A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet

Teleconference June 25, 2009

1. Opening remarks. [No action anticipated.]

2. Review of minutes of February 17-18, 2009, Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet meeting. [Minutes were sent previously to all cabinet members.] [**Action anticipated**.]

3. Cabinet Policies and Operating Procedures. [Supplement No. 1] [No action anticipated.]

   Background: *Note cabinet mission and principles on Page No. 2 of Policies and Operating Procedures Manual. Appendix N, Conflict of Interest Policy, has been revised. Also note Appendixes P, Academic Performance Program, and Q, Budget Timeline, were added.*

4. National office cost reduction efforts. (Jim Isch) [No action anticipated.]

   Background: *In a response to the growing economic uncertainty that is impacting member institutions, Myles Brand has directed national office leadership to find $5 million in cost savings from the national office operating budget without impacting the current level of service to the membership. Moneys saved by this initiative will be redistributed to the membership in accordance with the supplemental revenue distribution process. Jim Isch, Senior Vice President of Administration and CFO, will provide a brief summary of the national office's cost reduction efforts.*

5. Bylaw and Practices Review. [Supplement No. 2] (NCAA staff) [**Action anticipated**.]

   Background*: Given the current economic conditions that are stressing athletics budgets, the Division I Board requested that the councils and cabinets review all operational aspects under their purview to identify bylaws and practices that could be modified to provide financial relief to the membership. The NCAA staff will outline this initiative and request that each cabinet member submit concepts that may be worth exploring for possible discussion at the cabinet's September meeting. Cabinet members should begin thinking about NCAA rules in Bylaw 17 and championship policies that are ripe for this type of*

discussion. These concepts will be collected after the conference call and AdCom will assist in prioritizing the list for full cabinet discussion in September.

6. Report of Olympic Sports Liaison Committee. [Supplement No. 3] (Chris Hoyles) [**Action anticipated**.]

   Background: *The Olympic Sports Liaison Committee is requesting the cabinet's approval of its legislative recommendations for the 2009-10 legislative cycle. Both proposals relate to eligibility requirements for student-athletes to practice with an institutions team.*

7. Report of Men's Basketball Issues Committee. [Supplement No. 4] (Larry Williams) [**Action anticipated**.]

   Background: *The Men's Basketball Issues Committee is requesting the cabinet's approval of two legislative recommendations for the 2009-10 legislative cycle. One recommendation is to permit institutions to subscribe to recruiting and video services under certain circumstances and the second relates to evaluation activities of noncoaching athletics department staff members.*

8. Report of Women's Basketball Issues Committee. [Supplement No. 5] (Myndee Larsen) [**Action anticipated**.]

   Background: *The Women's Basketball Issues Committee is requesting the cabinet's approval of two legislative recommendations for the 2009-10 legislative cycle. One proposal relates to evaluations during standardized test weekends and the second would preclude summer evaluations at noninstitutional nonorganized events.*

9. Report of Football Issues Committee. [Supplement No. 6] (Keith Tribble) [**Action anticipated.**]

   Background: *The Football Issues Committee is requesting the cabinet's approval of several NCAA Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) legislative recommendations for the 2009-10 legislative cycle. The recommendations include one related to the timing of football camps, another would permit FCS coaches to evaluate at nonscholastic events, a third would increase the preseason squad size in FCS from 90 to 95 and a fourth would allow FCS coaches to make contact with a prospect prior to the prospect's competition.*

10. Report of Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports. [Supplement No. 7, to be distributed prior to teleconference] (Connie Dillon) [**Action anticipated.]**

    Background: *The committee is scheduled to meet June 5-7, 2009.*

11. Sand volleyball playing and practice season. [Supplement No. 8] (Brad Hostetter) [**Action anticipated.**]

    Background: The *cabinet will review a playing and practice season's model developed by The American Volleyball Coaches Association. The cabinet is being asked to sponsor legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle on legislative proposals for the length of the playing and practice season for this emerging sport.*

12. Report of the Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct Committee. [Supplement No. 9, to be distributed prior to teleconference] (Rachel Newman) [**Action anticipated**.]

    Background: *Current NCAA policy precludes the hosting of championship events in metropolitan areas where sports wagering occurs. The policy does not distinguish between predetermined and nonpredetermined championship sites. In addition, the current policy does not define "metropolitan area". The Executive Committee requested feedback from the Championships/Sport Management Cabinet as well as the Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct Committee regarding these two issues.*

13. Sports committees' recommendations regarding Division I and National Collegiate Championships. (Committee or liaison listed in parenthesis) [**Action anticipated**.]

    Background: *The cabinet will review informational items and formulate a position and/or offer suggested modifications regarding the action items contained in the following sport committee requests:*

    a. Football Championship Committee. [Supplement No. 10] (Greg Burke) [**Action anticipated.**]

       Background: *The Football Championship Committee is requesting approval of AQs.*

    b. Division I Wrestling Committee. [Supplement No. 11] (Jim Fallis) [No action anticipated.]

Background: *The Wrestling Committee is considering a proposal from ESPN to change the date of the Division I Wrestling Championships to the same weekend as the Division I Men's Ice Hockey Championship.*

14. Update travel cost management initiatives. [Supplement No. 12] (Steve Brown) [No action anticipated.]

    Background: *The cabinet will be provided an update on championships travel, cost and capacity. In addition, the cabinet will be provided an evaluation of the championships from all involved including student-athletes, tournament directors, officials and institutions.*

15. Future meeting dates and sites.

    a. September 15-16, 2009; Indianapolis Downtown Marriott, Indianapolis.

    b. February 16-17, 2010; The Westin Indianapolis.

    c. September 14-15, 2010; The Westin Indianapolis.

16. Other business.

    - Southeastern Conference letter regarding track and field regional qualifying and the women's soccer tournament format.

17. Adjournment.

# # # # #

NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet

Policies and Operating Procedures

[Effective April 22, 2009]

NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet

Policies and Operating Procedures

Table of Contents

Objectives at the Levels below the Board of Directors for all Division I Cabinets 1

Cabinet Mission and Principles 2

Cabinet Responsibilities 3-4

Cabinet Organization 5-7

Representational Requirements and the Appointment Process 8

Agenda Development and Report Distribution 9

Cabinet Communication within the Governance Structure 10

Establishment of Brackets/Field Sizes 11-12

Working Principles for Seeding/Pairing/Site Selection 13

Appeals of Championships Matters 14

Legislative Process 15-17

Liaison Assignments 18

Appendixes

Appendix A -- Roster of Cabinet Members

Appendix B -- Committees Appointed By and That Report to the Championships/Sports Management Cabinet

Appendix C -- Sport Sponsorship Levels and Bracket Sizes

Appendix D -- Sports Sponsorship

Appendix E -- Chronology of Bracket/Field Size Expansion

Appendix F -- Squad Sizes/Official Traveling Parties

Appendix G -- Liaison Assignments

Appendix H -- Meeting Schedule for Division I Governance Entities

Appendix I -- Chart of Division I Legislative Process

Appendix J -- Excerpted Legislation Governing Division I Cabinets and Committees

Appendix K -- Guidance Regarding Meeting Minutes, Notes and E-Mail

Appendix L -- Championships Participation

Appendix M -- Race and Ethnicity Report for Championships Participation

Appendix N -- Conflict of Interest Policy

Appendix O -- Vacation Policy for Championships Infractions
Appendix P -- NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program
Appendix Q -- Budget Timeline, Biennial

OBJECTIVES OF THE NEW NCAA DIVISION I GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

If the recent governance restructuring is to ultimately achieve its desired goals and be responsive to the NCAA Division I Board of Directors, it is imperative that both staff liaisons and representatives serving within the governance structure be mindful of the objectives behind this restructuring and stay true to its intent.

OBJECTIVES AT THE LEVELS BELOW THE NCAA DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF ALL DIVISION I CABINETS

1. Develop a national dialog within the full membership on consequential issues facing Division I and use representative governance bodies to develop legislation and discuss policy issues.

2. Achieve a significant contributing role for the membership in decisions that set the direction of the Association.

3. Identify a delegated agenda from the Board on which the governance entities take action for the Association.

4. Ensure governance matters are addressed at the appropriate level in the substructure so the Board and the NCAA Division I Legislative Council and the NCAA Division I Leadership Council are not tied down addressing minutiae.

5. Attract the right people to serve (experience, maturity, respect and judgment) for meaningful work.

6. Regain membership trust that the operating level of intercollegiate athletics has a voice in consequential decisions within the Association.

7. Provide for minimum representational (functional, gender, ethnicity) distribution in some defined sense overall within the governance structure, but not necessarily on each Council, cabinet or committee.

Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet
Policies and Operating Procedures

CABINET MISSION AND PRINCIPLES

Mission

The Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet will oversee the Division I Championships (including National Collegiate) and provide leadership at a national level for Division I sports programs, sports committees and sports issues committees. The Championships shall provide the highest quality student-athlete experience and fair national-level competition within the context of higher education and stated NCAA Core Values and constitutional principles, particularly those principles related to diversity and gender equity.

