A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association
Division I Board of Directors

The Westin Indianapolis — April 29, 2010
Indianapolis, Indiana — 8 a.m. – 3 p.m.

1. Opening remarks.

2. Minutes of the January 16, 2010, Board of Directors meeting. [Supplement No. 1] [**Anticipated Action Item.]**

3. Report of the January 16, 2010, meeting of the NCAA Executive Committee. [Supplement No. 2] [No action anticipated.]

4. Report of the Division I Presidential Advisory Group April 29, 2009, meeting. [Supplement No. 3.] **[Possible action item.]**

5. Governmental relations report. [Supplement No. 4] [No action anticipated.]

6. Final report of the Football Working Group. [Supplement No. 5 – report presented by Joseph Castiglione, chair.] [**Anticipated Action Item.**]

7. Report from Interim NCAA President Jim Isch. [No action anticipated.]

   - NABC update. (Jim Haney, NABC executive director to provide update.) [Supplement No. 6]

   - Update on presidential search.

   - Media contract.

8. Litigation update. [Supplement No. 7 will be distributed at the meeting.] [No action anticipated.]

9. Report from the Committee on Academic Performance. [Supplement No. 8. An addendum will be distributed at the meeting. – report by Walter Harrison, chair.] [No action anticipated.]

10. Report of new budget initiatives for Division I. [Supplement No. 9] [**Anticipated Action Item.**]

11. Division I Governance Structure Update.

    a. Update from the February cabinet meetings. [Supplement No. 10] [No action anticipated.]

    b. Report of the March 23, 2010, Division I Leadership Council meeting. [Supplement No. 11] [**Anticipated Action Item.**]

    c. Report of the April 12-13, 2010, Division I Legislative Council meeting. [Supplement No. 12 will be distributed in advance of the meeting.] [An agenda is enclosed for your reference.] **[Possible Action Item.]**

        (1) Possible emergency/noncontroversial legislation.

        (2) Report of legislative proposals adopted by the Legislative Council.

            [Note: As a reminder, the Legislative Council will be responsible for considering, and ultimately voting on, all legislative proposals remaining in the annual legislative cycle. Thereafter, the Board has the authority to consider any proposal adopted by the Legislative Council but is not required to examine every adopted proposal. The intent of this process is to allow the Legislative Council to take the final action on the legislative matters necessary for the efficient management of Division I, and to leave to the discretion of the Board the authority to address the broader legislative issues facing the division. After the April 12-13, 2010, Legislative Council meeting, and prior to the Board meeting, the Board will be sent a listing of those proposals adopted by the Legislative Council to assist in preparation for the meeting.]

        (3) Update on requests for override votes on Proposal Nos. 2009-22 and 2009-51-B.

11. Committee on Infractions. [Supplement No. 13] **[Anticipated Action Item.]**

    - Committee appointment.

    - Status report on infractions issues.

12. Governance transitional issues. **[Anticipated Action Items.]**

    a. Appointment of new members to the Division I Board [Supplement No. 14]

    b. Appointment of FBS members to councils and cabinets. [Supplement No. 15A] [Supplement No. 15B will be posted prior to the meeting.]

    c. Appointments to the NCAA Executive Committee.

13. Other business.

14. Future meeting dates.

    a. August 12, 2010, The Westin Indianapolis, Indianapolis, Indiana.

    b. October 28, 2010, The Westin Indianapolis, Indianapolis, Indiana.

    c. January 15, 2011, San Antonio, Texas in conjunction with the 2011 NCAA Convention.

    d. April 28, 2011, The Westin Indianapolis, Indianapolis, Indiana.

    e. August 11, 2011, The Westin Indianapolis, Indianapolis, Indiana.

    f. October 27, 2011, The Westin Indianapolis, Indianapolis, Indiana.

15. Adjournment.

REPORT OF THE JANUARY 16, 2010, MEETING OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1. **Report of the October 29, 2009, Board of Directors Meeting. The Board approved the revised minutes of its October 29, 2009, meeting noting an amended vote [16-0-1 (Raines)] for Item No. 5-c regarding the Infractions Committee appointment.** (Unanimous voice vote) [Reference Supplement No. 1.]

2. **Report of the October 29, 2009, Executive Committee Meeting**. The Board reviewed a report of the October 29, 2009, meeting of the Executive Committee and took no action. [Reference Supplement No. 2.]

3. **Report of the Division I Presidential Advisory Group (PAG).** The Board received a report from Ann Millner, chair of the Division I Presidential Advisory Group, regarding the group's January 11, 2010, conference call. The Board was informed of PAG's review of various Board agenda items as they were reviewed by the Board. [Reference Supplement No. 4.]

4. **Report from the Interim President.** NCAA Interim President Jim Isch reported on the following items:

   a. **Update on Presidential Search**. Dan Parker of Parker Executive Search, updated the Board on the search process for the next NCAA president. The group was asked to comment regarding desired characteristics of a new president and individuals were invited to contact Dan Parker directly to provide input.

   b. **Value-Based Decisions**. The Board received a report from Greg Curtner, outside counsel, regarding values-based decision-making and was informed that a small working group including presidents, athletics directors, commissioners and experts will be working with staff to examine the issue.

   c. **Enforcement Process**. Bernard Franklin, NCAA executive vice president, reminded the Board of a 2006 report related to the evaluation of the Association's enforcement policies and was informed that a number of recommendations from that report have been implemented, and a small group, including Board members, will be formed to review the results of those recommendations, as well as a number of broader related issues. The Board requested a report from the group in April.

5. **Litigation Update**. Elsa Cole, NCAA General Counsel, provided this report to the Board.

6. **Report from the Committee on Academic Performance**. The group received an update on the activities of the Committee on Academic Performance (CAP) from the chair, Walter Harrison. Harrison noted that items on the committee's agenda for the upcoming year include an evaluation of the results of a study of the academic support services provided by Division I institutions, a review of the Division I initial-eligibility and 2-4 transfer requirements and a comprehensive examination of the Academic Performance Program (APP) to determine if the original goals of the program are being achieved. [Reference Supplement No. 6.]

7. **Status Report on the Efforts of the Football Academic Working Group**. The Board received a report of the working group's key findings regarding the academic performance of Division I football student-athletes and recommendations for strategies to improve their academic performance. It was noted that the working group will submit its final report to the Board in April for appropriate legislation to be considered in the 2010-11 legislative cycle. [Reference Supplement No. 7.]

8. **Infractions Appeals Committee Appointment**. The Board appointed Patti Ohlendorf, vice president of institutional relations and legal affairs at the University of Texas at Austin. (Unanimous voice vote) [Reference Supplement No. 8.]

9. **Division I Governance Structure Update**.

   a. **Update from the Communications and Coordination Committee**. The group was informed that the Communications and Coordination Committee is comprised of the chairs of the Division I cabinets and councils, and was created to coordinate consideration of issues and legislative concepts between the various governance bodies and to ensure a high level of communication among the bodies. It was noted that the committee continues to effectively communicate within the structure and move the Division I agenda.

   b. **Report of the January 14, 2010, meeting of the Leadership Council**. Damon Evans, chair of the Division I Leadership Council, reported briefly on the January 14, 2010, Leadership Council meeting. [Refer to Attachment D for the full report.]

      (1) The Board received information that the Council has concluded its work related to the consideration of Division I membership principles and standards, and will present its final recommendations to the Board for review during its April 2010 meeting.

(2) The Board also was informed that the Leadership Council continued its discussions regarding methods to enhance gender, ethnic minority and positional representation among those individuals serving in the Division I governance structure. The Leadership Council recommended that in April, the Board of Directors be presented with a slate of FBS nominations for the eight councils and cabinets that meets the following requirements:

(a) Apply the current gender (35 percent) and ethnic minority (20 percent) minimum requirements to **each** council and cabinet (three 31-person bodies and five 21-person bodies).

(b) Apply a **new** minimum positional requirement for athletics directors (20 percent) and faculty athletics representatives (20 percent) to **each** council and cabinet independently (eight total groups).

(c) Determine that the requirements of "a" and "b" above apply to the combined FCS and Division I representatives for each council and cabinet, effective with FCS and Division I term expirations in April and June 2012. [Note: It is recommended that all the FCS and Division I terms on councils and cabinets expire during the same year in order to enable those conference to work together in submitting nominations that would meet the new diversity requirements.

(d) That the Board adopt appropriate emergency legislation in April 2010 to implement these policies.

BOARD ACTION: **The Board endorsed the endorsed the Leadership Council's recommendations for enhanced diversity requirements for various Division I governance bodies.** (Unanimous voice vote)

c. **Report of the January 13-14, 2010, meeting of the Division I Legislative Council**.

(1) Report on the override votes. The Board was informed that the override votes on Proposal Nos. 2008-46 (For 100, Against 168, Abstain 19) and 2008-59 (For 166, Against 118, Abstain 1) were unsuccessful. (Refer to Attachment B for the voting results.)

(2) Report of the Legislative Council's Actions Related to Selected Proposals. Joseph D'Antonio, chair of the Division I Legislative Council, reported the

Legislative Council's action relative to men's basketball Proposal Nos. 2009-96, 2009-97, 2009-98 and 2009-99, and the definition of a "deserving team" in FBS football (Proposal No. 2009-103) that had been sponsored by the Board in October. (Refer to Attachment C for the full report of the legislative Council's actions.)

(3) Emergency or Noncontroversial Legislation. **The Board agreed to adopt emergency legislation to delay the effective date of Proposal No. 2008-59 to August 1, 2011**. (Unanimous voice vote) This proposal recently was sustained following an attempted override vote and adds women's sand volleyball to the NCAA list of emerging sports.

10. **Update on Possible Cost Savings Initiatives**. The Board was informed that cost savings initiatives will be an item on the February meeting agenda of all the cabinets and the March meeting agenda of the Leadership Council. It is anticipated that the Board will receive a report with recommendations during its April 2010 meeting.

11. **Future meeting Dates**.

a. April 29, 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana.

b. August 12, 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana.

c. October 28, 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana.

d. January 15, 2011, NCAA Convention, San Antonio, Texas.

e. April 28, 2011, National Office, Indianapolis, Indiana.

f. August 11, 2011, National Office, Indianapolis, Indiana.

g. October 27, 2011, National Office, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Board of Directors chair: James Barker, Clemson University
Staff Liaisons: S. David Berst, Division I governance
Jacqueline Campbell, Division I governance

MINUTES OF THE

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Hyatt Regency Atlanta
Atlanta, Georgia

January 16, 2010

Participants:

Charles Bantz, Indiana Univ.-Purdue Univ. at Indianapolis
James Barker, Clemson University
Kathleen Brasfield, Angelo State University
Damon Evans, University of Georgia
Judy Genshaft, University of South Florida
James Harris, Widener University
William Harvey, Hampton University
Stephen Jordan, Metropolitan State College of Denver
Lynn Oberbilling, Smith College
Ann Millner, Weber State University
Kevin Mullen, Siena College
Harvey Perlman, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
John Peters, Northern Illinois University
Beverley Pitts, University of Indianapolis
Edward Ray, Oregon State University, chair
Paul Trible, Christopher Newport University
Jim Isch, NCAA
Bernard Franklin, NCAA
Delise O'Meally, NCAA, recording secretary

Robert Kustra, Boise State University, and Shirley Raines, University of Memphis, were not able to participate.

Also in attendance were: Gary Brown, director of NCAA News; Elsa Cole, vice president of legal affairs/general counsel; Joni Comstock, senior vice president of championships/senior woman administrator; Dennis Cryder, senior vice president of branding and communications; Michelle Hosick, associate director of NCAA News; Tom Jernstedt, executive vice president, Kevin Lennon, vice president of academic and membership affairs; Keith Martin, interim vice president for administration/chief financial officer; Wallace Renfro, vice president and senior advisor to the president; Greg Shaheen, senior vice president of basketball and business strategies; Robert Vowels, vice president of educational affairs; Charlotte Westerhaus, vice president of diversity and inclusion; Bob Williams, managing director of public and media relations; David Berst, Daniel Dutcher and Mike Racy, NCAA governance vice presidents; and Jackie Campbell, Leah Kareti, and Terri Steeb, NCAA governance directors.

DRAFT

[Note: These minutes contain only actions taken (formal votes or stated "sense of the meeting") in accordance with NCAA policy regarding minutes of all Association entities. While certain items on the Committee's agenda were acted on at various times throughout the meeting, all final actions within a given topic are combined in these minutes for convenience of reference.]

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m. by the chair, President Ray. All members were present as noted above.

1. Welcome and announcements. Ray welcomed Kathleen Brasfield, director of athletics at Angelo State University and incoming chair of the Division II Management Council. Also, Ray presented Stephen Jordan, chair of the Division II Presidents Council, and Paul Trible, chair of the Division III Presidents Council, with awards for their service to the Executive Committee.

2. Approval of October 29, 2009, meeting minutes.

   It was VOTED

   "To approve the Executive Committee minutes of the October 29, 2009, meeting as distributed."

3. Executive session. Ray convened an executive session during which the Executive Committee received an update from NCAA Interim President Jim Isch, approved the position description for the position of president of the NCAA and accepted the recommendation of Mercer in compliance with the Taxpayer Bill of Rights.

4. St. Andrews Presbyterian College request. The Committee reviewed a request from St. Andrews Presbyterian College related to NCAA membership standards. Pursuant to NCAA Constitution 3.02.3.1, one of the requirements necessary for active membership is accreditation by one of the six regional accrediting agencies. St. Andrews requested that the Executive Committee consider accreditation by a national accrediting body as sufficient to meet this requirement. The Executive Committee agreed to form a working group to study the issue.

5. Association-wide membership and the approval of a working group. The Executive Committee appointed a working group to explore from an Association-wide perspective the issue of membership growth within the NCAA.

6. NCAA Executive Committee Finance Committee report.

a. Fiscal year 2008-09 audited statements. The Finance Committee met with the audit firm of KPMG to review fiscal year 2008-09 financial statements and conduct the required audit communications and review.

(1) KPMG issued an unqualified opinion for the fiscal year statements ending August 31, 2009.

(2) Highlights of the Consolidated Statement of Financial Position are:

(a) The Association's total assets increased by approximately $34 million in comparison to the prior year. The increase was primarily in the investments holdings as of the year end and the acquisition of Arbiter and eOfficials. Assets purchased consisted of primarily goodwill and intangible assets.

(b) The Association's net assets increased by more than $47 million this past fiscal year due to the surplus of revenues over expenses. It was noted that the Association does not budget investment earnings since these funds, by Executive Committee policy, are allocated to the quasi-endowment.

(c) All allocations to the respective reserves, per Executive Committee policy, have been made.

(d) The Association had an increase in revenue this past year that was primarily due to the increases in TV rights fees, ticket revenues from championships and the revenues from the Eligibility Center. Investments earnings for the year were $9 million, as compared to a loss of $4 million in the prior year.

(e) From an expense standpoint, the distribution to Division I increased approximately nine percent per the scheduled distribution plan. Division I championships expenses decreased approximately nine percent, which is primarily the result of lower costs of travel

this past year. The increase in Association-wide expense is due to the addition of Arbiter and eOfficials LLC expenses and youth basketball expenses.

(f) Excess revenues over expenses for the year were approximately $47 million.

It was VOTED

"To approve the fiscal year 2008-09 financial statements."

b. Recommended uses of unallocated net assets. Fiscal year 2008-09 year ended with the Association having $15.8 million in unrestricted net assets available for allocation. The Finance Committee recommended the surplus be used in the following manner:

(1) $15 million distributed back to the Division I members. The Association committed $5 million last January from budget reductions, and the result of additional revenues over expenses at year end allows for an additional $10 million.

(2) $400,000 allocated to the Myles Brand Chair for Pancreatic Cancer.

(3) $400,000 allocated for the presidential search and executive move.

It was VOTED

"To approve the proposed unallocated net assets allocations."

c. First quarter fiscal year 2009-10 budget to actual.

(1) The Association has limited financial activity in the first quarter, with the majority of revenues and expenditures occurring in the second half of the year related to championship activity and revenue distributions.

(2) Revenue received is 16 percent of the budget and is in line with the prior year. Although championships revenue is three percentage points behind the prior year, this is the result of timing differences, and, to date, men's basketball tickets sales revenues are in line with last year.

(3) The Association's expenses are seven percent of the total budget for the first quarter and are in line with the prior year.

d. Investment subcommittee report. The investment subcommittee of the Finance Committee met during the Convention and made the decision to add an opportunistic strategies allocation to the quasi endowment. The primary reasons for adding an allocation are to increase diversification, the potential for a partial hedge against future inflation and the possibility of adding alpha by allowing managers more discretion in their investment approach. The subcommittee approved Wellington Diversified Inflation hedges and Leuhold Weeden's Core Fund for 10 percent of the overall quasi-endowment allocation. Funding will come from the annual contributions to the quasi-endowment and the current stock and bond funds. The investment subcommittee voted to rebalance the two portfolios in accordance with its asset allocation policies.

e. New building project financing. The Finance Committee reviewed various funding options for the new building project. It was determined that, as a result of the favorable rates in the market, the staff should explore financing $20 million of financing for the building project over a maximum 10-year period. It also was determined that the annual debt service could be paid from the Eligibility Center revenues and cost savings from holding our meetings in Indianapolis.

It was VOTED

"To approve a resolution for the authorization and issuance of bonds or other comparable financing options, and the reimbursement of building project expenses with the proceeds of the selective financing option."

7. Litigation update. The Committee received a report from the NCAA general counsel regarding litigation and settlement actions.

8. NCAA Division I Board of Directors and Divisions II and III Presidents Councils reports.

a. Division I Board of Directors. The Committee received an update on the actions of the Division I Board of Directors that included the following:

(1) Values-based decision-making. Received a presentation regarding values-based decision-making and was informed that a small working group including presidents, athletics directors, commissioners and experts will be working with staff to examine the issue.

(2) Supplemental distribution. Agreed to recommend that the Executive Committee approve the Finance Committee's recommendation for a supplemental distribution of $15 million to the Division I membership.

(3) Sand volleyball – emerging sport. Adopted emergency legislation to delay the effective date of NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2008-59 to August 1, 2011. This legislation survived an override vote and adds women's sand volleyball as an emerging sport.

(4) Diversity requirements. Endorsed the Division I Leadership Council's recommendations for enhanced diversity requirements for the various Division I governance bodies. The new standards would add positional requirements for athletics directors (20 percent) and faculty athletics representatives (20 percent) to the current gender (35 percent) and ethnic minority (20 percent) requirements. In addition, the various subdivisions [Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) on its, own and Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) and Division I combined] will be required to meet the new standards on each of the eight councils and cabinets. The expectation is that FBS conferences meet these requirements when appointing their representatives to the councils and cabinets this spring. The FCS and Division I conferences would be required to meet the new minimums in the spring 2012 when their terms expire.

b. Division II Presidents Council. The Committee received an update on the actions of the Division II Presidents Council that included the following:

(1) 2010 NCAA Convention. Division II completed another successful Convention. The membership voted on 14 proposals during its business session – all 14 passed. Significant proposals included the four proposals presented as the Presidents Council "Life in the Balance" package:

(a) 2010 NCAA Convention Division II Proposal No. 2010-5—playing and practice seasons—fall sports, which moves the start date for the first contest or date of competition by one week later; starts the preseason practice a week later in the summer; and shortens the season with a reduction in contests or dates of competition.

(b) 2010 NCAA Convention Division II Proposal No. 2010-6—playing and practice seasons—spring sports, which reduces the maximum number of contests from 56 to 50 in baseball; reduces the maximum number of dates of competition from 24 to 21 in golf; and eliminates the tournament dates exception in softball.

(c) 2010 NCAA Convention Division II Proposal No. 2010-7—playing and practice seasons—winter break, which establishes a "dead period" from December 20 through December 26 for winter sports (basketball, swimming and diving, indoor track and field and wrestling), during which it would not be permissible for an institution to have practice, competition or other countable athletically related activities (e.g., weight training, conditioning); and establishes a "dead period" during the same dates for all sports, during which it would not be permissible for a student-athlete to participate in voluntary athletically related activities on campus, unless the facility is open to the general student-body.

(d) 2010 NCAA Convention Division II Proposal No. 2010-8—playing and practice seasons—winter sports—basketball, which reduces the maximum permissible number of contests in men's and women's basketball from 27 to 26.

(2) Division II financial dashboard tool. At its annual chancellors and presidents session Friday, Division II chancellors and presidents previewed information on a new financial dashboard tool that will be unveiled at the June 2010 Chancellors and Presidents Summit. This tool will provide the membership with access to accurate, timely and relevant information to encourage moderation in the growth rate of athletics budgets and provide a catalyst for communication and education among presidents, chief financial officers and athletics departments, thus re-centering athletics within the educational mission of the university.

(3) Division II public service announcement. Jordan shared the most recent Division II public service announcement, which features Division II student-athletes telling why they "Chose Division II." All five student-athletes are members of the national Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

c. Division III Presidents Council. The Committee received an update on the actions of the Division III Presidents Council. These included:

(1) Division III Identity Initiative. The 2010 Convention marked the formal launch of the division's strategic positioning platform. Division III delegates received a presentation on the content and intended purpose of the platform, and saw early creative expressions of the platform, including a video describing the essence of the Division III experience.

(2) Convention highlights. Other Convention highlights included a presentation on the concepts under consideration to enhance the leadership and engagement of presidents in the division. The membership adopted nine proposals in the Division III business session, including a unanimous vote on 2010 NCAA Convention Division III Proposal No.1, which established in the Division III philosophy statement an expectation for presidential leadership to be exercised at the campus, conference and national levels.

9. NCAA Executive Committee Subcommittee on Gender and Diversity Issues. The Committee received a report on the work of the Executive Committee Subcommittee on Gender and Diversity Initiatives. The Committee noted that the subcommittee had the opportunity to meet with Parker Executive Search and offer comments and feedback relative to the presidential search.

10. Future meetings. The Committee reviewed its future meetings schedule.

11. Adjournment. Ray adjourned the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

# # # # #

DRAFT

REPORT OF THE JANUARY 11, 2010, CONFERENCE CALL OF THE DIVISION I PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY GROUP

Participants:

Charles Bantz, Indiana University/Purdue University – Indianapolis
Greg Dell'Omo, Robert Morris University
Philip Dubois, University of North Carolina, Charlotte
Robert Fisher, Belmont University
Joanne Glasser, Bradley University
Milton Gordon, California State University, Fullerton
Franklin Hagenbeck, United States Military Academy
Walter Harrison, University of Hartford
Penelope Kyle, Radford University
William (Bill) Meehan, Jacksonville State University
Ann Millner, Weber State University
Kevin Mullen, Siena College
Kenneth Peacock, Appalachian State University
David Sweet, Youngstown State University
Randall Webb, Northwestern State University
George Wright, Prairie View A&M University
S. David Berst, NCAA
Jacqueline Campbell, NCAA, recording secretary

Presidential Advisory Group members unable to participate were: Robert Caret, Towson University; E. William Beauchamp, University of Portland; William Harvey, Hampton University; and Drew Gilpin Faust, Harvard University.

