P.O. Box 6222
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206
Telephone: 317/917-6222

Shipping/Overnight Address:
1802 Alonzo Watford Sr. Drive
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

www.ncaa.org

MEMORANDUM

June 1, 2012

TO: NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet.

FROM: Joni B. Comstock
Senior Vice President of Championships and Alliances

David W. Schnase
Managing Director of Academic and Membership Affairs.

SUBJECT: Agenda and Supplements for the June 20, 2012, Meeting.

Enclosed are the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet agenda and supplements for the June 20, 2012, cabinet meeting, to be held at the Hyatt Regency Indianapolis, One South Capitol Avenue, Indianapolis (telephone: 800/233-1234) in the Regency AB room from 8 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. Any remaining supplements will be sent prior to or distributed at the meeting, as indicated on the agenda. [Note: The dress for the meetings is business casual.]

If you have any questions, please call us. We look forward to seeing you.

JBC/DWS:jb

Enclosures

cc: Selected NCAA Staff Members

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION I CHAMPIONSHIPS/SPORTS MANAGEMENT CABINET
JUNE 20, 2012, MEETING

MEETING SCHEDULE

Wednesday, June 20 – Hyatt Regency

7:30 to 8 a.m.	Breakfast. *Location: Regency AB*
8 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.	Championships/Sports Management Cabinet meeting (lunch included). *Location: Regency AB*

[Note: Indianapolis Weather Averages for the meeting timeframe in June, Hi 82 and Low 63.]

A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet Meeting

Hyatt Regency Indianapolis — June 20, 2012
Room: Regency AB — 8 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.

1. Welcome and opening remarks. (Judy Rose)

2. Review minutes from the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet February 15, 2012, meeting. [Minutes were sent previously to all cabinet members.] [**Action anticipated.**]

3. Report from the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet Administrative Committee June 19 meeting. (Rose) [No action anticipated.]

4. Consent package. [Supplement No. 1] [**Action anticipated**.]

   Background: R*outine matters such as approving the appointment of new committee chairs and the automatic qualification (AQ) of conference teams have been pulled from the sports committee supplements and placed in a consent package for cabinet approval. Any item may be removed from the consent package at the request of a cabinet member.*

5. Cabinet Policies and Operating Procedures. [Supplement No. 2] [No action anticipated.]

   Background: *The Cabinet Policies and Operating Procedures have been updated.*

6. Report from the NCAA Division I Leadership Council, NCAA Division I Board of Directors and NCAA Executive Committee April 2012 meetings. (Dave Schnase) [No action anticipated.]

7. Report from the NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. (Logan Roberts) [No action anticipated.]

8. Remarks from Mark Lewis, executive vice president of championships and alliances.

9. Runner-up team protocol for championship awards. (Joni Comstock) [No action anticipated.]

10. Travel update. (Keith Martin) [Supplement No. 3] [No action anticipated.]

11. Reengineering of the cabinet's work and business. [Supplement No. 4] [No action anticipated.]

    Background: *The cabinet will be asked to identify ways in which future work will be conducted including: greater strategic oversight of groups reporting to the cabinet, enhancing communication with the membership regarding all championships and sport related matters; and the development of procedures and best practices to ensure effective operations of the cabinet.*

12. Per diem reimbursement proposal for NCAA preliminary round competition. [Supplement No. 5] (Tom Douple)

    Background: *The cabinet will be provided a funding recommendation for the next budget cycle for per diem expenses for individual/team championships that do not currently receive NCAA reimbursement in their qualifying/preliminary rounds.*

13. Championships financial updates. (Martin) [No action anticipated.]

14. Bowl certification revisions. (Martin) [No action anticipated.]

    Background: *The cabinet will be provided an update on bowl certification revisions and administrative policy discussions resulting from the current work of the NCAA Bowl Licensing Task Force.*

15. Modifications to misconduct appeals process. (Comstock) [Supplement Nos. 6, 6a and 6b] [No action anticipated.]

Background: The *cabinet will be provided an update on the status of the modifications to the misconduct appeals process.*

16. Failure to adhere to championship administrative policies and procedures. (Comstock) [Supplement No. 7 - to be distributed at a later date] [No action anticipated.]

17. Sports committees' recommendations regarding Division I and National Collegiate Championships. (Cabinet liaison or staff 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. NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Committee. [Supplement No. 8] (Mario Moccia) [No action anticipated.]

b. NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Committee. [Supplement No. 9] (Rose) [No action anticipated.]

Background: *The cabinet will receive an update on items discussed at the Final Four meeting.*

c. NCAA Division I Field Hockey Committee. [Supplement No. 10] (Carol Reep) [**Action anticipated.**]

Background: *The cabinet will be asked to approve conference AQs and a new committee chair.*

d. NCAA Division I Football Championship Committee. [Supplement No. 11] (Greg Burke) [**Action anticipated.**]

Background: *The cabinet will be asked to approve a new committee chair. The cabinet will also be provided information on various topics specific to the championship, including bracket expansion the expanded use of instant replay.*

e. NCAA Division I Men's Golf Committee. [Supplement No. 12] (Rick Villarreal) [No action anticipated.]

Background: *The cabinet will be provided information specific to preliminary round per diem funding in the next budget cycle.*

f. NCAA Division I Women's Golf Committee. [Supplement No. 13] (Carrie Coll) **[Action anticipated.]**

Background: *The cabinet will be provided information specific to preliminary round per diem funding in the next budget cycle.*

g. NCAA Division I Men's Soccer Committee. [Supplement No. 14] (Tom Hickman) **[Action anticipated.]**

Background: *The cabinet will be asked to approve Division I men's soccer officials and an increase in the number of official's selection criteria on site at the 2012 NCAA Men's College Cup. The cabinet will be asked to approve conference AQs and a new committee chair.*

h. NCAA Division I Women's Soccer Committee. [Supplement No. 15] (Shelley Appelbaum) **[Action anticipated.]**

Background: *The cabinet will be asked to approve conference AQs and a new committee chair.*

i. NCAA Division I Men's and Women's Swimming and Diving Committee. Supplement No. 16] (Carrie Coll) [**Action anticipated**]

Background: *The cabinet will be asked to approve a request by the* Men's and *Women's Swimming and Diving Committee that would allow it to review current participant numbers, with the goal of developing a recommendation for an increase of the field size for the men's and women's championships in the next budget cycle.*

j. NCAA Division I Men's and Women's Tennis Committee. [Supplement No. 17] (Kenneth Kavanagh) [No action anticipated.]

Background: *The cabinet will be provided information related to preliminary round per diem funding in the next budget cycle.*

k. NCAA Division I Men's and Women's Track and Field Committee. [Supplement Nos. 18a, 18b and 18c] (Douple) **[Action anticipated.]**

Background: *The cabinet will be asked to approve a recommendation to change the format for indoor track and field championships and receive information related to preliminary round per diem funding in the next budget cycle.*

l. NCAA Division I Women's Volleyball Committee. [Supplement No. 19] (NCAA staff) **[Action anticipated.]**

Background: *The cabinet will be asked to approve an increase in the bench size and conference AQs. The cabinet will receive information on the use of additional selection resources, and the elimination of the Saturday and Sunday format option for first- and second- round competition.*

m. NCAA Men's Water Polo Committee. [Supplement No. 20] (Paula Smith) **[Action anticipated.]**

Background: *The cabinet will be asked to approve conference AQs. The cabinet will receive information on the Rating Percentage Index (RPI) pilot program.*

n. NCAA Women's Water Polo Committee. [Supplement No. 21] (Smith) **[Action anticipated.]**

Background: *The cabinet will receive information specific to a site change that will be required for the 2013 National Collegiate Women's Water Polo Championship.*

o. NCAA Division I Wrestling Committee. [Supplement No. 22] (Jim Fallis) **[Action anticipated.]**

Background: *The cabinet will be asked to approve conference AQs. The cabinet will be asked to support further evaluation and development of a team championship that would be separate from the current individual championships, as well as, an adjustment in the prioritization of the "bronze" selection criteria. The cabinet will also receive updates on many informational items specific to the sport.*

18. Report of the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Issues Committee. [Supplement No. 23] (Rick Hart) **[Action anticipated.]**

Background: The cabinet will be provided several informational items to review, which will include feedback on potential legislation impacting the sport of Division I men's basketball.

19. Report of the NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Issues Committee. [Supplement Nos. 24a and 24b] (Barbara Burke) [No action anticipated.]

    Background: *The cabinet will be provided information regarding the women's basketball recruiting model.*

20. Report of the NCAA Division I Football Issues Committee. [Supplement No. 25] (Staff) [No action anticipated.]

    Background: *The cabinet will be provided several informational items to review.*

21. Report of the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports (CSMAS). [Supplement No. 26 – partial supplement, remainder will be distributed at the meeting] (Connie Dillon) [**Action anticipated.]**

22. Report of the NCAA Olympic Sports Liaison Committee (OSLC). [Supplement No. 27] (Raynoid Dedeaux) [No action anticipated.]

    Background: *The cabinet will be provided informational items regarding the strategic plan generated at the September 2011 in-person meeting, the NGB/OSLC/USOC Task Force, training expenses and a status update on legislation proposed as part of the 2012 legislative process.*

23. Report of the Playing Rules Oversight Panel. [Supplement No. 28] (Fallis) [No action anticipated.]

    Background: *The cabinet will be provided an update on any rules changes that would impact championships execution or financial implications for implementation.*

24. Legislative update. [Supplement No. 29] (Kris Richardson) [No action anticipated.]

    Background: *The cabinet will receive an update on legislative proposals of interest to the cabinet.*

25. NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model – Enforcement presentation. [Supplement No. 30] (Tom Hosty) [No action anticipated.]

    Background: *The cabinet will receive an overview from staff on the Enforcement Working Group's efforts.*

26. NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model – Rules presentation. [Supplement No. 31] (Schnase) [No action anticipated.]

    Background: *Staff will provide the cabinet with a status report, solicit feedback on specific concepts and provide an overview of next steps.*

27. Process for election of cabinet chair. (Rose) **[Action anticipated.]**

28. Future meeting dates and sites.

    a. September 11-12, 2012; national office, Indianapolis.

    b. February 12-13, 2013; national office, Indianapolis.

    c. June 11-12, 2013; national office, Indianapolis.

    d. September 10-11, 2013; national office, Indianapolis.

29. Other business.

30. Adjournment.

CONSENT PACKAGE

In consultation with the chair of the cabinet, the staff has identified the following recommendations as noncontroversial or routine in nature. The recommendations will be voted on as a package. Any objection from any member of the cabinet will remove the relevant item from the consent package for separate consideration and a separate vote.

1. NCAA Division I Field Hockey Committee. [Refer to Supplement No. 10 of cabinet agenda.]

   - automatic qualification
   - committee chair

2. NCAA Division I Football Championship Committee. [Refer to Supplement No. 11 of cabinet agenda.]

   - automatic qualification
   - committee chair

3. NCAA Division I Men's Soccer Committee. [Refer to Supplement No. 14 of cabinet agenda.]

   - automatic qualification
   - committee chair

4. NCAA Division I Women's Soccer Committee. [Refer to Supplement No. 15 of cabinet agenda.]

   - automatic qualification
   - committee chair

5. NCAA Division I Women's Volleyball Committee. [Refer to Supplement No. 19 of cabinet agenda.]

   - automatic qualification

6. NCAA Men's Water Polo Committee. [Refer to Supplement No. 20 of cabinet agenda.]

   - automatic qualification

7. NCAA Division I Wrestling Committee. [Refer to Supplement No. 22 of cabinet agenda.]

   - automatic qualification

8. NCAA Division Women's Basketball Issues Committee. [Refer to Supplement No. 24b of cabinet agenda.]

   - committee chair

NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet

Policies and Operating Procedures

[Effective June 20, 2012]

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

Cabinet Organization 4

Representational Requirements 7

Liaison Assignments 8

Agenda Development and Report Distribution 8

Processing Committee Recommendations 9

Sport Committee Chair Selection 10

Cabinet Communication within the Governance Structure 10

Establishment of Brackets/Field Sizes 11

Working Principles for Seeding/Pairing/Site Selection 12

Appeals of Championships Matters 13

Protocol for Administrative Committee Appeal 14

Legislative Process 15

Excerpted Legislation and Policies Governing Division I Cabinets and Committees 17

Appendices

Appendix A	Committees Appointed by and that Report to the Championships/Sports Management Cabinet
Appendix B	Chart of Division I Legislative Process
Appendix C	Division I Governance Structure Chart
Appendix D	Conflict of Interest Policy
Appendix E	Championships Vacation Policy for Infractions
Appendix F	Guidance Regarding Meeting Minutes, Notes and Email
Appendix G	Sport Sponsorship Levels and Bracket Sizes
Appendix H	Sports Sponsorship
Appendix I	Division I Participation and Sponsorship
Appendix J	Chronology of Bracket/Field Size Expansion
Appendix K	Race and Ethnicity Report for Championships Participation
Appendix L	Budget Timeline, Triennial
Appendix M	NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program
Appendix N	Roster of Cabinet Members
Appendix O	Liaison Assignments
Appendix P	Meeting Schedule for Division I Governance Entities

OBJECTIVES OF THE NCAA DIVISION I GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

For the NCAA's governance structure to achieve its desired goals and be responsive to the NCAA Division I Board of Directors, it is imperative that staff liaisons and representatives serving within the structure be mindful of the objectives and intent of its design.

OBJECTIVES OF ALL DIVISION I CABINETS

1. Develop a national dialogue 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. Promote 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.

NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet
Policies and Operating Procedures

CABINET MISSION AND PRINCIPLES

Mission

The NCAA 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 athletics 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 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 Division I sports committees and sports issues committees;

    b. NCAA Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports Committee;

    c. NCAA Olympic Sports Liaison Committee; and

    d. NCAA Playing Rules Oversight Panel (informational purposes).