Principles

A Division I Championship will be conducted showcasing student-athletes and institutions whose performances have earned them the opportunity to compete for a national championship through automatic qualification or at-large selection. In addition, a Division I Championship shall:

1. Be presented as the foremost intercollegiate athletic event in that sport under the direction and supervision of the appropriate sports committee.

2. Be conducted under fair and safe conditions.

3. Provide championship access reflective of the quality of nationwide competitive excellence and membership sponsorship of the sport.

4. Insure that long-term sustainability of the championship is reflected in sound fiscal management and the development of strategies that can diversify and enhance revenue streams.

5. Be conducted in collaboration with corporate, media and host partners in recognition of their potential to strengthen and support the championship.

6. Recognize the dual objective of serving both the university/college community and the general public.

CABINET RESPONSIBILITES

1. The NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet has oversight authority in the following areas:

    a. NCAA Division I National Championships and National Collegiate Championships;

    b. Sports sciences issues, including injury surveillance, drug education and drug testing;

    c. Playing and practice seasons;

    d. Olympic sports issues; and

    e. Sports and sports issues committees.

2. The following committees report to the cabinet:

    a. All sports committees and sports issues committees;

    b. Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports Committee;

    c. Olympic Sports Liaison Committee; and

    d. Playing Rules Oversight Panel (informational purposes).

3. Additional Responsibilities:

    a. Oversight of the NCAA statistics program;

    b. Oversee the Championships Awards Program;

    c. Offering comments on legislative proposals as directed by the Legislative Council; and

    d. Provide counsel to NCAA staff on matters under the cabinet jurisdiction.

Initially the cabinet will meet two times annually (February and September). The number of annual meetings will be evaluated on a regular basis. The cabinet's meetings will take place during a designated three week window for all Division I cabinets. If a cabinet member is unable to attend a cabinet meeting, a conference may appoint an alternate for that individual. Alternates may attend, participate fully and vote in any cabinet meeting or activity in which the regular member is unable to participate (excluding the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet Administrative Committee meetings). The cabinet will use technology to the greatest extent possible to help manage the workload.

e. Decisions of the cabinet are not final until after the conclusion of the meeting. Do not tell your conference or make public any cabinet decisions until after the conclusion of the cabinet meeting.

CABINET ORGANIZATION

Thirty-one individuals serve on the cabinet; all 31 multisport conferences are represented. Beginning September 2, 2008, representatives on the cabinet will have been assigned staggered terms of two, three and four years to help create a level of continuity. On expiration of these terms, all service terms will be four years in length.

1. Leadership Roles.

The cabinet will operate with a chair and a vice chair. Cabinet chairs shall serve at least one year but no more than two years in that role. A vice chair will be appointed when the chair has one year remaining on his or her term. The cabinet chairs and vice chairs will be forwarded to the Board for approval. At least once in every three rotations, there shall be a representative serving as chair who is not from the Football Bowl Subdivision.

One representative from the NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee will serve as a nonvoting member of the cabinet.

2. Administrative Committee.

The cabinet has established the Administrative Committee to allow the cabinet to make timely and efficient progress on issues between meetings. The Administrative Committee consists of four members, including the chair of the cabinet (who also serves as chair of the Administrative Committee) and one member from each of the subdivisions of Division I. The vice chair of the cabinet will serve as a nonvoting member of the Administrative Committee if he or she is not already a member of the Administrative Committee.

- The Administrative Committee is authorized to:

  (1) Act for the cabinet on routine and noncontroversial matters (e.g., site recommendations) between cabinet meetings;

  (2) Act for the cabinet on matters of an emergency nature, particularly those related to the health and safety of student-athletes;

  (3) Organize and structure meeting agendas; and

  (4) Hear appeals from individuals and institutions on matters determined to be misconduct by governing sports committees.

The full cabinet will receive minutes or reports of Administrative Committee actions as soon as possible.

3. Conference Representation in the Governance Structure.

- Weighted voting and voting percentages. Weighted voting shall be applied at the Leadership Council, Legislative Council and Championships/Sports Management Cabinet levels, as these bodies are the three 31-member bodies in the Division I governance structure. The voting percentages in the new governance structure reflect the percentages established under the 1997 agreement. These percentages are listed below as follows:

  (1) One representative (who shall have three votes) from each of the following seven conferences:

    (a) Atlantic Coast Conference;

    (b) Big East Conference;

    (c) Big Ten Conference;

    (d) Big 12 Conference;

    (e) Conference USA;

    (f) Pacific-10 Conference; and

    (g) Southeastern Conference.

  (2) One representative (who shall have 1.5 votes) from each of the following four conferences:

    (a) Mid-American Conference;

    (b) Mountain West Conference;

    (c) Sun Belt Conference; and

    (d) Western Athletic Conference.

(3) One representative (who shall have 1.2 votes) from each of the following conferences:

(a) America East;

(b) Atlantic 10 Conference;

(c) Atlantic Sun Conference;

(d) Big Sky Conference;

(e) Big South Conference;

(f) Big West Conference;

(g) Colonial Athletic Association;

(h) Horizon League;

(i) Ivy Group;

(j) Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference;

(k) Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference;

(l) Missouri Valley Conference;

(m) Northeast Conference;

(n) Ohio Valley Conference;

(o) Patriot League;

(p) Southern Conference;

(q) Southland Conference;

(r) Southwestern Athletic Conference;

(s) Summit League; and

(t) West Coast Conference.

REPRESENTATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND THE APPOINTMENT PROCESS

1. Gender and Diversity Requirements. The legislated minimums of 20 percent ethnic minorities and 35 percent of either gender shall be applied independently to two separate groups of governance bodies (i.e., the three 31-member governance bodies and the five 21-member governance bodies). Specifically, the representational minimums shall be applied to the 93 service opportunities provided by the cabinet, the 31-member Legislative Council and the 31-member Leadership Council. The minimum percentages shall be applied separately to the 105 service opportunities provided by the five 21-member cabinets.

2. Positional Requirements. While there are no specific positional requirements at the Council and cabinet levels, it is expected that the Division I governance structure will be populated by faculty members and athletics administrators who hold a variety of positions.

3. Role of the Board in the Appointment Process. The Board will make all appointments to the Councils and cabinets. As part of this process the Board will examine slates of nominees not only to ensure they meet the legislated requirements but to confirm that each governance body has balanced representation.

AGENDA DEVELOPMENT AND REPORT DISTRIBUTION

Any cabinet member or conference may submit an agenda item for a meeting. Agenda items should be sent to the staff liaison at the NCAA national office. The staff will consult with the cabinet member or conference to determine how best to handle the item and what supplementary material should be provided, if any. The item will be placed on the agenda with the name of the member or conference that submitted the item.

The staff will send a request for agenda items to cabinet members approximately 10 weeks prior to the meeting. Items must be submitted eight weeks prior to the meeting. The agenda and supplements will be mailed approximately three weeks prior to the meeting so as to be received at least 17 days prior to the meeting. All materials will be posted on the NCAA Web site at least 17 days prior to the meeting. Every effort will be made to ensure the meetings materials are as complete as possible at the time of mailing and the distribution of supplemental materials at meetings are kept to a minimum. In the event additional supplements need to be distributed after the 17-day mailing/posting deadline, these supplements will be posted to the NCAA Web site in a timely fashion.

Coaches associations should submit issues through the respective sports committees, rather than directly to the cabinet.

Agendas will include background information regarding action items to assist the cabinet members and the membership in putting the issues in contest.

Every effort will be made to ensure that the cabinet has the best information possible and will enlist the participation of subject matter experts as appropriate. Generally, appearances before the cabinet must be approved by the Administrative Committee on a case-by-case basis.

The report from the cabinet meetings will be written and posted on the NCAA Web site within three days of the scheduled conclusion of the meeting.

Reports shall distinguish between action items and informational items, and between legislative items and nonlegislative items.

CABINET COMMUNICATION WITHIN THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

- NCAA Communications and Coordination Committee.

  a. Duties. The NCAA Communications and Coordination Committee, which is composed of the chairs of the cabinets and Councils, is charged with coordinating consideration of issues and legislative concepts between the various Division I governance bodies.

  b. Staff Liaisons. At least one staff liaison from each cabinet and Council will be expected to participate on this group's conference calls and in-person meetings.

  c. Communication with Governance Representatives and with the Membership.

     - Cabinet Level. The cabinet chair may be asked to attend a meeting of one of the Councils from time to time depending on the issues being discussed but it will not be required as a matter of course. Additionally, as a supplement to the work of the Communications and Coordination Committee, representatives from both Councils will be assigned as informal liaisons to follow the work and discussions of each cabinet. These liaisons will not automatically be expected to attend their assigned cabinet meetings; rather the type and frequency of communication between the Councils and the cabinets will be dictated by the issues being examined.