Participating during portions of the conference call were NCAA staff members: Julie Cromer, Jim Isch, Kevin Lennon, Steve Mallonee, Delise O'Meally, Wallace Renfro and Greg Shaheen. In addition, Dan Parker, president, and Laurie Wilder, senior vice president and managing director of Parker Executive Search, participated in a portion of the call.

1. **Opening Remarks**. The chair welcomed the group and recognized the new members of the Presidential Advisory Group (PAG).

2. **Report of the October 28, 2009, Division I Presidential Advisory Group meeting and highlights from the October 29, 2009, Division I Board of Directors meeting**. The group briefly reviewed actions from the October 29, 2009, Division I Board of Directors meeting relative to issues discussed by the Division I Presidential Advisory Group during

its October 28, 2009, meeting. The group approved the report of its October 28, 2009, meeting.

3. **Interim President's Report**. Jim Isch, along with Dan Parker and Laurie Wilder of Parker Executive Search, updated the group on the search process for the next NCAA president. The group was asked to comment regarding desired characteristics of a new president and individuals were invited to contact Dan Parker to provide input. Isch also informed the group that he would be speaking to the membership at the upcoming NCAA Convention about plans to examine the financial model for intercollegiate athletics, which has become an area of growing concern for university presidents.

4. **Review of agenda for the January 16, 2010, Board of Directors meeting**.

a. **Update from the Committee on Academic Performance**.
The group received an update on the activities of the Committee on Academic Performance (CAP) from the chair, Walt Harrison. Harrison noted that items on the committee's agenda for the upcoming year include an evaluation of the results of a study of the academic support services provided by Division I institutions, a review of the Division I initial-eligibility and 2-4 transfer requirements, and a comprehensive examination of the Academic Progress Program (APP) to determine if the original goals of the program are being achieved.

b. **Legislative Issues**.

(1) Review of the process regarding the override requests on Proposal Nos. 2008-46 and 2008-59. The group members were provided a brief overview of the process that will take place when considering the override requests on Proposal Nos. 2008-46 and 2008-59 during the Division I Business Session on Friday, January 15.

(2) Review of legislative process and discussion of proposals that are of potential interest to the Presidential Advisory Group and the Board of Directors. The PAG members were reminded that during its January 13-14 meeting, the Legislative Council will consider, and ultimately vote on, all legislative proposals being considered in the annual legislative cycle and that proposals receiving at least two-thirds support of the Legislative Council will be considered adopted, but that action will not be considered final until after the conclusion of the Board of Directors January 16 meeting, to ensure the Board has the appropriate level of oversight.

In addition, it was noted that the FCS members of the PAG have jurisdiction to further consider any action taken by the FCS Governance Subcommittee of the Legislative Council during its January13 meeting. The PAG members and conference offices will be notified of the subcommittee's actions via email on Thursday, January 14 in order to allow for review or comment prior to the January 16 Board meeting.

c. Report from the Communications and Coordination Committee.
The group was informed that the Communications and Coordination Committee is comprised of the chairs of the Division I cabinets and councils and was created to coordinate consideration of issues and legislative concepts between the various governance bodies and to ensure a high level of communication among the bodies. It was noted that the committee met via teleconference subsequent to the fall PAG meeting and received updates on the fall meetings of each of the Division I governance bodies. The committee members also highlighted the cabinets and councils agendas for the upcoming year.

d. Status report of the efforts of the Football Academic Working Group.
The PAG received a report of the working group's key findings regarding the academic performance of Division I football student-athletes and recommendations for strategies to improve their academic performance. It was noted that the working group will submit its final report to the Board in April for appropriate legislation to be considered in the 2010-11 legislative cycle.

5. Review of 2010 Convention events. The PAG members were encouraged to attend the following events at the 2010 NCAA Convention:

Thursday, January 14
Opening Business Session (3:30-5:30 p.m. – Centennial Ballroom)
Delegates Reception (5:30-7 p.m. – Regency Ballroom)

Friday, January 15
Division I Issues Forum (9:30-11:30 a.m. and 1-3 p.m. – International Ballroom)
Board of Directors/Leadership Council/Legislative Council Luncheon (11:30 a.m. – 1 p.m. – Regency V)*
Division I Business Session (3-4 p.m. – International Ballroom)

Saturday, January 16
Joint SAAC/Board of Directors Breakfast (8-9:30 a.m. – Cairo/Hong Kong)*
Board of Directors meeting (9:30 a.m. – 5 p.m. – International Ballroom North)*

NOTE: *Board of Directors members only.

6. **Update on possible cost saving initiatives**. The group was informed that cost savings initiatives will be an item on the February meeting agenda of all the cabinets and the March meeting agenda of the Leadership Council. The PAG will be asked to review the recommendations from the various governance groups during its April meeting.

7. **Future meeting dates**. The group was informed that the next meeting of the PAG will be in-person April 28, 2010, in Indianapolis, Indiana. The group was reminded that conference commissioners attend the April meeting to participate in discussions with the presidents.

Subcommittee chair: Ann Millner, Weber State University
Staff Liaisons: S. David Berst, Division I governance
Jacqueline Campbell, Division I governance

NCAA Government Relations Report
(March 2010)

1. Government Relations Overview.

Since convening for its second session, the 111th Congress has been subject to a limited schedule due to inclement weather in the Washington, DC area as well as scheduled recesses and party issues conferences. Despite the limited number of days in session, Congress has remained focused on important and pressing issues pertaining to health care reform, the struggling job market, a recovering economy and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. In addition to these and other domestic and foreign policy issues, members of Congress have begun to shift their focus toward the important November mid-term elections.

On Sunday evening, March 21, 2010, the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Senate version of the President's health care reform bill and a related reconciliation package. On March 23, 2010, the President signed this historic bill. The reconciliation package, which includes significant changes to college student lending, moved to the Senate. Congress continues to work through a financial regulatory reform bill and other important issues.

The 2010 mid-term elections will have a significant impact on the political landscape as both Democratic and Republican hopefuls vie for 36 vacant Senate seats and all 435 House of Representative openings. Adding to the expected competitive environment surrounding mid-term elections is the news that 10 senators and 37 representatives have elected to retire from Congress. The importance of each seat continues to grow for both parties, as evidenced during the election of Senator Scott Brown (R-MA) in February, 2010, as he assumed the vacant Massachusetts Senate seat, which had previously been held by the late Senator Ted Kennedy since 1962.

Despite their limited schedule, heavy workload and well-recognized concentration on important domestic and foreign affairs, the 111th Congress has spent considerable time on a number of issues relevant to the NCAA and the concerns of those involved in intercollegiate athletics.

2. Federal Issues.

a. Concussion Management.

As a follow-up to an initial October 2009 hearing on football related head injuries, the House Judiciary Committee conducted a field hearing on January 4, 2010. The hearing titled "Legal Issues Relating to Football Head Injuries, Part II," was held in Detroit, Michigan, which is in the district of House Judiciary Chairman John Conyers (D-MI). The hearing was called to discuss measures taken at the professional, college and high school levels to address concerns expressed at the October 2009 hearing. In addition, the hearing also provided an opportunity to continue discussions from the initial hearing, which focused on the prevalence of long term damage from athletic related head injuries and how to properly prevent, detect and ultimately treat such injuries. Chairman Conyers and Judiciary Committee members Representative Steve Cohen (D-TN) and Representative Linda Sanchez (D-CA) participated in the hearing. David Klossner, NCAA Director of Health and Safety, testified on behalf of the NCAA, with the NCAA's government relations staff in attendance.

Shortly following the hearing, the House Judiciary Committee called for another formal discussion on this matter. Through this forum the committee wanted to narrow the conversation and focus on head injuries in youth, high school and college football. The "Forum on Head Injuries and Other Sports Injuries in Youth, High School, College and Professional Football" was held on February 1, 2010, in Houston, TX. Representative Conyers (D-MI), Representative Cohen (D-TN) and Representative Sheila Jackson-Lee (D-TX) participated. Ron Courson, director of Sports Medicine, University of Georgia Athletic Association testified, with the NCAA's government relations staff in attendance.

At the conclusion of the forum, the committee did not give a clear indication into what, if any, next steps will be taken to address concerns with the health and safety of youth, high school, college and professional football players. The NCAA Office of Government Relations will continue to monitor any future action in this area and serve as an information resource for members of Congress and their staffs.

b. Dietary Supplements.

To address ongoing concerns with the sale and use of harmful and often unregulated dietary supplements, the NCAA has become a member of Supplement Safety Now Alliance. Supplement Safety Now is comprised of a number of entities and individuals concerned with the health and safety of athletes and consumers alike. Members of the coalition include the United States Anti-Doping Agency (USADA),

the professional sports leagues, and medical experts. To properly provide the necessary protection for consumers, the coalition is working to seek the implementation of a strict regulatory scheme to oversee the dietary supplement industry.

As supporters of more stringent regulation over this industry, the NCAA and Supplement Safety Now Alliance were pleased when Senator John McCain (R-AZ) introduced S. 3002, the Dietary Supplement Safety Act of 2010. S. 3002, which was introduced on February 4, 2010, would amend the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by requiring dietary supplement manufacturers to register with the FDA and fully disclose the ingredients contained in the supplement and provide the FDA with mandatory recall authority if a product is found to be unsafe or harmful. However, after introduction Senator McCain removed his support for the legislation as a result of concerns expressed by Senate colleagues. Recently a bipartisan agreement has been reached that will allow several key components from S. 3002 to be included in a larger food safety bill.

The NCAA and Supplement Safety Now Alliance will continue to monitor related legislative activity and push for regulations that provide the necessary safeguards to protect student-athletes and the American public from harmful dietary supplements.

c. United States Department of Education.

While commemorating the 45th anniversary of "Bloody Sunday" in which hundreds of civil rights marchers were beaten on Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, Education Secretary Arne Duncan announced that his department will increase its enforcement of civil rights laws. As part of this effort, the Department of Education Office of Civil Rights will be sending letters to thousands of school districts and colleges, detailing applicable standards of fairness and equal opportunity. In addition, the department plans to conduct investigations to ensure that secondary and post-secondary students are receiving equal access to advanced courses and necessary resources. Russlyn H. Ali, assistant secretary of Education for Civil Rights, will play an integral role in this initiative to combat discrimination in the country's schools and universities. NCAA government relations staff has met with Assistant Secretary Ali to educate her on NCAA policies.

We were pleased that Secretary Duncan participated in the NCAA's annual convention in January. The NCAA government relations staff continues to grow our relationship with senior staff at the Department of Education and looks forward to opportunities to continue to educate them on NCAA policies, including the academic reform efforts and Title IX policy, among others.

3. State Issues.

a. Concussion Management.

Concern regarding the health and safety of athletes has not been limited to the federal government. Recently there has been an increase in legislative activity on the state level aimed at protecting youth and high school athletes from the dangers associated with mild traumatic brain injuries. While state legislatures have taken a variety of approaches to solve this problem, most state laws and bills have focused on two areas. Some states have focused on education and are mandating concussion training for coaches and athletic trainers along with the dissemination of relevant materials to parents. Many other states have focused their efforts on "return to play" guidelines. Those focusing on this area have used Washington's Lystedt Law as a model in drafting their own measures. The Lystedt Law requires students who are removed from play, to receive medical clearance from a licensed health-care provider prior to returning to play. The NCAA office of government relations continues to monitor these state legislative issues.

b. Sports Wagering.

As state legislatures continue to explore a variety of options to raise revenue for their state's ailing budgets, sports betting has increasingly been discussed as a viable solution. However, due to the Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act (PASPA), only four states are allowed to legally conduct sports wagering activities. In line with recent sentiments expressed by some state legislators, New Jersey State Senator Lesniak filed a federal lawsuit on March 23, 2009, challenging PASPA on the grounds that the law treats four states differently than the rest of the country.

Despite the federal ban put in place under PASPA, state legislatures are aware of the recent challenge and have begun to to consider measures that would enact sports

betting if the federal law is successfully overturned. Measures have been introduced in Iowa and Minnesota that would allow sports betting if the federal law is repealed and resolutions have been introduced in New Jersey and Missouri urging Congress to repeal PASPA.

While the federal law continues to serve as a substantial hurdle for most states, the NCAA Office of Government Relations will continue to monitor the movement of these measures and will work to convey our concerns with wagering on athletic competitions.

c. **UAAA.**

Since the creation of the Uniform Athlete Agents Act (UAAA) in 2001, the NCAA has encouraged and helped states to adopt this model statute designed to protect student-athletes and their universities from the potentially unscrupulous conduct of athlete-agents in their state. As the lucrative business of professional athlete representation continues to grow, so too does the temptation for would-be agents to engage in illegal and improper conduct. This act has proven to effectively limit such rogue activity, as it mandates that each athlete agent must first register with the state in which he/she conducts business and provide that state's UAAA administrative branch with personal, professional and criminal information. Through this selective registration process, student-athletes, athletic department personnel and state agencies are able to better identify and evaluate prospective athlete agents.

The need for a model act to register all athlete-agents and limit the unlawful conduct of the minority is represented by the 38 states, Washington DC and the Virgin Islands, which have all adopted this model act as state law. In addition to these participating states, the UAAA has also been introduced and is currently being considered by state legislatures in New Jersey, California and Illinois. The UAAA, which serves both as a deterrent to unscrupulous activity and as an effective identification measure, has been very well-received by the states, which have chosen to enact this piece of legislation. However, due to a growing need for some states to cut their spending budgets during these difficult economic times, Colorado is considering a measure to scale-back various elements of the original act.

The NCAA has consistently worked with state administrators of the UAAA to ensure that this model act remains effective and to see that any concerns a state may have are

acknowledged and accounted for. While the necessity and success of this statute is demonstrated by the states which have enacted the UAAA over the previous nine years, the NCAA continues to encourage the few remaining states to take this legislative action to protect their student-athletes and the universities which they attend.

d. Higher Education Associations.

NCAA government relations staff continues to build strong relationships with various higher education associations. The American Council on Education (ACE), the Association of American Universities (AAU), the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU), and the National Association of Colleges and University Business Officers (NACUBO) among others, continue to provide guidance and support on issues of common interest. The NCAA government relations staff looks forward to continuing these mutually beneficial relationships to better formulate and further the NCAA's legislative goals.

DRAFT
April 7, 2010

FOOTBALL ACADEMIC WORKING GROUP
FINAL REPORT

BACKGROUND

The current one-year average APR in football (948), while up 18 points since 2003-04, is the second lowest of all sports. In April 2008 President Brand requested the establishment of a working group to examine the academic performance of football student-athletes with the goal of identifying strategies for improvement. Chaired by Joseph R. Castiglione, director of athletics at the University of Oklahoma, the working group is composed of 27 individuals, including Presidents, directors of athletics, commissioners, head coaches and faculty athletics representatives. The working group has had two in-person meetings, made presentations at the AFCA and NCAA Conventions and conducted multiple conference calls as a full group and in various subcommittees.

KEY FINDINGS

Research data and discussion of the working group have generated the following key findings regarding the academic performance of Division I college football student-athletes:

1. APR problems tend to be due to eligibility rather than retention issues. The most recent annual data show football with a 936 eligibility rate which is lower than any other sport and over 20 points lower than the eligibility rate in men's basketball.

2. Incoming freshmen in football have lower high school academic profiles (e.g., core GPA, SAT scores) than any other Division I sport besides basketball. Yet, first year college academic performance is worse than all other sports, including basketball.

3. Summer school enrollment is much higher in FBS than FCS. While 98% of FBS institutions and 94% of FCS institutions have at least one football student-athlete in summer school, 81% of all FBS student-athletes who persist into the next year are enrolled in summer school, compared to only 38% of those FCS student-athletes who persist into the next year. There also seems to be a relationship between athletics department budget and the number of credit hours attempted during summer school in FBS.

4. While football student-athletes miss less class time and spend less time away from school than most other sport groups, they reported greater time demands from their sport than student-athletes in all other sports.

5. APR 0-for-2s are more likely to occur in FBS after student-athletes exhaust eligibility and in FCS after the first year of enrollment. Two-year college transfers are more likely to be 0-for-2s than non-transfers and four-year college transfers.

6. Football student-athletes lose a significant number of eligibility points during the season of competition (i.e. in the fall term). When a first-year football student-athlete loses an e-point in the fall term, he is much more likely to lose additional e-points or become an 0-for-2. There is a similar trend for sophomores and juniors.

7. While there is a correlation between athletic department resources and APR for institutions, there is a much stronger correlation between APR and academic preparation of incoming student-athletes as measured by variables such as high school GPA, SAT scores and percentage of 2-4 transfers on a football squad.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Fall Term Academic Requirement for Future Competition.** Football student-athletes who do not successfully complete 9 credit hours and earn an eligibility point following either the fall semester or quarter, would be ineligible for participation in the first four games the following football season. However, if the student-athlete has successfully completed 27 credit hours by the end of the summer session he may have his penalty reduced to only the first two games of that season.

   Rationale. As noted in the key finding #1, football APR problems tend to be due to eligibility rather than retention and this recommendation will directly impact eligibility as well as academic progress issues. This recommendation also addresses key findings #2 (improving first-year college performance) and #6 (lost e-points in the fall term and subsequent 0-for2s).

   The working group debated whether the minimum academic requirement should be 6 or 9 credit hours; however, research indicated that of those student-athletes who achieved nine credit hours in the first semester of their freshman year and remained in school through at least the third year, over 72 percent graduated from that institution by the end of the fifth year. By contrast, the graduation rate was 51 percent among a similar group that did not achieve nine credit hours in the fall of their freshman year.

   Additional discussion was held as to whether the 9-hour requirement should be applied to only incoming freshmen or continuing student-athletes as well. Research data indicated that the negative impacts of the loss of eligibility are relatively consistent across all academic classes. For example, data show that 44 percent of freshmen who failed to maintain eligibility in the first term also failed to achieve academic eligibility in the second term as compared to only

seven percent of those freshmen who were academically eligible after the first term. Similarly, 38 percent of the sophomores who were ineligible after the first term failed again in the second term of that academic year, compared to less than 10 percent of sophomores who were eligible after the first term. These ratios for juniors were 35 percent and seven percent for the respective groups.

The group also noted that data from the latest NCAA Graduation Success Rate (GSR) study indicated that although the football bowl subdivision rate is up nearly three points since 1995, the rate has declined or leveled off in recent years. Therefore, it was the group's opinion that a concerted effort must be made to improve Division I football's graduation rate and that nine credit hours should be the minimum academic requirement. It is hoped that such a policy will put more football student-athletes in position to graduate within four and a half years, which may help with key finding #5 (the significant number of 0-for-2 departures after exhausting eligibility).

Originally the committee considered recommending that if a student-athlete did not earn 9 credit hours during the fall semester he would be automatically ineligible for the following football season. However, various constituent groups expressed concern with the severity of the measure and that a process should be available for the student-athlete to allow him to regain his eligibility as long as he met certain academic performance conditions. Therefore, the recommendation includes a four-game suspension and a provision that allows a student-athlete to restore his eligibility for two games as long as he successfully passes 27 credit hours at the end of the summer session, which would place the student-athlete in a better position to graduate in 4 ½ years.

During the various presentations to constituent groups questions were raised as to whether incoming freshmen could count summer "bridge" credit hours toward the 9-hour first term requirement and the 27-credit hour requirement at the end of the summer session. It was the group's decision that incoming freshmen may not count credit hours earned the summer prior to enrollment to meet the 9-hour fall term requirement. However, it was decided that those credit hours earned prior to enrollment may be counted with the summer hours earned after his freshman year to satsify the 27-credit hour requirement.

Input from the membership also raised the question as to whether remedial courses could be counted toward the 9-hour and 27-hour requirements. It was the position of the working group that for incoming freshmen only remedial courses could be used to meet the 9-hour and 27-hour requirements.

It should be noted the group considered that in addition to requiring football student-athletes to successfully complete 9 credit hours and earn an eligibility point following either the fall semester or quarter that this same requirement be for the spring semester or term as well. However, it was the consensus of the group that requiring 9 credit hours for the spring

semester or term was unnecessary since the normal progress-towards-degree requirements for each student-athlete would address this issue.

In addition to the 27-hour rule, any mitigating circumstances that impact a football student-athlete's ability to satisfy these academic requirements will also be considered through the current Division I progress-towards-degree waiver process. Relief should only be provided if it can be demonstrated by supporting documentation that the student-athlete was unable to satisfy these academic requirements due to compelling mitigating circumstances outside the control of the student-athlete and that the student-athlete is on track to graduate within five years.

A policy similar to this, which required a baseball student-athlete to be eligible at the start of the fall semester or quarter in order to be eligible to participate in the following baseball season, was implemented for the 2007-08 year in that sport. It appears that this academic requirement has been very effective in raising the eligibility rate in baseball. In fact, the eligibility rate in baseball increased by 18 points in the year after that rule went into effect. The eligibility rate in the spring term (the term directly affected by the rule in the sport of baseball) went up by over 40 points after this rule was enacted.

Possible impact. If a fall standard of 9 credit hours earned plus the E-point was put into place, 11.8% of MFB players at semester schools who have not exhausted their athletics eligibility would have a four-game penalty in the subsequent season. Approximately 17.1% of MFB players at quarter schools would have a four-game penalty the next season of competition. Note that actual numbers would be expected to be much lower due to (a) students who actually dropped out during that term (they show up as not meeting the enhanced standard here) and (b) students changing their fall academic behavior to meet an enhanced standard.

The following results apply to semester squads only (using data from the 2008-09 academic year):

- 54% of those football student-athletes declared ineligible for competition in the next season would result from the failure to earn their E-point. The additional 46% would lose eligibility due to failure to meet the 9 credit requirement.

- The proportion of football student-athletes currently not meeting the enhanced standard is similar in FBS (12%) and FCS (11%).

- Currently, 20% of football student-athletes with eligibility remaining at HBCUs do not meet the enhanced standards.

- Impacts are lower on private institutions as compared to public institutions.

- The current per squad average impact is about 7.5 players per squad. 15% of football squads have 2 or fewer student-athletes below that standard; roughly one-third of squads have 10 or more players below this standard (maximum=23).

2. **Exhausted Eligibility Departures.** The working group recommends to the Committee on Academic Performance (CAP) that the waiver of the contemporaneous penalty for football bowl subdivision student-athletes that are 0-for-2 after exhausting eligibility be eliminated.

   Rationale. The working group noted that this waiver was originally put in place to mitigate the financial aid impact on prospective student-athletes who sign financial aid agreements and issues created when institutions are required to reduce financial aid as part of a contemporaneous penalty. Because these penalties can be deferred until the following academic year, there is little or no impact on PSAs that have already signed NLIs. The working group also noted research indicating the disproportionate number of 0-for-2s in FBS football compared to other sports and that the elimination of this exception may compel student-athletes and institutions to better manage retention and eligibility issues for student-athletes with exhausted eligibility. This recommendation addresses key finding #5. It should be noted that the FCS subcommittee examined this concept and did not make the same recommendations for FCS institutions.