3. Additional Responsibilities:

    a. Oversight of the NCAA statistics program;

    b. Oversight of the Championships Awards Program;

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

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

The cabinet will meet three times annually (February, June 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. 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 for efficiency.

Decisions of the cabinet are not final until after the conclusion of the meeting. Cabinet members are bound by a commitment to keep all matters/decisions confidential and not make public any cabinet decisions until the conclusion of the cabinet meeting.

CABINET ORGANIZATION

Thirty-one individuals serve on the cabinet; all 31 multisport conferences are represented. 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. 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) Act on behalf of the cabinet on issues in which a student-athlete's eligibility has been jeopardized and championships competition is pending.

(4) Act on behalf of the cabinet for media issues that normally fall under its purview and require immediate attention to ensure that it responds to NCAA media partners in a nimble and efficient manner. The full cabinet will be consulted whenever feasible. It is noted that the sport committees remain subject matter experts and, therefore, will continue to be key players in relevant discussions.

(5) Organize and structure meeting agendas; and

(6) 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 the Administrative Committee actions as soon as possible following the committee's action.

3. Conference Representation in the Governance Structure.

- Weighted voting and voting percentages. Weighted voting shall be applied at the Leadership Council, Legislative Council and cabinet levels. The voting percentages reflect the percentages established under the 1997 re-structuring agreement, 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) Pac-12 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.

4. Service on Sport or Rules Committees. A cabinet member may not serve on a sport or rules committee concurrent with his or her cabinet term. (Effective September 15, 2010.) Current cabinet members affected by this policy shall be allowed to complete their current service commitments.

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 O]

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 cabinet 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 website 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 website 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 context.

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 website within three days of the conclusion of the meeting.

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

PROCESSING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The cabinet follows these policies in processing recommendations from committees that report to it:

1. In order that the Association's general operating budget may be prepared in a fiscally prudent manner, committees are permitted to submit recommendations that affect the Association's biennial budget only at the cabinet's fall meeting (i.e., recommendations with a budget impact will not be considered at the summer or winter meetings).

2. Committees are required to submit cost estimates with recommendations that may affect the general operating budget during the triennial budget process. Such estimates must be considered and confirmed by the committee before it votes to submit the particular recommendation to the cabinet.

3. Committees are required to include academic and financial impact statements in all recommendations that would alter championship dates or formats.

4. The cabinet will not reconsider a committee recommendation within a year from the date on which it was first acted unless new information of a significant nature that was not previously considered is provided, or unless the cabinet specifically requests that the recommendation be resubmitted at a future date. The chair of the cabinet is authorized to determine if the new information is significant enough to warrant reconsideration before one year has passed.

5. Recommendations that significantly affect championship formats or the membership in general must be approved at least one year before implementation, unless there is sufficient reason (e.g., overwhelming and documented support from the membership for such recommendation) to establish an earlier effective date.

6. Inflationary funds reserved for officiating fees, travel and per diem expenses will be reviewed every two years at the September meeting.

SPORT COMMITTEE CHAIR SELECTION

The cabinet is responsible for appointing sports committee and issues committee chairs. The position of chair of a combined men's and women's sports committee will be alternated between representatives of men's interests and representatives of women's interests, with a two-year limit of any individual's term as chair. [Note: A sports committee may request a waiver of this policy by the cabinet. The administrative committee of the cabinet is authorized to act on such a waiver request between meetings of the full cabinet, if necessary.]

An active head coach may not serve as the chair of either a team or individual-team sports committee in that sport. [Note: A sports committee may request a waiver of this policy from the cabinet in sports that are sponsored by less than 60 percent of the membership eligible to participate in the championship.]

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, 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 H and J]

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's financial resources;

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

    d. The number of Division I conferences that sponsor relevant 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 relevant 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.

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. In championships that do not generate revenue and for which only 25 percent of the bracket is seeded, sites will be awarded to the seeded teams who submit a bid by the deadline that meet the requirements for hosting. In the event that a seeded team does not submit a bid that meets the requirements, the sports committee will maintain the current policy of geographic consideration when assigning those host sites. The committees will use the geographic considerations to help maintain the balance and integrity of the bracket.

3. First- and second-round conference matchups should be avoided. However, if five or more teams from one conference are selected to the championship, then the integrity of the bracket will be protected. First round is defined as first contest.

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. Appellate procedures are as follows:

1. The appeal of a sports committee decision 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 or its designee 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 Administrative Committee 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. Any member of the Administrative Committee hearing an appeal who is from the conference or institution(s) involved will recuse himself or herself from the call.

PROTOCOL FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE APPEAL

1. Welcome and introductions of Administrative Committee members, speakers from appealing institution and chair of Division I sport committee.

2. Comments from appealing institution – five minutes.

3. Opportunity for Administrative Committee to ask questions of the appellant – 10 minutes.

4. Comments from the chair of the Division I sports committee (or designee) – five minutes.

5. Opportunity for Administrative Committee to ask questions of the committee representative – 10 minutes.

6. Administrative Committee deliberation.

7. Administrative Committee will vote to determine whether to uphold judgment of the sport committee, adjust penalty (ies) or vacate the penalty (ies) imposed by the sport committee.

8. The decision of the Administrative Committee will be communicated verbally once a decision has been reached, and written notice of the decision will be sent to the parties within a reasonable amount of time.

The appropriate Division I championships sport manager also may be invited to join the call to answer questions during the first 30 minutes of the call.

Any member of the Administrative Committee hearing an appeal who is from the conference or institution(s) involved will recuse himself or herself from the call.

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 Legislation.

There is a two-part process for voting on whether to recommend noncontroversial or emergency legislation, as follows:

a. The cabinet initially shall vote on whether a proposal shall be considered as noncontroversial or emergency legislation. The proposal must receive three-fourths majority of all cabinet 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 cabinet on its merits. Such a proposal will then require a three-fourths majority of cabinet 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.

EXCERPTED LEGISLATION AND POLICIES GOVERNING DIVISION I CABINETS AND COMMITTEES

Eligibility for Membership
[21.7.1]

1. "On the Staff." Individual shall be salaried on a regular basis by a Division I member institution or conference and perform a regular staff function representing at least 50 percent of the normal workload, unless otherwise specified. [21.7.1.1]

2. Modification in Employment Status. If a member's employment status is altered to the extent that the individual no longer meets this requirement, the individual shall be replaced. [21.7.1.1.1]

3. Individuals on Sabbatical or Temporary Leave. An individual on such leave for a period not exceeding 12 consecutive months may be considered to be "on the staff." An individual on terminal leave or on leave in excess of 12 consecutive months shall not be eligible to serve. [21.7.1.1.2]

4. Waiver of Replacement Requirement**.** The Administration Cabinet, subject to ratification by the Board of Directors, shall have the authority to waive this provision or to approve a delayed replacement if it deems that an immediate replacement would be detrimental to the work of the cabinet or committee involved. [21.7.1.1.3]

Appointments, Method of Selection and Term of Office
[21.7.3]

1. Appointment of Cabinets – Conference Representation. Each conference listed in Constitution 4.2.1-(a) shall have one representative on each of the cabinets. Each of the conferences listed in Constitution 4.2.1-(b) shall have at least two representatives on the cabinets in the aggregate. [21.7.3.1] (see Appendix C)

2. Conference Rotations**.** In consultation with the conferences listed in Constitution 4.2.1-(b), the Leadership Council shall assure that there is a fair rotation among those conferences of representation on more than two cabinets at any one time, and that over any period of time there is a fair rotation of representation on each cabinet. [21.7.3.1.1] (see Appendix O)

3. Term of Office of Cabinets**.** Members of cabinets shall be appointed for one four-year term. A former cabinet or committee member may be appointed to an additional term on that cabinet or committee after three years have elapsed. An individual who has served two terms on a cabinet or committee may not serve further on that cabinet or committee. [21.7.3.2]

Removal from Cabinet or Committee
[21.7.3.2-(f)]

The chair of each cabinet may recommend to the Administration Cabinet that a member be replaced if he or she is not properly discharging his or her duties.

Conflict of Interest
[21.7.4]

A cabinet or committee member shall not participate in the cabinet or committee's discussion or vote on any action that might bring direct or indirect financial benefit to the member or any organization in which the member is financially interested (other than the member's institution or the conference of which it is a member). A violation of this rule by a member of a cabinet or committee shall not invalidate the action taken by the cabinet or committee if, following

disclosure of the conflict of interest, the cabinet or committee authorizes, ratifies or approves the action by a vote sufficient for the purpose, without counting the vote of the cabinet or committee member with the conflict of interest, and the Leadership Council approves such action. (See Appendix D)

Requirements Related to Association-wide General Committees [21.2]

Method of Selection. Each division's governance structure shall appoint members to serve on the general Association-wide committees, consistent with the division's committee appointment procedures. The membership of each committee shall include representatives from each of the Association's membership divisions, including each subdivision of Division I. The Executive Committee also shall ratify policies regarding length, location and expenses of the Association-wide committee meetings. [21.2.1]

Requirements Related to Division I Sports Committees with Championships Administration Responsibilities [21.7.6.5.5.3]

Composition Requirements.

1. For committees that administer championships in individual sports, at least 25 percent of the positions on each committee shall be filled by athletics administrators (e.g., athletics directors, associate or assistant athletics directors, senior woman athletics administrators, individuals who are employed full-time as administrators by member conferences, or individuals who are employed both part-time as administrators by member conferences and full-time by member institutions). [21.7.6.5.5.3.1]

2. For committees that administer championships in team sports, at least 50 percent of the positions on each sports committee shall be filled by athletics administrators. [21.7.6.5.5.3.1]

NCAA Championships Policy Related to Sports Wagering

August 6, 2009, the NCAA Executive Committee voted to approve the following policy, effective immediately:

> "*"No pre-determined or non-predetermined session of an NCAA championship may be conducted in a state with legal wagering that is based on single-game betting on the outcome of any event (i.e., high school, college or professional) in a sport in which the NCAA conducts a championship."*

APPENDIX A

Committees Appointed by and/or that Report to the Championships/Sports Management Cabinet

The Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet appoints Division I members to the following committees that report to it:

Association-Wide General Committees

Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports
Olympic Sports Liaison Committee

Association-Wide Rules Committees without Championships Administration Responsibilities that Report to the Playing Rules Oversight Panel

NCAA Baseball Rules Committee
NCAA Men's Basketball Rules Committee
NCAA Women's Basketball Rules Committee
NCAA Football Rules Committee
NCAA Men's and Women's Ice Hockey Rules Committee
NCAA Men's Lacrosse Rules Committee
NCAA Women's Lacrosse Rules Committee
NCAA Men's and Women's Soccer Rules Committee
NCAA Women's Softball Rules Committee
NCAA Men's and Women's Swimming and Diving Committee
NCAA Men's and Women's Track and Field Committee
NCAA Women's Volleyball Rules Committee
NCAA Division I Wrestling Committee

Sports Committees with Division I Championships Administration Responsibilities

NCAA Division I Baseball Committee
NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Committee
NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Committee
NCAA Men's and Women's Fencing Committee
NCAA Division I Field Hockey Committee
NCAA Division I Football Championship (FCS) Committee
NCAA Division I Men's Golf Committee
NCAA Division I Women's Golf Committee
NCAA Men's Gymnastics Committee
NCAA Women's Gymnastics Committee
NCAA Division I Men's Ice Hockey Committee
NCAA Women's Ice Hockey Committee
NCAA Division I Men's Lacrosse Committee
NCAA Division I Women's Lacrosse Committee
NCAA Division I Women's Rowing Committee

NCAA Division I Men's Soccer Committee
NCAA Division I Women's Soccer Committee
NCAA Division I Softball Committee
NCAA Division I Men's and Women's Tennis Committee
NCAA Men's Volleyball Committee
NCAA Division I Women's Volleyball Committee

Common Committees with Playing Rules and Championships Administration Responsibilities

NCAA Women's Bowling Committee
NCAA Men's and Women's Rifle Committee
NCAA Men's and Women's Skiing Committee
NCAA Men's and Women's Swimming and Diving Committee
NCAA Men's and Women's Track and Field Committee
NCAA Men's Water Polo Committee
NCAA Women's Water Polo Committee
NCAA Division I Wrestling Committee

Additional Committees

Men's Basketball Issues Committee – Appointed by the Board of Directors, but reports to the Championships/Sports Management Cabinet

Women's Basketball Issues Committee – Appointed by the Board of Directors, but reports to the Championships/Sports Management Cabinet

Football Issues Committee – Appointed by the Leadership Council, but reports to the Championships/Sports Management Cabinet

# # # # #

FIGURE 5-1
NCAA Division I Legislative Process



DIVISION I GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE CHART- EFFECTIVE 9/2008



APPENDIX D

National Collegiate Athletic Association

CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND SPEAKING AGENTS POLICIES

The NCAA is a voluntary Association comprised of colleges, universities, conferences and other organizations, and governed through a membership-led committee structure. Within the governance structure, committee members must carefully balance their responsibilities to their respective institutions and/or conferences with the obligation to advance the interests of the Association, the division, or the sport, and ultimately enhance the student-athlete experience. While the fiduciary obligations of committee members to their own institution, their conference, and to the Association ordinarily are not in conflict, it is recognized that as a representative membership organization, committee members' fiduciary obligations are first to their institution, second to their conference, and third to the Association. NCAA committee service involves important ethical and moral obligations. Committee integrity is critical to the decision-making process and includes trust, confidentiality and honesty in all issues and aspects of service and representation. NCAA committee members shall disclose any conflict or potential conflict between their respective personal, professional, institutional, conference, or business interests and the interests of the Association that may affect or otherwise threaten such integrity, in any and all actions taken by them on behalf of the Association, for committee evaluation under this Statement.

