
All Federal money (loans, Federal Work Study, etc.)	2
Loans	1
Need aid if determined through FAFSA and FM	1
Employee fee waivers (specifically for family working at an institution with a reciprocity agreement – not the receiving institution)	1

What types of institutional need-based financial aid should not be subject to equivalency limitations? Why? What would be some suggested parameters for exempting such aid? (cont.)

- In regards to those who said *need-based aid* should be exempt, a few did place conditions on their statements:
  - If there is a systematic awarding process in place (e.g., same for all students; athletics not a criterion);
  - If the need-based aid is meeting unmet need, and
  - If the student-athlete is Pell eligible.

- Another suggestion was to allow all Federal, state and institutional need-based aid and athletics scholarships to be awarded up to the cost of attendance. In this calculation, only the athletics scholarships would count toward team limits.

What types of institutional need-based financial aid should not be subject to equivalency limitations? Why? What would be some suggested parameters for exempting such aid? (cont.)

- One of the most prominent reasons given for wanting to exempt certain types of need-based aid was a call to treat all students alike. For instance, if a student-athlete earns a merit award, s/he should be allowed to accept it just like all other students. Or, if a student-athlete is a 0 EFC student, s/he should receive the same automatic award as non-athletes who fit that financial profile.

- Two additional reasons for exempting need-based aid emerged, both of which were mentioned by three institutions:
  1. NEED. These student-athletes often have exceptional need (e.g., Pell eligible) and are forced to turn down aid due to a small athletics award.
  2. There are rules in place that help to keep everyone on equal footing, including Cost of Attendance caps to prevent over-awarding and use of the FAFSA and FM to determine need.

NCAA Research

What types of institutional need-based financial aid should not be subject to equivalency limitations? Why? What would be some suggested parameters for exempting such aid? (cont.)

- Suggested parameters for exempting the aid took on a few unique themes:
  - Tied to Pell: Four institutions felt that if the need-based aid that was awarded was tied to Pell eligibility, the aid should be exempt. One respondent noted, *"Use the Institutional limit and Federal guidelines, not team and individual limits."*
  - Authorized as need-based: Four institutions commented that if the award is "authorized" by an institutional financial aid administrator as NOT being tied to athletics and being based on calculated need then that should be sufficient for exemption.
  - Based on need or award: Other suggestions included exemption if the award was under a certain threshold; if the student reached a certain threshold of need or if the student's equivalency award was below a certain percentage.

NCAA Research

Are student-athletes in certain equivalency sports demonstrating a higher rate of unmet need than other equivalency sports? Which sports? Please explain what you think is the cause of this?

- Of the 24 respondents who track this data, 15* agreed there were sports with greater unmet need; seven disagreed and two were not sure.
- One institution commented that when compared with head-count sports, all equivalencies demonstrated greater unmet need and two commented that the problem is usually focused on sports with larger roster sizes (e.g., track).
- Specific sports they felt demonstrated the greatest unmet need:
  - The most frequently mentioned sport was Track with 12* references
  - Baseball and wrestling* each received five, and
  - Softball, soccer and men's tennis each received one to two.
- Four institutions added an additional comment that among head-count sports, football and basketball posed the greatest concern regarding unmet need.

NCAA Research

Are student-athletes in certain equivalency sports demonstrating a higher rate of unmet need than other equivalency sports? Which sports? Please explain what you think is the cause of this? (cont.)

- There was a large amount of consensus among possible causes for there being particular equivalency sports with greater unmet need.
  - Socio-economic status / Demographics was the most common response. A few indicated that track and baseball student-athletes are more likely to be Pell recipients and exhibit greater need in general than student-athletes in other sports (e.g., golf and tennis).
  - Also mentioned multiple times was the athletics scholarships these student-athletes receive are smaller than in other sports due to being divided among so many more players
  - One respondent also mentioned the constraints placed on student-athletes in accepting other forms of aid. This is particularly damaging to student-athletes in certain equivalency sports that traditionally exhibit greater need.

NCAA Research

Do you find that your method for calculations of student-athlete athletics aid equivalencies is different than the method used for the general student body? If so, how are the calculations different? Please explain what you think is the cause of this.

- The responses to these questions largely varied institution-to-institution.
- Some responses reiterated that need calculations did not vary between student-athletes and non-athletes.
- In all, 8* reported differences, and NCAA regulations were cited as the cause of these differences.
- One institution cited the NCAA's Room and Board calculation versus institutional calculations as the main difference. Two others referred to the use of Cost of Attendance for non-athletes, as opposed to the use of a Grant-in-Aid for student-athletes as the main difference.

NCAA Research

Are all of your institution's equivalency sports fully funded per NCAA equivalency limitations?

- Of the 24 institutions that provided a response, nine responded that their institutions do not fully fund all of their equivalency sports.
- Of the remaining, 8* do fully fund these sports and seven fully fund "nearly all".
- Of this "nearly all" group, a few indicated which sports are not fully funded:
  - Those that do not compete at a national level;
  - Men's Track / Cross Country
  - Women's Track / Cross Country
  - Men's Crew
  - Newly added teams that will be fully funded in the next few years

NCAA Research

PART II: Determining if Student-Athletes in Head-Count Sports Have Unmet Need

NCAA Research

Does your institution's financial aid office observe student-athletes in head-count sports having unmet need? If so, what is the average "gap" of unmet need for student-athletes in head-count sports identified by sport?

- 14* institutions indicated that they observe unmet need among student-athletes in head-count sports; however, a few qualified this by reporting that it is not common or that it is equivalent to what is seen among equivalency sports or the general student population.

- The average gap ranged from $1,000 to $7,000. Most, however, were between $2,500-$4,000.

- Seven reported that their head-count sport student-athletes do not have unmet need, and the remaining do not track unmet need by sport.

NCAA Research

Please explain what you think is the cause of any differences by sport?

- All institutions that replied to this question indicated the family financial situation as the cause. As was mentioned by one institution, certain sports have *"stereotypical socioeconomic"* demographics and these affect the prevalence of unmet need.

- One other institution commented that it is difficult to convince men's basketball student-athletes to complete the FAFSA. This will affect aid eligibility at a Federal Methodology institution.

NCAA Research

Are all of your institution's head-count sports fully funded per NCAA limitations?

- Nearly all of the institutions (n=18*) replied that their head-count sports are fully funded.
- Three indicated that some of their head-count sports are fully funded, but not all.
- The remaining four institutions did not comment.

NCAA Research

PART III: Determining the Treatment of Student-Athletes Compared to the General Student Body as it Relates to Financial Aid

NCAA Research

Generally, what is the sense of the financial aid office as it relates to the treatment of student-athletes…do NCAA rules require different treatment of student-athletes than the general student population?

- 14* of the respondents felt that student-athletes do receive differential treatment from the financial aid office.

- Some indicated that this differential treatment is sometimes positive (e.g., less stringent renewal requirements), while others thought they were put at a disadvantage (e.g., treatment of outside scholarships).

- Mentioned by nearly all 14 institutions that indicated there was differential treatment was the additional burden NCAA regulations placed on financial aid offices due to the necessary monitoring to ensure compliance.
  - Two institutions commented that they have separate staff dedicated to working with NCAA student-athletes who know not only Federal regulations but also NCAA rules.