ESTABLISHMENT OF BRACKETS/FIELD SIZES

The cabinet will review sports sponsorship numbers and trends for all NCAA championship sports annually at its February meeting, with a view toward long-range planning for future bracket/field size expansion or reduction. This planning is intended to ensure the appropriate allocation of the Association's financial resources relative to the membership's priorities, and to encourage the maintenance of a consistent and equitable championships program. [Appendixes D, E and F]

1. Accordingly, sports committees are not permitted to submit specific requests for bracket expansion independent of the February cabinet review. Instead, after reviewing the sports sponsorship trends at its February meeting, the cabinet will determine which, if any, sports committees would be asked to submit data at the February meeting that would support bracket/field size expansion. [Note: Relative to this policy, requests for expansion of regional competition for which the Association does not reimburse transportation and per diem expenses are considered bracket expansions, regardless of whether there is any cost to the Association.]

2. Any changes contemplated in the size of a specific championship bracket or field size will be based on the following factors:

    a. Maintenance of an equitable number of opportunities for men and women in the overall championships program (i.e., gender equity);

    b. The responsible allocation of the Association financial resources;

    c. The ability to efficiently manage and administer the event;

    d. The number of Division I conferences that sponsor each sport;

    e. The number of conferences eligible for automatic qualification and the need to provide access for all eligible conferences;

    f. The last time the particular bracket or field size was expanded;

    g. Any trend (increase or decrease) in sponsorship of the sport;

    h. Whether a sport is considered an emerging sport for women;

i. For National Collegiate Championships, the number of Divisions I, II and III institutions sponsoring the sport;

j. General interest in and commitment to creating opportunities for student-athletes;

k. The ratio of championship berths in a particular sport relative to the number of institutions that sponsor the sport; and

l. Perceived quality of competition in a particular sport.

3. The established bracket sizes within each percentage category are not intended to be automatic; in some cases, it would be logical that there be interim steps for bracket expansion when some increase is warranted (e.g., from 16 to 20 or 24 teams, rather than 32). What those appropriate interim steps are may differ from sport to sport and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

WORKING PRINCIPLES FOR SEEDING/PAIRING/SITE SELECTION (CHAMPIONSHIPS OTHER THAN MEN'S AND WOMEN'S BASKETBALL)

The following principles have been established for all sports other than men's and women's basketball:

A fair and equitable championship should be created to provide national-level competition among the best eligible student-athletes and teams of member institutions, with consideration also for approved regional structures for certain championships.

Access to championships shall be provided by a combination of automatic qualifiers and at-large selections (the cabinet previously approved guidelines based on sponsorship percentages).

Consideration should be given to the academic impact on the participating institutions and to the financial impact on the participating institutions and the NCAA.

1. Top teams should be seeded (no more than 25 percent of the bracket, except for those brackets where 25 percent does not make sense, for example allowing a 48-team bracket to seed the top 16 rather than the top 12).

2. First-round conference matchups should be avoided. First round is defined as first contest.

3. Higher seeded teams should be given consideration in hosting (e.g., taking into account other factors such as missed class time, quality and availability of the facility and other necessary accommodations, attendance history, financial considerations, geography, quality of the student-athlete experience, championship atmosphere and accessibility of fans, etc.).

4. After seeding the approved number of teams, teams should be placed in brackets per NCAA Bylaw 31.1.3.2.5 (i.e., geographically) with consideration given to missed class time, the quality of the student-athlete experience, championship atmosphere and accessibility of fans.

APPEALS OF CHAMPIONSHIPS MATTERS

The following sports committee actions relative to championships administration are subject to appeal to the cabinet, which acting for the Leadership Council, is the final authority on appeals of championships matters: (1) Automatic qualification/play-in conference decisions; (2) Assessment of penalties for misconduct (Item No. 6 below); and (3) Assessment of penalties for failure to adhere to policies and procedures governing championships administration. In addition:

1. The appeal of a decision made by a sports committee first must be submitted to and considered by the sports committee itself. The appeal must be submitted in writing not later than 30 days after receipt of notification of the original decision.

2. The sports committee must make available to the involved party the opportunity to present the appeal during a telephone conference, if the appellant wishes to do so. Otherwise, the appeal will be by written submission.

3. If consideration of an appeal could potentially impact an institution or conference other than the one submitting the appeal (for example, if a conference appeals for automatic qualification and such action would displace another conference), that other entity must be provided an opportunity to respond as well.

4. If the sports committee upholds its original decision, that action may be appealed to the cabinet. That appeal must be submitted to the cabinet within 30 days of receipt of notification of the sports committee's action.

5 If a decision involving failure to adhere to championships policies and procedures is appealed to the cabinet, the cabinet will afford to the involved party the same opportunity for a telephone conference, if the appellant wishes to do so; otherwise, the appeal will be by written submission. In appeals of automatic qualification/play-in conference decisions, the cabinet may, but is not obligated, to hear an appeal via telephone conference.

6. Appeals of Division I misconduct findings go directly to the Administrative Committee of the cabinet. If a decision involving misconduct is appealed to the cabinet, the cabinet will afford to the involved party the same opportunity for a telephone conference, if the appellant wishes to do so; otherwise, the appeal will be by written submission. The subcommittee has the authority to grant the appeal, in whole or in part or uphold or reduce but not increase penalties imposed by the sports committee.

LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

1. Sponsoring Legislation. The Legislative Council along with the Board, Leadership Council, cabinets and any of the 31 multisport conferences will be permitted to propose legislation under the Division I governance structure.

2. Timeframe for Sponsoring Legislation. The deadline for sponsoring legislation for the conferences, cabinets and Councils is July 15.

3. Role of the September Cabinet Meeting. The six issue-specific cabinets will meet within a three week window in September to begin offering comments and suggested modifications to legislative proposals in the annual legislative cycle. Comments will appear in the official notice, published November 15.

4. Emergency/Noncontroversial Legislation – Guidelines. The following guidelines are to assist in determining whether a proposal should be considered outside the normal legislative process as either noncontroversial or emergency legislation:

   a. Noncontroversial legislation**.** Legislative proposals shall be considered noncontroversial only if:

      (1) Broader consultation and debate are unlikely to improve the proposal in any substantial way;

      (2) Significant disagreement or alternative points of view will not be generated; or

      (3) Such proposals do not have a significant impact (unanticipated consequences, undesirable precedent) on existing legislation or proposed legislation.

   b. A noncontroversial proposal, at a minimum, should have the following factors present:

      (1) The proposal should have minimal impact on competitive or recruiting equity;

      (2) The proposal should have minimal financial impact;

      (3) The proposal must enjoy broad support from its primary stakeholders;

(4) The proposal should not negatively impact student-athlete welfare; and

(5) The proposal should not significantly impact the Division I academic standards (initial and continuing eligibility).

c. Emergency legislation. Legislative proposals shall be considered emergency legislation only if:

(1) Significant values or harm are at stake; or

(2) The use of the regular legislative cycle is likely to cause undue hardship to the Association or the Division I membership because of the delay in its effective date.

(3) Examples of situations in which it may be appropriate to consider legislation emergency include, but are not limited to, the following:

(a) Immediate health and safety concerns or issues;

(b) Potential legal actions;

(c) Issues that have a significant financial impact;

(d) Egregious situations involving disparities in fairness; or

(e) Unintended or unanticipated consequences resulting from the current legislation.

5. Process for Considering Noncontroversial or Emergency Proposals.

There is a two-part process for voting on noncontroversial or emergency proposals, as follows:

a. The Legislative Council shall initially vote on whether a proposal shall be considered as noncontroversial or emergency. The proposal must receive three-fourths majority of all Legislative Council members present and voting to satisfy such a standard. Those proposals that do not satisfy such standards will not be considered defeated, but will be considered by the Division I membership in accordance with the normal legislative process.

b. A proposal that satisfies the initial standard as being either noncontroversial or emergency will then be debated by the full Legislative Council on its merits. Such a proposal will then require a three-fourths majority of Legislative Council members present and voting to approve the proposal. Proposals that do not receive a three-fourths majority vote, but receive a majority vote, will be remanded back into the normal legislative cycle.

LIAISON ASSIGNMENTS

The cabinet has assigned its members to serve as liaisons to committees that report to the cabinet, to enhance communication and understanding of committees' issues and recommendations, and to better communicate the cabinet actions to the committees. These liaisons are to be a communication link between the committees and the cabinet, as opposed to a "champion" for a particular sport or an advocate for a particular sport or rules committee's issues or recommendations. There also should be consistency in the liaisons' degree of involvement in their respective committees' work.

Liaisons will receive the minutes of all meetings and telephone conferences of the sports committee for which they serve as liaison. In addition, prior to each cabinet meeting, liaisons should discuss with their sports committee chair the recommendations that will be submitted by the committee for cabinet consideration. Liaisons should be sufficiently knowledgeable about their sports committee's recommendations and issues to present them in a balanced and impartial manner to the full cabinet at each meeting (including making the cabinet aware of both the pros and cons of a recommendation) and to be prepared to offer clarification or explanation of them. Finally, it is not necessary for liaisons to attend sports or rules committee meetings or championships. [Appendix G]

SUPPLEMENT NO. 2
DI Champs/Sports Mgmt Cabinet 2/09

SUPPLEMENT NO. 6
DI Communications and
Coordination Committee 5/09

MEMORANDUM

May 4, 2009

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

FROM: Beth DeBauche, staff liaison.