In addition to any fiduciary obligations to their institution and conference, committee members also have a fiduciary duty to the Association not to use knowledge or information obtained solely due to service on that committee to the disadvantage of the Association during the term of committee service. Further, a Committee member shall not participate in the committee's discussion or vote on any action that might bring direct or indirect financial benefit to the member or any organization (other than the member's institution or conference) in which the member is financially interested. A committee member should also not participate in a discussion or vote for which the member's institution or conference is to be accorded a special benefit beyond benefits shared with other institutions or conferences or is to receive a penalty or disqualification. A violation of either of the above rules by a member of the committee shall not invalidate the action taken by the committee if, following disclosure of the conflict of interest, the committee authorizes, ratifies or approves the action by a vote sufficient for the purpose, without counting the vote of the committee member with the conflict of interest, and the appropriate oversight body approves the action.

A committee member is responsible for advising the chair of any actual or potential conflicts of interest or obligations which he/she may have hereunder, and should recuse himself/herself from participating in proceedings, as may be warranted by this policy. Abuse of one's position as a member of a committee may result in dismissal from that position. Where such abuse appears evident, a committee member will be notified by the committee chair and will have the

opportunity to present a rebuttal or details of the situation. (*August 2008 Executive Committee minutes)*

Speaking Agent Policy

The president of the Association and the chair of the Executive Committee are the only individuals authorized to speak on behalf of the Association except as outlined below.

An individual representing a member institution or conference who speaks or opines on an Association issue only has the authority to express the view of that individual or the member institution or conference unless the individual has been designated by the Executive Committee of the Association as a speaking agent of the Association on that issue.

Committee chairs are hereby designated as speaking agents of their committees regarding issues within their committees' jurisdiction on which there is consensus, except that positions of advocacy on behalf of the committee or the Association to be communicated in writing or orally to persons or entities external to the Association must have prior approval by the NCAA Executive Committee or the president of the Association.

The president of the Association is hereby granted authority to designate additional speaking agents of the Association. *(April 2001 Executive Committee minutes)*

APPENDIX E

Committee on Infractions Vacation Penalties

The following policy outlines the way in which vacation penalties, as established by the NCAA Committee on Infractions, will be applied in every NCAA championship. Currently, if a student-athlete, who is deemed ineligible, competes in a team championship, his or her team's participation in the championship is vacated. No places or results are adjusted. All finishes are listed as they originally happened during competition, with an asterisk listed next to the offending team as the result/finish was vacated by the Committee on Infractions. Therefore, if a championship team has a student-athlete who is later deemed ineligible, the championship is vacated and the second place team is not elevated to first.

To be consistent, the staff recommends that the Committtee on Infractions use its discretionary authority pursuant to bylaw 31.2.2.3 to apply the vacation penalties in the same fashion to any results in individual/team championships. Therefore, if a student-athlete is found to be ineligible, not only will his or her performances be vacated, but also the place finish of his or her team. The meet will not be rescored, and place-finishes will not be altered. For example, if a student-athlete scores 20 points in the NCAA Championships Swimming and Diving meet for Team X, and his or her team wins the team title by 15 points, Team X is not lowered to second place and the second place team is not elevated to first. All individual performances, awards and honors by individuals on that team who were eligible will stand. For example, Joe Smith from Team X won the 50-meter freestyle and was not declared ineligible, but his teammate was, he will still be the 50-meter champion. However, Team X will have to vacate its place in the team standings, and all finishes will be listed as they happened on the playing surface with an asterisk listed next to Team X and the ineligible student-athlete as the result/finish was vacated by the Committee on Infractions. In addition, as is with team sports, the ineligible student-athlete only has to participate and not necessarily score or accumulate points for the team for the vacation to apply. In the case of an ineligible student-athlete who is a member of a relay team, the results and awards for his or her relay team will be vacated for all relay team members.

This policy will assist in ensuring that vacation penalties will be applied consistently across all sports and championships. A team that has an ineligible basketball player play one minute will have the same penalty as a team that has an ineligible wrestler lose in the first round. By the same token, a soccer team that has a star player playing while ineligible will have the same penalty as a wrestling team who has a national champion. In addition, as with team championships, the team with the ineligible student-athlete must return the team trophy, if applicable, as well as any individual trophies won by the ineligible student-athlete. Trophies won in individual events by eligible student-athletes may be retained. Sports committees will have the opportunity to provide information to the Committee on Infractions regarding the existence of any unique circumstances, and the Committee on Infractions will ensure appropriate and consistent application of the policy.

To ensure that all institutional and student-athlete vacations, statistics and records are accurately reflected in official NCAA publication and archives, the sports information director (or other designee as assigned by the director of athletics) will be asked to contact the NCAA director of statistics to identify the specific student-athlete(s) and contest(s) impacted by the penalties and determine the appropriate actions to be taken by the institution.

In addition, the institution must send a written confirmation of the discussions and actions agreed upon with the director of statistics to the NCAA statistics department. This document will be maintained in the permanent files of the statistics department to verify that records are accurately corrected.

This written report must be delivered to the NCAA statistics department within ninety (90) days following the initial Committee on Infractions release or, if the vacation penalty is appealed, the final adjudication of the appeals process, whichever is later.

APPENDIX F

Guidance for Committee Members Regarding Meeting Minutes, Notes and Email

Committee members' notes of meetings are subject to discovery if litigation ensues regarding the committee's work. The following guidelines will assist in determining what is appropriate and what is not appropriate to include in meeting minutes and notes.

Meeting minutes and notes <u>should</u>…

- Be taken if needed.
- Include information regarding the historical development of programs.
- Synopsize the committee discussion along with whether the committee supported the proposed action or not.
- Clearly express the rationale and reasoning behind policy decisions and recommendations (including obvious reasons, e.g., the action was taken "to preserve the integrity of the game").

Meeting minutes and notes <u>should not</u>…

- Contain extraneous matters or personal comments.
- Identify what individual committee members said or how they voted.
- Include "attorney-client privileged" materials that were shared during a meeting (instead, the minutes should reflect that the committee reviewed and discussed recommendations of legal counsel in executive session without revealing specific recommendations and whether the committee chose to adopt them).

Retention of notes…

- Committee members should routinely discard their notes from committee meetings when they are no longer needed. **<u>However, in the event of litigation, committee members may be directed NOT to discard their notes. From that point until instructed otherwise by NCAA legal counsel, no material from past or present meetings may be discarded</u>.**

E-mail communications…

- Email communications between committee members and a staff liaison and other NCAA staff members are also discoverable in litigation. Care and discretion therefore should be exercised in committing to writing sensitive matters that might better be dealt with in person or by telephone.

- Committee members are advised to routinely discard email that is no longer needed, **<u>with the exception that should litigation ensue, they may be directed NOT to discard their email</u>.**

Sport Sponsorship Levels

Team Sports

60 Percent and Above Sponsorship Level
When at least 60 percent of the membership and conferences sponsor a sport, a minimum of 50 percent of the slots shall be maintained for at-large selections and a maximum of 50 percent of the bracket should be reserved for conference automatic qualifiers.

All conferences eligible for automatic qualification shall be provided access to the championship. Access would be accommodated through bracket expansion, which could include additional opening round games.

The intent is to provide access for all eligible conferences up to the point where a maximum of 50 percent of the bracket is filled, at which time if access is not available to all eligible conferences, the bracket may be expanded with additional opening rounds.

10 – 59 Percent Sponsorship Level
Sports with sponsorship below 60 percent and above 10 percent, at least 50 percent of the bracket shall be reserved for at-large selections, and no more than 50 percent of the bracket shall be available for automatic qualification of eligible conferences.

For sports in the 10 – 59 percent sponsorship category that show increased numbers of sponsoring institutions, or generate net revenue over a designated period of time, or have high marketability potential, bracket expansion may be considered.

Less Than 10 Percent Sponsorship
For sports with less than 10 percent sponsorship, sports committees shall make recommendations on an annual basis for automatic qualification conferences.

Individual Sports

Sports with 60 Percent and Above Sponsorship
In sports where sponsorship is 60 percent or above and where teams are selected to a preliminary round, not more than 50 percent of the bracket shall be designated for automatic bids for eligible conferences.

All conferences eligible for automatic qualification shall be provided access to the championship.

Access could be accomplished by expansion of the field size.

Other Sports

For sports with sponsorship less than 60 percent and where teams are selected, sports committees may make recommendations on an annual basis for automatic qualifications.

Field sizes in all other sports will be based on participation numbers.

Percentage of Sponsorship Categories for Determining Championships Brackets/Field Sizes

Active Membership Totals

(Provisional members are indicated in parentheses)

	2010-11	**2011-12**
Division I	337 (1)	340 (0)
Division II	290 (5)	290 (7)
Division III	435 (8)	436 (5)
Total	1,062 (14)	1,066 (12)

Team Championships

Brackets indicate number of mixed men's/women's teams (counted in men's sponsorship figures)

Percentage Category	**Bracket**	**Championship**	**% of Sponsorship**	**Number of Division I Institutions Sponsoring**	**Number of Division I Conferences Sponsoring**
60% or greater	68	Men's basketball	100%	340	31
	64	Women's basketball	99%	338	31
	64	Women's volleyball	95%	323	31
	64	Women's soccer	93%	317	30
	64	Baseball	87%	294	30
	64	Softball	84%	285	30
	48	Men's soccer	59%	202	23
10-59%	20	FCS football	36%	122	13
	16	Women's lacrosse	27%	91	12
	16	Women's rowing	26%	87	11
	16	Field hockey	23%	79	11
	16	Men's ice hockey	17%	58	5*
	16	Men's lacrosse	18%	61	9*
	8	Women's bowling	11%	37	3
Less than 10%	8	Women's ice hockey	10%	34	4*
	8	Women's water polo	10%	34	5
	4	Men's volleyball	7%	23	3
	4	Men's water polo	7%	22	2

***** Includes the Eastern College Athletic Conference as a sponsoring conference

Percentage of Sponsorship Categories for Determining Championships Brackets/Field Sizes

Individual-Team Championships

Championship	% Of Sponsorship	Field Size	Number of Division I Institutions Sponsoring	Number of Division I Conferences Sponsoring
Men's cross country	91%	255	310	31
Women's cross country	99%	255	337	31
Men's/women's fencing	13%	144	43	(1/1)
Men's golf	86%	156	293	29
Women's golf	74%	138	253	27
Women's gymnastics	18%	216 (max)	62	9
Men's gymnastics	5%	114	16	3
Men's/women's rifle	7%	48	25 [14]	(1/1)
Men's/women's skiing	7%	144	23	0/0
Women's swimming	57%	322	193	23
Men's swimming	39%	270	134	18
Women's tennis	93%	196	317	31
Men's tennis	76%	196	259	31
Women's indoor track	90%	284	309	30
Men's indoor track	75%	284	254	28
Women's outdoor track	93%	544	316	31
Men's outdoor track	81%	544	275	30
Wrestling	23%	330	77	10

# # # # #

APPENDIX H

2011-12 Sports Sponsorship

		Division I	Division II	Division III	Total
	Baseball	294	263	370	927
*	Men's Basketball	340	310	410	1060
*	Women's Basketball	338	312	434	1084
*	Women's Bowling	37	18	10	65
	Men's Cross Country	310	262	389	961
*	Women's Cross Country	337	291	411	1039
@	NC Men's Fencing (combined)	20 [0]	2 [0]	12	34 [0]
	NC Women's Fencing (combined)	23	3	15	41
					75
	Field Hockey	79	27	160	266
*	Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) IA:	120	169	239	650
*	Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) IAA:	122			
*	Men's Golf	293	231	284	808
*	Women's Golf	253	169	177	599
@	NC Men's Gymnastics	16	0	1	17
	NC Women's Gymnastics	62	6	15	83
	Men's Ice Hockey	58	6	71	135
*	NC Women's Ice Hockey	34	3	49	86
	Men's Lacrosse	61	45	189	295
*	Women's Lacrosse	91	66	216	373
@	NC Men's Rifle (combined)	17 [14]	4 [4]	7 [6]	28
	NC Women's Rifle (combined)	8	1	2	11
					39
*	Women's Rowing	87	18	40	145
	NC Men's Skiing (combined)	11	6	14	31
	NC Women's Skiing (combined)	12	7	14	33
					64
	Men's Soccer	202	200	402	804
*	Women's Soccer	317	254	427	998
*	Softball	285	285	407	977
@	Men's Swimming	134	70	206	410
*	Women's Swimming	193	89	243	525
@	Men's Tennis	259	177	329	765
*	Women's Tennis	317	239	376	932
	Men's Indoor Track	259	137	239	635
*	Women's Indoor Track	309	155	244	708
*	Men's Outdoor Track	275	183	272	730
*	Women's Outdoor Track	316	200	282	798
	NC Men's Volleyball	23	16	57	96
*	Women's Volleyball	323	300	424	1047
#	NC Men's Water Polo (@-Div. I)	22	7	14	43
*	NC Women's Water Polo	34	12	18	64
@	Wrestling	77	56	88	221

# Indicates sport is within 15 of 50 sponsoring institutions.
[ ] Indicates number of mixed men's/women's teams (counted in men's sponsorship figures).
* Indicates Division I sport sponsorship has increased by 15 or more sponsoring institutions since 1992-93.
@ Indicates Division I sport sponsorship has decreased by 5 or more sponsoring institutions since 1992-93.