NCAA Research

Generally, what is the sense of the financial aid office as it relates to the treatment of student-athletes…do NCAA rules require different treatment of student-athletes than the general student population? (cont)

- Another institution raised an important point considering current economic conditions. Many institutions are now more freely exercising their ability to use Professional Judgment in modifying packages. Student-athletes, however, largely can not benefit from this due to NCAA regulations.

If you use different processes for student-athletes and non-athletes when defining need, is this because of NCAA rules?

- Only two institutions responded that a different process is used for defining student-athletes' need, and this is because of NCAA rules.

NCAA Research

What are the most difficult aspects of handling financial aid for student-athletes versus students in general? Why?

- In response to what is the most difficult aspect of student-athlete financial aid, three topics were mentioned multiple times.
  1. Outside scholarships. Several institutions commented that the burden in certifying these is time and labor intensive.

  2. Balancing NCAA and Federal Regulations. Federal financial aid regulations are known to be dense and complicated. Comments indicated that the NCAA regulations add another burdensome layer to what financial aid administrators currently handle, including the addition of extra paperwork.

  3. Reducing a student-athlete's aid. Informing a student-athlete and/or a parent that aid cannot be accepted due to team limits places the student in a tough situation that is difficult to explain.

NCAA Research

What are the most difficult aspects of handling financial aid for student-athletes versus students in general? Why? (cont.)

- Several institutions commented on the "manual" process of handling financial aid for student-athletes. One institution's comment summarized the sentiment indicated by several, *"The manual processing of athletics aid makes it much more difficult to monitor. The third layer of rules to follow are much more restrictive on the types of aid student-athletes are eligible to receive and are more cumbersome to ensure compliance."*

PART IV: Potential Next Steps

Potential Next Steps

- These survey results provide a foundation for a broad-based survey instrument. There was a fair amount of consensus in response that could be used to develop quantitative questions that likely would be applicable to the majority of institutions. Having this additional data would enable data-driven policy options to be discussed.

- A second opportunity is to survey the student-athletes. The NCAA Research Department will be administering the GOALS survey during the 2009-10 AY and would be able to include one or two questions on how financial aid has been impacted by various NCAA regulations. The 2005-06 administration of GOALS resulted in over 6,000 Division I student-athlete respondents, representative by sport and gender.

NCAA Research

ATTACHMENT

Financial Aid Topics for Further Review

1. Countable versus Noncountable Aid:

    a. Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant.

    b. Other government grants administered by the institution.

    c. Outside aid with athletics as a major criterion:

        (1) Exempt up to a set dollar limit or equivalency value; and

        (2) Exempt for student-athletes below a set equivalency limit.

    d. Institutional Academic ("Merit") Awards:

        (1) Academic honor awards (change criteria for qualification – e.g., match institutional criteria);

        (2) Institutional academic scholarships (change criteria for qualification – e.g., match institutional criteria);

        (3) Honorary academic awards/research grants; and

        (4) Treat student-athletes like all other students.

    e. State grants.

    f. Institutional need-based aid:

        (1) Exempt up to a set dollar limit;

        (2) Exempt for student-athletes below a set equivalency limit;

        (3) Exempt for Pell recipients (be aware of "cliff" effect - $1 may be the difference between receiving Pell or not receiving Pell);

        (4) Exempt for student-athletes with a certain amount of need or unmet need; and

        (5) Treat student-athletes like all other students

2. Counter Status:

   a. Voluntarily relinquishing aid to avoid counter status.

   b. Is the current definition of "recruited" appropriate for determining counter status?

      (1) Involvement of NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet.

      (2) Consideration for football and basketball due to existing legislation.

3. Head Count versus Equivalency:

   a. Historical review of team limits;

   b. Communicate with external constituents regarding existing team limit legislation; and

   c. Expand "hybrid" model (e.g., ice hockey, baseball) to other sports.

4. Team Limits:

   a. Historical review of team limits; and

   b. Title IX considerations.

NCAA Division I Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet
Subcommittee on Financial Aid Legislative Models: Hearing Opportunities, Points to Consider and Suggested Best Practices

Bylaw 15.3.2.4 (Hearing Opportunity) - Points to Consider:

1. Prior to taking action to reduce or cancel the aid, the student-athlete must be provided with the following documents:

    a. Written notice of the reduction or cancellation;

    b. Written notice of an opportunity for a hearing; and

    c. Copy of the institution's established policies and procedures for conducting the required hearing, including the deadline by which the hearing must be requested.

2. Institutions may conduct hearings via conference call, in-person meeting (with or without the student-athlete present) or in writing. The format of the hearing depends on institutional policy.

Bylaw 15.3.5.1 (Renewals and Nonrenewals - Institutional Obligation) - Points to consider:

1. Institutions may choose to renew or not renew for any reason once the period of the award has concluded.

2. Requirements for renewals/nonrenewals only apply to athletically related aid.

3. The July 1 deadline applies to the date the notification must be postmarked, not actually received.

4. Electronically transmitted notification (e.g., e-mail) is permissible.

Suggested Best Practices:

The following information related to financial aid hearing opportunities (Bylaws 15.3.2.4 and 15.3.5.1) is intended to serve as **suggested** processes and procedures. Institutions are not required per NCAA legislation to conduct hearings in accordance with these suggested practices.

1. Suggestions for who should be involved:

a. Financial aid office (NOTE: NCAA legislation requires an institution's regular financial aid authority shall notify the student-athlete in writing of the opportunity for a hearing).

b. Financial aid hearing/appeals committee.

c. Athletics department.

d. Coach.

e. Student-athlete.

f. Advocate for the student-athlete (e.g., parent, legal guardian, immediate family member).

2. Suggestions for what should be in writing/documented:

a. Specific roles of financial aid, athletics department, hearing committee, student-athlete and coach.

b. Process for drafting and revising financial aid agreements and individuals who should be involved.

c. Specific steps of hearing process (e.g., submission of request, process and format for conducting the hearing, process for issuing the decision) including specific deadlines/timelines for each step in the process, who may be involved in the process and identify how and when information will be communicated to coaches and
student-athletes.

d. Process used during the academic year versus the summer.

e. Protocol for addressing situations when it is alleged that the normal procedures for a hearing were not followed.

3. Suggestions for communication and education:

a. Educate student-athletes, coaches, appropriate athletics department staff and appeals committee, at least annually, on the following topics:

(1) NCAA legislation governing increases and reductions and/or cancellations of athletics aid;

(2) NCAA legislation governing renewals and nonrenewals of athletics aid;

(3) NCAA legislation governing hearing opportunities; and

(4) Institutional policies and procedures governing hearing opportunities (including who is involved in the hearing process).

b. Include policies and procedures on athletics Web site and in student-athlete handbook.

c. Communicate and share ideas with other institutions.

4. Suggestions related to notifying the student-athlete of the reduction and/or cancellation:

a. The final communication that a student-athlete's athletics aid is being cancelled should not be the first time the student-athlete hears that his or her athletics aid is in jeopardy. Regular communication of issues should occur between the coach, athletics department staff and the student-athlete throughout the year.

b. Whenever possible, the coach and/or a member of the athletics department should meet in-person to discuss the decision to reduce or cancel athletics aid with the student-athlete (before sending the written notification).

c. Provide the student-athlete, in writing, a specific deadline by which he or she must request a hearing.

d. If using an electronic delivery (e.g., e-mail) to notify the student-athlete of the reduction and/or cancellation, have a follow-up process in place to ensure the student-athlete received the notice.

e. Ensure a process is in place to obtain proper contact information for student-athlete.

f. Note: NCAA legislation requires institutions to provide student-athletes with written notice of the renewal/nonrenwal of athletics aid on or before July 1; however, as a best practice, institutions are encouraged to get started on the process as early as possible.