SUBJECT: Bylaw and Practices Review.

1. <u>Charge</u>.

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

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

2. Illustrations.

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

3. Timeline.

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

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

REPORT OF THE NCAA OLYMPIC SPORTS LIASION COMMITTEE

1. ACTION ITEMS.

- **NONE.**

2. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

- **NONE.**

3. LEGISLATIVE ITEMS.

- **Action Items.**

(1) NCAA Bylaw 14.1.8.1.6-(a) Eligibility—Practice Requirement—Minimum Full-Time Enrollment Waiver.

(a) Recommendation. The Olympic Sports Liaison Committee (OSLC) recommends modifying NCAA Division I Bylaw 14.1.8.1.6-(a) to allow a former student-athlete, as long as he or she has graduated and has no eligibility remaining, to participate in organized practice sessions (while either not enrolled or enrolled part time) at an institution other than where the former student-athlete attended as an undergraduate and/or graduate student.

(b) Rationale. The current rule permits an individual (current and former student-athletes) to participate in organized practice sessions (while either not enrolled or enrolled part time) provided the individual does so at the institution where the individual previously attended or currently attends as an undergraduate or graduate student.

The OSLC supports the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) and national governing bodies' (NGBs) efforts to enhance opportunities for elite athletes to improve their chances of making USA Olympic teams and, in the long term, compete for Olympic medals. Allowing former student-athletes who have graduated and who have no eligibility remaining the opportunity to train with coaches (e.g., the Olympic team coach in that sport) during organized practice sessions at institutions other than where the former student-athlete previously attended or currently attends as an undergraduate or graduate student improves the chances for these former student-athletes to make Olympic teams and earn Olympic medals.

For example, a student-athlete at Institution A graduates from Institution A and in an effort to make the USA Olympic team, the former student-athlete wishes to train with the coach (e.g., the Olympic team coach for that sport) at Institution B. The current rule precludes the former student-athlete from participating in organized practice sessions with the Olympic coach's team at Institution B.

The OSLC's recommended modification would allow this former student-athlete the opportunity to train with the coach who coaches at Institution B during Institution B's organized practice session even though Institution B is not where the former student-athlete previously attended or currently attends as an undergraduate or graduate student.

It should be noted that allowing former student-athletes from other institutions who are not enrolled as full-time student-athletes to participate in an institution's organized practice sessions may create a recruiting and competitive advantage for the institution where the coach (e.g., the Olympic coach for that sport) is employed. Further, although some NGBs have the financial ability to extend insurance coverage to former student-athletes who are not members of the institution's team, but who are participating in organized practice sessions with the institution's team, not all NGBs do. Depending on the likelihood of a former student-athlete making the Olympic team, an NGB may choose to not offer insurance coverage while the former student-athlete participates in organized practice sessions. If an NGB does not provide the insurance, the institution may be confronted with resolving the insurance-coverage issue. Further, some institutions might be opposed to their coaches spending time coaching former student-athletes who are not eligible to represent the institution in competition. Finally, the current rule does not preclude a former student-athlete from practicing at another institution - and with the coach of that other institution - as long as the former student-athlete does so outside of the institution's organized practice session.
.

(c) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(d) Student-Athlete Impact. Allowing current student-athletes to practice against former student-athletes may enhance the chances for the current student-athletes to improve and qualify for national teams.

Allowing former student-athletes to participate in an institution's organized practice sessions and train under the supervision of coaches (e.g., current Olympic coach) at institutions other than where the former student-athlete attended as an undergraduate or graduate student

may enhance the opportunities for former student-athletes to qualify for national teams and compete internationally.

(2) NCAA Bylaw 14.1.8.1.6-(g) Eligibility—Practice Requirement—Minimum Full-Time Enrollment Waiver.

(a) Recommendation. The OSLC recommends modifying Bylaw 14.1.8.1.6-(g) to allow a former student-athlete who has either exhausted his or her eligibility or who has completed a degree, to participate in an institution's organized practice sessions for a period of time that would allow the former student-athlete to compete in two consecutive Olympic games (rather than one) following the former student-athlete's exhaustion of eligibility or completion of a degree

(b) Rationale. The current rule stipulates that in the case of a former student-athlete who has either exhausted his or her eligibility or who has completed a degree, the former student-athlete is limited to participating in an institution's organized practice sessions for no more than five years. The original intent of this rule was to allow a former student-athlete the opportunity to continue practicing with an institution's team in organized practice sessions for a five-year period thereby enhancing the former student-athlete's chances of qualifying for the next Olympic games following the former student-athlete's completion of a degree or exhaustion of eligibility. However, the average age of the Olympic athlete has increased significantly in the past 15 years. As a result, the OSLC is supportive of allowing former student-athletes the opportunity to train for Olympic games beyond the current five-year window.

This change would allow former student-athletes to spend additional years participating in an institution's organized practice sessions. Doing so might increase the former student-athlete's opportunity to make Olympic teams and earn Olympic medals.

It should be noted that allowing former student-athletes to participate in an institution's organized practice sessions may create a recruiting and competitive advantage for that institution. Further, although some NGBs have the financial ability to extend insurance coverage to former student-athletes who are not members of the institution's team but who are participating in organized practice sessions with the institution's team, not all NGBs have the financial ability to do so. Additionally, depending on

the likelihood of a former student-athlete making the Olympic team, an NGB may choose to not offer insurance coverage while the former student-athlete participates in organized practice sessions. If an NGB does not provide the insurance, the institution may be confronted with resolving the insurance-coverage issue. Finally, some institutions might be opposed to their coaches spending time coaching former student-athletes who are not eligible to represent the institution in competition.

It also should be noted that currently, some institutions hire former student-athletes to serve as assistant coaches (or appoint them as volunteer coaches) thereby enabling the former student-athletes to practice with the institution's team.

(b) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(c) Student-Athlete Impact. Allowing current student-athletes the opportunity to practice against former student-athletes will likely enhance the chances for the current student-athletes to improve and qualify for national teams.

Allowing former student-athletes the opportunity to participate in an institution's organized practice sessions and train under the supervision of college coaches for more than five years after the former student-athletes have exhausted eligibility or completed a degree may enhance the opportunities of these former student-athletes to qualify for national teams and compete internationally.

Committee Chair: Patty Viverito, Missouri Valley Conference
Staff Liaison(s): Dan Calandro, Academic and Membership Affairs
Jobrina Perez, Academic and Membership Affairs
Liz Suscha, Championships

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL ISSUES COMMITTEE
JUNE 1, 2009, MEETING

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Action Items.

a. Recruiting/Scouting Services.

(1) Recommendation. The NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Issues Committee recommends that the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet sponsor legislation to be considered in the 2009-10 legislative cycle to amend NCAA Bylaws 13.14.3.1 and 13.14.3.2 to specify that institutions are permitted to subscribe to published recruiting and video services, provided the service meets the following minimum guidelines. The service must:

(a) Disseminate information on at least a quarterly basis;

(b) Make public all applicable rates;

(c) Make public whether the service is a local, regional or national service, and the quarterly reports must reflect broad-based coverage of that chosen scope.;

(d) Incorporate some type of analysis into the report beyond demographical information or rankings of prospects; and

(e) Make sample reports available to subscribers prior to purchase.

(2) Effective Date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. Current NCAA rules only require a recruiting or scouting service to be regularly published and available at the same fee rate for all subscribers. There has been a proliferation of these services, particularly in the sport of men's basketball, that do not provide information consistent with the original intent of the legislation. Many of the operators of the recruiting or scouting services are tied directly to teams or events involving highly skilled prospective student-athletes and concerns have been expressed in the coaching community that the service is used as leverage. In some instances, the service merely provides demographical information that is available from other sources or in other instances, no

information that would assist the men's basketball coaches in the evaluation of talent. Many coaches are convinced that unless the staff subscribes to these recruiting or scouting services, the staff will be disadvantaged in attempts to recruit prospects linked with the recruiting-service operator. The committee acknowledged the value that can be derived from recruiting or scouting services. This proposal reflects the intent of the original legislation by establishing minimal guidelines that must be satisfied in order for institutions to subscribe to such a service.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. Potential significant cost savings to institutions based on the excessive number of current scouting-service subscriptions that produce limited or insufficient information.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

[Note: The cabinet may wish to consider whether the proposal should apply to all sports. Given the fact that this proposal impacts Division I men's basketball recruiting, it will be referred to the NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet for review at its September 2009 meeting.]

b. Observation of Prospective Men's Basketball Student-Athletes by Noncoaching Athletics Department Staff Members with Basketball Responsibilities.

(1) Recommendation. The committee recommends that the cabinet sponsor legislation to be considered in the 2009-10 legislative cycle to amend Bylaw 13.1.2.2 to specify that it is not permissible for noncoaching athletics department staff members with responsibilities in the sport of men's basketball to attend an off-campus athletics event (e.g., high school contest, sports camp) to observe a prospective men's basketball student-athlete, unless the staff member is an immediate family member of one of the participants in the activity. The staff member's attendance to observe activities involving a participant who is an immediate family member shall not be for evaluation purposes, the staff member shall not have direct contact with any prospective men's basketball student-athlete participating in the activity and the staff member shall not act as an institutional recruiter (e.g., by reporting back to the institution's coaching staff about the performance of a prospective men's basketball student-athlete, by speaking to a prospective men's basketball student-athlete's parents or coach).