2010-11 Sports Sponsorship

		Division I	Division II	Division III	Total
*	Baseball	293	251	373	917
*	Men's Basketball	337	296	413	1046
*	Women's Basketball	335	298	436	1069
*	Women's Bowling	34	22	10	66
*	Men's Cross Country	307	250	389	946
*	Women's Cross Country	333	276	411	1020
@	NC Men's Fencing (combined)	20 [0]	2 [0]	12	34 [0]
	NC Women's Fencing (combined)	23	3	15	41
					75
	Field Hockey	79	26	159	264
*	Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS)	120	164	238	639
*	Football Championship Subdivision (FCS)	117			
*	Men's Golf	292	218	288	798
*	Women's Golf	249	154	174	577
@	NC Men's Gymnastics	16	0	1	17
	NC Women's Gymnastics	63	5	15	83
	Men's Ice Hockey	58	6	71	135
*	NC Women's Ice Hockey	35	2	49	86
	Men's Lacrosse	60	41	176	277
*	Women's Lacrosse	90	61	205	356
@	NC Men's Rifle (combined)	21 [16]	2 [2]	7 [6]	28
	NC Women's Rifle (combined)	8	1	2	11
					39
*	Women's Rowing	85	17	40	142
	NC Men's Skiing (combined)	11	6	15	32
#	NC Women's Skiing (combined)	12	7	16	35
					67
	Men's Soccer	201	184	404	789
*	Women's Soccer	315	235	426	976
*	Softball	283	274	409	966
@	Men's Swimming	136	67	204	407
*	Women's Swimming	194	84	243	521
@	Men's Tennis	256	172	328	756
*	Women's Tennis	314	227	379	920
*	Men's Indoor Track	254	126	231	611
*	Women's Indoor Track	304	142	236	682
*	Men's Outdoor Track	274	168	272	714
*	Women's Outdoor Track	312	182	281	775
	NC Men's Volleyball	23	16	57	96
*	Women's Volleyball	321	286	428	1035
#	NC Men's Water Polo (@-Div. I)	22	6	14	42
*	NC Women's Water Polo	33	8	19	60
@	Wrestling	80	53	88	221

# Indicates sport is within 15 of 50 sponsoring institutions.
[ ] Indicates number of mixed men's/women's teams (counted in men's sponsorship figures).
* Indicates Division I sport sponsorship has increased by 15 or more sponsoring institutions since 1992-93.
@ Indicates Division I sport sponsorship has decreased by 5 or more sponsoring institutions since 1992-93.

Sport Sponsorship Trends Through 2011-12

Championships sponsored by fewer than 50 institutions		
	2010-11	2011-12
National Collegiate Men's Gymnastics	17	17
National Collegiate Women's Ice Hockey	37	37
National Collegiate Men's and Women's Rifle	41	39
National Collegiate Men's Water Polo	42	43

[Note: Per NCAA Bylaw 18.2.10.1, these championships (and any other championship in an Olympic sport) are exempt from being discontinued due to sponsorship.]

Championships within 15 of sponsorship by 50 institutions		
	2010-11	2011-12
National Collegiate Women's Bowling	65	65
Division I Men's Ice Hockey	58	58
Division I Men's Lacrosse	60	61
National Collegiate Women's Water Polo	60	64

Sports with increase of 15 or more sponsoring institutions since 1992-93		
Division I Men's Baseball	increase:	19
Division I Men's Basketball	increase:	43
Division I Women's Basketball	increase:	49
National Collegiate Women's Bowling	increase	66 All divisions
Division I Men's Cross Country	increase:	21
Division I Women's Cross Country	increase:	50
Division I-A and I-AA Football (14 and 33)	increase:	47
Division I Men's Golf	increase:	22
Division I Women's Golf	increase:	138
National Collegiate Women's Ice Hockey	increase:	28
Division I Women's Lacrosse	increase:	56
Division I Women's Rowing	increase:	57
Division I Women's Soccer	increase:	213
Division I Softball	increase:	97
Division I Women's Swimming	increase:	28
Division I Women's Tennis	increase:	34
Division I Men's Indoor Track	increase:	74
Division I Women's Indoor Track	increase:	21
Division I Men's Outdoor Track	increase:	27
Division I Women's Outdoor Track	increase:	66
Division I Women's Volleyball	increase:	49
National Collegiate Women's Water Polo	increase:	34

Sports with decrease of five or more sponsoring institutions since 1992-93		
National Collegiate Men's Fencing	decrease:	9
National Collegiate Men's Gymnastics	decrease:	26 All divisions
National Collegiate Men's Rifle	decrease:	14
Division I Men's Swimming	decrease:	25
Division I Men's Tennis	decrease:	12
Division I Wrestling	decrease:	33

Emerging Women's Sports

	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09
Women's Equestrian	18	18	18	18
Women's Rugby	2	2	1	1
^Women's Sand Volleyball	14	-	-	-

^ Effective as of August 1, 2011, Sand Volleyball will be included on the list of Emerging Sports for Women.

# # # # #

2010-11 Division I Participation and Sponsorship

TEAM CHAMPIONSHIPS

Team Championship	SPONSORSHIP			CHAMPIONSHIP										
	Total DI Institutions	Total All Divisions Institutions	Total Institutional Participants	Bracket Size	Squad Size	Travel Party				Teams Participating		Total Student-Athletes Participating		
						Student-Athletes		Non-Student-Athletes						
						Prelims	Finals	Prelims	Finals	RATIO	%	TOTAL	RATIO	%
M Baseball	293		10,046	64	27	35	35	8	8	1:4.6	21.8%	**1,728**	**1:5.8**	**17.2%**
M Basketball	337		5,199	68	15	75	100	60	85	1:5.0	20.2%	**1,020**	**1:5.1**	**19.6%**
W Basketball	335		4,820	64	15	52/75	100	37/60	85	1:5.2	19.1%	**960**	**1:5**	**19.9%**
NC W Bowling [4]	33	62	565	8	10	13	13	3	3			**80**	**1:7.1**	**14.2%**
W Field Hockey [3]	79		1,769	16	22	28	28	6	6	1:4.9	20.3%	**352**	**1:5**	**19.9%**
M Football FCS [1, 2]	117		11,784	20	60	130	145	70	75	1:5.9	17.1%	**1,200**	**1:9.8**	**10.2%**
M Football FBS [5]	120		14,303	N/A	119									
M Ice Hockey	58		1,596	16	27	37	37	10	10	1:3.6	27.6%	**432**	**1:3.7**	**27.1%**
NC W Ice Hockey [4]	35	37	841	8	24	34	34	10	10		22.9%	**192**	**1:4.4**	**22.8%**
M Lacrosse	60		2,740	16	32	40	40	8	8	1:3.8	26.7%	**512**	**1:5.4**	**18.7%**
W Lacrosse [3]	90		2,433	16	32	38	38	6	6	1:5.6	17.8%	**512**	**1:4.8**	**21.0%**
W Rowing	85		5,195	16	25	31	31	6	6	1:5.3	18.8%	**400**	**1:13**	**7.7%**
M Soccer	201		5,719	48	21	27	27	6	6	1:4.2	23.9%	**1,008**	**1:5.7**	**17.6%**
W Soccer	315		8,473	64	22	28	28	6	6	1:4.9	20.3%	**1,408**	**1:6**	**16.6%**
Softball	283		5,633	64	20	28	28	8	8	1:4.4	22.6%	**1,280**	**1:4.4**	**22.7%**
NC M Volleyball [4]	23	96	1,456	4	15	21	21	6	6			**60**	**1:24.3**	**4.1%**
W Volleyball	321		4,833	64	15	22	22	7	7	1:5.0	19.9%	**960**	**1:5**	**19.9%**
NC M Water Polo [4]	22	42	1,018	4	16	20	20	4	4			**64**	**1:15.9**	**6.3%**
NC W Water Polo [4]	33	60	1,193	8	16	20	20	4	4			**128**	**1:9.3**	**10.7%**
Total Male Participants			**53,861**	**Total Male Championship Participants**								**6,024**	**1:8.9**	**11.2%**
Total Female Participants			**35,755**	**Total Female Championship Participants**								**6,272**	**1:5.7**	**17.5%**

1 FCS Football has a squad size of 60 in the preliminary rounds and 70 in the finals.
2 Note: Ivy League and Pioneer League do not participate.
3 Currently hosting play-in games prior to championship selection with NCAA covering costs (Field Hockey - 3, Women's Lacrosse - 3).
4 National Collegiate represents Division I, II and III except in Women's Ice Hockey when it is DI and DII only.
5 Number of Bowl teams vary from year to year.

2010-11 Division I Participation and Sponsorship
INDIVIDUAL-TEAM SPORTS

Individual-Team Championship		SPONSORSHIP			CHAMPIONSHIP		
		Total DI Institutions	Total All Divisions Institutions	Total Institutional Participants	Field Size (Individuals Selected)	Teams Participating	
						RATIO	%
Men's Cross Country		307		4,844	255	1:19	5.3%
Women's Cross Country		333		6,079	255	1:23.8	4.2%
NC Fencing	M	20	34	605	72	1:8.4	11.9%
	W	23	41	655	72	1:9.1	11.0%
Men's Golf		292		2,951	450	1:6.6	15.2%
Women's Golf [2]		249		2,099	378	1:5.6	18.0%
NC Men's Gymnastics		16	17	318	169	1:1.9	53.1%
NC Women's Gymnastics		63	83	1,463	594	1:2.5	40.6%
NC Rifle	M	3	4	208	24	1:8.7	11.5%
	W	8	11	181		1:7.5	0.0%
NC Skiing	M	11	32	470	72	1:6.5	15.3%
	W	12	35	485	72	1:6.7	14.8%
Men's Swimming and Diving		136		3,837	270	1:14.2	7.0%
Women's Swimming and Diving		194		5,479	322	1:17	5.9%
Men's Tennis [1]		256		2,657	525	1:5.1	19.8%
Women's Tennis [1]		314		2,907	525	1:5.5	18.1%
Men's Indoor Track and Field		254		9,792	284	1:34.5	2.9%
Women's Indoor Track and Field		304		12,183	284	1:42.9	2.3%
Men's Outdoor Track and Field		274		10,944	544	1:20.1	5.0%
Women's Outdoor Track and Field		312		12,467	544	1:22.9	4.4%
Men's Wrestling		80		2,565	330	1:7.8	12.9%
Total Male Participants (individual)				39,191	2,995		
Total Female Participants (individual)				43,998	3,046		

Overall Male Participants (Individual + Team)	93,052	9,019		
Overall Female Participants (Individual + Team)	79,753	9,318		

1 Men's and Women's Tennis both have bracket size of 64 for team portion of their championship.

2 Women's Golf approved for an increase to 24 teams (+) 6 individuals per region (3).

2011-12 Division I Participation and Sponsorship
CHAMPIONSHIP OPPORTUNITIES

CHAMPIONSHIP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
Baseball	1,728	19%			1,728	9%
Basketball	1,020	11%	960	10%	1,980	11%
Bowling			80	1%	80	0%
Cross Country	255	3%	255	3%	510	3%
Field Hockey			352	4%	352	2%
Fencing	72	1%	72	1%	144	1%
Football	1,220	13%			1,220	7%
Golf	450	5%	378	4%	828	5%
Gymnastics	169	2%	594	6%	763	4%
Ice Hockey	432	5%	192	2%	624	3%
Lacrosse	512	6%	512	5%	1,024	6%
Rifle	24	0%	24	0%	48	0%
Rowing			400	4%	400	2%
Skiing	72	1%	72	1%	144	1%
Soccer	1,008	11%	1,408	15%	2,416	13%
Softball			1,280	14%	1,280	7%
Swimming & Diving	270	3%	322	3%	592	3%
Tennis	525	6%	525	6%	1,050	6%
Track & Field, Indoor	284	3%	284	3%	568	3%
Track & Field, Outdoor	544	6%	544	6%	1,088	6%
Volleyball	60	1%	960	10%	1,020	6%
Water Polo	64	1%	128	1%	192	1%
Wrestling	330	4%			330	2%
TOTAL	**9,039**		**9,342**		**18,381**	
	49.2%		**50.8%**		**100%**	
Women's lacrosse and field hockey play-ins *Travel and game expenses are paid by the NCAA, teams are not considered in the bracket. Adjustment if increase women's lacrosse by 64; field hockey by 66.*	**1,220**		**130**		**1,350**	
	90.4%		**9.6%**		**100%**	

Division I Institutuion Student Population (2009-10 NCAA Gender Equity Report)

Description	MALE	FEMALE
% undergraduate enrollment in 2009-10	**47.4%**	**52.6%**
% participation in college athletics 2009-10	**54.4%**	**45.6%**

Chronology of Bracket/Field Size Expansions

APPENDIX J

Championship:	**Modifications:**
Baseball	*1999* - Increased from 48 to 64 teams.
Men's Basketball	*1953* - Increased from 16 to 22 teams. *1975* - Increased from 22 to 32 teams. *1979* - Increased from 32 to 40 teams. *1980* - Increased from 40 to 48 teams. *1983* - Increased from 48 to 52 teams. *1984* - Increased from 52 to 53 teams. *1985* - Increased from 53 to 64 teams. *2000* - Increased from 64 to 65 teams. *2011* - Increased form 65 to 68 teams.
Women's Basketball	*1982* - Established with 32 teams *1986* - Increased from 32 to 40 teams, and the number of automatic qualifiers increased from 17 to 18 *1989* - Increases from 40 to 48 teams with 19 automatic qualifiers *1994* - Increased from 48 to 64 teams.
Women's Bowling	*2004* - Established with eight teams.
Men's Cross Country	*1998* - Increased from 184 to 255 participants.
Women's Cross Country	*1998* - Increased from 184 to 255 participants.
Men's/Women's Fencing	*2000* - Increased from 120 to 144 participants (added women's sabre).
Field Hockey	*1999* - Increased from 12 to 16 teams.
FCS Football	*1986* - Increased from 12 to 16 teams. *2010* - Increased from 16 to 20 teams.
Men's Golf	*1988* - Reduced from 180 to 156 participants at finals when regional qualifying tournaments were established. *2000* - Increased from 324 to 423 participants at regionals. *2008* - Expanded from three to six regions, increasing participants from 423 to 450.
Women's Golf	*1997* - Increased from 96 to 99 total participants. *1999* - Increased from 99 to 126 participants at finals and from 102 to 126 participants at each of two regionals (252 total). *2000* - Increased from 252 to 321 participants when changing to a three-regional format. *2001* - Increased from 321 to 324 participants at regionals. *2010* - Increased from 21 to 24 teams at each regional site (9 total teams). *2011* - Increased from 3 to 6 individual participants per region (9 total).
Men's Gymnastics	*1995* - Increased from 96 to 114 participants. (6 teams and 12 individuals (72); 6 individuals per event and 6 all around (42). *2008* - Increased additional non-athletes for institutions that only qualify individuals rather than an entire team. *2009* - Increased squad size travel party from 12 to 15.