5. Suggestions for correspondence and forms that should be used throughout the process:

   a. Forms for documenting an increase or decrease in athletics aid.

   b. Template notifying student-athlete of renewal/nonrenewal.

   c. Template notifying student-athlete of hearing opportunity.

   d. Template notifying coach that student-athlete has requested a hearing.

   e. Form for student-athlete to submit appeal request.

   f. Template for notifying student-athlete of details related to the conduct of the hearing (e.g., time, location, what parties may be present).

   g. Form for voluntary withdrawals.

   h. Tracking form to verify deadlines and process for hearing have been followed.

   i. Template notifying student-athlete of hearing committee decision.

6. Suggestions related to the format and process for conducting the hearing:

   a. Whenever possible, allow the student-athlete the option to request an in-person hearing.

   b. Consider whether allowing the student-athlete to have an advocate represent him or her during the process is appropriate (e.g., parent, legal guardian, immediate family member). Institutions are encouraged to refer to its financial aid appeals policies and procedures to determine if students in general are permitted to have representation from an advocate.

7. Suggestions related to actions and/or steps after the hearing has been conducted:

   a. Have a specific timeframe for when your institution must notify the student-athlete of the decision after the hearing has been conducted. Specify the format in which the decision will be delivered (e.g., standard mail, e-mail).

b. If using electronic notification (e.g., e-mail) to inform the student-athlete of the hearing decision, have a follow-up process in place to ensure the student-athlete received the decision.

c. If the result of the hearing is to uphold the coach's decision, be proactive and share options with the student-athlete (e.g., other sources of aid, transfer).

DISCLAIMER: The information contained in this document is provided as a reference to member institutions and does not constitute binding advice on compliance with NCAA rules and bylaws. Any inquiries related to NCAA rules and bylaws should be directed to the NCAA academic and membership affairs staff. The most up-to-date information regarding NCAA Division I rules, bylaws and procedures can be found by accessing the information on the Legislative Services Database (LSDBi).

Draft Plan for Outreach to Financial Aid Community

	Issue	Outreach Opportunities	Measureable Goals	Steps to Achieve Goal	Individuals Responsible for Implementation	Specific Timetable for Completing the Work
1.	Education for financial aid officers who interact with athletics aid.	Provide educational materials covering day-to-day responsibilities and best practices for dealing with student-athletes and athletics aid that can be accessed by financial aid officers. Use technology (e.g., Webinars, Internet meetings) to establish a periodic training session for the financial aid community, focusing on newer financial aid officers. Provide information on the rationale behind financial aid legislation to the financial aid community to help them better understand it.	Information related to day-to-day responsibilities and best practices for dealing with student-athletes and athletics aid will be included in Division I financial aid-related Regional Rules Seminar sessions. Determine what communication methods are feasible for educating the financial aid community	Include information related to day-to-day responsibilities and best practices for dealing with student-athletes and athletics aid in Regional Rules Seminar presentations and on ncaa.org. Work with National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA) to identify optimal education opportunities.	NCAA staff.	**Ongoing**. **2007 RRS**: Best practices for certifying outside awards was a focus of Division I Advanced Financial Aid Regional Rules Seminar session. **2008 RRS**: Best practices for hearing opportunities and renewals/nonrenewals was a focus of Division I Advanced Financial Aid session. **2007-08**: Big East Conference created the Guide to Financial Aid. **Spring 2009**: Best practices document for conducting hearing opportunities was developed by staff and approved by ABEFA Cabinet.

Draft Plan for Outreach to Financial Aid Community

	Issue	Outreach Opportunities	Measureable Goals	Steps to Achieve Goal	Individuals Responsible for Implementation	Specific Timetable for Completing the Work
2.	Involvement of financial aid officers in Regional Rules Seminars.	Provide opportunities for financial aid officers to participate in Regional Rules Seminar.	Financial aid officers will be co-presenters for Division I financial aid-related Regional Rules Seminar sessions.	Engage financial aid officers as co-presenters for Division I financial aid-related Regional Rules Seminar sessions.	NCAA staff.	**Ongoing**. Since 2007, financial aid officers have served as co-presenters during the Division I Advanced Financial Aid Regional Rules Seminar session.
3.	Communication of NCAA financial aid issues to the financial aid community.	Work with NASFAA to communicate NCAA financial aid-related issues and events to financial aid officers.	Explore the possibility of presenting Division I financial aid issues at NASFAA national convention; regional conventions; and in its newsletter.	Work with NASFAA to identify areas of interest and develop presentation materials.	NCAA staff and NASFAA staff.	**Spring 2009**: Talk with NASFAA leadership about goals and timing of conventions and newsletters. **Summer 2009**: Begin development of presentation materials. **Fall 2009**: Provide a presentation or newsletter article to NASFAA.

Draft Plan for Outreach to Financial Aid Community

	Issue	Outreach Opportunities	Measureable Goals	Steps to Achieve Goal	Individuals Responsible for Implementation	Specific Timetable for Completing the Work
4.	Enhancing existing resources for applying NCAA financial aid legislation.	Educate financial aid community on the availability of existing resources provided by the NCAA.	Promote the availability of NCAA resources (Regional Rules Seminar presentations, online educational videos, NCAA Compliance Assistant program) to financial aid administrators.	Devote upcoming NASFAA presentation or newsletter submission to promotion of existing NCAA resources.	NCAA staff.	See response to Item No. 3.

NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet

NCAA Division I Legislative Review and Interpretations Committee (LRIC) Referral

Background.

On January 21, 2009, the academic and membership affairs staff issued an interpretation to assist the membership with calculating equivalencies when dealing with lump sum awards. Lump sum awards are expressed in dollars, and are not assigned to any element of a full grant-in-aid. An award of $5,000, as opposed to an award of "$5,000 applied to tuition and fees," is considered a lump-sum award.

In its interpretation, the academic and membership affairs staff distinguished between situations in which an institution awards financial aid in a lump sum amount and has no institutional policies that require awards to be paid in a specific order, and those in which institutional policies do require awards to be paid in a specific order. In those situations where there is no institutional policy requiring awards to be paid in a specific order, the institution may use the lump sum amount in the numerator and either the actual or average cost of a full grant-in-aid in the denominator when determining the student-athlete's equivalency. However, if institutional policies require awards to be paid in a specific order, then the institution is considered to be awarding aid assigned to an element and, therefore, must use the same cost (i.e., actual or average) in both the numerator and denominator.

LRIC reviewed the staff's interpretation during its January 28 and February 18, 2009, teleconferences. During the February 18 teleconference, LRIC voted to refer the issue of establishing the correct method for determining equivalencies when lump sum awards are involved to this cabinet, with a recommendation that the cabinet examine this issue at its June 2009 meeting.

Staff Interpretation.