3. **Time Demands.** The group recommends continued study of the football student-athlete time demands to review what activities are accountable during a 20-hour week and what football-related activities occur outside the 20-hour time frame.

   Rationale. It is the group's belief that the recommendations pertaining to fall eligibility and exhausted eligibility departures will help shift the balance between academics and athletics to more of an emphasis on academics. However, the group recognized this is a complex issue and although current regulations exist that address student-athlete time demands more study of this issue should be conducted to discern the difference between mandatory and voluntary time demands. New data will be available in the spring of 2010 and the working group would like to review this data and devote more time to the study of time demands on football student-athletes.

4 **Two-year College Transfer Requirements.** Given key findings #5 and #7, the working group supports the efforts of the Academic Cabinet in its effort to develop enhanced academic requirements or a required academic year in residence for two-year college transfers and recommends the development of two-four transfer requirements that more accurately reflect the academic preparation most likely to lead to completion of a four-year degree.

Rationale: Without the necessary data for modeling transfer student-athlete success, the working group was unable to formulate specific, data-driven recommendations to enhance the two-four transfer requirements. However, the Academic Cabinet and Committee on Academic Performance recently implemented measures to collect two-year transfer academic performance data and will begin a review of potential models in February 2010. Specifically, the working group encourages exploration of concepts such as a core curriculum for two-year college transfers, more precise specifications regarding remediation completed at the two-year institution and limitations on the number of activity courses permitted to meet transfer requirements.

5. **Head Coaches' APR Portfolio.** The working group recommends to the Committee on Academic Performance (CAP) that in addition to attributing APR scores of football student athletes to the head coach, the scores also be attributed to the institution's chief executive officer and director of athletics and that additional institutional information (e.g., student body graduation rate, available resources) be included to provide context.

   Rationale. Institutional characteristics, including academic mission, admissions requirements and available resources all work in concert with support and guidance from coaches, administrators and faculty to facilitate student-athlete academic success. Working group members expressed the importance of an examination of all elements contributing to the APR performance of student-athletes including, but not limited to, the involvement of head coaches. Given the working group's interest in providing additional information through the APR Head Coaches' Portfolio, CAP reviewed this draft recommendation in July 2009 and determined that such elements should not be included at this time, given the additional institutional burden that would be placed on institutions to compile and report the information, as well as the complexities related to programming such reports. However, the committee agreed to reconsider these elements as it explores enhancements to the report at the end of the initial two-year phase-in period.

BEST PRACTICES.

The working group believes that most strategies to improve the academic performance of football student-athletes reside in the sharing and implementation of "best practices" among institutions, instead of national policies and requirements. This is consistent with NCAA Strategic Plan Goal 3.2.

Examples can be gleaned from Academic Improvement Plans recently submitted by institutions seeking to improve their APR scores. There are several institutions have successfully improved their APR scores and their strategies should continue to be shared with the membership. This information is available through a searchable database on the NCAA website and accessible via unique institutional logins and passwords.

The Facilitating Learning and Achieving Graduation (FLAG) program should also be emphasized among the best practices. The FLAG is a tool designed to help campuses assess the risk level of all student-athletes, assign suggested services based on risk factors, and evaluate the overall effectiveness of an institution's support services. While the FLAG program has been presented to the Board of Directors and endorsed by the Academic Cabinet, there will be a three-phased implementation of the program beginning 2009-10. Institutions with football programs should be encouraged to fully participate in this program.

Also, the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics is planning to develop a best practices program for the efficient academic support of football student-athletes. Upon completion, this information should be included in the final collection of FAWG best practices materials.

Finally, it is suggested that these and other resources be made more conveniently available to access on the NCAA website and supported by technology to facilitate the sharing of best practices between member institutions.

Note, however, that the best practices should be viewed as a place for institutions to begin, not end, as they examine their own policies and practices and that all practices may not work at every institution. It should also be noted that these best practices are models used by other institutions but may not necessarily be supported by research data available to the working group.

Communications Strategies for Coaches

The National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC) members have indicated a desire to more effectively participate in the governance processes that often result in rules or policies impacting their work. This document is intended to provide coaches with suggestions and best practices for enhancing communications at the campus, conference and national levels to help ensure that all voices are heard in the various governance processes. The following are tools and best practices for enhancing coaches' communications at all three levels.

Campus-level communications strategies.

1. On their own campuses, coaches can be most effective when working within the existing organizational structure to voice opinions regarding local, conference and national policies. This may include communication with compliance personnel, academic advisors, faculty athletic representatives, directors of athletics and/or chancellors or presidents. The following strategies may assist with these efforts:

    a. In some instances, a head coach will find it necessary to communicate with the institution's chancellor or president regarding issues of local, conference or national significance. Such discussions can be productive when conducted appropriately. For example, if a head coach reports to the director of athletics, the coach should communicate with the director of athletics first regarding these matters and then set up a meeting with the chancellor or president. The session with the chancellor or president may be most effective if the coach and director of athletics jointly share their perspectives.

    b. It may be less effective over time for coaches to speak to campus authorities about issues or concerns without first communicating with their direct supervisor (e.g., director of athletics). While solo communication with the institution chancellor or president can be beneficial, doing so without alerting the director of athletics is less effective.

    c. Topics that lend themselves to dialog with campus leaders include: financial and other resource matters, the academic success of student-athletes, and legislative or policy issues at the local, conference or national level. Academic topics may warrant dialog with the institution's faculty senate (or appropriately named campus faculty body). Periodic dialog between a head coach and this faculty body regarding the academic well-being of student-athletes can be useful in furthering the academic mission and goals of the institution and the coach.

    d. When meeting with the chancellor or president, faculty body or other campus leaders, it is helpful to determine in advance of the meeting, ideally with involvement from the director of athletics, the topics for discussion and goals of a particular meeting.

2. Coaches may want to communicate with compliance personnel when waivers are being filed on behalf of student-athletes on their team. Rather than relying entirely on others to pursue waiver options, coaches may want to review a draft of the waiver or seek to be included on a teleconference if that is part of the waiver process.

3. Similarly, coaches of teams that are academically underperforming should be engaged with academic advisors, faculty and other campus leaders in developing and implementing the institution's NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) Improvement Plan. Such a plan may identify strategies in which the coach's role is critical to success.

Conference-level communications strategies.

Each conference has its own unique governance structure and coaches will be most effective by identifying the most appropriate strategies for their particular conference. The following concepts may not apply in all conference governance settings.

1. Individually or collectively as a group of conference coaches, work with the conference office to provide feedback on a specific piece of legislation (national or conference legislation). In the case of national legislation, request the conference office consider this input when communicating with various governance representatives prior to key voting meetings.

2. During conference meetings, request time with the chancellors or presidents and/or athletics administration leaders to share issues, concerns or positions on legislation or policy. Coaches may be most effective in these settings when:

    a. They speak with one voice on key issues. This may necessitate coaches meeting in advance to determine their collective viewpoint on a matter of importance.

    b. They use the time allotted on a few critical matters. Sometimes these sessions dissolve into a general disgruntled potpourri of voices on an assortment of topics. Coaches may find greater success in making change when they collectively focus their efforts on one or a few key issues.

    c. They choose a leader among their peers to speak on behalf of the group. While such discussions should include a variety of coaches speaking, establishing a leader to initially present and direct the coaches share perspective can be useful.

    d. They communicate in advance to conference office leaders. If coaches have identified one or more key issues for dialog at a conference meeting, coaches will find greater success in moving their agenda when they work in advance with

conference administrators to strategize and assist in their efforts. Conference administrators are experienced in understanding the intricacies of the legislative and governance processes within the conference and nationally. Working alongside these professionals will enhance the effectiveness of the coaches' voice in the governance process.

National-level communications strategies.

The NCAA Division I structure is a representative form of governance. Conferences hold various "seats" in appointed leadership bodies such as the NCAA Division I Board of Directors, NCAA Division I Leadership Council, NCAA Division I Legislative Council and cabinets. The following strategies may be helpful in ensuring that coaches have a voice on key national issues:

1. Empower the NABC Board to take a position on particular legislative proposals or concepts and provide such input to the national office staff liaisons of the various governance bodies prior to its meeting. The national office stands ready to assist in this process by:

    a. Identifying a few key issues in each legislative cycle that the NABC may have the most interest in.

    b. Facilitating the NABC's communication with particular cabinet or body with jurisdiction on the identified issues.

    c. Providing education and background to the NABC for distribution to help inform coaches and ultimately assist the NABC board in formulating a position.

    d. Providing perspective on key issues that are being addressed by the structure in a given year. The governance process cannot address all topics in any given legislative cycle. In a given year there are generally a few major themes that arise for consideration (e.g., academic standards, technology in recruiting). Working with the staff, the NABC can effectively use these windows of opportunity to solidify its voice on these issues at the time they are ripe for consideration.

2. Be solution oriented, identifying not only the problem or concern, but recommending possible solutions. There may be instances in which the NABC Board needs assistance in identifying solutions to a particular concern. The national office staff can assist in identifying possible solutions.

3. The national office staff can provide a mechanism for the NABC to annually meet with the Board of Directors and/or Leadership Council to exchange ideas and share concerns.

4. The national office staff can provide a mechanism for the NABC to periodically meet with each cabinet and other committee's in the structure as agenda topics invite coaches perspectives.

Other "best practices."

1. Coaches have considerable influence by virtue of their public personas. This influence can be diminished by a poor communication style or conversely enhanced by superior communications skills. Style and approach when communicating with other leaders in college athletics is critically important. For example, coaches communicating with other leaders at the local, regional or national level are most effective when embracing the NABC's "guardians of the game" six pillars of character which include respect, caring, and trustworthiness.

2. As influencers within the governance structure, a key role coaches can play is educating others regarding the environment, issues, and realities of college basketball. Using each communications opportunity to educate others and provide a coaches perspective is an important function and coincides with the NABC's "guardians of the game" framework.

3. The governance process, locally, regionally and nationally generally involves compromise. For example, a legislative proposal is rarely adopted as originally drafted. Through the governance process, edits and sometimes substantive changes are incorporated based on feedback and input for various parties. All involved in this symphony of governance benefit from understanding that, in most cases, this compromise is effective at balancing the needs and interest of intercollegiate athletics. No one set of voices in the process (e.g., chancellors or presidents, faculty, athletics administrators, coaches) has cornered the market on good ideas. Appreciating the value of all voices being heard is critical to success.

A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division I Committee on Academic Performance

The Westin Hotel
Indianapolis, Indiana

April 26-27, 2010

1. Welcome and announcements. [Supplement No. 1]

2. Review the February 2010 report of the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance. [Supplement No. 2] (Julie Cromer)

3. Review NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) data.

   a. NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) data. [Supplement No. 3] (Tom Paskus and Todd Petr)

   b. Summary of penalties. [Supplement No. 4] (Bill Regan and Katy Yurk)

   c. Summary of APR adjustments and delayed-graduation points. [Supplement Nos. 5a and 5b] (Binh Nguyen, Tiese Roxbury and John Shukie)

   d. Impact of revised improvement standard on penalties. [Supplement No. 6] (Paskus and Petr)

4. Review and take action on the report from the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting. [Supplement No. 7] (Samantha Huge and Nguyen)

Anticipated Action Items:

a. Consider recommendation regarding the impact of APP data review outcomes on penalties. [Supplement No. 8]

b. Consider recommendation regarding unusable data. [Supplement No. 8]

c. Approve APP Data Collection Guide. [Supplement No. 9]

d. Approve APR Adjustment Directive. [Supplement No. 10]

e. Consider recommendation for data submission requirements and penalty application for an institution/team transitioning from Division I. [Supplement No. 11]

f. Update on data reviews. [Supplement No. 12] (Shukie)

5. Review and approve updated policies and Penalty Guide. (Regan and Yurk)

Anticipated Action Items:

a. Approve committee policies and procedures. [Supplement No. 13]

b. Approve Penalty Guide. [Supplement No. 14]

6. Review NCAA Football Academic Working Group (FAWG) report and consider relevant recommendations appropriate from the committee. [Supplement Nos. 15 and 16] (Regan and Yurk)

Anticipated Action Items:

a. Should the potential new nine credit hour requirement in the fall be a basis for losing the fall "E" point?

b. Should the current contemporaneous penalty exemption for exhausted eligibility student-athletes be removed, thus subjecting such "0/2" student-athletes with a contemporaneous penalty?

c. Should the Head Coaches APR Portfolio be expanded to include other institutional administrators?

7. Review APR Improvement Plan resource/educational document. [Supplement No. 17] (Andy Cardamone)

8. Consider changes to APR Improvement Plans. [Supplement No. 18] (Cardamone and Regan)

9. Review possible NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification role in APP matters. [Supplement No. 19] (Troy Arthur)

10. Final preparation for Occasion-Three Historical Penalties appeal hearings. (Shukie)

    a. Review factors and decision options. [Supplement No. 20]

    b. Review summary of previous Occasion-Three Historical Penalty decisions. [Supplement Nos. 21a and 21b]

    [Reference separate packet of materials for hearing schedule and materials.]

11. Consider whether to support budget request regarding continued funding of the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program Supplemental Support Fund (SSF). [Supplement No. 22] (Bob Chichester and Robert Vowels).

Anticipated Action Item:

- **Consider whether to support budget request regarding continued funding of the SSF.**

12. Review Head Coaches APR partial employment year listings. [Supplement No. 23] (Jeremiah Carter)

13. Continued discussion of the APP penalty structure, filters and APR benchmarks.

    a. Review research regarding possible impact of changes being considered. [Supplement No. 24] (Paskus and Petr)

    b. Narrow options for further consideration in June. [Supplement No. 25]

14. Review future meeting schedule.

    a. June 28-30; Indianapolis.

    - June 28 - Travel a.m./arrive by 1 p.m.
      Joint meeting with Academic Cabinet from 3 to 5 p.m.
      Reception from 5 to 6 p.m.

- June 29 - Joint meeting with Academic Cabinet from 8 to 10:30 a.m.
  Full committee meeting from 10:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

- June 30 - Full committee meets from 8 to 11 a.m.
  Return travel after 1 p.m.

b. October 25-26; Indianapolis.

- October 24 - Travel anytime.

- October 25 - Subcommittees meet from 8 am. to noon
  Full committee meets from 1 to 5 p.m.

- October 26 - Full committee meets from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m.
  Return travel after 4 p.m.

c. April 11, 2011; Indianapolis.

- April 24 - Travel anytime.

- April 25 - Full committee meets from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.
  (Hearings included.)

- April 26 - Full committee meets from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.
  (Hearings included.)

- April 27 - Full committee meets from 8 a.m. to noon.
  Return travel after 2 p.m.

15. Other business.

16. Adjournment.

FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12
Executive Summary of New Initiatives

Division I Initiatives (Action)

1. **FY 2010-11 | Distribution to Membership ($33,814,000).** This amount represents an increase of 8.1% going to the Division I membership based on the long-term budget plan approved by the NCAA Executive Committee. For FY 2011-12, distributions will be determined based on the final resolution of the television contract.

2. **FY 2010-11 | NCAA Football Championship Series Bracket Expansion ($250,000).** Championships will move forward with the four team FCS bracket expansion beginning with the 2010 football championship. Division I Board approved the Football Championship Series expansion of 16 teams to 20 teams last budget cycle for planning purposes. Approximately $400,000 was reallocated from championships to fund the expansion. The remaining allocation is the additional funds necessary for the FCS bracket expansion.

3. **FY 2010-11 | Expanded Softball Bat Testing ($83,000).** This initiative would expand the number of bats tested by an additional testing of 60 bats across all Divisions and enhancing the testing process. Resources aligned with student-athlete welfare and safety priorities, and an effective risk management best practice.

4. **FY 2011-12 | Preliminary Round Host Expenses ($50,000).** This amount reflects an increase stipend to more accurately reflect the host institution's costs associated with preliminary round expenses for tennis, men's golf and fencing sites.

5. **FY 2011-12 | Division I Outdoor Track and Field ($45,000).** Men's and Women's Track and Field Committee select the timing groups for the regionals, and this funding will enable the host sites to be reimbursed for the such expenses.

Executive Committee and Presidential New Initiatives (Information)

6. **FY 2010-11 | Men's Basketball Recruiting ($410,000).** Basketball recruiting environment has been a major problem for the NCAA membership. This initiative has been identified as an investment area by the Basketball Focus Group (BFG). These expectations and responsibilities include:

    - Developing specific expertise in and knowledge of the men's basketball recruiting environment through monitoring, investigation, outreach and educational efforts

designated to strengthen the enforcement staff's ability to monitor and enforce compliance with NCAA rules.

- Developing specific expertise in and knowledge of the men's basketball recruiting environment and using that expertise and knowledge in providing support to the basketball focus group staff.

- Developing and investigating cases involving potential violations of NCAA legislation, the compilation and evaluation of evidence of infractions, the drafting of necessary documents, and the oral presentation of information and evidence before the NCAA Committee on Infractions.

6. (continued year two) FY 2011-12 | Men's Basketball Recruiting and Major Enforcement Investigations ($105,000). This is a continuation of the investment in Men's Basketball Recruiting. This position is responsible for developing and investigating cases involving potential violations of NCAA legislation, the compilation and evaluation of evidence of infractions, the drafting of necessary documents, and the oral presentation of information and evidence before the NCAA Committee on Infractions.

FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12
New Initiatives

		FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
Division I			
	Proposed Expenditures		
1	Distribution to membership.	$ 33,814,000	TBD
	Division I Championships		
2	NCAA Football Championship Series bracket expansion.	$ 250,000	
3	Expanded softball testing.	$ 83,000	
4	Preliminary round host expenses.		$ 50,000
5	Division I outdoor track and field.		$ 45,000
	Subtotal	**$ 34,147,000**	**$ 95,000**
Executive Committee and Presidential New Initiatives Proposed Expenditure			
	Enforcement		
6	Men's basketball recruiting and major enforcement investigations.	$ 410,000	$ 105,000
	Subtotal	**$ 410,000**	**$ 105,000**
	Total of President's Recommendation for New Initiatives	**$ 34,557,000**	**$ 200,000**

KEY ITEMS FROM FEBRUARY CABINET MEETINGS

[For more detailed information regarding the February cabinet meetings, please view the complete cabinet reports found at:

http://www.ncaa.org/wps/ncaa?key=/ncaa/ncaa/legislation+and+governance/committees/division1.html.]

ACADEMIC CABINET.

Review of Eligibility Standards for Prospective Student-Athletes. The cabinet continued its review of initial-eligibility and transfer-eligibility requirements. Based on NCAA research, along with feedback from the NCAA Division I Board of Directors, two-year college and academic support communities, the cabinet continues to believe that the greatest improvements in student-athlete academic preparation will come when all eligibility requirements (e.g., initial eligibility, progress toward degree, transfer) are aligned to support student-athletes' academic success. The cabinet considered enhancements to the current initial and transfer eligibility requirements designed to identify those prospective student-athletes who are academically prepared for college work, and to foster additional support and accommodation to student-athletes who are academically underprepared. The cabinet will continue to discuss both models in June when it meets jointly with the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance.

ADMINISTRATION CABINET.

1. **Committee Appointments**. The cabinet approved appointments to Division I and Association-wide committees.

2. **Cost Savings Initiatives.** The cabinet reviewed and confirmed the recommendations developed during its September 2009 meeting relative to possible cost savings measures in legislative areas for which it has been assigned oversight responsibility. The cabinet stressed that any such measures ultimately identified and prioritized by the Leadership Council and Board of Directors be consistent with the Association's core mission. The cabinet also noted that although cost savings initiatives should be a high priority item in Division I, such measures should be scrutinized closely so as not to detrimentally impact equitable championship opportunities for student-athletes or detract from the overall championship experience.

3. **Governance Assessment Tool**. The cabinet reviewed the results of a preliminary tool designed to assess the 31 multisport conferences' knowledge of the goals and objectives behind the recent changes to the Division I governance structure. The cabinet discussed possible next steps in conducting a broader assessment of the new governance structure.

AMATEURISM CABINET.

1. **NCAA Proposal No. 2009-22 (Amateurism and Eligibility – Involvement with Professional Teams – Exception – Prior to Initial Full-Time Collegiate Enrollment – Seasons of Competition).** The cabinet recommended that the Division I Legislative Council adopt noncontroversial legislation to modify the effective date of the delayed enrollment portion of NCAA Proposal No. 2009-22 to August 1, 2011, for sports other than tennis and, for tennis, to August 1, 2012.

2. **Commercial Activity in Division I Intercollegiate Athletics.** The cabinet reviewed draft legislative concepts that would allow the use of current student-athletes name, picture and likeness to be used in promotional activities. The cabinet will continue to discuss this issue at its June meeting.

CHAMPIONSHIPS/SPORTS MANAGEMENT CABINET.

1. **Cabinet Review of NCAA Bylaws 17 and 31.** The cabinet continued its discussion of possible cost-reduction recommendations related to the administration of championships and playing and practice seasons. In September 2009, the cabinet identified potential areas of modification that would lead to institutional cost-reductions. During the February 2010 meeting, the cabinet reviewed the concepts identified in September and, discussed the pros, cons, student-athlete impact, estimated financial impact and any necessary legislative or policy changes that would result from the modifications.

   The concepts that were identified for future discussion will be discussed at the cabinet's June 2010 meeting. Cabinet members agreed to solicit feedback from their campuses and conferences for review at its June 2010 meeting. In addition to concepts that would require a legislative or cabinet policy change, cabinet members were asked to identify cost-reduction initiatives that have been implemented on their campus or within their conference. NCAA staff will compile a list of best practices to accompany any recommended legislative or policy changes.

   Finally, it was noted that fiscal management is an ongoing responsibility of the cabinet and cost reductions and revenue generation will be consistent themes during future discussions. The following concepts have been identified for further discussion:

   a. Prohibit hotel accommodations on the night before home contests-NCAA Football Championship Subdivision (FCS).

   b. Prohibit hotel accommodations on the night before home contests [all sports other than Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) football.]

c. Reduce the number of practice opportunities in all sports (number to be determined after discussion with key stakeholders.)

d. Reduce to 21 the number of practice opportunities in all sports.

e. Reduce preseason practice opportunities in volleyball to 21.

f. Count preseason Sundays when calculating preseason practice opportunities.

g. Eliminate travel for preseason practice.

h. Evaluate all exceptions to the 48/36 hour rule.

i. Reduce total competitions in all sports.

j. Establish one number for total competitions.

k. Reduce length of season and number of contests in ice hockey.

l. Reduce contests in all nonchampionship segments.

m. No overnight travel for nonchampionship segments.

n. No missed class time for nonchampionship segments.

o. Consider eliminating travel for practice during official vacation period.

p. Evaluate the number of complimentary tickets student-athletes are permitted to receive.

The cabinet agreed that the following concepts do not warrant additional discussion at this time:

a. Prohibit hotel accommodations on the night before home contests-FBS.

b. Eliminate all exceptions to the 48/36 hour rule.

c. Reduce to 18 the number of practice opportunities in all sports.

d. Eliminate contests in all nonchampionship segments.

e. Increase travel mileage limitation to 400 miles for championships travel in all sports.