(2) Effective Date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. Currently, there is an official interpretation that permits noncoaching athletics department staff members with responsibilities in the sport of men's basketball to attend an off-campus athletics competition that involves prospective men's basketball student-athlete in the locale of the staff member's institution. Although the interpretation attempts to establish restrictions to avoid potential recruiting advantages, there is concern in the basketball community that the mere presence of these individuals at prospective student-athletes' competitions is providing their institutions with a recruiting advantage. Multiple noncoaching athletics department staff members clothed in institutional apparel are attending basketball games in the institution's locale involving high-profile men's basketball prospects. The issue is magnified in major metropolitan areas that include a significant number of high-profile prospective student-athletes. It is difficult to enforce the official interpretation as there may be no real evidence that the staff member has been specifically directed to attend the contest. The committee believes there is no reason for these noncoaching staff members to be in attendance at such contests, unless the staff member has an immediate family member participating in the contest.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

[Note: The cabinet may wish to consider whether the proposal should apply to all sports. Given the fact that this proposal impacts Division I men's basketball recruiting, it will be referred to the NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet for review at its September 2009 meeting.]

2. Nonlegislative Action Items.

- None.

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. Updates. The committee received updates regarding the following:

a. NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Ethics Coalition.

b. Future of college basketball.

c. NCAA Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct initiative [The "Respect" Campaign].

d. NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group.

e. New legislation impacting Division I men's basketball. The committee received an update of the legislative proposals in the 2008-09 legislative cycle that were adopted by the NCAA Division I Legislative Council. The group engaged in a discussion regarding the impact of NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2007-30-C, which eliminated the observation of nonscholastic activities during the April contact period and also shortened the contact period. It was agreed that the legislation should be monitored and evaluated over a period of time to ascertain whether the desired objectives of promoting educational objectives/academic commitment and minimizing nonscholastic influences are being met. The group noted that there are issues for future discussion that have merit including the opportunity for observations of seniors at weekend events conducted by scholastic entities in the state in which they reside, the opportunity for institutions to conduct tryouts for senior prospective men's basketball student-athletes and a possible modification of the contact period. The staff clarified that it remains permissible pursuant to the legislation for coaches to observe regular out-of-season practice activities (including participation in leagues) involving prospective men's basketball student-athletes and their scholastic coaches during the April contact period, provided such activities are permitted by the applicable state scholastic athletics association.

2. Other topics considered and discussed. The committee reviewed and discussed the following issues:

a. Employment of Individuals Associated with a Prospective Men's Basketball Student-Athlete as Result of the Prospective Student-Athlete's Athletics Ability. The committee noted the proliferation of institutions employing individuals associated with a prospective men's basketball student-athlete (e.g.,

nonscholastic coach, high school coach) in the institution's athletics department in some capacity and the difficulty in enforcing the current legislation that precludes a future employment arrangement if it is contingent on the enrollment of the prospective student-athlete. The committee referred the issue for continuing study and action by the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Ethics Coalition.

b. **Nonscholastic events held on institution's campus during May.** The committee discussed the proliferation of nonscholastic men's basketball events that are held on campus outside a permissible contact period and noted increasing concern over the degree of involvement by the basketball coaching staff in arranging for such events to be conducted at the institution as well as campus activities during the event. The committee noted that current legislation precludes an institution from making contact with or observing any of the prospective men's basketball student-athletes participating in the activity, precludes institutions from making special financial arrangement for use of institutional facilities, prohibits athletics department staff members from any involvement in the conduct or administration of such events and precludes institutional-arranged activities (e.g., campus tours) during the event. The committee referred the issue for continuing study and action by the Men's Basketball Ethics Coalition.

c. **Coaches' discretionary tickets.** The committee discussed an emerging issue relating to men's basketball coaches being leveraged to provide tickets to specific events (e.g., conference tournaments, season football tickets) from the coaches' discretionary ticket allotment to persons tied to prospective men's basketball student-athletes. The committee noted that such an arrangement would constitute an impermissible recruiting inducement and referred the issue for continuing study and action by the Men's Basketball Ethics Coalition.

d. **Excessive event packet costs.** Coaches continue to complain about the escalating costs charged by event operators in order to obtain an event packet containing information about prospective men's basketball student-athletes. The committee referred the issue for continuing study and action by the Men's Basketball Ethics Coalition.

e. **Reduction of the summer evaluation period.** The committee discussed the merits of reducing the number of days available during the July evaluation period based on continuing concerns about the health, safety and well-being of participants, but declined to make any recommendation to change the current evaluation period.

f. **Guaranteed games**. The committee discussed the complex issues involved with scheduling concerns and guaranteed games, but declined to make any recommendations at this time. The committee determined that a more comprehensive review of the issues was necessary before any further action should be considered by the committee.

Committee Chair: Kevin Anderson, U.S. Military Academy
Staff Liaison(s): Tom Jernstedt, Executive
LuAnn Humphrey, Enforcement
Steve Mallonee, Academic and Membership Affairs

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I WOMEN'S BASKETBALL ISSUES COMMITTEE

ACTION ITEMS.

1. **Legislative Items.**

a. NCAA Bylaw 13.8.8.1-(b)-(1) Recruiting – Contacts and Evaluations – Basketball Evaluations – Women's Basketball – Nonscholastic Evaluations During Academic Year – National Standardized Testing Weekends.

(1) Recommendation. The committee recommends that the cabinet sponsor legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle to specify that, in the sport of women's basketball, evaluations during the fall and spring nonscholastic weekends may not occur on any weekends during which the PSAT, SAT, PLAN or ACT national standardized tests are administered.

(2) Effective Date. August 1, 2010.

(3) Rationale. The women's basketball recruiting calendar allows coaches to evaluate prospective student-athletes at nonscholastic events during the prospective student-athlete's academic year during the last full weekend (including Friday, Saturday and Sunday) of the fall contact period and the Friday, Saturday and Sunday of the spring evaluation period. There have been instances in which these designated time periods have conflicted with national standardized testing dates and, in some instances, resulted in prospective student-athletes facing undue pressure to forego the taking of a standardized test in order to participate in a nonscholastic event. The Women's Basketball Coaches Association (WBCA) supports and has requested this legislative change to the women's basketball recruiting calendar.

(4) Budget Impact. None.

(5) Impact on Time Commitment of Student-Athletes. None.

b. Bylaw 13.1.8.8.1-(b)-(1) Contacts and Evaluations – Basketball Evaluations – Women's Basketball – Summer Evaluation Period – Noninstitutional Nonorganized Events.

(1) Recommendation. The committee requests that the cabinet sponsor legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle to prohibit, in women's basketball, evaluations at noninstitutional nonorganized events (e.g., pick-up games, open gyms) during the summer evaluation period.

(2) Rationale. There has been an escalation in the number of impermissibly arranged activities disguised as open gym or pick-up games during the summer evaluation period. These activities subject coaches to potential rules violations

and can create an environment in which contact between NCAA coaches and outside influences occur. During the summer evaluation period, evaluations will be limited to institutional basketball camps and noninstitutional organized events (e.g., camps, leagues, tournaments and festivals) that are certified through the basketball certification process. The WBCA supports and has requested this legislative change to the women's basketball recruiting model.

(3) Budget Impact. None.

(4) Impact on Time Commitment of Student-Athletes. None.

2. **Nonlegislative Items**.

- None.

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATIONAL ITEM.

Update on 2008-09 Division I Legislative Proposals Related to Women's Basketball. The Division I Women's Basketball Issues Committee received an update on actions relative to legislative proposals impacting women's basketball that were reviewed during the 2008-09 legislative cycle.

NONLEGISLATIVE INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Update from the Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group.** The Women's Basketball Issues Committee received an update on the ongoing efforts of the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group and learned of minor changes to that group's preliminary recommendations. The committee was informed that the Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group will present its recommendations to the NCAA Division I Board of Directors in August, which will provide the Board with an opportunity to introduce legislation into the 2009-10 legislative cycle. The committee will continue discussions regarding an academic enhancement model for women's basketball during its August 2009 meeting.

2. **Report from the NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Cabinet.** The committee was informed that the Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Cabinet plans to engage in a review related to coaching limits and the proliferation of noncoaching, sport-specific positions. Feedback from the governance structure, including this committee, and membership is welcomed.

3. **Update from the NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet.** The committee learned that the Amateurism Cabinet has continued its discussions regarding the definition of a professional team and its impact on the eligibility of prospective student-athletes. The cabinet is contemplating sponsoring legislation in the 2009-10 legislative cycle but prior to doing so would like feedback from the membership, especially coaches groups.