Calculation of Equivalencies
Date Issued: January 21, 2009
Date Published: To Be Determined

The academic and membership affairs staff confirmed that an institution that awards financial aid in terms of dollars that is not assigned to any element (i.e., lump sum amount), rather than units of aid or a fraction that represents an element of a full grant, may use the amount received by the student-athlete (numerator) and either the actual or the average cost of a student-athlete’s full grant-in-aid (denominator) in calculating that student-athlete's equivalency. However, the staff determined that an institution whose policies require payment in a specific order (e.g., hierarchy of elements) for dollar awards is considered to be awarding aid assigned to an element(s) and, therefore, must use the same cost (i.e., actual or average) in both the numerator and denominator.

[References: NCAA Division I Bylaw 15.5.3.2 (equivalency computations) and an official interpretation (4/23/08, Item No. 4)]

Staff Position.

The staff was initially asked to issue an interpretation regarding the first part of the January 21 interpretation. The first part of the interpretation regarding the "lump sum" award was originally noted in an educational column: [Reference: 4/18/90], which contains several questions regarding the calculation of equivalencies. The question and answer relevant to this particular issue states:

Q9. What if student-athletes are awarded aid in terms of dollars, rather than units of aid or a fraction of a full grant?

A9. If a student-athlete is awarded aid in terms of dollars (numerator), the institution may utilize either the actual or average cost of that student-athlete's full grant-in-aid (denominator) in calculating that student-athlete's equivalency.

The rationale for this more flexible approach for lump sum amount awards is that there is no assignment of value to any particular element (e.g., tuition, room, board) so the student-athlete has the discretion to indicate how his or her award should be used. Therefore, the institution should have the same flexibility to calculate the student-athlete's equivalency value without being required to use one particular method. Since this question has been asked on a regular basis over the years and no formal staff or official interpretation exists, the staff agreed that a formal staff interpretation should be issued. Further, the staff agreed this should be a confirmation since it is included in the educational column: [Reference: 4/19/90].

In its review of the issue, the staff also discussed the application of this confirmation to institutions that award aid in terms of dollars, but have institutional policies that require payment in a specific order. For example, when credits are placed on a student's account some institutions have policies that require payment in a certain order such that tuition must be paid first, followed by fees, followed by room, followed by board and followed by books. The staff believed that while, in these instances, the award provided to the student-athlete may be reflected as a total dollar amount (e.g., $13,000) on the written grant-in-aid agreement or tender, the institution is essentially providing an award that is assigned to particular elements because the student-athlete does not have the option to indicate how the award should be applied as they do if receiving a true lump sum award. Therefore, the staff believed the legislation and previous interpretations, including an official interpretation: [Reference: 4/23/08, Item No. 4], provides instruction on how to calculate equivalencies in these circumstances and that the flexibility afforded in the first part of the January 21 interpretation may not be extended. Specifically, the staff believed the flexibility provided in the first part of the January 21 interpretation is unique only to instances in

which a true lump sum amount is awarded (e.g., student-athlete may determine to which elements of a grant-in-aid the award is applied).

Application.

Below is an example to help illustrate the application of this staff interpretation when calculating the equivalency value for a student-athlete who has received a $13,000 award.

Award to student-athlete = $13,000
Actual full grant-in-aid = $20,000
Average full grant-in-aid = $23,500

Scenario A

In this scenario, the institution does not have a policy that requires payment by element and provides the award in a lump sum amount of $13,000. Therefore, the institution can use either of the following methods to calculate the student-athlete's equivalency value by placing the amount received by the student-athlete ($13,000) in the numerator and either the actual full grant-in-aid [FGIA] ($20,000) or average FGIA ($23,500) in the denominator.

[Note: This scenario illustrates the first part of the January 21 staff interpretation.]

Actual method: $\frac{\$13,000}{\$20,000} = .65$ $\left(\frac{\text{Actual \$ awarded}}{\text{Actual FGIA}} = \text{equivalency}\right)$

OR

Average method: $\frac{\$13,000}{\$23,500} = .55$ $\left(\frac{\text{Actual \$ awarded}}{\text{Average FGIA}} = \text{equivalency}\right)$

As a result, the student-athlete's equivalency value is different depending on what method is used. When using the actual method the student-athlete's equivalency value is .65, whereas when using the average method the student-athlete's equivalency value is .55. This demonstrates the flexibility provided to institutions when providing lump sum awards.

Scenario B

In this scenario, the institution does have a policy that requires the awarding of certain elements in a specific, hierarchical order [e.g., (1) tuition, (2) fees, (3) room, (4) board, (5) books)]. Therefore, the institution can still use either the actual method or average method to calculate the student-athlete's equivalency, but the same value (i.e., actual or average) must be used in both the numerator and denominator.

[Note: This scenario illustrates the second part of the January 21 staff interpretation.]

Actual method: $\frac{\$13,000}{\$20,000} = .65$ $\left(\frac{\text{Actual \$ awarded}}{\text{Actual FGIA}} = \text{equivalency}\right)$

OR

Average method: First, the institution must determine the average cost of the student-athlete's FGIA. This is done by creating a proportionality equation.

[Note: It is important to note that although "x" represents the average cost of the student-athlete's FGIA, it does not mean the amount received by the student-athlete changes from the original $13,000 award. Rather, "x" only represents a certain value in order to compute the equation under this (i.e., average) calculation method.]

$\frac{\$13,000}{\$20,000} = \frac{x}{\$23,500}$ AND $x = \$15,275$ $\left(\frac{\text{Actual \$ awarded}}{\text{Actual FGIA}} = \frac{x}{\text{Average FGIA}}\right.$

x = Average cost of the student-athlete's FGIA$\left.\right)$

So: $\frac{\$15,275}{\$23,500} = .65$

Note that in this scenario, the equivalency value is the same regardless of the method (average or actual) since a proportion is used. This is important and distinct from the first scenario because, in this instance, the student-athlete's award must be applied on a per element basis. Therefore, the institution does not have the same flexibility in calculating equivalency values and must use the same cost (actual or average) in both the numerator and denominator, consistent with the official interpretation: [Reference: 4/23/08, Item No. 4] [see part (a) below]. As noted in the staff position section above, the only circumstance in which an institution has flexibility to use

the actual amount received by the student-athlete in the numerator and either the actual FGIA or average FGIA in the denominator is a circumstance in which the award received by the student-athlete cannot be tied or assigned to any element and is a true lump sum amount with the student-athlete having the discretion to indicate how the award should be used.

Legislation.

NCAA Division I Bylaw 15.5.3.2 - Equivalency Computations.

In equivalency sports, each institutional financial aid award (per Bylaw 15.02.4.1) to a counter shall be computed as follows:

a. Once a student becomes a counter, the institution shall count all institutional aid (per Bylaw 15.02.4.1) received for room, board, tuition and fees, and books up to the value of a full grant-in-aid. Exempted government grants per Bylaw 15.2.5 and exempted institutional aid per Bylaw 15.02.4.3 specifically are excluded from this computation. *(Revised: 1/9/96 effective 8/1/96, 4/29/04 effective 8/1/04, 10/20/08)*

b. A fraction shall be created, with the amount received by the student-athlete (up to the value of a full grant-in-aid) as the numerator and the full grant-in-aid value for that student-athlete as the denominator based on the actual cost or average cost of a full grant for all students at that institution. Financial aid unrelated to athletics ability (see Bylaw 15.1) received by the student-athlete in excess of a full grant-in-aid shall not be included in this computation. *(Revised: 1/10/90, 4/29/04 effective 8/1/04)*

c. The sum of all fractional and maximum awards received by counters shall not exceed the total limit for the sport in question for the academic year as a whole.