2. Women's Rowing - Automatic Qualification (AQ). The cabinet agreed to delay automatic qualification in women's rowing until 2013. The cabinet also discussed the NCAA Division I Women's Rowing Committee's recommendation that a play-in be held

when the number of automatic qualification-eligible conferences exceeds 50 percent of the bracket. The cabinet did not dispute that a play-in might be the most equitable way to handle automatic qualification when the number of eligible conferences exceeds 50 percent of the bracket; however, the cabinet expressed concern related to the expense that would accompany a play-in, whether the expense is incurred by a small number of institutions or ultimately by the NCAA.

AWARDS, BENEFITS, EXPENSES AND FINANCIAL AID CABINET.

1. **Review of Feedback from Financial Aid Discussion Document.** The NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet continued its review of the financial aid items prioritized during its February 2010 meeting. In December 2009, the cabinet distributed a discussion document outlining the legislative history of NCAA Bylaw 15 and describing possible legislative concepts for future consideration. In order to stimulate meaningful discussion across the membership and generate feedback for the cabinet, the discussion document was posted on the cabinet's page of ncaa.org and distributed to the NCAA Division I directors of athletics, NCAA Division I conference commissioners, the chair of the NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, the chair of the Conference Commissioners Association Compliance Administrators, the executive director of the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics, the executive director of the National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Administrators, the president of the National Association for Athletics Compliance, the chair of the National Association of Financial Aid Administrators and the executive directors of selected coaches associations. Further, the concepts were reported to the NCAA Division I Leadership Council at the 2010 NCAA Convention and shared with the membership during the Convention's Division I Issues Forum.

   Twenty-nine responses, ranging from individual coaches and institutions to conference offices and coaches associations were received. In addition, cabinet members reported on discussions taking place within their conferences about the concepts from the discussion document. The variety of feedback received provided useful information to the cabinet. Overall, the respondents were supportive of the cabinet's decision to undertake a review of Bylaw 15, and of the cabinet's willingness to seek feedback from a variety of entities as part of its review [Reference: Supplement No. 1]. Concept Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 were supported by a majority of the respondents. And, although Concept No. 9 was the only concept with over half of the respondents responding they were opposed to the concept, only six respondents replied that they supported Concept No. 8, and only nine replied that they supported Concept No. 10. Feedback on Concept Nos. 3-a, 3-b and 7 did not demonstrate either clear support or clear opposition to those concepts.

   Based on the feedback received, the cabinet agreed to request that the staff solicit additional feedback from the membership regarding several concepts that garnered support

from the cabinet and the membership (Concept Nos. 1, 2, 3-b, 4, 5, 6 and 7). This feedback will be gathered prior to the cabinet's June 2010 meeting. During its June 2010 meeting, the cabinet plans to develop and sponsor proposals for consideration during the 2010-11 legislative cycle.

2. **Referral from NCAA Division I Basketball Academic Enhancement Group related to Bylaw 15.01.5.** The cabinet discussed an issue referred by the Basketball Academic Enhancement Group related to the legislative barriers that exist for former student-athletes to return to his or her institution and earn their degree after a professional career (Bylaw 15.01.5). Specifically, the cabinet was asked to explore whether there is a willingness to remove these barriers through legislation noting that flexibility in this area may encourage more former student-athletes to return to complete their degrees. For example, a men's basketball student-athlete has not yet graduated and departs an institution after four years to pursue a professional career in his sport. The student-athlete returns to the institution four years later to finish his undergraduate degree. The current legislation specifies that in order to receive athletically related financial aid, the student-athlete must earn the aid (e.g., work in the athletics department). The cabinet agreed to take no action at this time, noting the current legislation is sufficient because there is a permissible way to provide athletics aid to these student-athletes (i.e., earned aid). Further, when truly extenuating circumstances are presented, institutions may consider submitting an NCAA Division I Legislative Council Subcommittee for Legislative Relief waiver on the student's behalf to permit the institution to provide the student-athlete with unearned athletics aid. Finally, the cabinet directed the staff to continue to monitor this issue and provide an update at a future meeting.

3. **Chapter 33 (Post-9/11 G.I. Bill) and Yellow Ribbon Program.** The cabinet was provided an overview of the Post-9/11 G.I. Bill and the Yellow Ribbon Program, which became effective in August 2009. The cabinet discussed how eligibility for both programs is determined and how these sources of aid impact individual and team financial aid limits. The Post-9/11 G.I. Bill is for service members on active duty after September 11, 2001. Eligible service members may transfer entitlement to a spouse, children, or any combination of spouse and child. The Yellow Ribbon Program allows institutions to voluntarily enter into an agreement with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to fund tuition expenses that exceed the amount covered by the Post-9/11 G.I. Bill. Participating institutions may contribute up to 50 percent of those expenses, and the VA will match that amount.

   The cabinet agreed to sponsor legislation for the 2010-11 legislative cycle that would add VA funds awarded through the Post-9/11 G.I. Bill to the list of exempted government grants in Bylaw 15.2.5.1. In the interim, the cabinet agreed to request a blanket waiver of Bylaw 15.2.5 (government grants) from the Subcommittee for Legislative Relief, effective through the 2010-11 academic year, to exempt VA funds awarded through the Post-9/11 G.I. Bill from counting against a student-athlete's individual limit. The blanket waiver request does not include Yellow Ribbon Program funds from either the VA or a

participating institution. Finally, the cabinet members agreed to solicit feedback from their conferences related to whether the Yellow Ribbon Program funds should be exempt and re-examine the Yellow Ribbon Program during the cabinet's June 2010 meeting.

RECRUITING AND ATHLETICS PERSONNEL ISSUES CABINET.

1. **Legislative Proposals.** The NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet commented on four legislative proposals related to the area of recruiting that were introduced in the 2009-10 legislative cycle after the cabinet's September meeting. The proposals were forwarded by the NCAA Division I Legislative Council to the membership at its January meeting and will be voted on by the Legislative Council at its April meeting. Two of the proposals opposed by the cabinet relate to men's basketball camps and clinics.

2. **Priority Item – Examination of the Recruiting Model.** The cabinet engaged in a comprehensive discussion regarding the current recruiting model, including but not limited to: communication methods and frequency, evaluations, campus visits and verbal and written offers of athletics aid. The cabinet directed the staff to develop alternative recruiting models as a result of the discussion. The cabinet agreed to obtain feedback from the NCAA membership on such models prior to sponsoring appropriate legislation at its June meeting for consideration as part of the 2010-11 legislative cycle.

3. **Priority Item – Discussion on Limits of Noncoaching Staff with Sport-Specific Responsibilities.** The cabinet reviewed survey results obtained from the membership pertaining to noncoaching staff members with sport-specific responsibilities. The cabinet directed the staff to develop alternative proposals that would place numerical limitations on such personnel in the sports of football and men's and women's basketball. The cabinet agreed to seek additional feedback from institutions and the coaches' associations regarding such proposals prior to sponsoring appropriate legislation

.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I LEADERSHIP COUNCIL MARCH 23, 2010, MEETING

1. ACTION ITEMS.

- **Division I Membership Standards**. The Leadership Council reviewed a final draft of recommendations for Division I membership standards.

  Recommendation: That the Board of Directors endorse the attached report of recommendations for Division I membership standards for review by Division I membership groups and conferences during the spring 2010 and that in August 2010, the Board sponsor necessary legislative proposals for implementation of the recommendations beginning in August 2011. (See Attachment)

2. INFORMATION ITEMS.

a. **Update on President's search**. Jim Isch, interim NCAA president, updated the group on the search for the next NCAA president and noted that the process appears to be on track to have the new president in place by the start of the 2010-11 academic year.

b. **Update on Media Contract**. Greg Shaheen, NCAA senior vice president of basketball and business strategies, discussed the status of the Association's media contract. Shaheen reviewed information related to past contracts and options as the Association moves forward. Shaheen informed the Council of discussions related to expansion of the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Championship and the factors being considered as expansion is evaluated.

c. **Litigation Report.** Elsa Cole, NCAA general counsel, reported on the legal activity in which the Association is involved.

d. **Cost Savings Initiatives**. The Leadership Council reviewed a list of possible cost savings measures recommended by various Division I cabinets, as well as a number of financial recommendations discussed by the IA Athletics Directors Association. The Council noted that many of the recommendations appear to address "low-hanging fruit" and it may be wiser to take a more global approach when attempting to address spending in intercollegiate athletics. The Council recommended that staff collect additional data regarding actual spending areas and, with the possible help of consultants, develop a set of principles that could guide a review of spending. The Council suggested a two-pronged approach involving the evaluation of costs on campus as well as a review of the Association's spending related to the activities of the national office.

e. **Legislative items in the 2009-10 cycle of potential interest to the Leadership Council.** The Council received a report on the two legislative proposals (Proposal No. 2009-22 and Proposal No. 2009-51-B) that received the requisite number of requests for an override vote. The Council was informed of the status of the two proposals and the options for action by the Legislative Council during its April meeting.

f. **Report of the January 14, 2010, Leadership Council meeting**. The Council approved the report of its January 14, 2010, meeting. (Unanimous voice vote)

g. **Report from the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.** Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee chair Nick Fulton presented a report of the committee's recent meeting and priorities for the upcoming year.

h. **Future Meetings**.

a. October 5, 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana.
b. January 15, 2011, San Antonio, Texas.

Leadership Council chair: Damon Evans, University of Georgia
Staff Liaisons: S. David Berst, Division I governance
Jacqueline Campbell, Division I governance
Kevin Lennon, academic and membership affairs

NCAA Leadership Council Final Report Regarding Division I Membership Criteria

Background.

On August 9, 2007, the Division I Board of Directors adopted Legislative Proposal 2007-10, which established a four-year a moratorium that prohibited consideration of any new institutional, conference or multi-divisional Division I members until August 2011.

The Board concluded that the time was right, following similar moratoriums in Divisions II and III, for the Division I membership to assess and study the impact of membership migration and to develop reasonable philosophical expectations and legislative requirements for membership in the division. The Board requested the Leadership Council to conduct this study and to make appropriate recommendations regarding possible NCAA legislation.

A preliminary report of recommendations was provided to the Board of Directors in April 2009 and the Division I governance structure, member conferences and institutions were asked to provide reactions. The Leadership Council has continued discussions and submits the following report of recommendations to the Board of Directors for its April 29, 2010 meeting.

Excerpt from the Division I Manual--Division I Philosophy (Bylaw 20.9).

Athletics programs in Division I are guided by a philosophy statement that among other things:

- Emphasizes high standards of academic quality and breadth of academic opportunity;
- Strives for regional and national excellence and prominence and recognizes the dual objective of serving both the institutional community and the general public;
- Provides for extensive opportunities for participation in varsity intercollegiate athletics for both men and women (consistent with the requirements of Title IX) and sponsors at the highest feasible level of intercollegiate competition, men's and women's basketball and football, recognizing subdivisional designations in football;
- Advocates scheduling athletics contests primarily among Division I institutions;
- Emphasizes maintaining institutional control over all funds supporting athletics; and that
- Understands, respects, and supports the programs and philosophies of other membership divisions.

Additional Standards and Assumptions Relied Upon by the Leadership Council in its discussions included that:

- Applicants for membership in Division I should be required to meet, over a period of time, prescribed criteria in order to assure compatibility and compliance with the principles and program objectives of Division I.
- Central to the mission of intercollegiate athletics in Division I is the academic and athletic success of student-athletes, as well as protection of the student-athletes' health and well-being.
- Division I members should be expected to demonstrate a meaningful program-wide financial commitment across its entire athletics program, including for financial aid, number of sports sponsored, recruiting, athletics facilities, rules compliance, coaching, team travel and academic support services.
- Membership standards should promote conference stability, provide access to Division I for qualifying institutions and treat institutions fairly in determining their status as members of Division I.
- The number and nature of multisport conferences in Division I are fundamental considerations in establishing the level, structure and scope of Division I championship competition, the allocation of financial benefits and access to services and governance of the division.
- The multisport conference is the foundation of the NCAA DI governance structure, championships structure, and compliance structure and is rightly positioned in the proposed Division I membership process as a gatekeeper in the new membership model.
- A more comprehensive definition of a multisport conference is appropriate.
- There is a finite level of resources, benefits and good will available to current members of the division, which should be maintained or enhanced through any further expansion of membership.
- Potential new members of Division I should be expected to demonstrate a sustained commitment to Division I standards, assumptions and the Division I philosophy statement before election to membership in the division.
- Current voting ratios/percentages by conference and subdivision within Division I should be maintained through appropriate mathematical adjustments in the event the membership increases.
- The Division I brand has a value that can be approximated through a calculation of the value of direct and indirect services and benefits, as well as of the "image" of Division I and its subdivisions.

Recommendations.

The Council requests that the Board of Directors endorse the following recommendations for further discussion and debate by Division I membership groups and conferences during the spring 2010 and that in August 2010, the Board sponsor appropriate legislative proposals for membership consideration in January and April 2011.

1. **Potential new members of Division I shall enter the division through a four-year "reclassification" process following no less than five-years of membership in Division II. Further, the process described in Bylaw 20.5 shall apply, and an application for membership in Division I will be accepted only after presenting a bona fide offer of membership from a Division I multisport, voting conference. The sponsoring conference will be expected to provide appropriate guidance and counsel to the transitioning new member, assist with scheduling, monitor student-athlete well being and enhance accountability during the transition process.**

   Comment: Requiring conference sponsorship and prior membership in Division II is intended to promote the long-term stability of the Association. There should be a check list to assist conferences and transitioning institutions to ensure that institutions are meeting their appropriate benchmarks. The Administration Cabinet should provide additional thought to the timing of when various benchmarks should apply.

2. **The "provisional" process provided for in Bylaw 20.3.1, which now permits an institution outside the NCAA to become a Division I member through a seven-year process, shall be eliminated.**

   Comment: Multisport conferences within the Division I championships and governance structure are well suited to determine the needs of conferences and thereby the division. Experience in Division II serves as an appropriate platform to demonstrate the traits necessary to become a productive Division I member.

3. **An application fee shall be required before entering the "reclassification" process, which should either be commensurate with; (1) the estimated annual average value of direct benefits through distributions and championships made available to Division I members - - currently approximately $1,300,000, or (2) the "median" annual value of direct benefits through distributions and championships - - currently approximately $900,000.**

   Comment: This requirement should be data-driven and will change from time to time. This calculation does not include the costs of services or costs to administer the reclassification program. Upon election to Division I membership, the application fee shall be deposited in the NCAA Student Athlete Opportunity Distribution Fund. In the event an institution withdraws during the reclassification process, the application fee would be returned to the institution on a prorated basiss—75% after year one, $50% after year two, 30% after year three and 0% thereafter. It should also be emphasized that conferences may require separate fees for joining the conference. Discussion occurred regarding alternatives where the application fee would be analogous to a business model tied to "brand" value or

possibly tied to the educational and administrative costs of the process. It was concluded that as a higher-education association, data based on direct benefits received would be a simple and clear method and also would demonstrate a meaningful commitment from the prospective member.

4. **Upon beginning the "reclassification" process, the institution must meet Division I sports sponsorship requirements (i.e., 50 percent of the grants-in-aid maximums in the conference sponsored sports in which the institution will participate). In addition, the alternative means of satisfying this requirement now set forth in Bylaw 20.9.1.2-(b) (c) and (d) would continue to apply.**

   Comment: This is the current requirement and no change is recommended. Data reviewed regarding a possible increase to these minimums did not appear to support a change.

5. **A prospective member institution may not be elected to active membership in Division I if it is subject to a "historical penalty" under the APR program.**

   Comment: The Leadership Council believes a demonstrated commitment to academics should be required. The Committee on Academic Performance recommends that a numerical standard (e.g., 925) be avoided in deference to a "category" of academic penalties.

6. **A preliminary NCAA certification shall be required in year 1 of the four-year "reclassification" period and a full compliance review shall be required before final election to Division I membership. (See Proposed New Division I Reclassification Process beginning on page 8.)**

   Comment: There should be an expectation that the sponsoring conference will assist the institution in this process and that special attention should be given to rules compliance, academic support services, recruiting, coaches, team travel and facilities. Meeting standards early in the process and then demonstrating the ability to sustain such standards is important. The review process must make it clear that reclassification is an evolutionary process so that there is no confusion that receiving positive marks during the certification process does not guarantee eventual Division I membership.

7. **A member institution in Division I will qualify to begin receiving revenue distributions related to sports sponsorship and grants-in-aid upon serving three**

calendar years as an "active" Division I member. The institution would qualify in year one of active membership to receive Student-athlete Opportunity, Special Assistance and Academic Enhancement Funds, as well as basketball grant funds as determined by its sponsoring conference.

Comment: This change ensures that sustainability in the division is not based solely on receipt of NCAA revenues.

8. **The multi-divisional practice that permits a Division II or III institution to designate one men's and one women's sport in Division I shall be discontinued upon the completion of the 2010-11 academic year, except in a sport where no championship is conducted in its division. Division II and III institutions that sponsor sports teams in Division I in 2010-11 may continue to do so in the sports so designated but will forfeit this opportunity permanently if it fails to conduct the sport in Division I in any ensuing academic year. No change is recommended to qualify for participation in national collegiate championships.**

   Comment: It appears there is agreement to discontinue multidivisional competition, but teams that currently conduct such division I programs should be "grandfathered."

9. **A multisport conference in Division I may not receive voting privileges, conference grant funds or committee service positions in the Division I governance structure until legislation is enacted that names the conference among those identified in applicable sections of Constitution 4 related to representation and voting ratios on the Division I Board of Directors, Legislative and Leadership Councils and the five cabinets. (Refer to No. 13 below.)**

   Comment: This is the current requirement in Division I. Refer to Constitution 3.3.3.2.

10. **No change in criteria is recommended for designation in the Football Championship Subdivision, although it is recommended that the FBS subdivision consider legislation that would require a bona fide invitation for membership in an FBS conference before and an FCS institution may change subdivisions.**

    Comments: The FCS conferences do not appear to support additional membership requirements for its subdivision. However, it was noted that the bowl structure of the FBS should not be expected to support an expanded membership in that subdivision without conference sponsorship and support.

11. The role of the Administration Cabinet and the benchmarks for the four-year reclassification process shall be reviewed by the Administration Cabinet to ensure coordination by the cabinet with sponsoring conferences.

Comments: Through coordination with conferences in providing guidance and assistance to potential new member institutions, some procedural functions performed now by the Administrative Cabinet could be transferred to conference offices.

12. Constitution 3.2.3.1 shall be amended to provide that the vote to elect an institution to Division I active membership upon recommendation by the Administration cabinet shall be taken by the Board of Directors, rather than the Leadership Council.

Comments: This should be noncontroversial legislation and is recommend by the Leadership Council.

13. NCAA Division I – Recommended Multisport Conference Standards and Definition.

a. Institutional Members.

(1) A multisport conference shall have a minimum of seven (7) active Division I members.
(2) A multisport conference shall have a minimum of seven (7) active members participate in both men's and women's basketball.

b. Conference Sports Sponsorship.

(1) A multisport conference shall sponsor a minimum of 12 NCAA Division I sports.
(2) A multisport conference shall sponsor a minimum of six men's sports. In each of these six sports, a minimum of six active members shall compete.
(3) A multisport conference shall sponsor a minimum of six women's sports. In each of these six sports, a minimum of six active members shall compete, or a minimum of five active members for an emerging sport.
(4) In addition to men's basketball, a multisport conference shall, at a minimum, sponsor either football, with a minimum of six active members competing in football, or sponsor two additional men's team sports, with a minimum of six active members participating in each of these two sports.
(5) In addition to women's basketball, a multisport conference shall sponsor at least two additional women's team sports, with a minimum of six active members participating in each of these two sports.

c. Regular Season Conference Competition.

(1) Basketball: Basketball teams shall participate in a regular season conference schedule of a double round robin, or a minimum of 14 regular season conference contests.
(2) Minimum Required Team Sports, Other Than Basketball [b- (4) and (5) above]: In the team sports sponsored to meet the minimum team sports sponsorship requirement, teams shall compete in a minimum regular season conference schedule of five contests. A minimum of five regular season conference contests must be hosted by one of the two competing teams at its home site venue.

d. Officiating. A multisport conference shall provide oversight of the officiating programs for selecting, training and assigning officials for its men's and women's basketball programs.

e. Compliance. A multisport conference shall have a comprehensive compliance program.

f. Continuity. A multisport conference must meet the institutional membership requirement (a. above) before it may be considered for continuity. To establish continuity, a multisport conference must meet the sports sponsorship and regular season competition requirements (b. and c. above) for a period of eight consecutive years. If a conference establishes continuity, it may be considered for multisport membership in Division I.

g. Core. A multisport conference that is recognized in the NCAA Governance Structure as a result of legislation [see No. 9 above] shall be considered a core conference. A core conference shall:

(1) Have representation and voting standing in the NCAA Division I Governance Structure.
(2) Be eligible to submit nominees for and have its delegates serve on NCAA Division I committees.
(3) Be eligible to receive AQ into NCAA championships, provided the conference competes with a minimum of six active participants in the sport.
(4) Receive conference grant funds.
(5) Receive, on behalf of its members, Special Assistance/Student-Athlete Opportunity Funds.

Proposed New Division I Reclassification Process.

The following information outlines the membership reclassification process for any Division II or non-NCAA institution seeking to reclassify its entire athletics program to Division I membership. It should be noted that multidivisional membership (i.e., classifying one men's and or one women's sport other than football and basketball in Division I) will be discontinued following the 2010-11 academic year for any additional Division II or III institutions.

General Requirements.

The following general requirements must be satisfied prior to an institution entering the reclassification process.

- The reclassifying institution must have been an active NCAA Division II member for the preceding five years.
- The institution must be meeting applicable Division I minimum financial aid and sports-sponsorship membership requirements.
- The institution must have been extended a bona fide offer of membership by an active DI multisport voting conference.
- The institution and conference must complete an application form accompanied by an application fee (based on a yet to be determined figure based on either the average or mean of the Division I revenue distributions and championship benefits in the year of application) no later than June 1 preceding entry into year one of the reclassification process that is approved by the Division I Administration Cabinet. The institution must provide notice if it is currently involved in an investigation, an infractions case or on probation with its current governing body.
- The institution must submit a skeletal strategic plan to the Administration Cabinet that addresses the Division I philosophy statement (see Bylaw 20.9) and athletics certification operating principles (see Bylaw 22.2) approved by the conference office no later than June 1 preceding entry into year one of the reclassification process.

[Note: The Administration Cabinet shall have oversight responsibilities and shall monitor each institution's progress through the reclassification process. The cabinet shall have the authority to decline moving an institution to the ensuing year of the process if it deems that deficiencies warrant that the institution repeat a year].

Year One.