4. **Update from the NCAA Women's Basketball Rules Committee.** The committee received a report of the recent meeting of the Women's Basketball Rules Committee, noting specifically that the rules committee proposed modifications to the uniform rule as well as expanded the use of the monitor in order to better address unsporting behavior.

5. **Next Meeting.** The committee's next in-person meeting is scheduled for August 20-21, 2009 in Indianapolis.

Committee Chair: Nora Lynn Finch, Atlantic Coast Conference
Staff liaisons: Jackie Campbell, Women's Basketball
Sue Donohoe, Women's Basketball
Beth DeBauche, Governance
Lynn Holzman, Academic and Membership Affairs
Michelle Perry, Women's Basketball

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I FOOTBALL ISSUES COMMITTEE

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Summer Camps.

a. Recommendation. That legislation be amended to allow FCS football coaches to conduct and coach at institutional or noninstitutional football camps anytime during the months of June, July and August.

b. Rationale. FCS coaches have expressed concern that the current legislation limiting institutional camps and working private camps to two 15-day periods in June and July is unnecessarily restrictive for FCS coaches. Coaches have expressed that the issues and circumstances surrounding the adoption of legislation limiting the camp periods more directly impact FBS coaches than FCS coaches and more flexibility in scheduling and working at summer camps for FCS coaches is needed.

c. Budget Impact. None.

d. Student Athlete Impact. None.

2. Evaluations at Nonscholastic Events.

a. Recommendation. That legislation be amended to allow FCS football coaches to evaluate prospective student-athletes at nonscholastic events (e.g., high school all-star games).

b. Rationale. FCS coaches have expressed that current legislation limiting evaluation of football prospects to scholastic events makes it difficult to efficiently evaluate FCS-level football prospects. Institutions can be more efficient in their management of recruiting resources if able to evaluate FCS football prospects in central locations (e.g., all-star games or combines). FCS coaches also noted that the issues and circumstances surrounding the adoption of the current legislation more directly impacts FBS than FCS.

Effective August 1, 2009, legislation will permit coaches to attend all-star games that are organized and conducted by high school, preparatory school and two-year college associations; however, this recommendation would permit evaluation at any all-star contest, regardless of what entity conducts or sponsors the event. Further, due to the adoption of 2008-20-A, it should be noted that FCS coaches will still be precluded from attending recruiting events at which information related to prospects is provided to coaches.

c. Budget Impact. Potential for more efficient use of institutional recruiting expenses.

d. Student Athlete Impact. Increased opportunities for prospective student-athletes to be evaluated by college coaches.

3. Preseason Squad Limit.

a. Recommendation. That legislation be amended to increase from 90 to 95 the maximum number of football student-athletes who may engage in preseason practice activities at FCS institutions.

b. Rationale. FCS coaches have expressed concern that the current maximum of 90 does not allow teams to effectively prepare for the season, particularly when FCS teams play FBS teams in their first game and FBS teams are allowed to have 105 student-athletes in preseason practice. Having more student-athletes involved in preseason practice may also reduce the risk of injury and heat illness inasmuch as there would be more student-athletes available to participate in practice repetitions.

c. Budget Impact. The room and board costs associated with the five additional student-athletes in preseason practice.

d. Student Athlete Impact. Increased participation opportunities for student-athletes during preseason practice.

4. Contact with Prospects on Game Days.

a. Recommendation. That legislation be amended to allow FCS coaches to make contact with football prospects prior to the prospect's athletics competition.

b. Rationale. FCS coaches expressed concern that this legislation is often unintentionally violated when there are communication gaps between the prospect and the coach or when high school contests are rescheduled unbeknownst to the coach. As recruiting resources are limited, coaches do not have many opportunities to make in-person contacts in some recruiting locales so the current legislation can eliminate the only opportunity for in-person contact in a prospect's locale.

c. Budget Impact. Potential for more efficient use of institutional recruiting expenses.

e. Student Athlete Impact. Prospective student-athletes having contact with college coaches prior to participating in athletic competition later that day.

5. Committee Chair.

a. Recommendation. That Nick Carparelli of the Big East Conference be appointed chair of the Football Issues Committee.

b. Rationale. The committee term of the current chair of the committee, Wright Waters (Sun Belt Conference), expires September 1, 2009. Mr. Carparelli has been a member of the of the committee since 2005. As Associate Commissioner of the Big East Conference, Mr. Carparelli is the conference's primary contact for football and postseason bowl-related matters. As such, he is ideally suited to serve as chair of this committee.

c. Budget Impact. None.

d. Student Athlete Impact. None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Postseason Bowl Licenses. The bowl licensing subcommittee licensed the following 34 bowl games for the 2009-10 season: Allstate Sugar, AT&T Cotton, AutoZone Liberty, BCS National Championship, Bell Helicopter Armed Forces, Brut Sun, Capital One, Champs Sports, Chick-Fil-A, EagleBank, Emerald, Fed Ex Orange, Gaylord Hotels Music City, GMAC, Advocare V100 Independence, Insight, International, Konica Minolta Gator, MAACO Bowl Las Vegas, Meineke Car Care, Motor City, New Mexico, Outback, Pacific Life Holiday, Papajohns.com, R+L Carriers New Orleans, Roady's Humanitarian, Rose, San Diego County Credit Union Poinsettia, Sheraton Hawaii, St. Petersburg, Texas, Tostitos Fiesta and Valero Alamo. These are the same 34 bowls that were licensed for the 2008-09 season.

2. Postseason Bowl Licensing Criteria. The bowl licensing subcommittee considered possible changes to its bowl licensing criteria for the next round of bowl-conference negotiations for bowls occurring in 2010-11 and beyond. The subcommittee will continue to discuss these issues over the coming months (e.g., multi-year licenses, requirement of secondary agreements, bowl eligibility legislation, etc.).

3. Secondary Bowl Agreements. Bowl management will be required to inform the bowl licensing subcommittee in writing of any secondary agreements prior to the first game of the 2009 FBS football season.

4. Bowl Eligibility Waiver Request. The committee reviewed and denied a request from Duke University to have the ability to count a win against North Carolina Central University towards bowl eligibility in 2009 per Bylaw 30.9.2.2.1.

5. **FBS – Review of 2008-09 Postseason Bowl Games**. The committee reviewed the attendance and television ratings from the 2008-09 bowl games. While the overall attendance was significantly higher, with the addition of two new bowl games the average was virtually the same as in 2007-08. The average television rating did increase slightly from 2007-08.

6. **FBS – Communication with the Bowl Championship Series (BCS)**. The committee discussed ways to better improve the communication between the Football Issues Committee and the BCS.

7. **FBS – Institutions with Two Wins Against Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) Institutions**. The committee confirmed that an institution that has a 7-5 record with two wins against FCS institutions would still be considered to have a winning record (essentially 6-5). If they were to be an at-large team they would be in the pool with other winning-record institutions, not 6-6 teams.

8. **FBS – Subcommittee**. The committee formed a small subcommittee to review the most important issues facing postseason football. The subcommittee will meet via conference calls to further discuss the issues (process to evaluate applications, number of bowl games, selection of at-large teams, etc).

Committee Chair: Wright Waters, Sun Belt Conference
Staff Liaison(s): Dennis Poppe, Baseball and Football
Damani Leech, Baseball and Football

Sand Volleyball Playing and Practice Season Discussion
Executive Summary of American Volleyball Coaches Association Recommendations

- Sand volleyball and women's volleyball would conduct separate 132-day playing seasons.

- Sand volleyball would conduct a fall nonchampionship segment and a spring championship segment.

- Preseason practice and first nonchampionship segment date of competition may not occur until the first day of classes or September 7, whichever is earlier.

- First championship segment date of competition may not occur until the first Thursday in March.

- Season would end with final exams. [NOTE: See staff comments on Page No. 4.]

- Dates of competition maximums = 16 in the championship segment and four in the nonchampionship segment.

- Minimum contests for sports sponsorship = eight with 10 participants and under the conditions noted within the document. [NOTE: See staff comments on Page No. 7.]

- Sand volleyball team is composed of five two-player units.

Sand Volleyball Playing and Practice Season Discussion
NCAA Division I Championship/Sport Management Cabinet

Background: On April 20, 2009, the NCAA Division I Legislative Council adopted Proposal No. 2008-59, adding sand volleyball to the list of emerging sports for women as of August 1, 2010. In accordance with NCAA Constitution 3.2.4.5.2 (emerging sports timetable), playing and practice season and minimum contest legislation is one area in which legislation must be in place for an emerging sport's first year. To assist the cabinet in its discussion on these issues for sand volleyball, this document contains a possible playing and practice season and minimum contest model for the sport. The model presented is one proposed by the American Volleyball Coaches Association (credit: T.J. Meagher, AVCA Legislative Board Representative & Assistant Athletics Director for Compliance and Special Projects, University of Houston) and includes staff comments, as appropriate.

Playing and Practice Seasons

Length of Playing Season. An institution that sponsors only indoor or sand volleyball (but not both) shall be limited to a 132-day season, which may consist of two segments (each consisting of consecutive days) and which may exclude only required days off and official vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during which no practice or competition shall occur.