Other Relevant Interpretations.

Calculation of Equivalencies
Date Issued: April 23, 2008
Date Published: April 23, 2008
Item Ref: 4

The committee confirmed the following regarding equivalency computations:

a. An institution may use either the actual cost or average cost of a full grant for any or all of the elements of financial aid (i.e., room, board, tuition and fees), provided the institution is consistent in the method it uses in the numerator and denominator (i.e., if the institution uses

the average cost of room in the numerator, it also must use the average cost in the denominator).

b. In computing equivalencies for tuition and fees, it is not permissible to average the value of in-state and out-of-state tuition and fees to determine an average cost for tuition and fees at that institution.

c. An institution may compute equivalencies based on the averaging method for one of the institution's teams and the actual method for another of the institution's teams. Further, an institution may compute equivalencies based on the actual method for one student-athlete and the averaging method for another student-athlete on the same team.

d. An institution must use the legislated amount for books ($400 for the academic year) in the denominator to calculate book allowances in equivalencies. Therefore, if a student-athlete receives a full-book allowance for the academic year, $400 must be placed in the numerator and denominator, regardless of the actual cost of the books. If a student-athlete is receiving less than the full book allowance, the institution must determine the fraction of book aid received and use the appropriate numerator based on the $400 denominator to reflect the fraction of the book allowance actually received. For example, if a student-athlete receives only one-half of the institution's book allowance, $200 would be used as the numerator and $400 would be used as the denominator.

[References: Division I Bylaws 15.2.3 (books), 15.2.3.1 (dollar limits) and 15.5.3.2 (equivalency computations), and staff interpretations (2/9/90, item d), (9/6/89, item e) and (10/14/98, Item No. 10), which have been archived]

NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet

Possible Financial Aid Models for Division I Sand Volleyball

Background.

On April 20, 2009, the NCAA Division I Legislative Council adopted Proposal No. 2008-59, adding sand volleyball to the list of emerging sports for women as of August 1, 2010. In accordance with NCAA Constitution 3.2.4.5.2 (emerging sports timetable), financial aid legislation is one area in which legislation must be in place for an emerging sport's first year. To assist the cabinet in its discussion of financial aid legislation for sand volleyball, this document contains possible financial aid models for the sport. In addition to two models proposed by the NCAA staff, a model proposed by the American Volleyball Coaches Association also is included.

Model 1 – No Changes to Volleyball; Add Eight Equivalencies for Sand Volleyball.

Twelve head count grants for volleyball, plus, in the first year, five equivalencies for sand volleyball. An additional equivalency for sand volleyball shall be added each year for the next three years, for a total of eight equivalencies for sand volleyball.

- For student-athletes receiving the equivalencies - no minimum equivalency value or maximum number of counters.

Point to Consider.

- For institutions sponsoring only sand volleyball, should the equivalencies be phased in as described in the model? Or, should all eight equivalencies be immediately available?

Model 2 – For Institutions Sponsoring Both Sports, Share 15 Equivalencies.

For institutions sponsoring both volleyball and sand volleyball, 15 equivalencies shared between the two sports. For institutions only sponsoring volleyball, the current maximum limit of 12 counters (head count) would remain in effect. For institutions only sponsoring sand volleyball, five equivalencies would be available in the first year and one additional equivalency would be added each year for the next three years, resulting in a total of eight equivalencies for sand volleyball.

- No minimum equivalency value or maximum number of counters.

Points to Consider.

1. Will institutions use the grants to fund student-athletes for sand volleyball, or to increase the number of aided indoor student-athletes?

2. For institutions sponsoring only sand volleyball, should the equivalencies be phased in as described in the model? Or, should all eight equivalencies be immediately available?

Addressing Multisport Student-Athletes.

Option A.

Regardless of the overall counter/equivalency limits chosen, consider allowing a specified number of counters who participate in volleyball and sand volleyball to be counted against the sand volleyball limit.

Option B.

Counters who participate in both sports shall be counted against the volleyball limit.

Option C.

Counters who participate in both sports shall be counted against the sand volleyball limit.

The following information is excerpted from the American Volleyball Coaches Association's legislative recommendations for collegiate sand volleyball.

Financial Aid.

Operating Principle: In drafting financial aid guidelines for the sport of sand volleyball, it is a general directive to avoid radical changes in the current financial aid parameters for indoor volleyball.

15.5.3 Equivalency Sports

15.5.3.1 Maximum Equivalency Limits

15.5.3.1.3 Women's Sports

Sand Volleyball (w/o Indoor)……..……6 (Implemented Immediately)

Rationale: The average roster size of an indoor volleyball team is roughly 13.5 student-athletes. Divide 12 full scholarships among 13.5 student-athletes (understanding that indoor volleyball is a head count sport and scholarships are not administered in this manner), and it is .88 scholarships per student-athlete. With the average roster size for a sand volleyball team projected at 12, multiply 12 by .88, and the result is 10.6. Further multiplying 10.6 by the maximum playing date differential between indoor and sand (proposed) is 16/28 or .57, yielding 6.08.

Sand Volleyball (w Indoor)…….1 (Effective Immediately)
Increase by 1……2 (Effective 2011-2012)
Increase by 1……3 (Effective 2012-2013)
Increase by 1……4 (Effective 2013-2014)

Rationale: Average roster size of an indoor volleyball team is roughly 13.5 student-athletes. Divide 12 full scholarships among 13.5 student-athletes (understanding that indoor volleyball is a head count sport and scholarships are not administered in this manner), and it is .88 scholarships per student-athlete. Using the maximum playing date differential between indoor 28 and sand 16 (proposed) or .57, the scholarship equivalency is reduced to approximately .50 per sand volleyball player. With four equivalency scholarships for sand applied to the .50

scholarship per sand volleyball student-athlete model, the yield is eight sand volleyball players. Increasing total volleyball roster sizes by arguably eight additional student-athletes represents a material change in participation.

It is expected that the sand discipline will evolve in the high schools and junior volleyball ranks with more players being interested and pursuing sand volleyball as a primary focus. However, in the first years of inception, sand rosters will likely be fulfilled with indoor student-athletes for programs which have both sports. By starting with an one additional scholarship equivalency for sand in the first year of sponsorship and staggering additional scholarships for the next four years to increase to the ideal number four (for augmented roster size and athlete independence from indoor), the financial commitment is eased at the onset and additional aid provided for when the pool of prospects for sand deepens.

Sand Volleyball: Minimum Equivalency Value.

An institution shall provide each counter athletically related and other countable financial aid that is equal to or greater than 33 percent of a full grant-in-aid.

Rationale: This stipulation is recommended based on the fact that the player pool for sand volleyball – females under age 18 - is very large, over 200,000, and quite inexperienced, only 32,000 are frequent participants who only play sand not indoor volleyball. To avoid the pitfalls of coaches splitting one scholarship among 10-12 student-athletes, this caveat guarantees that the institution makes an investment and will assist with APR consistency, in the same manner that the minimum equivalency limit has been conceived for baseball.

There is also a concern in the volleyball community that programs will be able to stockpile talent with minimum offers of athletics aid. A minimum equivalency value will guarantee that programs will have a cap on the number of student-athletes who can receive athletics aid for sand volleyball, 18 for programs without indoor and 12 for programs with indoor and sand.