Championship:	Modifications:
Women's Gymnastics	*1987* - Increased from 10 to 12 teams at nationals (a total of 168 participants at finals). *2000* - Increased squad size from 13 to 15 (a total of 168 participants at finals). *2001* - Approved invitation of event specialists from regionals (winners of regional events) if specialists are not on one of the advancing teams or an all-around competitor. Maximum number of additional invitees is 24. *2008* - Increased additional non-athletes for institutions that only qualify individuals rather than an entire team.
Men's Ice Hockey	*1988* - Increased from 9 to 12 teams. *2003* - Increased from 12 to 16 teams at national site, and from two to four regional sites.
Women's Ice Hockey	*2001* - Established with 4 teams. *2005* - Increased from 4 to 8 teams.
Men's Lacrosse	*1987* - Increased from 10 to 12 teams. *2003* - Increased from 12 to 16 teams.
Women's Lacrosse	*1997* - Increased from 6 to 8 teams. *1998* - Increased from 8 to 12 teams. *2001* - Increased from 12 to 16 teams. *2008* - Increased squad size from 28 to 32.
Men's/Women's Rifle	*1996* - Reduced from 56 to 48 participants.
Women's Rowing	*1999* - Increased from 8 to 10 teams (296 to 349 participants). *2002* - Reformatted to 12 teams and 4 at larges (369 participants). *2008* - Increased from 12 to 16 full teams (369 to 400 participants). *2010* - Automatic qualification approved to begin in 2013.
Men's/Women's Skiing	*1996* - Reduced from 160 to 148 participants.
Men's Soccer	*1993* - Increased from 28 to 32 teams. *2001* - Increased from 32 to 48 teams.
Women's Soccer	*1992* - Reduced from 5 to 4 regional sites. *1993* - Increased from 12 to 16 teams. *1994* - Increased from 16 to 24 teams. *1995* - Increased from 4 to 6 regional sites. *1996* - Increased from 24 to 32 teams. *1998* - Increased from 32 to 48 teams. *2001* - Increased from 48 to 64 teams.
Softball	*1999* - Increased from 32 to 48 teams. *2003* - Increased from 48 to 64 teams.
Men's Swimming	*1992* - Established a limit of 270 participants; prior to that year, field sizes fluctuated due to time standards.
Women's Swimming	*1992* - Established limit of 230 participants. *1994* - Increased limit from 230 to 270 participants. *2002* - Increased limit from 270 to 322 participants.

Men's Tennis	*1998* – Reaffirmed 16 teams at the finals site; regionals consist of 4 teams at 16 sites; total of 196 participants.
Women's Tennis	*1998* – Reaffirmed 16 teams at the finals site; regionals consist of 4 teams at 16 sites; total of 196 participants.
Men's Indoor Track	*1989* - Established a limit of 270 participants; prior to that year, field sizes fluctuated due to time standards. *2006* – Increased limit from 270 to 284 participants.
Women's Indoor Track	*1992* - Established 213 participant cap. *1994* - Increase from 213 to 240 participants. *1996* - Increased from 240 to 254 participants. *1998* - Increased limit from 254 to 270 participants. *2006* - Increased limit from 270 to 284 participants .
Men's Outdoor Track	*1992* - Established a limit of 388 participants; prior to that year, field sizes fluctuated due to time standards. *2003* - Increased limit from 388 to 544 participants; implemented regional qualifying meets.
Women's Outdoor Track	*1992* - Established a limit of 280 participants. *1994* - Increased limit from 280 to 357 participants. *1996* - Increased limit from 357 to 373 participants. *1998* - Increased limit from 373 to 388 participants. *2003* - Increased limit from 388 to 544 individuals; implemented regional qualifying meets.
Men's Volleyball	1969 - Established at 4 teams.
Women's Volleyball	*1993* - Increased from 32 to 48 teams. *1997* - Increased from 48 to 56 teams. *1998* - Increased from 56 to 64 teams.
Men's Water Polo	*1995* - Reduced from 8 to 4 teams.
Women’s Water Polo	*2001* - Established with 4 teams. *2005* - Increased from 4 to 8 teams.
Wrestling	*1987* - Reduced from 355 to 330 participants.

# # # # #

APPENDIX K

RACE AND ETHNICITY REPORT FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS PARTICIPATION
Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet

Introduction
For twelve consecutive years, the NCAA has compiled the following statistical information regarding student-athlete race and ethnicity in intercollegiate athletics at its member institutions. The 2010-11 year was the first that the NCAA introduced the searchable database tool in place of the report that has been seen in previous years.

Suggestions for the reader
It is important to note that the statistics provided by the NCAA in this report are derived from self-reported data supplied by member institutions. No specific checks were made to verify the information provided by the institutions. While this information provides our best estimate of recent general trends in student-athlete race and ethnicity, the data may not be absolutely precise.

Factors affecting the data
As with any data collection effort, there were minor errors and omissions in the data collection process. Data were evaluated on a school by school basis and every effort was made to ensure that corrections were made. Therefore, because of the high response rate and the low error rate the reported percentages and frequencies can be considered good estimations of the actual race and ethnicity data. Historical data may have some inaccuracies due to changes in numbers for a specific year after the report was published.

Race and Ethnicity Category Definitions
In an effort to increase the accuracy of the data a major change has been made to this edition of the report. For ease of comparison, the race and ethnicity categories used in this report are the same categories historically defined by the federal government and currently used in the NCAA Graduation-Rates Reports. More specifically, there are eight race and ethnicity categories (i.e., American Indian/Alaskan Native; Asian, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; Black, Non-Hispanic; Hispanic/Latino; Two or More Races; Other; and White, Non-Hispanic) and one category for Nonresident Aliens (i.e., international student-athletes). In previous reports foreign student-athletes could fall in any of the race and ethnicity categories (e.g., Black, White, or Asian) but for the purposes of this research they were only considered Nonresident Aliens. The residency status and the ethnicity of foreign students were treated as mutually exclusive events. For the 1999-00 through 2005-06 as well as in 2010-11 the residency status of student –athletes is considered separately from their ethnicity. The inclusion of nonresident alien among the ethnic categories may have been a point of confusion early in this longitudinal data collection effort for those individuals submitting the data. Therefore, fluctuations in the data for Nonresident Aliens may represent a combination of changes in the actual number of student-athletes in this category, fluctuations in the accuracy of the data the NCAA received from its member institutions, and now a change in the data collection.

For the purposes of this report the following definitions were used for the race and ethnicity and residency status categories:

- American Indian/Alaskan Native - A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.
- Asian - A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian Subcontinent. This includes people from China, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands, India, and Vietnam.
- Black, Non-Hispanic - A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa (except those of Hispanic origin).
- Hispanic/Latino - A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

- White, Non-Hispanic - A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East (except those of Hispanic origin).
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander - A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.
- Two or More Races - A person having origins in more than one ethnicity category.
- Other - A person unable to identify with the other ethnicity categories.
- Nonresident Alien - A person who is not a citizen or national of the United States and who is in this country on a visa or temporary basis and does not have the right to remain indefinitely.

Please note that we do not collect information on specific countries of citizenship of the Nonresident Alien student-athletes.

Total Division I Participation

Women's Participation
(Division I)

	Alaskan Native/Alaskan Native		Asian/Pacific Islander		Black, Non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Two or More Races/Other/ Non Resident Alien		White, Non-Hispanic		Total Participants
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
BASKETBALL	21	0.4	62	1.3	2,441	50.6	87	1.8	437	9.1	1,772	36.8	4,820
CROSS COUNTRY	25	0.4	83	1.4	726	11.9	317	5.2	466	7.7	4,462	73.4	6,079
FIELD HOCKEY	4	0.2	30	1.7	13	0.7	35	2.0	224	12.7	1,463	82.7	1,769
GOLF	5	0.2	161	7.7	77	3.7	86	4.1	363	17.3	1,407	67.0	2,099
LACROSSE	6	0.2	24	1.0	53	2.2	35	1.4	160	6.6	2,155	88.6	2,433
ROWING	21	0.4	154	3.0	157	3.0	209	4.0	553	10.6	4,101	78.9	5,195
SOCCER	34	0.4	193	2.3	451	5.3	489	5.8	831	9.8	6,475	76.4	8,473
SOFTBALL	43	0.8	156	2.8	463	8.2	445	7.9	282	5.0	4,244	75.3	5,633
SWIMMING/DIVING	13	0.2	151	2.8	107	2.0	167	3.0	486	8.9	4,555	83.1	5,479
TENNIS	4	0.1	157	5.4	195	6.7	121	4.2	975	33.5	1,455	50.1	2,907
TRACK, INDOOR	47	0.4	153	1.3	3,431	28.2	471	3.9	990	8.1	7,091	58.2	12,183
TRACK, OUTDOOR	49	0.4	172	1.4	3,431	27.5	484	3.9	1,033	8.3	7,298	58.5	12,467
VOLLEYBALL	15	0.3	122	2.5	562	11.6	159	3.3	420	8.7	3,555	73.6	4,833

Men's Participation
(Division I)

	Alaskan Native/Alaskan Native		Asian/Pacific Islander		Black, Non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Two or More Races/Other/ Non Resident Alien		White, Non-Hispanic		Total Participants
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
BASEBALL	46	0.5	117	1.2	508	5.1	637	6.3	482	4.8	8,256	82.2	10,046
BASKETBALL	9	0.2	21	0.4	3,083	59.3	88	1.7	503	9.7	1,495	28.8	5,199
CROSS COUNTRY	27	0.6	55	1.1	413	8.5	327	6.8	421	8.7	3,601	74.3	4,844
FOOTBALL (FCS)	49	0.4	129	1.1	5,194	44.1	279	2.4	576	4.9	5,557	47.2	11,784
GOLF	8	0.3	128	4.3	72	2.4	76	2.6	408	13.8	2,259	76.6	2,951
ICE HOCKEY	4	0.3	6	0.4	11	0.7	12	0.8	450	28.2	1,113	69.7	1,596

LACROSSE	13	0.5	13	0.5	56	2.0	40	1.5	188	6.9	2,430	88.7	2,740
SOCCER	14	0.2	105	1.8	563	9.8	607	10.6	903	15.8	3,527	61.7	5,719
SWIMMING/DIVING	10	0.3	124	3.2	75	2.0	143	3.7	428	11.2	3,057	79.7	3,837
TENNIS	9	0.3	119	4.5	113	4.3	132	5.0	1,016	38.2	1,268	47.7	2,657
TRACK, INDOOR	44	0.4	110	1.1	2,580	26.3	413	4.2	823	8.4	5,822	59.5	9,792
TRACK, OUTDOOR	44	0.4	132	1.2	2,805	25.6	512	4.7	896	8.2	6,555	59.9	10,944
WRESTLING	22	0.9	34	1.3	154	6.0	172	6.7	137	5.3	2,046	79.8	2,565

* n is the estimated number of student-athletes in a given sport based on race/ethnicity
*% is the number of student-athletes in a given race/ethnicity (n) divided by total number of participants in the sport (N) multiplied by 100

Women's National Collegiate

(Includes total participation for all three divisions)

	Alaskan Native/Alaskan Native		Asian/Pacific Islander		Black, Non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Two or More Races/Other/ Non Resident Alien		White, Non-Hispanic		Total Participants
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
BOWLING	1	0.3	5	1.7	100	34.2	14	4.8	10	3.4	162	55.5	292
FENCING	1	0.3	44	11.8	21	5.6	21	5.6	49	13.1	237	63.5	373
GYMNASTICS	6	0.5	70	6.4	75	6.8	48	4.4	86	7.9	810	74.0	1,095
ICE HOCKEY	2	0.2	10	1.2	3	0.4	5	0.6	279	33.9	525	63.7	824
RIFLE	1	0.7	3	2.2	3	2.2	5	3.7	13	9.6	111	81.6	136
SKIING	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	31	15.1	170	82.9	205
WATER POLO	2	0.3	31	4.3	5	0.7	53	7.3	98	13.4	540	74.1	729

Men's National Collegiate

(Includes total participation for all three divisions)

	Alaskan Native/Alaskan Native		Asian/Pacific Islander		Black, Non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Two or More Races/Other/ Non Resident Alien		White, Non-Hispanic		Total Participants
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
FENCING	1	0.3	39	10.5	12	3.2	16	4.3	40	10.7	265	71.0	373
GYMNASTICS	2	0.7	21	7.1	12	4.0	12	4.0	22	7.4	228	76.8	297
RIFLE	0	0.0	4	3.0	2	1.5	4	3.0	6	4.4	119	88.1	135
SKIING	0	0.0	2	1.2	1	0.6	1	0.6	35	21.0	128	76.6	167
VOLLEYBALL	4	0.9	29	6.2	14	3.0	21	4.5	39	8.4	360	77.1	467
WATER POLO	6	1.0	20	3.4	4	0.7	37	6.2	64	10.7	466	78.1	597

* n is the estimated number of student-athletes in a given sport based on race/ethnicity
*% is the number of student-athletes in a given race/ethnicity (n) divided by total number of participants in the sport (N) multiplied by 100

Key Division I Findings from the 2010-11 Race and Ethnicity Data

As with the previous years, in 2010-11 the highest percentage of male (60.2 percent) and female (67.6 percent) student-athletes in Division I was white with the next highest percentage of student-athletes being black (24.3 percent for male student-athletes and 15.6 percent for female student-athletes). The percentage of black male student-athletes has increased from 22.9 percent in 1999-00 to the current level in 2010-11. The percentage of black female student-athletes has also increased during the same period, from 13.8 to 15.6 percent.