- Attendance at an orientation session conducted by the national office staff related to basic Division I operating rules and membership requirements. Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Attendance at the NCAA Convention Division I Issues Forum and business session (if such a session is conducted). Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Attendance at a regional rules seminar conducted by the NCAA. Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president [or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution], the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Apply all Division I legislation except scheduling requirements and continuing eligibility requirements (e.g., progress-toward-degree, five year rule) for student-athletes who are completing their final season of competition and were enrolled at the institution at least one year prior to entering year one of the reclassification process.
- Completion of a preliminary NCAA athletics certification orientation (conference representatives will also be required to be in attendance).
- Process institutional and individual student-athlete violations of Division I legislation through the Division I enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement processes. The institution shall be subject to any and all sanctions for violations of Division I legislation.
- Submit an annual report and an updated strategic plan by June 1 based on feedback from the previous year's plan. The institution shall report all violations to the Administration Cabinet as part of the annual report and provide notice if the institution is currently involved in an investigation, infractions case or on probation with its current governing body.

Year Two.

- Full compliance with all Division I legislation and membership requirements.
- Attendance at the NCAA Convention Division I Issues Forum and business session (if applicable). Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Attendance at a regional rules seminar conducted by the NCAA. Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Completion of a compliance review conducted by the national office and submission of a report with an institutional response to the findings and recommendations.
- Process institutional and individual student-athlete violations of Division I legislation through the Division I enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement processes. The institution shall be subject to any and all sanctions for violations of Division I legislation.
- Submit an annual report and an updated strategic plan by June 1 based on feedback from the previous year's plan. The institution shall report all violations to the Administration Cabinet as part of the annual report and provide notice if the institution is currently involved in an investigation, infractions case or on probation with its current governing body.

Year Three.

- Attendance at the NCAA Convention Division I Issues Forum and business session (if applicable). Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Attendance at a regional rules seminar conducted by the NCAA. Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.

- Completion of an athletics certification orientation.
- Process institutional and individual student-athlete violations of Division I legislation through the Division I enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement processes. The institution shall be subject to any and all sanctions for violations of Division I legislation.
- Submit an annual report and an updated strategic plan by June 1 based on feedback from the previous year's plan. The institution shall report all violations to the Administration Cabinet as part of the annual report and provide notice if the institution is currently involved in an investigation, infractions case or on probation with its current governing body.

Year Four.

- Successfully complete an NCAA athletics certification and evaluation visit.
- Attendance at the NCAA Convention Division I Issues Forum and business session (if applicable). Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Attendance at a regional rules seminar conducted by the NCAA. Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president [or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution], the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Process institutional and individual student-athlete violations of Division I legislation through the Division I enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement processes. The institution shall be subject to any and all sanctions for violations of Division I legislation.
- Submit an annual report and an updated strategic plan by June 1 based on feedback from the previous year's plan. The institution shall report all violations to the Administration Cabinet as part of the annual report and provide notice if the institution is currently involved in an investigation, infractions case or on probation with its current governing body.
- A prospective member institution may not be elected to active membership if it is subject to a historical penalty under the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program.

Post-Reclassification.

- After completion of the four year reclassification process, the Board of Directors, on the recommendation of the Division I Administration Cabinet, shall have the authority to elect the institution to active Division I status.
- The institution must submit a progress report to the Committee on Athletics Certification regarding its progress on any plans for improvement (as previously recommended by the committee) no later than the conclusion of its second year of active Division I membership.
- A new Division I institution will qualify to receive revenue distributions related to sports sponsorship and grants-in-aid after serving three calendar years as an active Division I member.
- A new Division I institution will qualify immediately to receive Student-Athlete Opportunity, Special Assistance and Academic Enhancement Funds, as well as basketball grant funds as determined by the institution's conference.

A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division I Legislative Council

The Westin Indianapolis
Indianapolis

April 12-13, 2010
8:30 a.m.

(Note: Items in bold are anticipated action items.)

1. Opening remarks.

2. Report of the January 16, NCAA Division I Board of Directors and the January 14, NCAA Division I Leadership Council meetings. [Supplement No. 1-a and 1-b]

3. Report of the January 16, NCAA Executive Committee meeting. [Supplement No. 2]

4. Litigation update.

5. Reports of the NCAA Division I Communications and Coordination Committee. [Supplement No. 3] **[**Note: Due to the date of the subcommittee's teleconference, the LGC will be notified in advance of its meeting when the supplement is available.]

6. NCAA Division I Cabinet and Committee/Subcommittee reports.

   [Note: The NCAA Division I Legislative Review/Interpretations Committee, NCAA Division I Subcommittee on Legislative Relief, NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification and NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee report directly and only to the NCAA Division I Legislative Council. Therefore, reports from those entities will be fully reviewed. For the other entities listed below, the Legislative Council will focus its review only on legislative action and legislative information items included in the reports.]

   a. **Report of the February 1-2, NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet. [Supplement No. 4]**

b. **Report of the February 9-10, NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet. [Supplement No. 5]**

c. Report of the February 25-26, NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet. [Supplement No. 6]

d. Report of the February 23, NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet. [Supplement No. 7]

e. Report of the February 16-17, NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet. [Supplement No. 8]

f. **Report of the February 3-4, NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet. [Supplement No. 9]**

g. **Report of the NCAA Division I Legislative Review/Interpretations Committee.**

h. **Report of the March 25, NCAA Division I Legislative Council Subcommittee for Legislative Relief. [Supplement No. 10] [**Note: Due to the date of the subcommittee's teleconference, the LGC will be notified in advance of its meeting when the supplement is available.]

i. **Report of the February 17-18 NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification. [Supplement No. 11]**

j. Report of the NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC). [Supplement No. 12]

k. **Report of the February 22-23, NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance. [Supplement No. 13]**

l. Report of the NCAA Division I Football Championship Subdivision Governance Committee.

m. Report of the NCAA Division I Football Academic Enhancement Working Group.

7. NCAA association-wide committee reports.

[Note: The Legislative Council will focus its review only on legislative action and legislative information items included in these reports.]

a. Report of the February 11, NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics. [Supplement No. 14]

b. Report on the February 3, NCAA Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee. [Supplement No. 15]

8. Legislative issues.

a. Status of override requests following January Board of Directors meeting. **[Supplement No. 16]**

(1) 2009-22 Amateurism and eligibility – involvement with professional teams – exception – prior to initial full-time collegiate enrollment – delayed enrollment – seasons of competition – sports other than men's ice hockey and skiing. **[Supplement No. 17]**

(2) 2009-51-B Recruiting – camps and clinics – institution's sports camps and clinics – location -- restriction – sports other than football. **[Supplement No. 18]**

b. **Legislation from cabinet/committee reports recommended as emergency or noncontroversial. [Supplement No. 19]**

c. **Consideration of modifications of wording. [Supplement No. 20]**

d. **Final review of legislative proposals in the 2009-10 legislative cycle.**

(1) **NCAA Division I 2009-10 legislative cycle voting chart. [Supplement No. 21]**

(2) **Remaining proposals in 2009-10 legislative cycle. [Supplement No. 22]**

(3) Points to consider related to remaining 2009-10 legislative cycle proposals. [Supplement No. 23]

(4) Question and answer document related to remaining 2009-10 legislative cycle proposals. [Supplement No. 24]

(5) Comments received from the membership and various constituent groups. [Supplement No's. 25]

9. Division I Manual project update.

10. Ratify chair and vice chair appointments.

11. Future meeting dates.

    a. October 18-19, Indianapolis.

    b. January 2011, San Antonio in conjunction with the NCAA Convention.

12. Other business.

13. Key discussion points summary.

14. Adjournment.

MEMORANDUM

April 9, 2010

TO: NCAA Division I Board of Directors.

FROM: Rob Halvaks, chair
Division I Administration Cabinet.

SUBJECT: Appointment to the Division I Committee on Infractions.

The Administration Cabinet recommends that the Board of Directors appoint Gregory Sankey, associate commissioner, Southeastern Conference, to the Division I Committee on Infractions. Mr. Sankey's term will begin September 1, 2010. (Attachment)

Please contact Sharon Tufano if you have any questions regarding this information.

RH/skt

Attachment

2009-10 DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS

Legislated Requirements: Ten members, seven of whom shall be at present or previously on the staff of an active member institution or member conference of the Association, no more than three but no less than two of whom shall be from the general public and shall not be associated with a collegiate institution, conference, or professional or similar sports organization, or represent coaches or athletes in any capacity. One of the members shall serve as chair and one as vice-chair. Two positions shall be allocated for men, two for women and six unallocated. Two members shall be elected as the coordinators of appeals. 19.1.1.3

There shall be no subdivision restrictions except that all nonpublic members may not be from the same subdivision; however the coordinator of appeals shall not be considered in determining whether such a requirement is satisfied.

Appointed for three-year term. A member may be reappointed but shall not serve more than nine years on the committee, with the exception of the coordinator of appeals, which may be filled by a former member of the committee who had previously served nine years. (Three years must elapse before a former member can be appointed to fill the coordinator of appeals slot.)

Vacancies: One immediate vacancy. Public member. Alfred Lechner resigned. **One September 2010 vacancy. Any subdivision.**

Committee preference:

Staff Liaison: Shep Cooper, Jim Elworth

Chair: Paul Dee (9/08-9/10)

DIV.	GEN	EM	POS	NAME AND INSTITUTION	CONFERENCE	9/9-9/10	9/10-9/11	9/11-9/12
FBS	**M**	**N**	**AD**	**Paul Dee** **University of Miami**	**Atlantic Coast Conference**	**Dee*** **(term 3)**		
FBS	M	N	Comm	Britton Banowsky Conference USA	Conference USA	Banowsky (Term 1)	Banowsky (Term 1)	
FBS	M	N	Law Professor	Rodney Uphoff University of Missouri, Columbia (coordinator of appeals)	Big 12	Uphoff (term 1)	Uphoff (term 1)	Uphoff (term 1)
FBS	M	N	FAR	James O'Fallon University of Oregon	Pacific-10	O'Fallon (term 1)	O'Fallon (term 1)	O'Fallon (term 1)
FBS	F	N	Deputy Dir of Ath	Melissa Conboy University of Notre Dame	Big East	Conboy (term 1)	Conboy (term 1)	
DI	F	N	FAR	Eleanor Myers Temple University	Atlantic-10	(Myers) (term 1)	(Myers) (term 1)	(Myers) (term 1)
FCS	M	Y	Comm	Dennis Thomas Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	Mid-Eastern Athletic	Thomas (term 2)	Thomas (term 2)	Thomas (term 2)
PUBLIC	M	N	Attorney	Brian Halloran (coordinator of appeals)		Halloran (term 3)	Halloran* (term 3)	
PUBLIC	M	Y	Attorney	Roscoe Howard Troutman Sanders		Howard (term 1)	Howard (term 1)	Howard (term 1)
PUBLIC	M	N	Attorney	John Black		Black (term 1)	Black (term 1)	

*Not eligible for reappointment. 10/30/09

ATTACHMENT
SUPPLEMENT NO. 13
DI Board of Directors 4/10

DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS NOMINEES							
Nominee	**Job Title**	**Institution**	**Conference**	**Conference Subdivision**	**Gender**	**Ethnicity**	**Current Service**
Matthew Wheeler	FAR	University of Illinois, Champaign	Big Ten Conference	FBS	M		
Warde Manuel	Director of Athletics	University at Buffalo, the State University of New York	Mid-American Conference	FBS	M	Y	1ACADC 07/10*
Rhonda Hatcher	FAR/Associate Professor of Mathematics	Texas Christian University	Mountain West Conference	FBS	F		1ACADC 07/10*
Gregory Sankey	Associate Commissioner	Southeastern Conference	Southeastern Conference	FBS	M		1LEGSC 04/10*, PREF 09/12
Laurie Connelly	Chief of Staff /Legal Counsel	Eastern Washington University	Big Sky Conference	FCS	F		
Robert Corran	Associate VP and Director of Athletics	University of Vermont	America East Conference	DI	M		
Eugene Doris	Director of Athletics	Fairfield University	Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	DI	M		
Debra Gore-Mann	Director of Athletics	University of San Francisco	West Coast Conference	DI	F	Y	

DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS NOMINEE INFORMATION

Name	Matthew B Wheeler
Job Title	FAR, Professor, Animal Sciences
Institution	University of Illinois, Champaign
Gender	M
Ethnicity	N
50% Rule	Y
Conference	Big Ten Conference
Qualification Stmt	The FARs in the Big Ten report all rules violations to the conference and NCAA. As the FAR at Illinois over the past 7 years, I have experience as a member of the Big Ten Compliance & Reinstatement Subcom. and extensive experience at the campus level in the review, investigation, fact finding, reporting of violations, and from hearings before the Com on Infractions. Through this I became interested in the NCAA infractions process. At Illinois, the FAR is inserted in the flow chart regarding rules infractions at a higher level & more often than the campus administrative officers, providing tremendous insight into the athletic compliance enterprise. I have also been involved on a federal level with research compliance as a consultant to the Food &Drug Administration. I believe my broad experience in rules compliance, self-reporting and rules violation investigation allows me to bring a unique perspective to the Infractions Committee.
Committees Served On	Chair of the Academic Progress and Eligibility Committee at the University of Illinois for 2 years, Current Co-Chair, Member of the Academics and Eligibility Sub-Committee of the Big Ten Conference for 5 years, Member of the Compliance and Rules Committee of the Big Ten Conference, Member, Big Ten Legislative Review Committee, Chair, Athletic Advisory Board at the University of Illinois for 3 years; Big Ten Faculty Representative for past 7 years. Vice Chair of the University of Illinois Faculty Senate Member, NCAA Review Academic Integrity Committee, Chancellor's Office, University of Illinois, 2007-2008. Member, Faculty Senate, General University Policy (GUP) Committee, 2007-present.
Prof Empl Hist	1989-1995: Assistant Professor, Department of Animal Sciences, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. 1995- 2001: Associate Professor, Department of Animal Sciences, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. 1996- 1999: Associate Professor, Department of Veterinary Pathobiology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. 2001 – present Professor, Department of Animal Sciences, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. 2001- present Visiting Professor, Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Wisconsin-Madison. 2002 - present Professor, Department of Clinical Medicine, College of Veterinary Medicine, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. 2002 - present Professor, Department of Bioengineering, College of Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Education	1972-1973: West Los Angeles Community College, Los Angeles, CA 90019. 1973-1974: L.A. Pierce Community College, Woodland Hills, CA. 1974-1977:B.S. (Animal Science), University of California-Davis, Davis, CA 95616. 1977-1979: M.S. (Reproductive Physiology), University of California- Davis, Davis, CA, 95616 1979-1985: Ph.D. (Physiology & Biophysics/Cell & Molecular Biology Program), Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523 1985-1988: NIH Post-Doctoral Fellow, Division of Endocrinology and Metabolism, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Virginia School of Medicine, Charlottesville, VA 22908 1988-1989: NIH-NRSA Research Associate, Endocrinology-Reproductive Physiology Program, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706

DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS NOMINEE INFORMATION

Name	Warde Manuel
Job Title	Director of Athletics
Institution	University at Buffalo, the State University of New York
Gender	M
Ethnicity	Y
50% Rule	Y
Conference	Mid-American Conference
Qualification Stmt`	I am honored to be nominated to serve on the Committee on Infractions. I believe my 15 years of experience working in three difference athletic departments and total of 19 years of collegiate administrative experience will add value to the discussion and help to aid in the decisions of the committee. I am in my 5th year as AD at Buffalo, serve on the Academic Cabinet (transition from service on the AEC Comm), chaired the NCAA AdHoc Comm on Transfer Issues, serve on the Football Academic Work Group (chair FBS Financial Issues sub-comm), serve as the Chair of the MAC Finance comm, served as the sports administrator at Michigan for football, men's basketball, women's basketball, and ice hockey, and lastly I was over academics at both Georgia Tech and Michigan. In addition, I was a highly recruited student-athlete who played football and participated in track at Michigan. I have done all of this with a commitment to adhering to the rules that govern both academic and athletic integrity.
Committees Served On	Division I Academic/Compliance/Eligibility Cabinet (A/E/C) Continuing Eligibility Subcommittee: September 2006 – June 2008 Transfer Issues Ad Hoc Group (chair): June 2007 – June 2008 Division I Academic Cabinet: September 2008 – present (term expires July 2010) Division I FBS Football Academic Working Group FBS Finances Subcommittee (chair): June 2008 – present
Prof Empl Hist	University at Buffalo Department of Athletics (Aug 2005-present); Athletic Director University of Michigan Athletic Department (June 1996-Aug 2005); served in several roles Assistant to AD, Assistant AD, & Associate AD Georgia Institute of Technology Athletic Department (Aug 1994-Aug 1995); served as Assistant AD and Academic Adivsor Upjohn Pharmaceutical (Aug 1993 - Feb 1994); sales rep University of Michigan Office of Minority Affairs (May 1990-AUg 1993); Coordinator of the Wade H. McCree Incentive Scholars Program
Education	Master of Business Administration, The University of Michigan Ross School of Business, Ann Arbor, MI (April, 2005) Executive Program Certificate, The Sports Management Institute, Chapel Hill, NC & Los Angeles, CA (January, 1999) Masters in Social Work; The University of Michigan; Ann Arbor, MI (August, 1993) Bachelor of General Studies; The University of Michigan; Ann Arbor, MI (May, 1990)

DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS NOMINEE INFORMATION

Name	Rhonda Hatcher
Designation	FAR
Job Title	Associate Professor of Mathematics
Institution	Texas Christian University
Gender	F
Ethnicity	N
50% Rule	Y
Conference	Mountain West Conference
Qualification Stmt`	I have served as TCU's FAR for 10 years. In this role, I have acquired a deep understanding of NCAA rules and a knowledge of the history of the actions of the Committee on Infractions over the past decade. As FAR, I have had direct experience in the process involved when an instituion is faced with a major infraction. Also, as a mathematician, I have strong logical reasoning skills that I believe would serve me well in analyzing the often complex cases that come before the committee.
Committees Served On	AEC Cabinet, Nov. 2001-June 2004 Academic Consultants for the NCAA, Nov. 2001-Oct. 2003 Finance Committee of Conference USA, March 2001-May 2004 Sportsmanship Committee of the Mountain West Conference, April 2005-April 2006 Recognition Committee of the Mountain West Conference, April 2005-Aug.2007 Division I Initial Eligibility Waivers Committee, Sept. 2004-August 2008 (Chair 2007-2008) Division I-A Representative on the FARA Executive Committee, Jan. 2007-Dec. 2008 NCAA Div. I Football Academic Working Group (Chair of FBS Subcom. on Eligibility), April 2008-present
Prof Empl Hist	Associate Professor of Mathematics, Texas Christian University, 1990-present Faculty Athletics Representative, Texas Christian University, 1999-present Assistant Professor of Mathematics, Saint Olaf College, 1987-1990
Education	Ph.D. Mathematics, Harvard University, 1987 A.M. Mathematics, Harvard University, 1982 B.A. Mathematics, University of Colorado at Boulder, 1980

DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS NOMINEE INFORMATION

Name	Gregory Sankey
Job Title	Associate Commissioner
Institution	Southeastern Conference
Gender	M
Ethnicity	N
50% Rule	Y
Conference	Southeastern Conference
Qualification Stmt`	Since 2002 I have served the Southeastern Conference as Associate Commissioner with primary responsibility in the areas of compliance, governance and enforcement. This position has provided a unique perspective on the enforcement process, the work of the Committee on Infractions and insight in to the function of highly competitive intercollegiate athletics programs. I have also served in the rules development process as a member of the Division I Management Council, which provides an understanding of the background surrounding many of the policies governing intercollegiate athletics programs. Prior to joining the SEC staff, I served as commissioner of a Division I conference that was noted as having a history of strong compliance efforts, which provides an in depth understanding of the challenges faced by a group of universities lacking access to the financial resources of conference like the SEC.
Committees Served On	Division I Legislative Council (Present) Committee on Academic Performance (2007-Present) Executive Committee Working Group on Membership Issues (2006-2007) Division I Management Council, Representing the Southeastern Conference (2005-2008) Division I Committee on Athletic Certification (2002-2007) Working Group to Examine Initial Eligibility Trends (2005-2006) Southeastern Conference Task Force on Compliance and Enforcement (2002-2004) NCAA Football Study Oversight Committee (2001-2002) Division I Membership Subcommittee, Chair (1999-2008) Division I Management Council Administrative Committee (1998-2000) Division I-AA Governance Subcommittee, Chair (1997-1999) Division I Management Council, Representating the Southland Conference (1997-2001)
Prof Empl Hist	Southeastern Conference, Associate Commissioner for Governance and Compliance (2002-Present) Southland Conference, Commissioner (1996-2002) Southland Conference, Associate Commissioner for Championships and Marketing (1994-1996) Southland Conference, Assistant Commissioner for Compliance (1992-1994) Northwestern State University, Director of Compliance and Academic Services (1990-1992) Northwestern State University, Head Men's Golf Coach (1990-1992) Northwestern State University, Athletics Department Intern (1989-1990) Utica College of Syracuse University, Director of Intramural Sports (1987-1989)
Education	State University of New York, College at Cortland (Bachelor of Science in Education, 1987) Syracuse University (Master of Science in Education, 1993)

DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS NOMINEE INFORMATION

Name	Mary Laurie Connelly
Job Title	Chief of Staff /Legal Counsel
Institution	Eastern Washington University
Gender	F
Ethnicity	N
50% Rule	Y
Conference	Big Sky Conference
Qualification Stmt`	I am interested in serving on the infractions committee because I strongly believe that participation in athletics should enhance the student athlete's education by teaching athletes about the values of life balance, fair play and sportsmanship, teamwork and working hard. The infractions committee serves as a safeguard for the mission of athletics. My experience with college athletics includes working with the AD as members of the President's Executive Committee and President's Cabinet on University issues. In addition I represent the President on the President's Advisory Committee on Athletics. I also participated as a member of the university's certification steering committee on the subcommittee on Equity and Student-Athlete Well-being. I am also involved with student issues and am familiar with student athlete welfare issues. Having recently participated in a major infractions case, I appreciate the difficult and complex issues involved with rules enforcement.
Committees Served On	I served as a past member of Board of Directors of the YMCA of the Inland Northwest, dealing with organizational mission, youth sports programs, athletics facilities, and a residential camp. I served as past president and trustee of the Spokane County Bar Association. Member of Editorial Board for Ethics Primer, Washington State Association of Municipal Attorneys Member of Washington State Bar Association, admitted 1981
Prof Empl Hist	Before attending law school, I taught for three years in special education at the elementary level. After law school, I clerked for the US District Court in the Eastern District of Washington. I served as an assistant attorney general for the state of Washington representing the Department of Labor and Industries in administrative hearings on workers compensation appeals. I worked as an associate in the firm of Preston, Thorgrimson, Gates and Ellis primarily in the areas of municipal law and bonds. In 1989, I became an Assistant City Attorney for the City of Spokane, where I advised boards and commissions such as the Civil Service Commission and Park Board, and advised the Human Resources Department on compliance with human rights laws, investigations of employee complaints and general personnel issues. In January, 2000, I joined Eastern Washington University as a Human Resources Associate for Affirmative Action and Risk Management. I investigated complaints of violations of the university's policies on harassment and discrimination and reviewed university actions and recommended measures for mitigation of risk. In July, 2001, I became the Associate to the President, and my responsibilities include providing advice to the President and vice presidents on complying with university policy and laws. I review
Education	B.A. in Education from Washington State University, 1974, M.Ed. from University of Washington, 1975, J.D. from University of Washington School of Law, 1981.

DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS NOMINEE INFORMATION

Name	Robert Corran
Job Title	Associate VP and Director of Athletics
Institution	University of Vermont
Gender	M
Ethnicity	N
50% Rule	Y
Conference	America East Conference
Qualification Stmt`	With 25 years of senior leadership in collegiate/international athletics, and experience in teaching/research in planning and organizational behavior, I now better understand how the educational and other purposes of athletics influence, and are influenced by, its leadership, organization and management. It seems to me that the work of the Committee on Infractions is ultimately focused on the effectiveness with which universities navigate this intersection and is something of great interest to me. Through my involvement in international sport, I have served on a number of judicial and investigative bodies and juries of appeal. This work was challenging and instructive, providing insight as to how and why individuals and the organizations they represent respond to competitive and other pressures as they do. I bring a broad experience, a unique perspective and a thoughtful approach to developing opinion and
Committees Served On	NCAA Ice Hockey Rules Committee 2005-2009 Chair, America East Executive Committee, 2007-09 Chair, America East Strategic Planning Committee, 2007-09 Chair, Hockey East Competitive Standards Committee, 2007-09 Chair, NCAA Women's Frozen Four Organizing Committee 2003 Chair, Technical Commission, Federation Internationale du Sport Universitaire 1995-1999 Executive Committee, Calgary Olympic Development Association 1985-1989 President, Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union (CIS) 1990-1992 President, Canada West Universities Athletic Association, 1988-1991 Vice Chair, World Speedskating Championships, 1994 Head of Delegation, World University Games, Sheffield, England 1993 Asst. Chef de Mission, World University Games, Fukuoka, Japan 1995 Board of Directors, Canadian Hockey Association 1992-1996 Board of Trustees, Canadian Athletic Foundation 1992-1997 Executive Committee, International Hockey Center of Excellence, 1992-1997 Editorial Board, Athletic Management, 1994-present
Prof Empl Hist	Associate Vice President & Director of Athletics - Univ. of Vermont 2003-present Director of Intercollegiate Athletics, University of Minnesota Duluth, 1997-2003 Director of Athletics, University of Calgary (Canada), 1985-1997 Visiting International Scholar, University of California, Berkeley, 1995-96 Visiting Professor, Pan American Institute for Sport, Maracaibo, Venezuela 1996 Asst. Professor/Head Hockey Coach, University of Windsor (Canada) 1980-1985 Asst. Hockey Coach, The Ohio State University, 1977-79 Teacher/Coach, Mackenzie Collegiate Institute, Toronto, 1971-76
Education	B.S. Ithaca College, Ithaca, NY M.S. Springfield College, Springfield, MA Ph.D. The Ohio State University

DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS NOMINEE INFORMATION

Name	Eugene Doris
Job Title	Director of Athletics
Institution	Fairfield University
Gender	M
Ethnicity	N
50% Rule	Y
Conference	Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference
Qualification Stmt`	Served as Peer Reviewer on three occasions and have been in athletic administration since 1984. In addition to the 25 years in athletics administration I have also had 15 years experience as a basketball coach both on the high school and college level. Compliance with NCAA rules has been an important part of every athletics program of which I have been a part. We applied and were accepted into the pilot Div. I Certification Program while I was at Marist College in an effort to bring a better awareness of the need for shared responsibility which had been an issue prior to my arrival I believe that my background in having had profile athletes recruited while as a high school coach and my involvement in administration would serve me well as a member of the Committee on Infractions.
Committees Served On	2005-2009 NCAA Committee on Sportsmanship & Ethical Conduct 2002-03 NCAA Division I Committee on Regulatory Culture 1996-97 Special Committee to study NCAA Marketing, Licensing, and Promotional Activities 1993-94 NCAA Div I-AA Football Regional Committee 1995-2002 MAAC Gender Equity Subcommittee 1993 NCAA Football Site Representative 1985 - Present NIT Site Representative 1991-93 & 1996-99 ECAC Executive Council 1998 President ECAC 1999 President Div I-AA Athletics Director Association
Prof Empl Hist	1994-Present Director of Athletics, Fairfield University, Fairfield, CT 1989-94 Director of Athletics, Marist College, Poughkeepsie, NY 1984-1985 Asst. Director of Athletics, Fordham University, New York, NY 1977-1984 Social Studies Instructor, Archbishop Stepinac HS, White Plains, NY 1974-1977 Social Studies Instructor, Archbishop Molloy HS, Jamaica, NY 1971-1973 Chief, Nonappropriated Welfare Funds Management Branch, USAF 1974-1985 Varsity Basketball Coach, Archbishop Stepinac HS, White Plains, NY 1977-1985 Varsity Basketball Coach, Archbishop Molloy HS, Jamaica, NY 1971-1973 Varsity Basketball Coach, Castle Air Force Base, CA
Education	1970 BA History, Fordham University, New York, NY 1974 MAT Social Studies, Fordham University, New York, NY 1983 Certificate, Basic Computer Literacy, WNET Academy on Computers

DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS NOMINEE INFORMATION

Name	Debra Gore-Mann
Job Title	Executive Director of Athletics
Institution	University of San Francisco
Gender	F
Ethnicity	Y
50% Rule	Y
Conference	West Coast Conference
Qualification Stmt`	In particular, I am a female Athletic Director from a Jesuit institution on the west coast. I am of African American and Asian decent and I am a former student-athlete. I worked in a major conference, Pacific 10, previously and now I work in the West Coast Conference. I¿ve worked at an institution that supported 35 sports program to one that supports 14 programs. I believe I bring a wide range of perspectives with a strong commitment to NCAA rules compliance. At the University of San Francisco, we have been working closely with the NCAA Enforcement staff and third party council for the past two-plus years to investigate major violations on our campus and to effectively discover, report, resolve and correct these situations all with a commitment to the spirit of the law of NCAA rules not just abiding by the legal interpretation.
Committees Served On	Member, West Coast Conference Executive Council (2006-present) NCAA – then: Academic/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet member (2001-2005); Chairman for Recruiting subcommittee Pacific-10 Conference Council member (2001-2006) Member, Mayor San Francisco Gavin Newsome Physical Activity Council (2008 - present) Board member, Positive Coaching Alliance (2001-2006) Board member, East Palo Alto Tennis and Tutorial Program (2002-2006) Board member, Team Up for Youth (2004-2006) Board member, Stanford Federal Credit Union (2000-2004) University Fellows participant. Selected by the Stanford President's Office to serve in the Fellows Program that communicates and exchange ideas and concepts that effect university policy and procedures (2001-2003)

DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS NOMINEE INFORMATION

Name	Debra Gore-Mann (continued)
Prof Empl Hist	UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, San Francisco, CA Executive Director of Athletics •Provide strategic and managerial leadership to USF's (14) varsity sports teams and is responsible for strategic planning, program management, budgeting, personnel and student-athlete development, and staffing decisions. 3/99 – 6/07, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, Palo Alto, CA Senior Associate Athletics Director for External Relations & SWA •Strategic planning, business development and organizational execution with senior management team and University offices for overall Athletics Department •SWA for 34 sports programs; approximately 90 head / assistant coaches and approximately 900 student-athletes. •Direct involvement with Athletics Director for attraction, retention, hiring, and promotion of head coaches and staff as well as termination. Participated in hiring of football head coach & staff (January 2002 & January 2004), women's volleyball coach (July 2001), who captured the 2001 and 2004 NCAA D1 women's volleyball championship. Director, Athletics Investment Fund, venture capital funds dedicated for use by Stanford Athletics includes 42 directors who invest approximately $80 million. •Management oversight of major football stadium renovation of $90 million including fundraising, marketing, public relations and season ticket sales of $4-$6 million additional annual revenues. Created strategic and business marketing plan for new Stanford Stadium. •Responsible for all financial and operational elements of Stanford Athletic Department totaling approx. $60 million operating budget as well as $305 million endowment and over $500 million in total assets. •Oversight of community outreach program. BECHTEL ENTERPRISES, INC., San Francisco, CA
Education	STANFORD UNIVERSITY, Stanford, CA Graduate School of Business, MBA. Emphasis on Capital Markets and Finance. STANFORD UNIVERSITY, Stanford, CA Bachelor of Science in Industrial Engineering. NCAA Cardinal Club Athletic Scholarship recipient, member of Varsity Basketball Team. Played point guard. Elected team captain by coaches and teammates during 1980-81 and 1981-82 seasons. Adjunct teaching: Stanford Graduate School of Business - Executive / NFL management course USF Sports Management - Strategic Managment Course Intercollegiate Athletics Leadership - Graduate Program; guest lecturer

MEMORANDUM

April 1, 2010

TO: NCAA Division I Board of Directors.

FROM: Sharon K. Tufano
Committee Coordinator.

SUBJECT: Appointments to the Division I Board of Directors.

Following are the conference recommendations for Board of Directors positions with terms beginning at the conclusion of the April 2010 Board of Directors meeting.

Board of Directors (Attachment):

- Atlantic Coast Conference – Nathan Hatch, president, Wake Forest University.
- Conference USA – Steadman Upham, president, University of Tulsa.
- Southeastern Conference – Lee Todd, president, University of Kentucky.

The Board will meet the legislated minimum gender and diversity requirements.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this information.

SKT

Attachments

2010-11 Division I Board of Directors

Legislated: Eighteen members comprised of chief executive officers (CEOs). All 11 Division Football Bowl Subdivision conferences have a permanent seat. Seven Football Championship Subdivision and Division I conferences rotate seats. As a minimal goal, the Board membership shall include at least one person who is an ethnic minority and at least one person who is of each gender and a single member shall not be considered to meet both minimums.

Chair: Harvey Perlman (4/10-4/13)

Subd	Pos	Name	Institution	Conference Representation	GEN	EM	Term Expiration
FBS	**President**	**Nathan Hatch**	**Wake Forest University**	**Atlantic Coast**	**M**	**N**	**Apr 2014***
FBS	Chancellor	Harvey Perlman	University of Nebraska, Lincoln	Big 12	M	N	Apr 2013*
FBS	President	Judy Genshaft	University of South Florida	Big East	F	N	Apr 2011
FBS	President	Robert Bruininks	University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	Big Ten	M	N	Apr 2011*
FBS	**President**	**Steadman Upham**	**University of Tulsa**	**Conference USA**	**M**	**N**	**Apr 2014***
FBS	President	John Peters	Northern Illinois University	Mid-American	M	N	Apr 2013*
FBS	President	David Schmidly	University of New Mexico	Mountain West	M	N	Apr 2012*
FBS	President	Edward Ray	Oregon State University	Pacific-10	M	N	Apr 2011*
FBS	**President**	**Lee Todd**	**University of Kentucky**	**Southeastern**	**M**	**N**	**Apr 2014***
FBS	President	James Cofer	University of Louisiana at Monroe	Sun Belt	M	N	Apr 2013*
FBS	President	Robert Kustra	Boise State University	Western Athletic	M	N	Apr 2012*
FCS	President	F. Ann Millner	Weber State University	Big Sky	F	N	Apr 2012*
FCS	President	Gregory Dell'Omo	Robert Morris University	Northeast	M	Y	Apr 2011*
FCS	President	William Meehan	Jacksonville State University	Ohio Valley	M	N	Apr 2013*
FCS	President	William Harvey	Hampton University	Mid-Eastern Athletic	M	Y	Apr 2013*
DI	President	Fr. Kevin Mullen	Siena College	Metro Atlantic Athletic	M	N	Apr 2011*
DI	Chancellor	Charles Bantz	Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis	Mid-Continent	M	N	Apr 2011*
DI	President	E. William Beauchamp	University of Portland	West Coast	M	N	Apr 2012*

*Not eligible for reappointment.
NCAA/04/01/2010/SKT

ATTACHMENT
SUPPLEMENT NO. 14
DI Board of Directors 4/10

Recommendations for Diversity in the Division I Governance Structure

During its January 16, 2010 meeting, the Board of Directors endorsed the following recommendations from the Leadership Council regarding ways to enhance gender, ethnic minority and positional representation among those individuals serving in the Division I governance structure:

1. Apply the current gender (35 percent) and ethnic minority (20 percent) minimum requirements to **each** council and cabinet (three 31-person bodies and five 21-person bodies).

2. Apply a **new** minimum positional requirement for athletics directors (20 percent) and faculty athletics representatives (20 percent) to **each** council and cabinet independently (eight total groups).

3. Determine that the requirements of "a" and "b" above apply to the combined FCS and Division I representatives for each council and cabinet, effective with FCS and Division I term expirations in April and June 2012. [Note: It is recommended that all the FCS and Division I terms on councils and cabinets expire during the same year in order to enable those conference to work together in submitting nominations that would meet the new diversity requirements.

4. That the Board adopt appropriate emergency legislation in April 2010 to implement these policies.

The Leadership Council recommended that in April, the Board of Directors be presented with a slate of FBS nominations for the eight councils and cabinets that meets the above requirements.

Board of Directors Resolution:

The Legislative Council is requested to develop a draft of a policy statement that the Board of Directors and Legislative Council might adopt that would provide better guidance regarding consideration of proposed NCAA legislation by applying a metric to identify those legislative proposals to defeat or consider, and those proposals to call to the attention of the Board. The objective of this policy statement should be twofold: (1) to limit the number of legislative proposals approved to those that identify and document a clear national problem that needs to be addressed, and (2) identifies those proposals that might appropriately be considered directly by the Board of Directors.

In considering a policy directed to (1), the Legislative Council may wish to consider procedures that assure proposals receive the comments of the various governance groups and what evidence should be submitted with any proposal to document its need. For example, mere assertion that a practice may create a recruiting advantage should not be enough but it should also be demonstrated that the perceived advantage is "unfair", the practice would require other schools to adopt a practice that is inconsistent with the values of the NCAA, and there is evidence that such advantage in fact exists.

In considering a policy directed at (2), the Legislative Council may wish to consider the extent to which the proposed legislation has received broad support or whether a governance group or other cabinet or council has rejected the proposal. It may also wish to consider whether the proposed legislation implements a core NCAA value or is at the periphery or has implications that may conflict with a core NCAA value. The Board would value the Council's advice regarding possible categories of proposals that should be reviewed by the Board, i.e., those that intrude on student athlete time or benefits, those that increase costs, etc.

Board of Directors

Josephine (Jo) R. Potuto
President
University of Nebraska
Big 12 Conference

Ken Casavant
Vice-President
Washington State University
Pacific-10 Conference

Charles Fourtner
Secretary/Treasurer
University at Buffalo
Mid-American Conference

Percy Bates
University of Michigan
Big Ten Conference

Dydia DeLyser
Louisiana State University
Southeastern Conference

Jack Evans
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Atlantic Coast Conference

Fred Green
Troy University
Sun Belt Conference

Rhonda Hatcher
Texas Christian University
Mountain West Conference

Peter Nicholson
University of Hawaii-Manoa
Western Athletic Conference

C. Paul Rogers III
Southern Methodist University
Conference USA

Tom Stephens
Rutgers University
Big East Conference

1A FACULTY ATHLETICS REPRESENTATIVES (FAR)

Academics & Athletics as an Integrated Whole: on Campus, in Governance

TO: NCAA Division I Board of Directors
FROM: Josephine (Jo) R. Potuto
President, 1A Faculty Athletics Representatives (1A FAR)
RE: Principles to Inform Decisions Related to Fiscal Responsibility in Intercollegiate Athletics
DATE: April 28, 2010

Background

Several years ago the NCAA Division I Board of Directors conducted a broad strategic review of the challenges facing intercollegiate athletics, including athletics expenditures that were rising faster than overall education costs and faster than the national rate of inflation. Although there are three levels of players in intercollegiate expenditures – institution, conference, and NCAA national office – by far the major expenditure issues reside at the institutional level. Among these are escalating coach salaries, the seemingly never-ending upgrading of athletics facilities, and the proliferation of non-coach personnel assigned to particular sports. To date, we know of no articulation of overall philosophy to govern fiscal decisions, even though there have been cost containment efforts by institutions, conferences and at the NCAA national office. The absence of such principles has led, we believe, to decisions that fail to reflect core values and also to an approach by various interested groups to give prime focus to preserving the current situation for their respective constituent groups.

WWW.ONEAFAR.ORG DIV-1A-FARS-LIST@LISTSERV.BUFFALO.EDU
College of Law • P.O. Box 830902 • Lincoln NE 68583-0902 • DD Phone: 402.472.1252 • DD Fax: 402.472.3843 • E-mail: jpotuto1@unl.edu

The 1A FAR Board is aware that there now is an NCAA committee charged with articulating principles to inform institutional values-based decision-making. Currently there are no FARs participating in that effort, and we urge the Division I Board and interim president Jim Isch to include the broader campus voice in those discussions. We also share here our perspective on intercollegiate athletics and the principles that should frame budget decisions. We believe that there are two prime focuses of this discussion – institutions and NCAA operations[1] – and that the principles we set forth here are applicable to each, both in the identification of current programs and services and in the articulation of what should be their appropriate scope. With particular regard to the NCAA, the 1A FAR Board believes that there is an additional, macro, aspect of achieving fiscal responsibility, and that is to look at overall operations and decide whether a reassessment and reconceptualization is needed.

Core Principles in Cost Containment

1. Intercollegiate athletics are undertaken on college campuses with students enrolled in academic programs on those campuses. The prime objective must be to assure that student-athletes have the opportunity to achieve their academic goals, to experience many of the opportunities available to students not athletes, and to grow socially and intellectually as members of their university communities while also pursuing high levels of training and competition as amateur athletes.

2. NCAA core principles divide into four basic areas: student-athlete well-being; amateurism; university implementation of athletics programs that assures rules compliance and the fair and equitable operation of athletics programs (diversity, ethical conduct, etc.); and university implementation of athletics programs that is fiscally responsible. NCAA Const. Art. 2. Cost containment should be undertaken with reference to these core principles.

3. Cost cuts should not be made if they will have adverse impact on student-athlete health or safety, no matter the projected savings.

4. Cost cuts should not be made if they will have adverse impact on student-athlete academic performance or success, no matter the projected savings (unless there is extreme financial exigency such that the operation of NCAA core services and functions may not otherwise be maintained). If extreme financial exigency requires cuts, then they

[1] We do not include athletics conferences here because, in our experience, conference offices are not a major player in intercollegiate athletics expenditures. Instead, their prime purpose is to identify and foster revenue streams and funnel revenues back to the campuses.

should come only after cuts first are made to all other possible areas (except student-athlete health or safety).

5. Cost cuts with adverse impact on student-athlete well-being (other than health or safety) or the student-athlete experience should not be made unless there is extreme financial exigency such that the operation of NCAA core services may not otherwise be maintained and then only after cuts first are made to all other possible areas (except student-athlete health or safety and student-athlete academic performance or success). For example, there should be no cuts made to the amount of post-graduate scholarships. (In fact, the 1A FAR Board believes that the post graduate scholarship program budget should be expanded to increase the current amount of award – $7500 – and the current number of years of an award – one year, and perhaps the number of awards distributed annually.)

6. Cost cuts should be made in the context of universities maintaining broad-based athletics programs. Intercollegiate athletics programs are tax exempt because they are part of the overall academic mission. It is not a prime focus of these programs that they serve as a training ground for professional athletes or, in some sports, as a semi-pro league. No sport or aspect of an athletics operation should be immune to change. The 1A FAR Board recognizes, however, that in all but a few institutions the vast amount of sports revenue is generated by two or at most three sports.

7. Cost cuts should be made with an eye to the potential for systemic change.

8. Cost cuts at the NCAA level should result in real cuts and not simply a transference of needed function, with the associated consequence of transferring cost to conferences or campuses.

9. We recognize that the "prisoner's dilemma" is that (s)he cannot or cannot easily make a unilateral decision without all other prisoners proceeding in lock step. Nonetheless, we believe that cost containment dictated at the association level should not intrude on what properly should be campus decisions.

10. Cost containment measures should be evaluated by antitrust counsel.

Principles in Application

Cost containment decisions should be data driven.

2. The prime objective in cost containment should be to achieve the maximum amount of cost reduction consistent with the principles set forth above. To do this, cost cuts must be based on concrete data in two areas. There must be data with reasonable predictive force on the amount of the savings to be achieved by any particular cut, in the immediate period following the cut, and thereafter. There must be data setting forth where the impact of

any particular cut will fall, and with reasonable predictive force on the consequence of any cut.

Reassessment of National Office Overall Operations

The 1A FAR Board believes that this might be a good time for the Division I Board to review all NCAA operations, programs, and services with an eye to deciding which are within the core mission and functions of the NCAA. We are not aware that such an overall assessment has been conducted, or at least conducted within recent times. Because we recognize that there may be disagreement as to what constitutes a "core" function or service or what is necessary to effectuate the core NCAA mission, we recommend that there be a special committee comprised of representatives from the membership groups formed to work with the Board on this effort. Campus representatives can offer a concrete and operational perspective on the NCAA mission and services. They also will have close experience of campus structures and how projects are made operational at the campus level. Campus representatives also can supplement the Board's approach with particular expertise as to where there might be overlap or an extension of core services, and where these programs and services increase the work on campus without particular payoff.

As with institutional cuts, the 1A FAR Board believes that the prime objective in cost containment at the NCAA national office should be to achieve the maximum amount of cost reduction consistent with NCAA core principles and with minimal impact on NCAA core functions and services as identified.

1 There needs to be an assessment of NCAA operations to identify those core functions and services that must be preserved.

2. There needs to be an assessment of what is minimally/optimally needed to perform NCAA core functions and services.

3. There needs to be a cost/benefit analysis of the savings to be achieved with any particular budget cut as against its impact on core principles and functions. As with institutional cuts, cuts to national office operations must be based on concrete data in two areas. There must be data with reasonable predictive force on the amount of the savings to be achieved by any particular cut, in the immediate period following the cut, and thereafter. There must be data setting forth where the impact of any particular cut will fall, and with reasonable predictive force on the consequence of any cut.

Cost Containment Suggestions

1. The IA FAR Board is aware of several cost containment proposals that have surfaced. We set forth here those that we believe warrant study.

2. Eliminate the regional track and field qualifying event. This proposal not only involves cost containment, but we note that the regional competition may occur before the end of the academic year and also has impact on conference tournaments (and scheduling that occurs during exam periods).

3 Reduce non-coach, sport-specific administrative staff. We understand that the Recruiting Cabinet is engaged in an effort to get a handle on the number per sport of non-coach, sport-specific administrative staff. We know that the Big 12 and Mountain West FARs support such an effort and believe this proposal is supported by most, if not all, FARs. We have heard no FAR express opposition.