Indoor/Sand Volleyball, Women's.

A student-athlete who receives a sand volleyball athletics grant-in-aid shall become a counter for indoor volleyball should she practice or compete for the indoor volleyball team.

Rationale. The implementation of a hierarchy for what program the student-athlete should count is a core issue with institutions currently sponsoring indoor volleyball. It is important the institutions sponsoring sand volleyball which also sponsor an indoor program not be allowed to use sand volleyball scholarships to fund a "farm" program of talent for their indoor program. Much in the way women's volleyball aid counts toward women's basketball, so should sand volleyball aid count towards indoor volleyball.

Offers of Financial Aid for Sand Volleyball.

A student-athlete who signs an athletics grant-in-aid for sand volleyball upon first enrolling at the certifying institution shall not be eligible to participate in practices and/or competitions for indoor volleyball until the third year of consecutive enrollment.

Rationale: This regulation will assure indoor programs are not utilizing the extra financial aid afforded by the sponsorship of a sand program to create a "stable" of student-athletes from which they may pick to support their indoor program. While the counting hierarchy will achieve most of this intent, it is still possible if not probable that a coach could after one year re-evaluate his aid recipients to determine which combination would provide the best situation for his/her indoor program – essentially in the manner of a tryout.

The genesis of this idea was spawned by a former National Letter of Intent provision (now outdated) that prevented football programs from signing football prospects to track scholarships during the early period in order to capture the commitment for the football program prior to football's signing period. While this parallel is not exact, the intent is to respect the spirit of sand volleyball team sponsorship and preclude the use of additional aid for bettering the indoor program.

Playing Rules.

Participants. A team is composed of five (5) two-player units who compete in a flighted draw. No substitutions are allowed once a two-player unit has started a match or a tournament. Player substitutions may occur between different competitions.

Rationale: See clarification under "Rationale for Minimum Participant Requirements for Sports Sponsorship."

Prepared by T.J. Meagher, AVCA Legislative Board Representative & Assistant Athletics Director for Compliance and Special Projects, University of Houston

SUPPLEMENT NO. 7

MEMORANDUM

May 4, 2009

TO: Members of the Division I Communications and Coordination Committee.

FROM: Beth DeBauche, staff liaison.

SUBJECT: Bylaw and Practices Review.

1. <u>Charge</u>.

Given the current economic conditions that are placing stress on institutional and athletics budgets at many NCAA member institutions, the Division I Board of Directors at its April 30, 2009, meeting, requested that the Division I councils and cabinets begin an immediate review of all operational aspects under their purview to identify bylaws and practices that could possibly be modified to provide financial relief to the membership. Specifically, the Board asked that each governance body at its next meeting start developing an exhaustive list of possible bylaws and policy changes ranked in priority order with the relevant projected financial impact on the membership.

In conducting these reviews, the cabinets and councils should consider the impact of the proposed changes on the principles of fair competition, the well-being of student-athletes, sound academic standards, the integrity of the sport, and costs. The recommendations should be consistent with the NCAA principle governing the economy of athletics program operations, which states that intercollegiate athletics programs shall be administered in keeping with prudent management and fiscal practices to arouse the financial stability necessary for providing student-athletes with adequate opportunities for athletics competition as an integral part of a quality educational experience. The Board of Directors appreciates that some of the bylaws identified in this review may include concepts previously considered by the Division I governance structure but encourages the cabinets and councils to take a fresh look at issues in light of this charge.

2. <u>Illustrations</u>.

The NCAA staff was also asked to seek to think creatively about possible bylaw and policy changes that could provide financial relief on campuses and some of the ideas identified by staff may be illustrative to the cabinets and councils as they seek to begin their examination. Ideas discussed included: suspending athletic certification for a year or predetermined amount of time; eliminating nontraditional seasons for selected sports; modifying championships bracketing and seeding; eliminating the printing of recruiting materials and media guides and modifying recruiting calendars.

3. <u>Timeline</u>.

Cabinets will be asked to begin this review at their June meetings. Cabinets shall provide a progress report in their June cabinet reports including a listing of bylaws appropriate for possible amendment. Depending on the scope of cabinet jurisdiction, some cabinets may be able to finish their reviews in June, while others may require additional time to formalize recommendations. Those cabinets needing extra time would be encouraged work expeditiously where possible with the goal of concluding their reviews during the September series of meetings. [Note: The Championships/Sports Management Cabinet does not have an in-person meeting scheduled in June but does have a conference call scheduled.]

The Leadership Council, with the help of the Legislative Council, will then be asked to prioritize the work and recommendations of the cabinets to ensure a level of consistency between recommendations in keeping with the priorities on the Division I agenda. The prioritized list of recommended changes will be presented to the Board of Directors during its October meeting, as the Board will be asked to consider sponsoring legislation in the 2009-10 legislative cycle as it deems appropriate. Consideration of the proposals by the membership will occur thereafter under the normal legislative process. It is hoped that as a result of this process appropriate legislative changes will be adopted that will result in cost savings from an operational standpoint on campus that will in no way compromise the well-being of student-athletes, sound academic standards, and the integrity of the sports.

NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet

Review of Issues Related to NCAA Bylaw 16.8.1.2.1 (Departure/Return Expense Restrictions)

Purpose.

The purpose of this document is to stimulate a review of options related to the current NCAA restrictions surrounding departures for competition. At the conclusion of the discussion, it is anticipated that the NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet will decide whether to propose a legislative change or maintain the status quo.

Background.

As a reminder, at its September 2008 meeting, the cabinet received an overview of past discussions related to rules regarding departure/return expense restrictions and agreed to place this item on the June 2009 agenda for further discussion. In recent years, the NCAA Division I Management Council defeated a recommendation from the former Administrative Review Subcommittee (now the Subcommittee for Legislative Relief) to sponsor a legislative proposal which would have allowed an institution to leave prior to the 48-hour or return after the 36-hour restrictions in the departure/return legislation if the institution could document all of its eligible student-athletes would not miss additional scheduled class time. The concerns expressed in opposition of the proposal included the potential additional time away from campus or study time and consistency in the availability of institutional funds for traveling in excess of the 48-hour/36-hour period.

Following the lack of support for its recommendation, the former Administrative Review Subcommittee provided the following review standards for waiver submissions as guidance to the Division I membership:

1. Minimal to no missed class time.

2. Minimal to no missed campus or study time, even if scheduled class time is not being missed in excess of the 48-hour/36-hour period.

3. If the institution is asserting the early departure involves cost savings (e.g., objective documentation of cheaper flights in comparison to permissible flight times), the institution will also need to indicate how much scheduled class time will be missed and how much campus or study time will be missed.

4. If the institution is asserting the early departure involves limited availability of flights (e.g., objective documentation of flights available in comparison with permissible flight times), the institution will also need to indicate how much scheduled class time will be missed and how much campus or study time will be missed.

The above-referenced guidelines were released June 19, 2006, and institutional and conference personnel were encouraged to educate their administrative staffs, coaching staffs and travel resources regarding the current legislation and make efforts not to miss additional class or campus time. While noting that the legislative relief waiver process would continue to remain available for these types of waivers, the former Administrative Review Subcommittee emphasized that institutions would need to demonstrate extenuating or extraordinary circumstances whenever submitting a request to have its student-athletes depart prior to the 48-hour period or return after the 36-hour period, especially when missed class or campus time is involved.