In 2010-11, the highest percentage of male basketball student-athletes in Division I were black (59.3 percent) and the highest percentage of female basketball student-athletes was also black (50.6 percent). The next highest percentage of male basketball student-athletes were white (28.8 percent) and the next highest percentage of female basketball student-athletes were also white (36.8 percent). More, specifically, the percentages of black male and female basketball student-athletes have steadily increased from 55.0 and 35.7 to their current levels of 59.3 and 50.6 percent respectively in 2010-11.

In 2010-11, the highest percentage of football student-athletes in Division I overall were black (46.0 percent) followed closely by white football student-athletes (44.0 percent). The percentage of black football student-athletes in Division I overall have steadily increased from 39.5 percent in 1999-00 to the current level in 2010-11.

In 2010-11, the highest percentage of football student-athletes in Division I Bowl Subdivision were black (47.6 percent) followed closely by white football student-athletes (41.4 percent). The percentage of black football student-athletes in Division I Bowl Subdivision has steadily increased from 40.3 percent in 1999-00 to the current level in 2010-11.

In 2010-11, the highest percentage of football student-athletes in Division I Championship Subdivision were white (47.2 percent) followed by black football student-athletes (44.1 percent). The percentage of black football student-athletes in Division I Championship Subdivision has increased from 38.5 percent in 1999-00 to the current level in 2010-11.

The sports with the highest percentage of black male student-athletes are basketball (59.3), football (46.0), indoor track and field (26.3) and outdoor track and field (25.6). Basketball (50.6), Bowling (34.2), indoor track and field (28.2) and outdoor track and field (27.5) and were the women's sports with the highest percentages of black females. All other sports for both men and women had less than ten percent black student-athletes, except for women's volleyball (11.6) and women's cross country (11.9).

NCAA Fiscal Years 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15

Triennial Budget Process Timeline

August 2011 - January 2012:

- Executive Committee Finance Committee reviews projected revenue and expense budgets for FY 2012-13, FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15, and recommends tentative allocations to support divisional and Association-wide initiatives, and broad priorities for funding.

- Association-wide governance and championship liaisons meet with administrative services to discuss triennial budget process.

- Finance staff conducts education and training for staff on the triennial budget process.

- Staff liaisons meet with divisional and Association-wide committees to discuss proposed budget requests for the next three budget years (FY 2012-13, FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15).

January 2012:

- Preliminary budget requests submitted to administrative services staff by January 6, 2012, from NCAA president, Association-wide committees, Division I committees and cabinets, and Division II and III committees and NCAA staff. NCAA finance staff summarizes funding requests.

- Summary of triennial funding requests submitted to the NCAA president, and senior vice presidents for review and recommendations.

January - February 2012:

- Review budget requests for questions and clarifications. Meet with President's Cabinet as needed. NCAA president will provide summary and recommendations to the Executive Committee Finance Committee.

February - March 2012:

- Divisional budget committees review divisional revenue distributions, divisional budget requests and Association-wide budget requests and recommend items for funding.

- The NCAA president's and Association-wide budget recommendations transmitted to the Executive Committee Finance Committee.

- Executive Committee Finance Committee meets to establish three-year budget recommendations.

April 2012:

- Management Councils receive the Executive Committee Finance Committee recommendations for Association-wide budget requests and divisional budget committees' recommendations for divisional budget requests.

- Divisional presidential bodies consider its respective Management Council input and approve divisional budget recommendations.

- Executive Committee approves FY 2012-13, FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 Association-wide and divisional initiatives, and approves the FY 2012-13 budget.

- Actions of Executive Committee, Board of Directors and Presidential Councils communicated to the membership.

April - August 2012:

- Budget is finalized and 2012-13 final budget is communicated to the membership and staff.

NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program
Notification of Institutions/Teams Ineligible for Postseason Competition

Penalty Information.

Within the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP), an institution and/or team(s) may be rendered ineligible for postseason competition (including NCAA championships and bowl games) either by failing to submit the requisite APP data by the prescribed deadline, by submitting unusable APP data, falling below the prescribed benchmark for access to postseason competition or by being subject to Level-Three penalties. The following chart outlines this information. *It is important to note that penalties are imposed the academic year after the penalties are announced.

	Postseason Competition Penalty Imposed on Team or Institution.	**Notes**
Failure to submit Graduation Success Rate (GSR) data by the prescribed deadline (i.e., June 1).	Institution.	
Failure to submit NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR)/ Academic Performance Census (APC) data or usable APR/APC data by the prescribed deadline (i.e., six weeks following the first day of class in the fall term).	Institution.	
*Level-Three penalties.	Team(s).	Menu of penalties may include postseason ineligibility. Team(s) may be in Level-Three penalties, and not receive postseason ineligibility.
*Falling below prescribed benchmark for access to postseason competition (i.e., 930)	Team(s).	

Notification.

If an institution and/or team(s) is ineligible for postseason competition, the appropriate individuals will be provided written notification (email or letter) of the institution's or team's ineligibility for championships by the dates listed below.

1. June 15 – for GSR data.

2. December 1 – for APR/APC data.

3. July 1 – for postseason ineligibility and/or Level-Three penalties.

The individuals noted below will receive the written notification. In addition, the academic and membership affairs staff will notify the institution's conference.

1. **Academic and Membership Affairs:** Michelle Vaughn and Dave Schnase (if necessary for the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet).

2. **NCAA Division I Championships:** Sharon Cessna, Carol Reep and Jim Wright (if necessary for statistics).

3. **NCAA Division I Baseball and Football:** Dennie Poppe.

4. **NCAA Division I Men's Basketball:** Jeanne Boyd/Byron Hatch.

5. **NCAA Division I Women's Basketball:** Tina Krah.

Questions.

Questions about this process should be directed to the following academic and membership affairs staff members.

Binh Nguyen
317/917-6613
bnguyen@ncaa.org

John Shukie
317/917-6041
jshukie@ncaa.org

APPENDIX N

NCAA DIVISION I CHAMPIONSHIPS/SPORTS MANAGEMENT CABINET ROSTER AND COMMITTEE LIAISON ASSIGNMENTS

2011-12

Shelley E. Appelbaum Senior Associate Director of Athletics Michigan State University 220 Jenison Field House East Lansing, MI 48824-1025 WORK: 517/353-8849 FAX: 517/432-0068 EMAIL: appelbau@ath.msu.edu	Subdivision: FBS Conference: Big Ten Conference Term Expires: July 2014 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignments: Women's Soccer Committee and Playing Rules Oversight Panel
Barbara Burke Director of Athletics Eastern Illinois University 600 Lincoln Avenue Charleston, IL 61920 WORK: 217/581-2319 FAX: EMAIL: baburke2@eiu.edu	Subdivision: FCS Conference: Ohio Valley Conference Term Expires: July 2015 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Women's Basketball Issues Committee
Gregory S. Burke Director of Athletics Northwestern State University 399 Caspari-NSU Fieldhouse Natchitoches, LA 71497 WORK: 318/357-5251 FAX: 318/357-4221 EMAIL: burkeg@nsula.edu	Subdivision: FCS Conference: Southland Conference Term Expires: July 2012 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Football Championship Subdivision Committee
Dr. Doze Y. Butler Professor-Family and Consumer Sciences Southern University, Baton Rouge E.C. Harrison Boulevard, Bldg. 125 Baton Rouge, LA 70813 WORK: 225/771-3220 FAX: 225/771-2371 EMAIL: doze_butler@subr.edu	Subdivision: FCS Conference: Southwestern Athletic Conference Term Expires: July 2015 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Women's Bowling Committee
Dr. Kenneth Casavant Professor Washington State University Bohler Gym, Addition 285 A Pullman, WA 99164-1602 WORK: 509/335-3411 FAX: 509/335-4327 EMAIL: casavantk@wsu.edu	Subdivision: FBS Conference: Pac-12 Conference Term Expires: July 2014 (Not eligible for reselection)
Carrie Coll Associate Commissioner Mountain West Conference 15455 Gleneagle Drive, #200 Colorado Springs, CO 80920 WORK: 719/488-4044 FAX: 719/487-7240 EMAIL: ccoll@themwc.com	Subdivision: FBS Conference: Mountain West Conference Term Expires: July 2014 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignments: Men's Golf, Men's/ Women's Swimming Committee

Raynoid Dedeaux Director of Championships Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference 2730 Ellsmere Avenue Norfolk, VA 23513 WORK: 757/951-2055 FAX: 757/951-2076 EMAIL: dedeauxr@themeac.com	Subdivision: FCS Conference: Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference Term Expires: July 2015 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Olympic Sports Liaison Committee
Connie Dillon Professor University of Oklahoma Dept of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Monnet Hall, Room 557 630 Parrington Oval Norman, OK 73019 WORK: 405/325-5984 FAX: 405/325-4881 EMAIL: cdillon@ou.edu	Subdivision: FBS Conference: Big 12 Conference Term Expires: July 2014 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignments: Men's/Women's Rifle Committee and the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and the Medical Aspects of Sports
Tom Douple Commissioner The Summit League 340 W. Butterfield Rd, Ste. 3D Elmhurst, IL 60126 WORK: 630/516-0661 FAX: 630/516-0673 EMAIL: Douple@thesummitleague.org	Subdivision: NCAA Division I Conference: The Summit League Term Expires: July 2015 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Men's/Women's Track and Field Committee
Jim Fallis Director of Athletics Northern Arizona University 1 Skydome Drive, Room 277 Flagstaff, AZ 86011 WORK: 928/523-9595 FAX: 928/523-6035 EMAIL: jim.fallis@nau.edu	Subdivision: FCS Conference: Big Sky Conference Term Expires: July 2012 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Wrestling Committee and Playing Rules Oversight Panel
James D. Fiore Director of Athletics Stony Brook University Indoor Sports Complex Stony Brook, NY 11794-3500 WORK: 631/632-7131 FAX: 631/632-7122 EMAIL: jdfiore@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	Subdivision: NCAA Division I Conference: America East Conference Term Expires: July 2012 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Playing Rules Oversight Panel

Rick Hart Director of Athletics University of Tennessee at Chattanooga 615 McCallie Avenue, Dept. 3503 Chattanooga, TN 37403 WORK: 423/425-2270 FAX: 423/425-2160 EMAIL: Rick-Hart@utc.edu	Subdivision: FCS Conference: Southern Conference Term Expires: July 2015 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Men's Basketball Issues Committee
Tom Hickman Director of Athletics Winthrop University Winthrop Coliseum 1162 Eden Terrace Rock Hill, SC 29733 WORK: 803/323-2129 x6226 FAX: 803/323-3439 EMAIL: hickmant@winthrop.edu	Subdivision: FCS Conference: Big South Conference Term Expires: July 2012 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Men's Soccer Committee
Ken Kavanagh Director of Athletics Florida Gulf Coast University Alico Arena Fort Meyers, FL 33965 WORK: 239/590-7007 FAX: 239/590-7014 EMAIL: kavanagh@fgcu.edu	Subdivision: NCAA Division I Conference: Atlantic Sun Conference Term Expires: July 2015 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Men's/Women's Tennis Committee
Robert S. Krimmel Director of Athletics Saint Francis University (Pennsylvania) 117 Evergreen Drive Loretto, PA 15940 WORK: 814/472-3276 FAX: 814/472-3209 EMAIL: bkrimmel@francis.edu	Subdivision: FCS Conference: Northeast Conference Term Expires: July 2015 (Not eligible for reselection)
Scott Leykam Associate Commissioner West Coast Conference 1111 Bayhill Drive, Suite 405 San Bruno, CA 94066 WORK: 650/873-8622 FAX: 650/873-7846 EMAIL: sleykam@westcoast.org	Subdivision: NCAA Division I Conference: West Coast Conference Term Expires: July 2015 (Not eligible for reselection)
Jeffrey P. Long Director of Athletics University of Arkansas, Fayetteville 350 Broyles Athletic Center Fayetteville, AR 72701 WORK: 479/575-7641 FAX: 479/575-4904 EMAIL: jplong1@uark.edu	Subdivision: FBS Conference: Southeastern Conference Term Expires: July 2014 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Baseball Committee