4. Limit the size of travel squads in every sport. This suggestion was proposed, as we understand it, by the IA Athletics Directors Association (IA AD). We understand that the FARs in the Mountain West Conference formally support such a cost containment measure. We are informed that information provided the Division I Championships Cabinet is that student-athlete travelers as a percentage of total travelers on team trips has dropped from 54.05 % in 2003-04 to 53.13 % in 2006-07.

There are at least three issues embedded here.

A. Who should be cut? We believe that cuts should be made to all others on the travel squad before student-athletes are prohibited from team travel. We suggest that a first step would be to identify the categories of those who travel. We understand that there are data that the Big 12 Conference FARs have accumulated regarding Big 12 Conference team travel. We also believe that there should be a hierarchy of categories of non-athletes who travel with a team regarding the necessity of their service, and cuts made in that order.

B. Where should the limits apply? The NCAA as an association certainly can limit team travel size for NCAA championships; the number of persons for whom the NCAA will reimburse travel costs; the number of persons who will have AA passes; etc. But we question whether there should be a limit on institutional choice to fund additional travel as that seems to intrude on campus decision-making.

5. Eliminate non-traditional playing seasons. We understand that the IA AD support this proposal as do the Mountain West FARs. We also understand that the current position of the Championship Cabinet is to "reduce" not "eliminate." We note that independent of cost containment there are academic reasons for eliminating the non-traditional season as it would contain competition within one semester. We also note that with roster management (soccer, track), there is argument that the non traditional season permits opportunity for more student-athletes to compete. (There are variants of this proposal, including prohibiting overnight travel in the nontraditional season or prohibiting any

missed class time or restricting competition to local teams and NAIA schools. Some opponents claim that these will result in a competitive disadvantage to institutions in small population of geographically remote areas as they will be unable to complete against higher level competition.)

6. Limit the number of regular season contests in all or selected sports. The IA Ads proposed this. There also are a series of Division II proposals to limit contests and practice that could be reviewed.

Conclusion

There is virtual unanimity among stake-holders and observers that current expenditures in intercollegiate athletics are not sustainable. Disturbingly, many institutions increasingly are resorting to cutting sports: more than 200 have been eliminated in the past three years. If and as cost containment measures are undertaken, the IA FAR Board believes they should reflect a principled approach that mirrors the core values of intercollegiate athletics. We hope that the principles and approach that we have articulated here are helpful in forming the approach finally implemented.

cc: Selected NCAA Administrators

Rights Negotiations Task Force

Greg Shaheen, responsible staff member

Task Force Charge: Analyze the current media rights contract, conduct research on sports property rights and determine whether the NCAA should exercise the "opt out" provision in the current CBS and ESPN contracts.

Status: The NCAA reached a new 14-year television, internet and wireless rights agreement with CBS Sports and Turner Broadcasting System, Inc., to present the Division I Men's Basketball Championship beginning in 2011 through 2024 for more than $10.8 billion. As part of the agreement, all games will be shown live across four national networks beginning in 2011 – a first for the 73-year old championship. Additionally, CBS Sports and Turner Broadcasting have been licensed and will collaborate on the NCAA's corporate marketing program.

Completion Date: April 22, 2010.

* * *

Task Force #2

Communication Issues Task Force

Bernard Franklin, responsible staff member

Task Force Charge. The charge of the task force is to examine and analyze all communication efforts and platforms that the national office staff has with the NCAA membership and frame how the national office staff communicates with staff and constituents. The task force is expected to suggest recommendations in order to (a) establish a more coordinated approach to membership communications, as well as (b) how to achieve a more collaborative approach to internal staff communications.

Status: The task force is currently in the process of developing a communication philosophy/framework for the national office, as well as a strategy for membership review and approval of the philosophy/framework. As a part of the June 2010 survey of the membership regarding the NCAA, the task force will include questions to gather the membership's preferences regarding communication. These survey results will be used as a resource in the development of recommendations regarding the manner and mechanism(s) of communication with the membership. Additionally, the task force will work with a consultant and national office staff to develop recommendations to improve communication within the national office.

Completion Date: October 2010.

Open Records Task Force

Elsa Cole, responsible staff member

Task Force Charge: In anticipation of requests for NCAA records under state open records laws, the task force is to review policies and procedures for disclosing information with member institutions and to propose principles or guidelines regarding how to structure communications in the future and what NCAA material should be shared.

Status: The draft report is being circulated to task force members for comment. It will (1) recommend a number of steps to provide support for the NCAA's position that committee members' access to NCAA documents does not change them into school records accessible under open records laws; (2) provide guidance for committee liaisons about how and when to distribute documents to best protect them; and (3) asks each group for a plan on how it will conduct its work with the membership to protect NCAA documents from disclosure to the extent practical and feasible.

Completion date: April 29, 2010.

* * *

Task Force #4

Values-Based Decision Making Task Force

Bernard Franklin, responsible staff member

Task Force Charge: This task force is charged with exploring innovative and creative legislative alternatives that support and defend the core values of the NCAA. Recommendations made by this task force will include input from various cabinets, committees and constituent groups prior to being presented to the appropriate presidential body.

Status: The task force convened its first meeting April 18-19. At this meeting, task force members identified and discussed issues regarding the maintenance of the collegiate model and how best to address these issues within a values-based decision making framework. NCAA staff and consultants were requested to develop specific proposals for review by the task force prior to its next meeting.

Completion date: A preliminary list of recommendations should be submitted to the Division I Board of Directors at its October meeting.

Performance Management Metrics Task Force

Kevin Lennon and Leigh Ann Price, responsible staff members

Task Force Charge: The Performance Management Metrics Task Force goal is to create and oversee the implementation of a formal business performance management process throughout the NCAA national office that enhances accountability, improves results and demonstrates value to the membership. A key focus for the task force is documenting or developing the measurements (performance metrics) each group is using to determine its success against its stated goals. The national office will use the performance metrics to share and discuss our internal operations results both internally and externally.

Status: Almost every national office group has submitted their goals as they link to the Strategic Plan. For the next phase of metrics definition, the task force has engaged the consulting firm Oliver Wyman to help us research existing NCAA metrics and processes, determine foundations and drivers for performance metrics, and identify proposed metrics and linkages in order to deliver enterprise-wide metrics and a scorecard design. Further work as part of this engagement will be data collection and actual delivery of the NCAA scorecard.

Completion date: June 30, 2010

* * *

Task Force #6

Task Force to Clarify Roles of Committees on Infractions and Infractions Appeals Committee

Bernard Franklin, responsible staff member

Task Force Charge: This task force is charged with reviewing key recommendations from an internal audit conducted several years ago that focused on enforcement and infractions policies and procedures. The final report recommended several procedural changes primarily to improve both public relations and relations with member institutions, and enhance the processing of cases from the investigation through the appellate hearing. The task force will focus on the recommendations that addressed procedures for conducting hearings for both the Committee on Infractions and the Infractions Appeals Committee, as well as reviewing and clarifying the relationship between the two committees. The task force will review the impact of the implementation of these recommendations and determine whether any additional modifications should occur.

Status: The task force is in the process of developing a detailed list of discussion issues. The task force's consultant will interview several constituents (e.g., national office staff, committee members, membership) about these issues and develop a preliminary report of recommendations by August 2010.

Completion Date: Timeline being developed.

Risk Assessment Task Force

Keith Martin, responsible staff member

Charge: Update the enterprise risk assessment conducted in 2004, identify significant risk exposures and present strategies for mitigating these risks.

Status:

Deloitte updated the risk assessments and presented the summary of potential risks, residual impact and likelihood of occurrence. Following are the findings:

- **Reputation** is the Association's most valuable asset and without strong strategic and proactive management, the NCAA's reputation could adversely affect the public's understanding and confidence in the integrity of intercollegiate athletics. Reputation is also a common theme in all the significant risks identified and, therefore, requires indisputable positive direction and clear-cut leadership practices that strengthen the NCAA brand and its reputation.
- **Lack of revenue diversification.** The Association's reliance on a single source of revenue makes the organization vulnerable to competitive actions, adverse events, stakeholders' issues and the impact on the bundled rights agreement.
- **Regulatory intervention** that could impact the NCAA's ability to administer its core purpose, goals and legislative authority. Maintaining the current nonprofit tax status by ensuring that athletics is integral to higher education.
- **Adverse legal rulings** and interpretations by the court systems have the potential to impact the Association's ability to govern and regulate intercollegiate athletics, which could improve student-athlete experiences.
- **Security and privacy** of the media, transactions and data managed by the NCAA continues to grow, increasing the reputational and financial risks associated with a loss or breach of such information.
- **Physical security** of all stakeholders at collegiate athletics events managed or sanctioned by the NCAA requires ongoing focus and resources.

Next step will be to identify mitigating strategies for these risks.

Completion Date: April 29, 2010

Compliance Standards Task Force

David Berst, responsible staff member

Charge: Evaluate the role of institutional compliance officers and explore the feasibility of a certification program for institutions to demonstrate that they have met established standards of institutional control through a review of their compliance and monitoring programs.

Status: the I-A ADs appointees have met by conference call and members of the NCAA staff, a Committee on Infractions member and an Infractions Appeals Committee member are awaiting invitations to participate in the project. The NCAA volunteered to provide meeting space and logistical support to the group.

Completion Date: A report may be expected for the I-A ADs meeting September 2010 for consideration thereafter by the NCAA Division I structure.

* * *

Task Force #9

NCAA Initial-Eligibility Amateur Review Task Force

Kevin Lennon, responsible staff member

Task Force Charge: Conduct a review of the current initial-eligibility amateurism process; identify responsibilities for the Eligibility Center, academic and membership affairs, and enforcement; and present recommendations for consideration.

Status: The task force determined that, while the current model is much better than the previous model in which institutions certified amateurism eligibility, there is collective buy-in among the Eligibility Center and NCAA staff as to the need to refine current operating practices and protocols to create a more collaborative and transparent environment with the membership. In addition, it was determined that amateurism certifications will be conducted and completed in accordance with established business performance management principles, and that performance metrics will be used to ensure efficiency and ongoing efforts to improve. Finally, the current model of interaction between the amateurism certification process (ACP) and enforcement (including major enforcement; the Basketball Focus Group; and Agent, Gambling and Amaterism staffs), with strategic improvements, is the most efficient and effective to certify the amateur status of PSAs.

Completion Date: March 9, 2010

Employee Climate Assessment Task Force

Bob Fiala, responsible staff member

Task Force Charge: Conduct an organizational culture survey to provide information and a benchmark to the incoming president regarding the current NCAA office culture and climate.

Status: Consultants from Oliver Wyman assisted in developing a survey instrument to gather perceptions about the NCAA organizational culture, how well the NCAA is performing relative to its strategic plan and on the strategic priorities for the new President. On April 16, the survey was sent out to national office and Eligibility Center staff, select committees within the membership and some key external stakeholders. The survey will close on April 30 and Oliver Wyman will tabulate the results.

Completion Date: Oliver Wyman will provide a report summarizing the results of the survey by June 1.

* * *

Task Force #11

NCAA Youth Initiatives Task Force Program Description

Robert Vowels, responsible staff member

Task Force Charge: The Youth Initiatives Task Force (YITF) was charged with: (1) reviewing current programming, including program goals and target audiences; (2) developing a shared vision of NCAA youth programming with supporting goals for each youth initiative; (3) developing a coordinated approach that improves communications while recognizing the unique needs of each initiative within the overall shared vision; and (4) providing an ongoing means of evaluating the success of the various youth initiatives, which may lead to program modifications.

Status: Our vision of this new program is that it will be a turnkey toolkit or package that would be used by NCAA member institutions and community organizations. The toolkit would include a curriculum; event planning; marketing and communications tools; and a variety of games, simulations and activities that create a progression over time. The toolkit would allow member institutions or community groups to deliver this program and have all the elements for successful delivery included in the package. This new program will be launched in three distinct phases: Phase 1 has a target audience of 7th to 10th grade students; Phase 2 will then allow the program to be extended to K to 6th grade students; Phase 3 will then also include 11th and 12th grade students. We see the program as including an (annual?) event that serves as a "gateway" into the program, but that event is surrounded by a progression of activities and opportunities to engage across those 7th to10th grade years. Athletics serves the "hook" for the participants, but also allows the program to introduce academic achievement as a key content focus. An electronic "roadmap" is a key component of the program, which engages the youth, tracks their progress, and provides incentives and activities across the 7th to 10th grade years.

Completion Date: The first phase should launch in the summer of 2010, with the other phases being implemented over the next three to five years. While our target audience is 7th to 10th grade students, we believe that students might opt in or out at any time over that 7th to10th grade period.

Gender and Diversity Program Review Task Force

Bernard Franklin, responsible staff member

Task Force Charge: In August 2008, President Brand called for an audit of the Association's gender and diversity initiatives to evaluate and assess their relative success and organizational impact and to make recommendations where appropriate to strengthen the programs, create new programs or, in some cases, discontinue or redesign programs that may be less effective. The audit encompassed 18 programs with a budget of just under $6 million.

Status: The working group has completed the first phase of the review, and is now overseeing the implementation phase. During the 2010 NCAA Convention, the divisional governance bodies had the opportunity to review and comment on a framework and vision statement for gender and diversity initiatives. This framework will be presented to the Executive Committee for approval during the April 2010 meeting. The working group developed an extensive timeline with additional markers of progress set for August 2010, October 2010 and January 2011. Next steps include the remediation of any gaps between program design and execution, and the assessment of current programs against the newly defined vision and framework, as well as the development and implementation of a comprehensive tracking mechanism and program evaluation process. These steps should be completed by August 2010 and October 2010, respectively.

Completion Date: January 2011 (there will be a biennial review of the programs).

* * *

Task Force #13

Presidential Briefing Document Task Force

Wally Renfro and Lydia Sanchez, responsible staff members

Task Force Charge: Develop a briefing document for the incoming president that includes a SWOT analysis of each unit, identifies critical issues and reports on the results of the internal task forces.

Status: Most of the briefing documents have been received from each staff group; editing process is under way. Also included in the binder are entries for Association structure, national office structure, staff group structures, LLCs, major issues/challenges and task force summaries.

Completion Date: Anticipated to be completed at the time the new president is named.

Organizational Structure Task Force

Jim Isch, responsible staff member

Task Force Charge: Review the current internal executive organizational structure and prepare recommendations for the incoming president's consideration that will encourage and improve communications and teamwork.

Status: Oliver Wyman Consulting was hired to provide an independent recommendation of potential options.

Completion Date: Mid-May 2010.
\

* * *

Task Force #15

Division I Revenue Distribution Task Force

David Berst, responsible staff member

Task Force Charge: Review the revenue distribution formulas, as specified in the Constitution (i.e., Academic Enhancement, Basketball, Conference Grant, Grants-in-Aid, Sports Sponsorship, Special Assistance and Student-Athlete Opportunity Funds) and recommend to the Division I Board of Directors modifications appropriate for the next decade. The Task Force shall agree upon a set of guiding principles and guidelines to direct the discussions and recommendations.

Status: The group's first Web-based teleconference is scheduled for May 12, 2010, and it is expected that the group will meet once in person and conduct its remaining meetings via teleconferences.

Timeline: A report to the Division I Board of Directors is expected in August 2010.

REPORT OF THE APRIL 29, 2010, MEETING OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

1. **Opening Remarks from the Chair**. President Barker noted that this would be his last meeting and wanted to leave the group with a few thoughts:

   - Financial decisions often can be in conflict with our values/mission. The Association has evidenced that it can find equilibrium, as shown by the new Turner/CBS media contract. Emphasis should continue on supporting values-based decisions.

   - The NCAA needs to be human and transparent. A bureaucracy works against our values.

   - We need to link postseason competition more clearly to academic success. I see this as the next major step in academic reform.

   - We should survey our student-athletes to collect data regarding the question—If you had it to do over again, would you select the same institution to attend?

2. **Report of the January 16, 2010, Board of Directors meeting. The Board approved the report of its January 16, 2010, meeting**. (Unanimous Voice Vote.) [Reference Supplement No. 1.]

3. **Report of the Division I Presidential Advisory Group**. The Board received a report from Ann Millner, chair of the Division I Presidential Advisory Group (PAG), regarding the group's April 28, 2010, meeting. The Board was informed of PAG's view regarding various Board agenda items as they were considered by the Board. [Reference Supplement No. 3.]

4. **Report from the Interim President.** NCAA Interim President Jim Isch reported on the following items:

   a. **Introduction of NCAA President-Elect**. Mark Emmert, NCAA president-elect, was introduced to the Board. The president-elect addressed the group, noting the challenges ahead for the Association and his excitement in working with the NCAA staff and the membership to address them.

   b. **Media Contract**. The Board received a report from Greg Shaheen, NCAA senior vice president for basketball and business strategies, regarding the general terms of the NCAA's Turner/CBS media contract.

BOARD ACTION: The Board discussed expansion of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship field and agreed to expand the championship field from 65 to 68 teams. (Unanimous voice vote)

c. **Internal Task Forces**. Jim Isch informed the Board of the various short term task forces that have been formed to evaluate topics of importance to Division I and the national office. It is anticipated that appropriate recommendations from these groups will be reported to the Board of Directors and referred to appropriate groups within the governance structure for consideration.

5. **Final Report from the Football Academic Working Group**. The Board received the final report of the working group's key findings regarding the academic performance of Division I football student-athletes and recommendations for strategies to improve their academic performance.

BOARD ACTION: The Board expressed strong support for the first four recommendations, noting its intent to sponsor legislation in the 2010-11 cycle to implement the recommendations. The Board requested that the recommendations be put in legislative format for review during its August meeting, with the understanding that the working group will work with the Committee on Academic Performance to address CAP's concerns and any potential unintended consequences that could arise as a result of planned changes in the rules. (Unanimous voice vote) [Reference Supplement No. 5.]

6. **Division I Governance Structure Update**.

a. **Report of the March 23, 2010, meeting of the Leadership Council**. Damon Evans, chair of the Division I Leadership Council, reported the following from the March 23, 2010, Leadership Council meeting:

(1) The Council initiated discussion of cost savings recommendations from various Division I cabinets, as wells as financial recommendations discussed by the Division IA Athletics Directors Association. The Council recommended a more global approach when attempting to address spending in intercollegiate athletics. The Council suggested that principles be developed to guide a review of spending and costs. Several Board members suggested that central to values-based decision making will be identification of a set of guiding principles.

(2) The Council completed its study of the Division I membership standards and presented its final report to the Board, requesting that the Board sponsor legislation for the 2010-11 legislative cycle to implement the recommendations.

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the recommended Division I membership standards, with plans to review the recommendations in legislative format in August, prior to inserting them in to the 2010-11 legislative cycle. (Unanimous voice vote) [See Attachment for the membership standards.]

b. Report of the April 12-13, 2010, meeting of the Division I Legislative Council.

(1) Report on proposals receiving the requisite number of override votes. The Board was informed that the Legislative Council reconsidered Proposal Nos. 2009-22 and 2009-51-B, which were subject to override requests from the membership.

(a) The Council amended the effective date of Section E (related to delayed enrollment and organized competition) of Proposal No. 2009-22 to August 1, 2011, for sports other than tennis, and August 1, 2012, for tennis.

(b) The Council amended Proposal No. 2009-51-B to apply only to men's and women's basketball.

If these changes are acceptable to the membership, no override vote will be necessary at the 2011 NCAA Convention.

(2) Report of Actions Related to Proposals Recommended by the Basketball Academic Enhancement Group and Sponsored by the Board.

(a) The Council adopted Proposal No. 2009-97, which would specify that a student-athlete who receives athletically related financial aid in academic years following the departure of a head coach from the institution is not a counter, provided several criteria are met.

(b) The Council also adopted Sections A and B and defeated Sections C and D of Proposal No. 2009-98. Section A of the proposal specifies policies related to missed class time and Section B modifies the current departure/return restrictions in men's basketball. Section C of the proposal modifies the preseason playing and practice season regulations in men's basketball while Section D would have reduced the maximum number of contests in men's basketball by one.

(3) Report of Actions Related to Proposals that originated with the Basketball Focus Group (BFG). The Council took the following actions regarding the BFG proposals:

(a) Referred Proposal No. 2009-100 to the Division I Men's Basketball Issues Committee for review and consideration of possible legal issues related to the proposal. Proposal No. 2009-100 would specify that an institution shall not host, sponsor or conduct a nonscholastic basketball practice, contest or event in which men's basketball prospective student-athletes participate on its campus or at an off-campus facility regularly used by the institution for practice and/or competition by any of the institution's sport programs.

(b) Adopted Proposal No. 2009-101, as amended by Proposal No. 2009-101-1, which would permit men's basketball coaches to engage in recruiting conversations with prospects during the institution's men's basketball camps or clinics.

(c) Defeated Proposal No. 2009-102, which would specify that in men's basketball, an institution shall only employ (either on a salaried or a volunteer basis) enrolled students or institutional staff members in any capacity at its camps and clinics.

(4) Report of Actions Related to other Selected Proposals. The Council adopted the following selected proposals:

(a) Proposal No. 2009-32-B, which would permit telephone calls at an institution's discretion during a contact period in sports other than football with defined recruiting calendars. D'Antonio noted that the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee expressed its opposition to this legislation; however, the Council supported it.

(b) Proposal No. 2009-47-B, which would specify that that prior to August 1 of a prospective student-athlete's senior year in high school, an institution shall not provide a written offer of athletically related financial aid or indicate in writing to the prospective student-athlete that an athletically related grant-in-aid will be offered by the institution.

(c) Proposal No. 2009-75-B as amended by Proposal No. 2009-75-B-1, which would specify that the required medical examination or evaluation that student-athletes who are beginning their initial season of eligibility and students who are trying out for a team must undergo prior to participation

in voluntary summer conditioning or voluntary individual workouts pursuant to the safety exception, practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities shall include a sickle cell solubility test (SST), unless documented results of a prior test are provided to the institution or the individual declines the test and signs a written release.

(5) Resolution. Harvey Perlman presented a resolution requesting that the Legislative Council develop a draft of a policy statement that the Board of Directors and Legislative Council might adopt that would provide better guidance regarding consideration of proposed NCAA legislation by applying a metric to identify those legislative proposals to defeat or consider, and those proposals to call to the attention of the Board. The objective of this policy statement should be twofold: (1) to limit the number of legislative proposals approved to those that identify and document a clear national problem that needs to be addressed, and (2) identifies those proposals that might appropriately be considered directly by the Board.

In considering a policy directed at (1) above, the Legislative Council may wish to consider procedures that assure proposals receive the comments of the various governance groups and what evidence should be submitted with any proposal to document its need. In considering a policy directed at (2) above, the Legislative Council may wish to consider the extent to which the proposed legislation has received broad support or whether a governance group or other cabinet or council has rejected the proposal. It may also wish to consider whether the proposed legislation implements a core NCAA value or is at the periphery or has implications that may conflict with a core NCAA value.

The Board would value the Council's advice regarding possible categories of proposals that should be reviewed by the Board (e.g., those that intrude on student athlete time or benefits, those that increase costs).

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the resolution. (Unanimous voice vote)

7. **Litigation Update**. Elsa Cole, NCAA General Counsel, provided this report to the Board.