Recommendations for Consideration.

The current 48-hour departure/36-hour return restriction was adopted in 1991 as a means to reduce travel costs and the number of student-athletes missing class time. The options below would alleviate the need for a waiver to be submitted for an individual or team to depart campus outside the 48-hour period and would allow each member institution to exercise their individual discretion. These options (as well as others discussed by the cabinet) could be recommended as potential legislative proposals for the 2009-10 legislative cycle.

1. One alternative would be to propose legislation to permit weekend departures (Friday through Sunday) to exceed the 48-hour restriction if no additional scheduled class time is missed. Although this alternative does not address missed campus or study time, it is easy for institutions to administer and provides institutions flexibility to determine an appropriate departure time for their student-athletes when no additional scheduled class time is missed.

2. A second alternative would be to propose legislation to permit, once per sport per academic year, a team to depart up to 12 hours outside of the 48-hour restriction (i.e., an institution could depart campus up to 60 hours before its scheduled competition) for a circumstance involving documented limited availability of flights or cost savings and no additional missed class time. Allowing a one-time exception for each sport each academic year would eliminate the need for most waivers of the 48-hour restriction and would minimize potential abuses provided by permitting an exception to be used multiple times by a sport during an academic year. As with the first alternative, this alternative does not address missed campus or study time; however, this issue would exist only once per sport and it is easy for institutions to administer and provides institutions flexibility to determine an appropriate departure time for their student-athletes when no additional scheduled class time is missed.

3. A third alternative would be to propose legislation to permit an institution's chancellor or president to waive the 48-hour restriction. An institution using this exception would be required to maintain a record of the waiver on file in the chancellor or president's office.

To provide the chancellor or president some administrative flexibility, the authority to grant the waiver could be designated to another administrator, provided the administrator was not an athletics department staff member and was not the faculty athletics representative. This proposal provides flexibility to institutions and, through the involvement of the chancellor or president, encourages institutions to remain sensitive to student-athletes' missed class time and missed campus or study time. However, the application of such legislation could vary widely from campus to campus.

Legislative Proposals for Review by NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2008-14	RECRUITING -- DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS -- PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETE -- ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE IN SUMMER CLASSES PRIOR TO INITIAL FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT	Adopted - Final	NCAA Division I Academics/Eligibility/ Compliance Cabinet (Subcommittee on Recruiting).	Immediate	To specify that an individual shall no longer be considered a prospective student-athlete for purposes of the contact limitations in Bylaw 13 and shall be considered a student-athlete for purposes of Bylaw 16 at the point in which he or she officially registers and enrolls and attends classes in an institution's summer term prior to initial full-time enrollment.
2008-25-A	RECRUITING -- OFFICIAL VISIT AND LETTER OF INTENT PROGRAMS -- REQUIREMENTS FOR OFFICIAL VISIT AND OFFERS OF ATHLETICALLY RELATED FINANCIAL AID -- COMPLETION OF AMATEURISM CERTIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE	Defeated - Final	NCAA Division I Academics/Eligibility/ Compliance Cabinet (Subcommittee on Agents and Amateurism and Subcommittee on Recruiting).	August 1, 2009	To specify that a high school, preparatory school or transfer (if applicable) prospective student-athlete must complete the amateurism certification questionnaire administered by the NCAA Eligibility Center before an institution may provide the prospective student-athlete an official visit; further, to specify that an institution shall not provide a high school, preparatory school or transfer prospective student-athlete a written offer of athletically related financial aid until he or she has completed the amateurism certification questionnaire with the Eligibility Center.
2008-25-B	RECRUITING -- LETTER OF INTENT PROGRAMS -- REQUIREMENTS FOR OFFERS OF ATHLETICALLY RELATED FINANCIAL AID -- COMPLETION OF AMATEURISM CERTIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE	Defeated - Final	NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet.	August 1, 2009	To specify that an institution shall not provide a high school, preparatory school or transfer (if applicable) prospective student-athlete a written offer of athletically related financial aid until he or she has completed the amateurism certification questionnaire administered by the NCAA Eligibility Center.
2008-25-C	RECRUITING -- OFFICIAL VISIT AND LETTER OF INTENT PROGRAMS -- REQUIREMENTS FOR OFFICIAL VISIT AND OFFERS OF ATHLETICALLY RELATED	Defeated - Final	Big Ten Conference.	August 1, 2010	To specify that a high school, preparatory school or transfer (if applicable) prospective student-athlete must complete the amateurism certification questionnaire administered by the NCAA Eligibility Center before an institution may provide the

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
	FINANCIAL AID -- COMPLETION OF AMATEURISM CERTIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE -- DELAYED EFFECTIVE DATE				prospective student-athlete an official visit; further, to specify that an institution shall not provide a high school, preparatory school or transfer prospective student-athlete a written offer of athletically related financial aid until he or she has completed the amateurism certification questionnaire with the Eligibility Center.
2008-25-D	RECRUITING -- LETTER OF INTENT PROGRAMS -- REQUIREMENTS FOR OFFERS OF ATHLETICALLY RELATED FINANCIAL AID -- COMPLETION OF AMATEURISM CERTIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE -- DELAYED EFFECTIVE DATE	Adopted, 60-Day Override Period	Big Ten Conference.	August 1, 2010	To specify that an institution shall not provide a high school, preparatory school or transfer (if applicable) prospective student-athlete a written offer of athletically related financial aid until he or she has completed the amateurism certification questionnaire administered by the NCAA Eligibility Center.
2008-28	RECRUITING -- FINANCIAL AID AGREEMENTS -- OFFERS OF AID BEFORE JULY 1 FOLLOWING JUNIOR YEAR -- WOMEN'S LACROSSE	Defeated - Final	Ivy Group.	August 1, 2009	In women's lacrosse, to specify that an institution shall not offer (or indicate that it will or may offer), orally or in writing, athletically related financial aid, other institutional financial aid or admissions assistance before July 1 following the prospective student-athlete's junior year in high school; further, to specify that an institution shall not accept any commitment from a prospective student-athlete before July 1 following the prospective student-athlete's junior year in high school.
2008-40	FINANCIAL AID -- MAXIMUM INSTITUTIONAL GRANT-IN-AID LIMITATIONS BY SPORT -- WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL	Defeated - Final	Pacific-10 Conference.	August 1, 2009	In women's volleyball, to increase the maximum institutional grant-in-aid limitation from 12 to 13.
2008-41	FINANCIAL AID -- MAXIMUM	Defeated -	Southeastern	August 1,	In baseball, to increase the annual limit on the value