Eugene Marshall, Jr. Director of Athletics Iona College 715 North Avenue New Rochelle, NY 10801 WORK: 914/633-2654 FAX: 914/633-2072 EMAIL: emarshall@iona.edu	Subdivision: NCAA Division I Conference: Metro Atlantic Athletic Term Expires: July 2016
Erin McDermott Executive Associate Athletics Director/SWA Princeton University Jadwin Gymnasium, Suite 5 Princeton, NJ 08544 WORK: 609/258-3751 FAX: 609/258-4477 EMAIL: emcdermo@princeton.edu	Subdivision: FCS Conference: Ivy League Term Expires: July 2012 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignments: Men's/Women's Fencing, Men's Lacrosse, and Men's/Women's Skiing Committees
Jane Miller Senior Associate Athletics Director University of Virginia 3rd Floor McCue Center, 290 Massie Road Charlottesville, VA 22903 WORK: 434/982-5151 FAX: 434/982-5012 EMAIL: jm2y@virginia.edu	Subdivision: FBS Conference: Atlantic Coast Conference Term Expires: July 2014 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Women's Lacrosse Committee
Mario Moccia Director of Athletics Southern Illinois University at Carbondale 1490 Douglas Drive Carbondale, IL 62901 WORK: 618/453-7250 FAX: 618/453-5152 EMAIL: mmoccia@siu.edu	Subdivision: NCAA Division I Conference: Missouri Valley Conference Term Expires: July 2015 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Men's Basketball Committee
Marilyn Moniz-Kaho'ohanohano Associate Director of Athletics University of Hawaii, Manoa 1337 Lower Campus Road Honolulu, HI 96822 WORK: 808/956-4499 FAX: 808/956-4637 EMAIL: monizkah@hawaii.edu	Subdivision: FBS Conference: Western Athletic Conference Term Expires: July 2014 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Softball Committee
Derita Ratcliffe Senior Woman Administrator University of Alabama at Birmingham 701 South 20th Street Birmingham, AL 35294 WORK: 205/975-6283 FAX: 205/975-7286 EMAIL: deritar@uab.edu	Subdivision: NCAA Division I Conference: Conference USA Term Expires: July 2016

Lee Reed Director of Athletics Georgetown University 37th and O Streets SW Washington, DC 20057 WORK: 202/687-3513 FAX: 202/687-6309 EMAIL: ler48@georgetown.edu	Subdivision: FBS Conference: Big East Conference Term Expires: July 2014 (Not eligible for reselection)
Logan Roberts SAAC Representative University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill 220 Elizabeth Street, Apt G-4 Chapel Hill, NC 27514 WORK: 919/610-8100 EMAIL: lwroberts@gmail.com	Subdivision: FBS Conference: Big 12 Conference (Baylor University) Term Expires: July 2012 (Eligible for reselection)
Judith W. Rose Director of Athletics University of North Carolina, Charlotte Barnhardt Student Activity Center 9201 University City Boulevard Charlotte, NC 28223 WORK: 704/687-4920 FAX: 704/510-6965 EMAIL: jwrose@uncc.edu	Subdivision: NCAA Division I Conference: Atlantic 10 Conference Term Expires: July 2012 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Women's Basketball Committee
Jim Schmidt Director of Athletics University of Illinois at Chicago 839 West Roosevelt Road Chicago, IL 60608 WORK: 312/996-2695 FAX: 312/996-8349 EMAIL: jschmidt@uic.edu	Subdivision: NCAA Division I Conference: Horizon League Term Expires: July 2012 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Men's Gymnastics Committee
Jon Steinbrecher Commissioner Mid-American Conference 24 Public Square, 15th Floor Cleveland, OH 44113 WORK: 216/566-4622 FAX: 216/696-2622 EMAIL: jsteinbrecher@mac-sports.com	Subdivision: FBS Conference: Mid-American Term Expires: July 2014
Dr. Camden Wood Selig Director of Athletics Old Dominion University ODU, 1107 Athletic Administration Bldg. Norfolk, VA 23529 WORK: 757/683-3369 FAX: 757/683-5377 EMAIL: wselig@odu.edu	Subdivision: FCS Conference: Colonial Athletic Association Term Expires: July 2015 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Field Hockey Committee

Rosemary A. Shea Associate Director of Athletics College of the Holy Cross One College Street Worcester, MA 01610 WORK: 508/793-2318 FAX: 508/793-2309 EMAIL: rshea@holycross.edu	Subdivision: FCS Conference: Patriot League Term Expires: July 2012 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignments: Men's and Women's Ice Hockey, and Women's Rowing Committees
Paula Smith Senior Associate Athletic Director University of California, Irvine 2000 Mesa Irvine, CA 92697 WORK: 949/824-7590 FAX: 949/824-1493 EMAIL: paula.smith@uci.edu	Subdivision: NCAA Division I Conference: Big West Conference Term Expires: July 2012 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignments: Men's Volleyball and Men's and Women's Water Polo Committees
Rick Villarreal Director of Athletics University of North Texas 1301 S. Bonnie Brae Denton, TX 76205 WORK: 940/565-3646 FAX: 940/369-8408 EMAIL: rickv@unt.edu	Subdivision: FBS Conference: Sun Belt Conference Term Expires: July 2014 (Not eligible for reselection) Cabinet liaison assignment: Men's Golf Committee

# # # # #

2011-12 Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet
Committee Liaison Assignments

Committee	Cabinet Liaison (Term Expiration)	NCAA Point Person
Baseball	Jeff Long (2014) University of Arkansas, Fayetteville jplong1@uark.edu	Damani Leech dleech@ncaa.org
Men's Basketball	Mario Moccia (2015) Southern Illinois University at Carbondale mmoccia@siu.edu	Jeanne Boyd jboyd@ncaa.org
Women's Basketball	Judy Rose (2012) University of North Carolina, Charlotte jwrose@uncc.edu	Tina Krah tkrah@ncaa.org
Women's Bowling	Doze Butler (2015) Southern University, Baton Rouge doze_butler@subr.edu	Jan Gentry jgentry@ncaa.org
Men's/Women's Fencing	Erin McDermott (2012) Princeton University emcdermo@princeton.edu	Kelly Shaul kshaul@ncaa.org
Field Hockey	Wood Selig (2015) Old Dominion University wselig@odu.edu	Mary Berdo mberdo@ncaa.org
FCS Football	Greg Burke (2012) Northwestern State University burkeg@nsula.edu	Damani Leech dleech@ncaa.org
Men's Golf	Rick Villarreal (2014) University of North Texas rickv@unt.edu	Donnie Wagner dwagner@ncaa.org
Women's Golf	Carrie Coll (2014) Mountain West Conference ccoll@themwc.com	Carol Reep careep@ncaa.org
Men's Gymnastics	Jim Schmidt (2012) University of Illinois, Chicago jschmidt@uic.edu	John Baldwin jbaldwin@ncaa.org
Women's Gymnastics	Jeff Long (2014) University of Arkansas, Fayetteville jplong1@uark.edu	D'Ann Keller dkeller@ncaa.org
Men's Ice Hockey	Rose Shea (2012) College of Holy Cross rshea@holycross.edu	Kristin Fasbender kfasbender@ncaa.org
Women's Ice Hockey	Rose Shea (2012) College of Holy Cross rshea@holycross.edu	Russ Yurk ryurk@ncaa.org
Men's Lacrosse	Erin McDermott (2012) Princeton University emcdermo@princeton.edu	Jeff Jarnecke jjarnecke@ncaa.org

Committee	Cabinet Liaison (Term Expiration)	NCAA Point Person
Women's Lacrosse	Jane Miller (2014) University of Virginia jm2y@virginia.edu	D'Ann Keller dkeller@ncaa.org
Men's/Women's Rifle	Connie Dillon (2014) University of Oklahoma cdillon@ou.edu	Chad Tolliver ctolliver@ncaa.org
Women's Rowing	Rose Shea (2012) College of Holy Cross rshea@holycross.edu	Tina Krah tkrah@ncaa.org
Men's/Women's Skiing	Erin McDermott (2012) Princeton University emcdermo@princeton.edu	Mark Bedics mbedics@ncaa.org
Men's Soccer	Tom Hickman (2012) Winthrop University hickmant@winthrop.edu	D'Ann Keller dkeller@ncaa.org
Women's Soccer	Shelley E. Appelbaum (2014) Michigan State University appelbau@ath.msu.edu	Sharon Cessna scessna@ncaa.org
Softball	Marilyn Moniz-Kaho'ohanohano (2014) University of Hawaii, Manoa monizkah@hawaii.edu	Sharon Cessna scessna@ncaa.org
Men's/Women's Swimming	Carrie Coll (2014) Mountain West Conference ccoll@themwc.com	Katie Holmes kholmes@ncaa.org
Men's Tennis	Ken Kavanagh (2015) Florida Gulf Coast University kavanagh@fgcu.edu	Kristin Fasbender kfasbender@ncaa.org
Women's Tennis	Ken Kavanagh (2015) Florida Gulf Coast University kavanagh@fgcu.edu	Mary Berdo mberdo@ncaa.org
Men's and Women's Track	Tom Douple (2015) The Summit League douple@thesummitleague.org	Liz Suscha lsuscha@ncaa.org
Women's Volleyball	TBA	Kristin Fasbender kfasbender@ncaa.org
Men's Volleyball	Paula Smith (2012) University of California, Irvine paula.smith@uci.edu	Russ Yurk ryurk@ncaa.org
Men's Water Polo	Paula Smith (2012) University of California, Irvine paula.smith@uci.edu	Connie Israel cisrael@ncaa.org
Women's Water Polo	Paula Smith (2012) University of California, Irvine paula.smith@uci.edu	Connie Israel cisrael@ncaa.org

Committee	Cabinet Liaison (Term Expiration)	NCAA Point Person
Wrestling	Jim Fallis (2012) Northern Arizona University jim.fallis@nau.edu	Jeff Jarnecke jjarnecke@ncaa.org
Football Issues	TBA	Damani Leech dleech@ncaa.org
Men's Basketball Issues	Rick Hart (2015) University of Tennessee at Chattanooga Rick-Hart@utc.edu	Steve Mallonee smallonee@ncaa.org
Women's Basketball Issues	Barbara Burke (2015) Eastern Illinois University baburke2@eiu.edu	Tina Krah tkrah@ncaa.org
Playing Rules Oversight Panel	Jim Fallis (2012) Northern Arizona University jim.fallis@nau.edu Jim Fiore (2012) Stony Brook University jdfiore@notes.cc.sunysb.edu Shelley E. Appelbaum (2014) Michigan State University appelbau@ath.msu.edu	Ty Halpin thalpin@ncaa.org
Competitive Safeguards & Medical Aspects of Sports	Connie Dillon (2014) University of Oklahoma cdillon@ou.edu	Mary Wilfert mwilfert@ncaa.org
Olympic Sports Liaison Committee	Raynoid Dedeaux (2015) dedeauxr@themeac.com	Dan Calandro dcalandro@ncaa.org

Meeting Schedule for Division I Governance Entities

Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet

September 11-12, 2012; TBD, Indianapolis.
February 12-13, 2013; national office, Indianapolis.
June 11-12, 2013; national office, Indianapolis.
September 10-11, 2013; national office, Indianapolis.

Division I Leadership Council

October 2012; Indianapolis, Indiana.

Division I Board of Directors

August 2, 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.
October 30, 2012, NCAA National Office, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Executive Committee

August 1, 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.
January 18, 2013, Grapevine, Texas.
July 31, 2013, Indianapolis, Indiana.

# # # # #

DIVISION I GROUND TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM
Results Year to Date

Sport	2009-10 Cost	# Trips	Cost/Trip	2011-12 Cost	# Trips	Cost/Trip	Percentage Change
DI FB	$ 215,000	16	$ 13,438	$ 51,106	17	$ 3,006	-78%
DI MBB	$ 227,000	34	$ 6,676	$ 126,320	24	$ 5,263	-21%
DI MIH	$ 54,000	16	$ 3,375	$ 24,838	14	$ 1,774	-47%
DI MSO	$ 118,000	35	$ 3,371	$ 136,513	41	$ 3,330	-1%
DI WBB	$ 281,000	42	$ 6,690	$ 180,529	40	$ 4,513	-33%
DI WFH	$ 66,000	19	$ 3,474	$ 46,575	14	$ 3,327	-4%
DI WSO	$ 174,000	51	$ 3,412	$ 184,058	60	$ 3,068	-10%
DI WVB	$ 185,000	54	$ 3,426	$ 163,938	56	$ 2,927	-15%
NC MWP	$ 3,000	1	$ 3,000	$ 2,648	1	$ 2,648	-12%
NC WBO	$ 19,000	6	$ 3,167	$ 6,574	2	$ 3,287	4%
NC WIH	$ 14,000	4	$ 3,500	$ 15,886	6	$ 2,648	-24%
NIT Post	$ 52,000	16	$ 3,250	$ 48,419	28	$ 1,729	-47%
NIT Pre	$ 68,000	21	$ 3,238	$ 55,385	20	$ 2,769	-14%
	$ 1,476,000	315	$ 4,686	$ 1,042,790	323	$ 3,228	-31%

	Winter 2012 Exceptional Above Avg Average	Fall 2011 Exceptional Above Avg
Courteousness	96%	96%
Accuracy of booking	90%	89%
Responsiveness	87%	83%
Ability to resolve issues	95%	91%
Ease in Contacting	96%	92%
TTC answers questions	91%	91%
Ability to accommodate entire schedule	99%	96%
Online systems	82%	77%
Overall Average	92%	89%

NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet
Administrative Committee Meeting Notes from the February 14, 2012

Goals:

1. Establish policy and oversee procedures that support the experience of the NCAA Division I student-athletes in NCAA championships;

2. Provide for participant and membership feedback on championships to ensure that the expectations of the membership are met;

3. Provide effective oversight of committees reporting to or affiliated with the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet; and

4. Provide for effective communication and ensure appropriate transparency in cabinet matters related to the Division I membership.

Strategies:

1. Ensure effective functioning of the cabinet by establishing objectives, developing metrics, evaluating performance and identifying specific strategies for improvement.

    a. Annually review cabinet objectives, metrics and strategies.

    b. Assign working groups or formal subcommittees for cabinet projects or oversight of specific responsibilities of the cabinet.

    c. Outline expectations and ensure communication with committees reporting to the cabinet; including explaining expectations.

        (1) Annual review of the strategic plan for each sports and issues committee.

        (2) Ensure consistency in how each committee is conducting the business of its committee and decisions.