Rationale: The 132-day calendar is the minimum limit for a sport activity under current NCAA rules. The playing season, both championship and non-championship, will fit reasonably within the confines of that parameter. It should be noted that sand volleyball's calendar will be completely separate from the indoor volleyball playing and practice season for institutions sponsoring both sports.

Other calendar configurations have been modeled specifically looking at one declared calendar for institutions sponsoring both indoor and sand programs. Ultimately an increased but merged calendar (144 or 156) will lengthen the amount of time the roster stays in season. In other words, instead of a select number of players who may choose to participate in both disciplines having longer in-season training during the academic year, all student-athletes in either discipline will have longer in-season training during the academic year.

Indoor Volleyball Student-Athletes Participating in Sand Volleyball. Indoor volleyball student-athletes listed as participants for sand volleyball must participate fully in sand volleyball practices. If student-athletes are practicing indoor volleyball skills unrelated to sand volleyball, such practices must be counted in the institution's established segment in indoor volleyball.

Rationale: Cross Country has the origin of this bylaw to prevent dedicated track and field student-athletes from utilizing an opportunity to train in-season at 20 hours per week when the

differentiating discipline has no basis in distance training. In other words, this prevents sprinters from training to be better sprinters while listed on the cross country roster. As it applies to the sand/indoor concept, it is possible that clarifying language or possibly an education column may be needed to explain the intent of this legislation. For instance, it is reasonable that sand players may train indoors on a firm surface, so sand training is not exclusive to sand only activity. However training for participation in sand doubles should not employ combinations of activity that are commensurate with indoor, six person volleyball – the majority of training would not have more than two persons on one side of the net at a time, the focus of activity would see the alternation of contacts between two players and not involve a third, etc.

Preseason Practice. A member institution's sand volleyball team shall not commence practice sessions in sand volleyball prior to September 7 or the institutions first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.

Rationale: The start date provides for programs to begin as early as the academic calendar allows in the fall to utilize as favorable weather conditions as possible especially for programs in northern climates. It is also commensurate with the men's volleyball indoor start date designation, and men's volleyball mirrors the fall non-championship segment/spring championship segment configuration just as sand volleyball will be oriented.

First Contest Date

(a) **Nonchampionship Segment**. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition (game or scrimmage) in the nonchampionship segment with outside competition in sand volleyball prior to September 7 or the institutions first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.

Rationale: The start date provides for programs to begin as early as the academic calendar allows in the fall to utilize as favorable weather conditions as possible especially for programs in northern climates. It is also commensurate with the men's volleyball indoor start date designation, and men's volleyball mirrors the fall non-championship segment/spring championship segment configuration just as sand volleyball will be oriented.

(b) **Championship Segment**. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition (game or scrimmage) in the championship segment with outside competition in sand volleyball prior to the first Thursday in March.

Rationale: Beginning the first Thursday in March allows for 10 weeks of competition concluding the 1st or 2nd week of May which should provide for ample opportunity to schedule the maximum dates of competition proposed for sand volleyball. There is also an interest to offer the programs in the northern climates the consideration to be outdoors as much as possible in respect to

weather conditions while tempering the advantage that will be afforded sand programs in southern climates.

End of Regular Playing Season: A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (games and scrimmages) in sand volleyball by the last date of final examinations for the regular academic year.

Rationale: Commensurate with emerging sport legislation for DI

Special Note: The future for sand volleyball appears to have enormous potential. Given the strong support the proposal received, a high percentage of institutions seem to have interest, motivation, and means to invest in this sport. Should the sport gain the institutional sponsorship to push it from "emerging" to fully sanctioned, serious consideration should be given to moving the championship segment playing season to begin in April and conclude by 4 July. This is a recommendation which would encourage better representation by northern climate schools who would arguably be more interested in sponsoring teams. Also, this sport has strong potential as evidenced by the professional version, that media and television exposure could be imminent.

Staff Comments for Consideration: Most spring championship segment sports conclude with the NCAA championship, a National Collegiate Championship, a National Governing Body championship or a recognized national championship event. It may be more appropriate to mirror the language in this bylaw from the postseason annual exemption to permit teams to compete beyond its final examination period if they are selected for a recognized national intercollegiate sand volleyball championship.

Number and Dates of Competition
(a) Maximum Limitations – Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in sand volleyball during the institution's sand volleyball playing season to sixteen (16) dates of competition during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and four (4) dates of competition during another segment.

Rationale: Commensurate with emerging sport legislation for DI. Further support for this limit is available in a later section.

Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in women's sand volleyball shall exclude the following:

a) **Conference Championship.** Competition in one conference championship tournament or playoff;

b) **Season-Ending Championship Tournament.** Competition in one of the recognized national intercollegiate championship events in sand volleyball (e.g., National Collegiate Sand Championships). A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of the regular season;

c) **Alumni Game.** One date of competition with an alumni team of the institution;

d) **Foreign Team in U.S.** A date of competition against a foreign team in the United States played in the facility in which the member institution regularly plays its home dates of competition;

e) **Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico.** Any dates of competition played in Hawaii or Alaska, respectively, either against or under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico by a member institution located outside those locales;

f) **Fund-Raising Activity.** Any activities in which student-athletes from more than one of the institution's athletics teams participate (or in individual sports per Bylaw 17.02.14.2, in which team members of that sport participate) with and against alumni and friends of the institution, the purpose of which is to raise funds to benefit the institution's athletics or other programs, provided the student-athletes do not miss class as a result of their participation (see Bylaw 12.5.1.1);

g) **Celebrity Sports Activity.** Competition involving a maximum of two student-athletes from a member institution's team who participate in local celebrity activities in women's sand volleyball conducted for the purpose of raising funds for charitable organizations, provided:

1) The student-athlete does not miss class as a result of the participation; and

2) The involvement of the student-athletes has the approval of the institution's athletics director; and

h) **U.S. National Team.** One date of competition against a U.S. national team as selected by the appropriate national governing body in that sport.

Rationale: Commensurate with DI legislation – (b) is based on legislation from the sport of Equestrian where recognized championship(s) may evolve in lieu of an NCAA sanctioned championship which will provide opportunities for student-athletes to garner post-season distinction.

Minimum Contests and Participants Requirements for Sports Sponsorship: In each sport, the institution's team shall engage in at least a minimum number of intercollegiate contests (against four-year, degree-granting collegiate institutions) each year. In the individual sports, the institution's team shall include a minimum number of participants in each contest that is counted toward meeting the minimum-contests requirement. The following minimums are applicable:

Minimum Contests 8 competitions
Minimum Participants 10 participants

NCAA Number of Contests/Dates of Competition

Sport	**Maximum**	**Minimum**	**% of Min.**
Baseball	56	27	48%

Basketball	29	25	86%
Field Hockey	20	11	55%
Football	12	9	75%
Men's Ice Hockey	34	25	74%
Women's Ice Hockey	34	20	59%
Lacrosse	17	10	59%
Sand Volleyball	16	8*	50%
Women's Rowing	20	6	30%
Women's Rugby	**11**	**9**	**82%**
Soccer	20	11	55%
Softball	56	27	48%
Women's Synch Swim	**15**	**8**	**53%**
Women's Team Handball	**20**	**10**	**50%**
Men's Water Polo	21	15	71%
Women's Water Polo	21	10	48%

Minimum Participant Rationale: The participant numbers as well as financial aid limits are connected thought processes. The determination of five two-player units is a function of the following:

- Pair total must be an odd number to prevent ties
- Three pairs only involve six players which would not inspire additional participants and teams could mostly be filled by current rosters for indoor
- Seven pairs requires a projected minimum roster of 14 which eclipses the 'standard' roster size for indoor and seven matches presents logistical issues with competition which could make the events generally problematic to manage
- Five pairs (or ten competing players) provides for a roster size that presents realistic options for competition in either dual, tri, quad, or tournament play

Competition Limit Rationale: Competition maximums and minimums are drawn from reasonable parallels related to other NCAA emerging sports. In averaging all emerging sports above, the maximum number of competitions was 15.14, rounded to 16. Also for the emerging sports above, the minimum limit for sports participation was averaged to be 50% of the maximum number, or 8 for sand. Given the fluctuating length of the season which is contingent upon academic calendar, institutions would see approximately 12 weeks at a minimum to compete. The scope of 16 dates of competition is reasonable to schedule as well as accommodating comfortable options for "fitting" in the minimum limit. It appears the example set forth with the

listed emerging sports is to encourage participation by not stipulating unreasonable limits or commitment.