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
	INSTITUTIONAL GRANT-IN-AID LIMITATIONS BY SPORT -- BASEBALL	Final	Conference.	2009	of financial aid awards (equivalencies) to counters from 11.7 to 14.
2008-42	AWARDS, BENEFITS AND EXPENSES -- COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS AND TICKET BENEFITS -- POSTSEASON EVENTS	Adopted - Final	Big Ten Conference.	August 1, 2009	To specify that an institution may provide each student-athlete who participates in or is a member of a team participating in a postseason event (e.g., conference championship, NCAA championship, National Invitation Tournament, bowl game) with six complimentary admissions to all intercollegiate athletics events at the site at which the student (or team) participates.
2008-43	AWARDS, BENEFITS AND EXPENSES -- HOUSING AND MEALS -- FRUIT, NUTS AND BAGELS	Adopted, 60-Day Override Period	Atlantic Coast Conference.	August 1, 2009	To specify that an institution may provide fruit, nuts and bagels to student-athletes at any time.
2008-44	AWARDS, BENEFITS AND EXPENSES -- EXPENSES PROVIDED BY THE INSTITUTION FOR PRACTICE AND COMPETITION -- DEPARTURE/RETURN EXPENSE RESTRICTIONS -- EXCEPTIONS -- TRAVEL FOLLOWING CHAMPIONSHIPS EVENTS AND POSTSEASON FOOTBALL GAMES	Adopted - Final	Atlantic Coast Conference.	Immediate	To specify that return transportation following contests in NCAA championship events, national governing body championships in emerging sports or licensed postseason football games that take place during the institution's official vacation period during the academic year or between regular academic terms are exempt from the requirement that a student-athlete remain no longer than 36 hours following the conclusion of the competition in order to receive actual and necessary expenses to return to campus.

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2008-52	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- FOOTBALL -- PRESEASON PRACTICE -- LIMIT ON NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS -- REPLACEMENT OF STUDENT-ATHLETE DUE TO INJURY OR ILLNESS -- FCS	Adopted, 60-Day Override Period	Southeastern Conference.	Immediate	In championship subdivision football, to specify that a student-athlete who sustains an injury or illness that prevents further participation in preseason practice activities may be replaced with another student-athlete without including that individual in the institution's limitation on the number of individuals who may participate in preseason practice.
2008-52	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- FOOTBALL -- PRESEASON PRACTICE -- LIMIT ON NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS -- REPLACEMENT OF STUDENT-ATHLETE DUE TO INJURY OR ILLNESS -- FBS	Adopted - Final	Southeastern Conference.	Immediate	In bowl subdivision football, to specify that a student-athlete who sustains an injury or illness that prevents further participation in preseason practice activities may be replaced with another student-athlete without including that individual in the institution's limitation on the number of individuals who may participate in preseason practice.

Current Bylaw:15.2.2 - Room and Board.

An institution may provide a student-athlete financial aid that includes the cost of room and board, based on the official allowance for a room as listed in the institution's official publication (e.g., catalog) and a board allowance that consists of three meals per day, even if the institution's maximum permissible award allowance for all students represents a lesser cost figure. *(Revised: 10/28/99 effective 8/1/00)*

Suggested language of Bylaw 15.2.2

An institution may provide a student-athlete financial aid that includes the cost of room and board, based on the official allowance for a room as listed in the institution's official publication (e.g., catalog) and ***an on campus meal plan that is available to all students as published in the institution's official publication (e.g., catalog or Web site). An off-campus board allowance that consists of three meals per day may be provided, even if the institution's maximum permissible award allowance for all students represents a lesser cost figure.***

If the above suggested language for Bylaw 15.2.2 was adopted, our full scholarship student-athletes would be able to select from any of the below meal plans, including the unlimited meal plan which costs the same as the meal plan that our student-athletes are forced to receive due to the current language of Bylaw 15.2.2. The key aspect of changing the legislation is to allow scholarship student-athletes the same opportunity to eat as non-scholarship student-athletes and regular students. Allowing the athletics scholarship to pay for full scholarship student-athletes to select a meal plan that best fits their eating habits and their class schedule benefits the welfare of the student-athlete, even if the meal plan may exceed three meals per day.

It doesn't make sense to me that we can spend unlimited amount of money on chemically enhanced nutritional supplements and provide them to student-athletes on an unlimited basis, but we can not provide an unlimited meal plan that costs the same has a 21 meal plan. 21 meal plans are rarely offered by institutions to their college students to meet their nutritional needs. only creates the meal plan for student-athletes during the fall and spring terms. During the summer months, there is no 21 meal plan available for our student-athletes. Thus, we have to provide our student-athletes cash which does not provide them the nutritional meals they need.

After reviewing several institutions' Web sites, including many institutions have moved away from the traditional three meals per day quote and have moved to a more flexible schedule for students.

Meal Plans

Meal Plan	Meal Plan Amount	Funds	Dining Dollars	Benefits	Total Cost
Unlimited Plus 5	$1,630	$125	$0	• 5 Retail Meals/Week — $7 Equivalency • Dining Locations Only	$1,755

				• $75 Gift Card (No Restrictions)	
Unlimited	$1,430	$125	$0	$75 Gift Card (No Restrictions)	$1,555
Classic 14	$1,314	$125	$0		$1,439
Basic 10	$1,080	$125	$0		$1,205
Social 75	$584	$125	$0	Can be used for guest meals	$709
400	$0	$0	$400	• Dining Locations Only • Non-Taxable Sales — 8% Savings • 10 Free Meals at Brittain or Woodruff Dining Halls	$400
	$0	$0	$200	• Dining Locations Only • Non-Taxable Sales — 8% Savings • $25 Gift Card (No Restrictions)	$200
21	$1,555	$0	$0	Edge Dining Hall Participation	$1,555
10	$1,205	$0	$0	Edge Dining Hall Participation	$1,205

I would like to see Bylaw 15.3.3.1.1 Exceptions to include letter (e) which would state:

(e) Graduate with Eligibility Remaining. A student-athlete who has graduated from the institution with a bachelor's degree and has one season eligibility remaining. If an institution awards aid under this provision, the institutional financial aid agreement shall include specific nonathletically related conditions (e.g., academic requirements) the student-athlete must satisfy in order for the aid to be renewed for the next academic term or terms. If the student-athlete satisfies the specified conditions, the institution shall award financial aid at the same amount for the next term or terms of the academic year. If the student-athlete does not satisfy the specified conditions, he or she must be provided a hearing opportunity per Bylaw 15.3.2.4.
This is more a football and other fall sports issue regarding student-athletes who graduate in the spring or summer terms with their bachelor's degree and have one season remaining. Thus, they return for the fall football season to complete their remaining season of eligibility. Per NCAA legislation they are required to be enrolled full-time and receive athletics aid for the entire academic year. We are paying for full-time tuition, fees, room and board for student-athletes to attend classes in the spring when they will not complete any hours. This is causing a financial impact on our institution in which we pay for football student-athletes to complete zero hours. We are going to have to submit a legislative relief waiver to allow for us to provide an athletics scholarship for only the fall term to our football student-athletes who have graduated and have one season remaining. The intent of the current legislation is to provide student-athletes who have not graduated with remaining eligibility their athletics scholarship for an academic year so that the aid would be available for the spring term to allow the student-athletes an opportunity to finish their degree. If a student-athlete has already received their degree and has no intention of pursuing a second degree, then why should the institution be required to pay for their scholarship for the fall. You may ask why is the student-athlete coming back for the spring term and not passing any hours. The answer is that they realize that the financial aid agreement includes the spring so that come back as a student to get their housing and meals stipends so they can work out for an NFL team.

Secondly, could the Cabinet discuss the increase of the $400 book amount for the equivalency computations in Bylaw 15.5.3.2. As the cost of books rise, it makes sense to raise the amount for books to help partial-scholarship student-athletes to get a little bit more to go towards the purchase of their books.