8. **Report from the Committee on Academic Performance**. The group received an update on the activities of the Committee on Academic Performance (CAP) from the chair, Walter Harrison. Harrison previewed the latest Academic Performance Rate (APR) data, noting recent trends in football, men's basketball and baseball. The committee continues its

extensive review of the Academic Performance Program (APP) and supported a request to continue the Division I Supplemental Support Fund for fiscal year 2011.

9. **Report of New Budget Initiatives for Division I.** Harvey Perlman informed the Board of the new Division I budget initiatives for fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12.

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the new initiatives. (Unanimous voice vote) [Reference Supplement No. 9.]

10. **Committee on Infractions.**

a. **Committee on Infractions Appointment**. The Board appointed Gregory Sankey, associate commissioner of the Southeastern Conference, to the Division I Committee on Infractions. (Unanimous voice vote) [Reference Supplement No. 13.]

b. **Review of Infractions Issues**. The Board received an update on the work of the Task Force to Clarify Roles of the Committee on Infractions and Infractions Appeals Committee. The Board was informed that the NCAA staff along with Shirley Raines have been engaged in conversations with the national testing agencies to identify ways in which improved and more timely information can be shared with member institutions and the NCAA Eligibility Center in instances in which a test score is being questioned or challenged by the testing agency. Raines agreed to work with the task force on issues regarding "strict liability" that affects institutions and consideration of "evidence" when such cases are deemed to affect eligibility for competition. Future reports will be provided to the Board as the discussions continue.

11. **Governance Transitional Issues.**

a. **Appointment of new members to the Board of Directors**. The Board unanimously approved the following new Board members whose terms begin following the Board's April 2010 meeting:

- Nathan Hatch, Wake Forest University, Atlantic Coast Conference
- Lee Todd, University of Kentucky, Southeastern Conference
- Steadman Upham, University of Tulsa, Conference USA

b. Appointments to the NCAA Executive Committee. The Board unanimously approved the appointment of the following Board members to the Executive Committee whose terms begin following the Board's April 2010 meeting:

- James Cofer, University of Louisiana at Monroe
- David Schmidly, University of New Mexico

c. Appointment of FBS Members to Councils and Cabinets. The Board reviewed the slate of nominees for councils and cabinets submitted by the FBS conferences. Although the slate falls slightly short of the enhanced diversity requirements, the Board agreed to approve the slate with the condition that any subsequent modifications due to attrition would have to assist in meeting the enhanced diversity requirements. (Unanimous voice vote)

12. Expression of Appreciation. David Berst, NCAA vice president of Division I, thanked departing Board members Michael Adams, president, University of Georgia, Southeastern Conference, and Shirley Raines, president, Memphis University, Conference USA, for their service to Division I. He gave a gave a special thanks to James Barker, president, Clemson University, Atlantic Coast Conference, for his service as chair of the Board.

13. Future meeting Dates.

a. August 12, 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana.

b. October 28, 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana.

c. January 15, 2011, NCAA Convention, San Antonio, Texas.

d. April 28, 2011, National Office, Indianapolis, Indiana

e. August 11, 2011, National Office, Indianapolis, Indiana

f. October 27, 2011, National Office, Indianapolis, Indiana

Board of Directors chair: James Barker, Clemson University
Staff Liaisons: S. David Berst, Division I governance
Jacqueline Campbell, Division I governance

The National Collegiate Athletic Association
April 30, 2010 SDB/JGC:vlm

NCAA DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS
April 29, 2010, MEETING ATTENDANCE

Board members in attendance:
Michael F. Adams, University of Georgia, Southeastern Conference
Charles Bantz, Indiana University-Purdue University of Indianapolis, Summit League
James Barker, Clemson University, Atlantic Coast Conference (chair)
William Beauchamp, University of Portland, West Coast Conference
Robert Bruininks, University of Minnesota, Big Ten Conference
Carol Cartwright, president, Bowling Green State University, Mid-American Conference
Jim Cofer, University of Louisiana at Monroe, Sun Belt Conference
Greg Dell'Omo, Robert Morris University, Northeast Conference
Judy Genshaft, University of South Florida, Big East Conference
Robert Kustra, Boise State University, Western Athletic Conference
William Meehan, Jacksonville State University, Ohio Valley Conference
Ann Millner, Weber State University, Big Sky Conference
Kevin Mullen, Siena College, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference
Harvey Perlman, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Big Twelve Conference
Shirley Raines, University of Memphis, Conference USA
Edward Ray, Oregon State University, Pacific-10 Conference
David Schmidly, University of New Mexico, Mountain West Conference

Board members not in attendance:
William R. Harvey, Hampton University, Mideastern Athletic Conference
John Peters, Northern Illinois University, Mid-American Conference

New Board members in attendance as observers:
Nathan Hatch, Wake Forest University, Atlantic Coast Conference
Lee Todd, University of Kentucky, Southeastern Conference
Steadman Upham, University of Tulsa, Conference USA

NCAA staff Liaisons in attendance:
S. David Berst, NCAA
Jacqueline Campbell, NCAA, recording secretary

Guests from other Division I governance bodies:
Damon Evans, University of Georgia, chair of the Division I Leadership Council
Joseph Castiglione, University of Oklahoma, chair of the Football Academic Working Group
Joseph D'Antonio, Big East Conference, chair of the Division I Legislative Council
Walter Harrison, University of Hartford, chair of the Division I Committee on Academic Performance

Other NCAA staff members in attendance: Scott Bearby, Elsa Cole, Erik Christianson, Joni Comstock, Julie Cromer, Diane Dickman, Lynn Holzman, Michelle Hosick, Jim Isch, Tom Jernstedt, Kevin Lennon, Steve Mallonee, Keith Martin, Delise O'Meally, Tom Paskus, Todd Petr, Dennis Poppe, William Regan, Wallace Renfro, Carl Segura, Greg Shaheen, Robert Vowels and Wendy Walters.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association
April 30, 2010 SDB/JGC:vlm

NCAA Leadership Council Final Report Regarding Division I Membership Criteria April 29, 2010

Background.

On August 9, 2007, the Division I Board of Directors adopted Legislative Proposal 2007-10, which established a four-year a moratorium that prohibited consideration of any new institutional, conference or multi-divisional Division I members until August 2011.

The Board concluded that the time was right, following similar moratoriums in Divisions II and III, for the Division I membership to assess and study the impact of membership migration and to develop reasonable philosophical expectations and legislative requirements for membership in the division. The Board requested the Leadership Council to conduct this study and to make appropriate recommendations regarding possible NCAA legislation.

A preliminary report of recommendations was provided to the Board of Directors in April 2009 and the Division I governance structure, member conferences and institutions were asked to provide reactions. The Leadership Council has continued discussions and submits the following report of recommendations to the Board of Directors for its April 29, 2010 meeting.

Excerpt from the Division I Manual--Division I Philosophy (Bylaw 20.9).

Athletics programs in Division I are guided by a philosophy statement that among other things:

- Emphasizes high standards of academic quality and breadth of academic opportunity;
- Strives for regional and national excellence and prominence and recognizes the dual objective of serving both the institutional community and the general public;
- Provides for extensive opportunities for participation in varsity intercollegiate athletics for both men and women (consistent with the requirements of Title IX) and sponsors at the highest feasible level of intercollegiate competition, men's and women's basketball and football, recognizing subdivisional designations in football;
- Advocates scheduling athletics contests primarily among Division I institutions;
- Emphasizes maintaining institutional control over all funds supporting athletics; and that
- Understands, respects, and supports the programs and philosophies of other membership divisions.

Additional Standards and Assumptions Relied Upon by the Leadership Council in its discussions included that:

- Applicants for membership in Division I should be required to meet, over a period of time, prescribed criteria in order to assure compatibility and compliance with the principles and program objectives of Division I.

- Central to the mission of intercollegiate athletics in Division I is the academic and athletic success of student-athletes, as well as protection of the student-athletes' health and well-being.
- Division I members should be expected to demonstrate a meaningful program-wide financial commitment across its entire athletics program, including for financial aid, number of sports sponsored, recruiting, athletics facilities, rules compliance, coaching, team travel and academic support services.
- Membership standards should promote conference stability, provide access to Division I for qualifying institutions and treat institutions fairly in determining their status as members of Division I.
- The number and nature of multisport conferences in Division I are fundamental considerations in establishing the level, structure and scope of Division I championship competition, the allocation of financial benefits and access to services and governance of the division.
- The multisport conference is the foundation of the NCAA DI governance structure, championships structure, and compliance structure and is rightly positioned in the proposed Division I membership process as a gatekeeper in the new membership model.
- A more comprehensive definition of a multisport conference is appropriate.
- There is a finite level of resources, benefits and good will available to current members of the division, which should be maintained or enhanced through any further expansion of membership.
- Potential new members of Division I should be expected to demonstrate a sustained commitment to Division I standards, assumptions and the Division I philosophy statement before election to membership in the division.
- Current voting ratios/percentages by conference and subdivision within Division I should be maintained through appropriate mathematical adjustments in the event the membership increases.
- The Division I brand has a value that can be approximated through a calculation of the value of direct and indirect services and benefits, as well as of the "image" of Division I and its subdivisions.

Recommendations.

The Council requests that the Board of Directors endorse the following recommendations for further discussion and debate by Division I membership groups and conferences during the spring 2010 and that in August 2010, the Board sponsor appropriate legislative proposals for membership consideration in January and April 2011.

1. **Potential new members of Division I shall enter the division through a four-year "reclassification" process following no less than five-years of membership in Division II. Further, the process described in Bylaw 20.5 shall apply, and an application for membership in Division I will be accepted only after presenting a bona fide offer of**

membership from a Division I multisport, voting conference. The sponsoring conference will be expected to provide appropriate guidance and counsel to the transitioning new member, assist with scheduling, monitor student-athlete well being and enhance accountability during the transition process.

Comment: Requiring conference sponsorship and prior membership in Division II is intended to promote the long-term stability of the Association. There should be a check list to assist conferences and transitioning institutions to ensure that institutions are meeting their appropriate benchmarks. The Administration Cabinet should provide additional thought to the timing of when various benchmarks should apply.

2. **The "provisional" process provided for in Bylaw 20.3.1, which now permits an institution outside the NCAA to become a Division I member through a seven-year process, shall be eliminated.**

   Comment: Multisport conferences within the Division I championships and governance structure are well suited to determine the needs of conferences and thereby the division. Experience in Division II serves as an appropriate platform to demonstrate the traits necessary to become a productive Division I member.

3. **An application fee shall be required before entering the "reclassification" process, which should either be commensurate with; (1) the estimated annual average value of direct benefits through distributions and championships made available to Division I members - - currently approximately $1,300,000, or (2) the "median" annual value of direct benefits through distributions and championships - - currently approximately $900,000.**

   Comment: This requirement should be data-driven and will change from time to time. This calculation does not include the costs of services or costs to administer the reclassification program. Upon election to Division I membership, the application fee shall be deposited in the NCAA Student Athlete Opportunity Distribution Fund. In the event an institution withdraws during the reclassification process, the application fee would be returned to the institution on a prorated basiss—75% after year one, $50% after year two, 30% after year three and 0% thereafter. It should also be emphasized that conferences may require separate fees for joining the conference. Discussion occurred regarding alternatives where the application fee would be analogous to a business model tied to "brand" value or possibly tied to the educational and administrative costs of the process. It was concluded that as a higher-education association, data based on direct benefits received would be a simple and clear method and also would demonstrate a meaningful commitment from the prospective member.

4. Upon beginning the "reclassification" process, the institution must meet Division I sports sponsorship requirements (i.e., 50 percent of the grants-in-aid maximums in the conference sponsored sports in which the institution will participate). In addition, the alternative means of satisfying this requirement now set forth in Bylaw 20.9.1.2-(b) (c) and (d) would continue to apply.

Comment: This is the current requirement and no change is recommended. Data reviewed regarding a possible increase to these minimums did not appear to support a change.

5. A prospective member institution may not be elected to active membership in Division I if it is subject to a "historical penalty" under the APR program.

Comment: The Leadership Council believes a demonstrated commitment to academics should be required. The Committee on Academic Performance recommends that a numerical standard (e.g., 925) be avoided in deference to a "category" of academic penalties.

6. A preliminary NCAA certification shall be required in year 1 of the four-year "reclassification" period and a full compliance review shall be required before final election to Division I membership. (See Proposed New Division I Reclassification Process beginning on page 9.)

Comment: There should be an expectation that the sponsoring conference will assist the institution in this process and that special attention should be given to rules compliance, academic support services, recruiting, coaches, team travel and facilities. Meeting standards early in the process and then demonstrating the ability to sustain such standards is important. The review process must make it clear that reclassification is an evolutionary process so that there is no confusion that receiving positive marks during the certification process does not guarantee eventual Division I membership.

7. A member institution in Division I will qualify to begin receiving revenue distributions related to sports sponsorship and grants-in-aid upon serving three calendar years as an "active" Division I member. The institution would qualify in year one of active membership to receive Student-athlete Opportunity, Special Assistance and Academic Enhancement Funds, as well as basketball grant funds as determined by its sponsoring conference.

Comment: This change ensures that sustainability in the division is not based solely on receipt of NCAA revenues.

8. The multi-divisional practice that permits a Division II or III institution to designate one men's and one women's sport in Division I shall be discontinued upon the completion of the 2010-11 academic year, except in a sport where no championship is conducted in its division. Division II and III institutions that sponsor sports teams in Division I in 2010-11 may continue to do so in the sports so designated but will forfeit this opportunity permanently if it fails to conduct the sport in Division I in any ensuing academic year. No change is recommended to qualify for participation in national collegiate championships.

Comment: It appears there is agreement to discontinue multidivisional competition, but teams that currently conduct such division I programs should be "grandfathered."

9. A multisport conference in Division I may not receive voting privileges, conference grant funds or committee service positions in the Division I governance structure until legislation is enacted that names the conference among those identified in applicable sections of Constitution 4 related to representation and voting ratios on the Division I Board of Directors, Legislative and Leadership Councils and the five cabinets. (Refer to No. 13 below.)

Comment: This is the current requirement in Division I. Refer to Constitution 3.3.3.2.

10. No change in criteria is recommended for designation in the Football Championship Subdivision. In addition, a two thirds majority vote of FCS conference representatives present and voting shall be required to modify NCAA rules related to the number of football grants-in-aid and membership standards for the subdivision.

Comment: FCS members do not support additional membership requirements to be designated as an FCS member. The unique and fundamental rules related to the number of grants-in-aid and FCS membership standards define the subdivision and should require broad support before modifications occur.

11. The FBS subdivision shall require a bona fide invitation for membership in an FBS conference before an FCS institution may be reclassified to the FBS subdivision.

Comments: The FBS conferences do not support additional membership requirements for its subdivision. However, the bowl structure of the FBS should not be expected to support an expanded membership in that subdivision without appropriate conference sponsorship and support.

12. The role of the Administration Cabinet and the benchmarks for the four-year reclassification process shall be reviewed by the Administration Cabinet to ensure coordination by the cabinet with sponsoring conferences.

Comments: Through coordination with conferences in providing guidance and assistance to potential new member institutions, some procedural functions performed now by the Administrative Cabinet could be transferred to conference offices.

13. Constitution 3.2.3.1 shall be amended to provide that the vote to elect an institution to Division I active membership upon recommendation by the Administration cabinet shall be taken by the Board of Directors, rather than the Leadership Council.

Comments: This should be noncontroversial legislation and is recommend by the Leadership Council.

14. NCAA Division I – Recommended Multisport Conference Standards and Definition.

a. Institutional Members.

(1) A multisport conference shall have a minimum of seven (7) active Division I members.
(2) A multisport conference shall have a minimum of seven (7) active members participate in both men's and women's basketball.

b. Conference Sports Sponsorship.

(1) A multisport conference shall sponsor a minimum of 12 NCAA Division I sports.
(2) A multisport conference shall sponsor a minimum of six men's sports. In each of these six sports, a minimum of six active members shall compete.
(3) A multisport conference shall sponsor a minimum of six women's sports. In each of these six sports, a minimum of six active members shall compete, or a minimum of five active members for an emerging sport.
(4) In addition to men's basketball, a multisport conference shall, at a minimum, sponsor either football, with a minimum of six active members competing in football, or sponsor two additional men's team sports, with a minimum of six active members participating in each of these two sports.
(5) In addition to women's basketball, a multisport conference shall sponsor at least two additional women's team sports, with a minimum of six active members participating in each of these two sports.

c. Regular Season Conference Competition.

(1) Basketball: Basketball teams shall participate in a regular season conference schedule of a double round robin, or a minimum of 14 regular season conference contests.
(2) Minimum Required Team Sports, Other Than Basketball [b- (4) and (5) above]: In the team sports sponsored to meet the minimum team sports sponsorship requirement, teams shall compete in a minimum regular season conference schedule of five contests. A minimum of five regular season conference contests must be hosted by one of the two competing teams at its home site venue.

d. Officiating. A multisport conference shall provide oversight of the officiating programs for selecting, training and assigning officials for its men's and women's basketball programs.

e. Compliance. A multisport conference shall have a comprehensive compliance program.

f. Continuity. A multisport conference must meet the institutional membership requirement (a. above) before it may be considered for continuity. To establish continuity, a multisport conference must meet the sports sponsorship and regular season competition requirements (b. and c. above) for a period of eight consecutive years. If a conference establishes continuity, it may be considered for multisport membership in Division I.

g. Core. A multisport conference that is recognized in the NCAA Governance Structure as a result of legislation [see No. 9 above] shall be considered a core conference. A core conference shall:

(1) Have representation and voting standing in the NCAA Division I Governance Structure.
(2) Be eligible to submit nominees for and have its delegates serve on NCAA Division I committees.
(3) Be eligible to receive AQ into NCAA championships, provided the conference competes with a minimum of six active participants in the sport.
(4) Receive conference grant funds.
(5) Receive, on behalf of its members, Special Assistance/Student-Athlete Opportunity Funds.

Division I Reclassification Process.

The following information outlines the membership reclassification process for any Division II or non-NCAA institution seeking to reclassify its entire athletics program to Division I membership. It should be noted that multidivisional membership (i.e., classifying one men's and or one women's sport other than football and basketball in Division I) will be discontinued following the 2010-11 academic year for any additional Division II or III institutions.

General Requirements.

The following general requirements must be satisfied prior to an institution entering the reclassification process.

- The reclassifying institution must have been an active NCAA Division II member for the preceding five years.
- The institution must be meeting applicable Division I minimum financial aid and sports-sponsorship membership requirements.
- The institution must have been extended a bona fide offer of membership by an active DI multisport voting conference.
- The institution and conference must complete an application form accompanied by an application fee (based on a yet to be determined figure based on either the average or mean of the Division I revenue distributions and championship benefits in the year of application) no later than June 1 preceding entry into year one of the reclassification process that is approved by the Division I Administration Cabinet. The institution must provide notice if it is currently involved in an investigation, an infractions case or on probation with its current governing body.
- The institution must submit a skeletal strategic plan to the Administration Cabinet that addresses the Division I philosophy statement (see Bylaw 20.9) and athletics certification operating principles (see Bylaw 22.2) approved by the conference office no later than June 1 preceding entry into year one of the reclassification process.

[Note: The Administration Cabinet shall have oversight responsibilities and shall monitor each institution's progress through the reclassification process. The cabinet shall have the authority to decline moving an institution to the ensuing year of the process if it deems that deficiencies warrant that the institution repeat a year].

Year One.

- Attendance at an orientation session conducted by the national office staff related to basic Division I operating rules and membership requirements. Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Attendance at the NCAA Convention Division I Issues Forum and business session (if such a session is conducted). Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Attendance at a regional rules seminar conducted by the NCAA. Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president [or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution], the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Apply all Division I legislation except scheduling requirements and continuing eligibility requirements (e.g., progress-toward-degree, five year rule) for student-athletes who are completing their final season of competition and were enrolled at the institution at least one year prior to entering year one of the reclassification process.
- Completion of a preliminary NCAA athletics certification orientation (conference representatives will also be required to be in attendance).
- Process institutional and individual student-athlete violations of Division I legislation through the Division I enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement processes. The institution shall be subject to any and all sanctions for violations of Division I legislation.
- Submit an annual report and an updated strategic plan by June 1 based on feedback from the previous year's plan. The institution shall report all violations to the Administration Cabinet as part of the annual report and provide notice if the institution is currently involved in an investigation, infractions case or on probation with its current governing body.

Year Two.

- Full compliance with all Division I legislation and membership requirements.
- Attendance at the NCAA Convention Division I Issues Forum and business session (if applicable). Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Attendance at a regional rules seminar conducted by the NCAA. Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Completion of a compliance review conducted by the national office and submission of a report with an institutional response to the findings and recommendations.
- Process institutional and individual student-athlete violations of Division I legislation through the Division I enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement processes. The institution shall be subject to any and all sanctions for violations of Division I legislation.
- Submit an annual report and an updated strategic plan by June 1 based on feedback from the previous year's plan. The institution shall report all violations to the Administration Cabinet as part of the annual report and provide notice if the institution is currently involved in an investigation, infractions case or on probation with its current governing body.

Year Three.

- Attendance at the NCAA Convention Division I Issues Forum and business session (if applicable). Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Attendance at a regional rules seminar conducted by the NCAA. Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.

- Completion of an athletics certification orientation.
- Process institutional and individual student-athlete violations of Division I legislation through the Division I enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement processes. The institution shall be subject to any and all sanctions for violations of Division I legislation.
- Submit an annual report and an updated strategic plan by June 1 based on feedback from the previous year's plan. The institution shall report all violations to the Administration Cabinet as part of the annual report and provide notice if the institution is currently involved in an investigation, infractions case or on probation with its current governing body.

Year Four.

- Successfully complete an NCAA athletics certification and evaluation visit.
- Attendance at the NCAA Convention Division I Issues Forum and business session (if applicable). Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Attendance at a regional rules seminar conducted by the NCAA. Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president [or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution], the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Process institutional and individual student-athlete violations of Division I legislation through the Division I enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement processes. The institution shall be subject to any and all sanctions for violations of Division I legislation.
- Submit an annual report and an updated strategic plan by June 1 based on feedback from the previous year's plan. The institution shall report all violations to the Administration Cabinet as part of the annual report and provide notice if the institution is currently involved in an investigation, infractions case or on probation with its current governing body.
- A prospective member institution may not be elected to active membership if it is subject to a historical penalty under the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program.

Post-Reclassification.

- After completion of the four year reclassification process, the Board of Directors, on the recommendation of the Division I Administration Cabinet, shall have the authority to elect the institution to active Division I status.
- The institution must submit a progress report to the Committee on Athletics Certification regarding its progress on any plans for improvement (as previously recommended by the committee) no later than the conclusion of its second year of active Division I membership.
- A new Division I institution will qualify to receive revenue distributions related to sports sponsorship and grants-in-aid after serving three calendar years as an active Division I member.
- A new Division I institution will qualify immediately to receive Student-Athlete Opportunity, Special Assistance and Academic Enhancement Funds, as well as basketball grant funds as determined by the institution's conference.