The eight competitions qualifying for the minimum sport sponsorship parameter should conform to the following conditions:

- No less than three of the eight shall be dual, one-day competitions where all five, two-person teams are competing (institution vs. institution on a single day on which no other competition occurs)

- The remaining number of contests shall be achieved by the option above or multi-opponent competitions – for a tournament to qualify for sports sponsorship purposes, all five, two-person teams must be in competition with all other participating institutions AND one institution is crowned champion for the event based on the performance of its five, two-person teams

- All other competition formats engaged will constitute the use of a "date of competition" but not count towards the sport sponsorship minimum

- Contests against four-year, degree-granting institutions competing in sand competitions but not formally sponsoring a sand volleyball team will not be counted toward sports sponsorship except in the following conditions:

    - Not more than 1 competition in a dual, one-day contest against a "non-sponsored" team

    - In tournament situations, not more than 40% of the teams participating may be "non-sponsored" (3 and 4 team events – not more than 1; 5, 6, & 7 team events – not more than 2; etc)

<u>Competition Qualification Rationale</u>: The suggested definition of countable contests is provided to address anticipated scheduling culture adaptations. A minimum requirement for dual match competitions engenders the directive for institutional rivalries and a simplistic display of the mechanism of the sport. Qualifying the details of multi-institution competition provides a basis for a pragmatic and equitable manner supporting the spirit of genuine competition applied to all opponents. To avoid issues of "non-sponsored" programs participating in sand competitions in the early years of the sport, legislation should provide for opportunities to incorporate programs which may be "testing" the possibilities for eventually adding the sport. Also, these individuals are considered student-athletes by their respective institutions, therefore an option for scheduling these teams for sports sponsorship purposes should exist.

The minimum participant number is based on 5 units of 2 players. See rationale below under "Playing Rules."

Staff Comments for Consideration: For the purposes of playing and practice seasons legislation, sand volleyball will be considered a team sport. Therefore, any date on which any number of sand volleyball participants represent the institution in competition will count as an individual and institutional date of competition against the playing and practice seasons maximum limits. However, in order to count the competition that occurs on that date toward meeting sports sponsorship requirements, the conditions in this specific section must be met.

Playing Rules

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

REPORT OF THE DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP COMMITTEE

ACTION ITEM.

Automatic Qualification.

1. Recommendation. That the following conferences receive automatic qualification (AQ) for the 2009 NCAA Division I Football Championship: Big Sky Conference, Colonial Athletic Association, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference, Missouri Valley Football Conference, Ohio Valley Conference, Patriot League, Southern Conference and Southland Conference.

2. Rationale. These are the same eight conferences that received automatic qualification for the 2008 championship.

   The committee received a request for automatic qualification from the Northeast Conference. While the NEC satisfies the eligibility requirements for automatic qualification, the committee agreed that the NEC did not merit one of the eight AQ positions in the bracket based on its review of AQ criteria: (1) non-conference records; (2) strength of non-conference opponents; (3) recent postseason history, and; (4) competition against FBS opponents. It should be noted that in 2010 the championship bracket will expand to 20 teams, accommodating AQs from the NEC and Big South Conference.

3. Estimated Budget Impact. None.

4. Student-Athlete Impact. None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Selection of Officials. The committee agreed to change the postseason officiating guidelines such that when two institutions from the same conference play each other in the championship, an officiating crew from a different conference must be selected to officiate the game.

2. Bracket Expansion. The committee reviewed and discussed potential implications of bracket expansion in seeding, selection, pairings, minimum financial guarantee from the host institution and television. The committee is seeking feedback on preliminary concepts and plans to recommend bracketing policies to the cabinet in February 2010.

Committee Chair: *John McCutcheon, University of Massachusetts, Amherst*
Staff Liaisons: *Dennis Poppe, Baseball and Football*
Damani Leech, Baseball and Football

The National Collegiate Athletic Association
May 28, 2009 DJL:ct

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I WRESTLING COMMITTEE

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. **Championships Date Formula.** The committee has expressed interest in conducting further study surrounding the possibility of moving the championships date formula, effective with the 2013 NCAA Division I Wrestling Championships, such that the championships would take place the weekend after the NCAA Men's Final Four. This would mean the event could take place during the same weekend as the NCAA Frozen Four. The NCAA Wrestling Committee has developed an internal strategic planning subcommittee, and would like permission to survey the membership if so desired. In addition, the committee also would like permission to survey the general public at the 2010 NCAA Division I Wrestling Championships on various issues surrounding this topic. The earliest a recommendation would be submitted would be in time for the June, 2010 Cabinet meeting.

2. **Misconduct.** The committee issued two misconducts in conjunction with the 2009 NCAA Division I Wrestling Championships. The first misconduct was a public reprimand of Brent Metcalf of the University of Iowa regarding Mr. Metcalf's aggressive post-match actions that could have jeopardized the opposing student-athlete's safety. The University of Iowa did not appeal this finding.

   In addition, the second misconduct involved a private reprimand of a head coach at the championships for comments about the officiating on a live broadcast on ESPNU. As stated in the general section of the championships handbook, members of the coaching staff of participating institutions shall not make public statements critical of officiating in any NCAA championship event. The institution also did not appeal this finding.

Committee Chair: Brad Traviolia, Big Ten Conference
Championship Manager(s): Randy L. Buhr, Championships
Marcus Blossom, Championships

NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Travel Update

Through the period ending with winter championships 2009, total travel costs have continued to decline when compared to the previous year. Preliminary numbers suggest the trend will continue through spring championships.

Factors contributing to this trend include the staff driven adjustments last fall (e.g. mileage software, baggage guidelines) and the 50 mile increase to the fly/drive threshold approved by the cabinet for the 2008-09 academic year. Also contributing to the improvement is the reduction in fuel costs, the slackened demand for air travel and a greater general awareness of the impact the length of charter flights have on their costs.

Fall and Winter Championships Actual Travel Costs			
	2007-08	**2008-09**	**% Savings**
Men's Championships Total	$12,357,289	$9,609,707	22.2%
Mixed Championships Total	$337,453	$271,596	19.5%
Women's Championships Total	$10,235,541	$8,177,660	20.1%
TOTAL	**$22,930,283**	**$18,058,963**	**21.24%**

Mileage increases and mileage software have increased efficiency in the following ways:

- 22 of 35 Division I championships completed.
- Reduction of **commercial flights** by 30
- **Charter flights** 170 vs. 173 last year
    - $12.5 million vs. $17.2 million last year
    - Savings of 27.3 percent
    - Attributable to fuel prices, demand and better awareness of the impact of trip length

NOTE: The cabinet will need to re-visit the conditional approval of the 50 mile increase prior to the start of the championship cycle for the 2009-10 academic year.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association
June 5, 2009 SMB:kw

SOUTHEASTERN CONFERENCE

MIKE SLIVE
COMMISSIONER

June 11, 2009

Joni Comstock, Vice-President for Championships
NCAA
P.O. Box 6222
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6222

Dear Joni:

The Southeastern Conference has recently engaged in a review of issues related to certain NCAA Championship events. In light of the current financial climate and following consultation with our coaches groups, we offer the following concepts for consideration by the Division I Championships Cabinet:

Eliminate Track and Field Regional Qualifying

The members of the Southeastern Conference believe the current approach to establishing national championship participants through a regional qualifying structure results in significant unnecessary cost to participating institutions. Given the fiscal challenges facing many athletics departments, we believe the regional qualifying format can be eliminated immediately. We ask the Cabinet act quickly to eliminate regional qualifying and that a qualifying standard be implemented for determining those who will qualify to participate in the national championship event.

Modify the Women's Soccer Tournament Format

Currently, the NCAA Division I Women's Soccer Tournament is played using a format that requires the successful team play two games during the opening weekend of the tournament, one game during the second weekend of the tournament, one game during the third weekend of the tournament, followed by two games during the College Cup weekend.

In reviewing this format, we suggest consideration be given to a format as follows:

- First Round played at 32 sites during the tournament's first weekend.
- Second and Third Rounds played during the tournament's second weekend, with the number of sites determined by the Women's Soccer Committee and Championships Cabinet. It appears the use of eight four-team sites would be appropriate for this round of competition.

2201 RICHARD ARRINGTON BLVD. N. • BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA 35203-1103
(205) 458-3000 • FAX (205) 458-3031 • WWW.SECSPORTS.COM

- Quarterfinals played during the tournament's third weekend at four sites.

- College Cup played during the tournament's fourth weekend using the current format.

The SEC's women's soccer coaches have expressed concern related to the physical demands associated with competing in a conference tournament, followed the next week by two more physically challenging games during the NCAA tournament's opening rounds. Our coaches believe adopting the suggested format provides the following benefits:

- The physical demands on student-athletes are better managed by requiring successful teams only play one contest during the NCAA tournament's first weekend.
- Using 32 home sites during the first round increases the opportunity to build interest around the country.
- Currently, 16 teams compete at home during the first round while 48 teams are required to travel for the first and second round competition. The suggested format reduces the number of teams traveling to participate in the first round, which is expected to reduce travel costs and missed class time for student-athletes.
- It is anticipated there will be a reduced need for lengthy travel for teams participating in first round contests. Since additional host sites are included in the suggest first round format, it is expected the Women's Soccer Committee will be able to establish appropriate regional matchups while maintaining the integrity of Championship competition.
- The suggested tournament format does not lengthen the season or the time required to play the NCAA tournament.

We appreciate your consideration of these suggestions and the work of the Championships Cabinet to fully evaluate our ideas.

Please contact our office if you have any questions regarding this information.

Sincerely,

Michael L. Slive
Commissioner

cc: Selected SEC Staff

MLS/gs