        (3) Develop expectations related to the committees' charge of serving as an issues as well as sports committee.

(4) Confirm that each sport committee is conducting business consistent with the Division I philosophy and is meeting the expectations of the cabinet.

(5) Ensure that sports and issues committees engage appropriately with affiliated entities (e.g., coaches associations).

d. Review liaison assignments to committees and ensure appropriate orientation and training of new cabinet members, chairs and liaisons.

e. Develop best practices for liaisons to interact with their respective committees.

f. Engage with issues committees of the respective Division I sports to assist with their efforts including legislation that is also supported by the cabinet.

g. Liaisons will have appropriate background and information to represent the cabinet related to the issues committees.

h. Request an annual briefing on the work of the issues committees to include the key issues of the sport and championship.

2. Ensure that there are clear and consistent policies and procedures for championships and sports management oversight.

a. Annual review of the key metrics to ensure that the cabinet has the appropriate information to make informed decisions.

b. Annual review of the finances of the championships.

(1) Review annual detailed expense and revenue reports for each championship.

(2) Review travel and per diem expenses per championship with trends over multiple years.

(3) Annually review financial procedures and address challenges encountered by hosts and the national office.

c. Every two years review the participant feedback from the championships.

d. Annual review of the elements of the championships related to the student-athlete experience including:

(1) Travel party;

(2) Squad size;

(3) Bracket size and principles;

(4) Selection principles and guidelines; and

(5) Awards.

e. Maintain knowledge of national office approaches to site selections and strategies, ensuring their alignment with Division I philosophy.

f. Evaluate the work of regional advisory committees (RAC) and implement improvements when appropriate.

(1) Define expectations for RACs that meet sports committee expectations; and

(2) Confirm attendance and participation of RAC members.

g. Annual review of the participation opportunities in championships relative to gender and participation by student-athletes representing racial minorities.

h. Review sports committee requests to ensure consistency of experience of all student-athletes across all championships.

3. Develop best practices for communication with the membership regarding all championships and sport matters.

a. Develop and use a tracking and communication process for association-wide committees who are associated with the cabinet.

b. Confirm principles for Division I and National Collegiate selections, seeding and bracketing and that the processes for each championship is shared and is as understood and as transparent to the membership, media and fans as possible.

c. Develop and maintain a communications system to communicate with the Division I membership regarding championship and sport matters.

(1) Actions of the Administrative Committee between meetings of the cabinet.

(2) Urgent, time sensitive matters requiring full cabinet participation.

d. Annual review of media related policies.

NCAA Men's and Women's Tennis Committee
NCAA Men's Golf Committee
NCAA Women's Golf Committee
NCAA Men's and Women's Outdoor Track & Field Committee

A. **Recommendation** – Per diem expenses for competing student athletes be provided for the first round of NCAA Championship competition in the sports of Men's/Women's Tennis, Men's/Women's Golf and Men's/Women's Outdoor Track and Field.

B. **Rationale** – These six sports are among the oldest NCAA Championships contested in Division 1 and are sponsored by an overwhelming majority of our member institutions and conferences.

- Women's Tennis - 317 institutions and 31 Conferences Sponsoring
- Men's Tennis - 359 institutions and 31 Conferences Sponsoring
- Women's Outdoor Track & Field - 316 institutions and 30 Conferences Sponsoring
- Men's Outdoor Track & Field - 275 institutions and 30 Conferences Sponsoring
- Women's Golf - 253 institutions and 27 Conferences Sponsoring
- Men's Golf - 293 institutions and 29 Conferences Sponsoring

Currently our member institutions fund the first round of Championship competition in these sports. Providing per diems would help address inequities in the way our First Rounds of NCAA Championships are funded.

C. **Estimated Budget Impact** – Monies to be Phased in over a three year period; Period Year 1 - $794,400, Year 2 - $1,588,800, Year 3 - $2,383,440

Competing student athletes only:
Men's Golf – 450 S/A x $120 per diem x 5 days = $270,000
Women's Golf – 378 S/A x $120 per diem x 5 days = $226,800
Men's Tennis – 525 S/A x $120 per diem x 4 days = $252,000
Women's Tennis – 525 S/A x 120 per diem x 4 days = $252,000
Men's Outdoor Track & Field – 1674 x 120 per diem x 3.5 days = $703,080
Women's Outdoor Track & Field – 1618 x $120 per diem x 3.5 days = $679,560

D. **Student Athlete Impact** – Providing per diem expenses has an impact on an extremely large number of student athletes, 5,170. This will help ensure that student athletes in these sports are treated on a more equitable basis as the other student athletes in the various first rounds of NCAA competition.

E. **Historical treatment of the item** – The student athletes in these six sports have never received per diem expenses for the first round of NCAA Championships.

F. **Consistency with other sports** – Adding per diem for the first round of Championship competitions would bring these six sports to a consistent level with other NCAA Championships.

G. **Known Opposition to Proposal, if any** – None.

NCAA CHAMPIONSHIPS
Failure to Adhere to Policies and Procedures
Dated as of May 24, 2012

Failure of an institution's representatives (staff member and/or student-athletes) to adhere to the policies and procedures governing championships administration.

STEP 1: NCAA site representative and/or the tournament operations administrator shall determine based on the applicable administrative policies of the respective sport if an incident constitutes failure to adhere to policies and procedures. These policies and procedures are set forth in the pre-championships handbook, the host operations manual and/or the participant manual (referenced in NCAA Bylaw 31).

EXAMPLES: Late submission of declarations for track and field, failure to attend/arriving late to mandatory administrative meetings, failure to adhere to published procedures for the submission of regular-season results.

STEP 2: If it is determined that failure to adhere has occurred, the NCAA site representative and/or tournament operations administrator will complete the incident report for action following the championship.

STEP 3: Once an incident report has been completed, the championship point person, in consultation with the governing sport committee, will submit the initial letter to the applicable individual(s)/institution regarding the failure to adhere to policies and procedures within thirty days of the completion of competition. The championship point person will notify the divisional director of the incident.

STEP 4: Following receipt of notification, the institution will have 30 days to respond to the championship point person concerning the incident.

STEP 5: The championship point person, in consultation with the governing sport committee, will review all information and determine a ruling and subsequent penalty based on a pre-determined penalty structure (unless there was an immediate withdrawal or suspension from competition of the respective sport) within 30 days of receipt of the response. Written communication regarding the outcome will be sent to the institution's director of athletics, head coach and Division II president. The communication to the institution will include a copy to the NCAA championship point person and governing sport committee members.

If necessary, the championship point person will inform SMT, legal, PMR, designated NCAA staff and/or the Division Cabinet/Championships Committee of the incident and subsequent outcome. The result will be logged into the national office database.

The NCAA shall have the right, in its sole discretion, to periodically review and/or amend/revise this policy.

DRAFT

NCAA CHAMPIONSHIPS
Misconduct
Dated as of May 24, 2012

For purposes of this policy, "misconduct" shall mean any act of dishonesty, unsportsmanlike conduct, unprofessional behavior or breach of law, occurring from the time the championship field is announced through the end of the championship that discredits the event or intercollegiate athletics. (NCAA Bylaw 31.02.4)

STEP 1: NCAA site representative and/or the championship point person shall review NCAA Bylaw 31 to determine if an incident constitutes misconduct. The championships and alliances divisional director on call will be informed as soon as possible.

Misconduct, as defined herein, can occur prior to (e.g., comments related to seeding or bracket placement), during (e.g., unsportsmanlike conduct on the field) or after (e.g., negative comments in postgame press conference) the championship competition.

In considering whether an act of misconduct has occurred, the sport committee must consider only misconduct that is included within and defined by NCAA Bylaw 31. If the sport committee determines that misconduct has occurred, the sport committee will identify the specific act that constitutes misconduct and outline the facts surrounding the relevant behavior.

[NOTE*:* To be considered misconduct, behavior MUST BE a specific action and not merely a failure to act.]

***STEP 2*:** Identify situation surrounding the misconduct and determine if an administrative hearing shall occur and the timing of the hearing (e.g., immediately on site or following the championship).

1) If misconduct violates the principles of fair play and sportsmanship during the competition and is in violation of the playing rules, the game officials may immediately withdraw the applicable student-athletes(s), coach(es) and/or representatives of the institution from the competition.

   ACTION: No further action needed. The sport committee must determine if additional penalties are warranted based on Bylaw 31.02.4.

2) If the misconduct occurs during the competition (and not covered by playing rules), under normal circumstances, the sport committee will allow the individual(s) to complete the competition in which he or she is participating at the time of the incident (Bylaw 31). If however, the act is so egregious and obviously violates the principles of fair play and sportsmanship, the penalty may result in nonparticipation in subsequent competitions (e.g., profanity and reaction to fan behavior).

   ACTION:

   - ***Determine if the situation needs to be handled prior to the next competition or at the sport committees' convenience (e.g., post game damage of property).***

DRAFT

- ***If the situation requires immediate action, the championship point person/site representative (in consultation with championship point person) shall:***

  - ***Provide the offending institution with specific acts that constitute misconduct and outline the facts surrounding the relevant behavior.***

  - ***Provide an opportunity for an administrative hearing following the days competition/round. (Refer to Attachment A, Misconduct Administrative Hearing Procedures – During Competition). If requested, the administrative hearing will be held at the conclusion of the day's competition or between rounds of the championship, when no competition is being conducted or at the conclusion of the championship, as the sport committee determines at its sole discretion.***

- ***If the situation does not require immediate action, the championship point person/site representative (in consultation with championship point person) shall follow Misconduct Administrative Hearing Procedures – Post NCAA Championship, Attachment B. When the sport committee determines that the individuals should be permitted to complete the competition because immediate withdrawal is not warranted, the sport committee will consider the acts of misconduct within a reasonable time, but not later than two weeks following the completion of the championship.***

(The championship point person/site representative should notify the applicable administrator on site that the student-athletes(s), coach(es) and/or representatives of the institution may be in violation of a misconduct and the championship point person will follow up after the conclusion of the championship).

3) If misconduct occurs outside of competition that would prohibit further competition, the championship point person/site representative (in consultation with championship point person) should notify the offending institutions administrator and/or coach of the misconduct and if a hearing will be necessary for continuation of play (e.g., during post game handshake a fight occurs and breach of law).

ACTION:

- ***Determine if the situation needs to be handled prior to the next competition or at the sport committees' convenience (e.g., post game damage of property).***

- ***If the situation requires immediate action, the championship point person/site representative (in consultation with championship point person) shall:***

  Provide the institution with specific acts that constitute misconduct and outline the facts surrounding the relevant behavior.

  Provide an opportunity for an administrative hearing following the days competition/round. If requested, the administrative hearing will be held at the conclusion of the day's competition or between rounds of the championship, when no competition is being conducted or at the conclusion of the championship, as the sport committee determines at its sole discretion. When

DRAFT

the sport committee determines that the individuals should be permitted to complete the competition because immediate withdrawal is not warranted, the sport committee will consider the acts of misconduct within a reasonable time, but not later than two weeks following the completion of the championship.

(Refer to Attachment A in Misconduct Administrative Hearing Procedures – During Competition)

STEP 3: Notification of findings and penalties.

ACTION: The championship point person determines that the misconduct will be handled at the sports committees' convenience.

- ***The championship point person/site representative will notify the applicable offending institutional administrator on site/director of athletics that the student-athletes(s), coach(es) and/or representatives of the institution may be in violation of a misconduct and the championship point person will follow up after the conclusion of the championship.***

- ***If an administrative hearing took place during the championship the championship point person will notify on site administrator of the findings and any penalties as soon as possible. A letter will be sent to the athletic director/president/chancellor confirming the findings, actions and any penalties imposed within 24 hours.***

Officials can communicate with the sport committee on a missed call that would constitute misconduct. Officials could not throw someone out of the game if they did not witness the act, but the sport committee member can act on the situation at the appropriate time.

DRAFT

ATTACHMENT A

Misconduct Administrative Hearing Procedures – During Championship

Administrative Hearing. To be held if there is reason to consider action to immediately ban or withdraw an individual(s) or team from competition **PRIOR TO COMPLETION OF THE CHAMPIONSHIP**.

The chair of the sport or games committee will notify the applicable offending director of athletics in writing that his or her team, student-athlete(s), coach (es) and/or institutional representative(s) are being reviewed for possible acts of misconduct that occurred during the championship. This notification will also include the commissioner of the respective conference. The notice will identify the specific act that constitutes misconduct and outline the facts surrounding the relevant behavior that could result in a finding of misconduct and an immediate ban or cause withdrawal of the individual, team, from the championship competition. The sport or games committee shall determine whether the hearing will be in-person, by conference call, or another format.

Procedures for the Administrative Hearing.

1. Except as otherwise expressly set forth herein, the sport or games committee shall be the final authority on all matters concerning the conduct of the administrative hearing.

2. If more than one individual is involved, each individual's circumstance will be considered independently.

3. Individuals participating in the hearing **may** include the director of athletics, and his/or her designee from the relevant institution, the individual(s) alleged to have committed misconduct, legal counsel for the institution and each individual, NCAA staff liaison(s) to the committee, the committee members (those employed at the institution, the institution's conference office or another such conference institution will not be a part of the hearing), NCAA legal counsel and additional NCAA staff if the chair of the sport committee.

4. To begin the hearing, the chair of the sport or games committee will provide a summary of the alleged acts of misconduct under review and name those charged with each act of misconduct.

5. Unless otherwise determined by the sport or games committee, the relevant institutional representative(s) or impacted individual(s) will have a total of 20 minutes to provide a summary of the events from their perspective and offer alternative or mitigating information, if appropriate.

6. After the sport or games committee chair's introduction and the relevant institutional individuals or impacted individuals have presented, the on-site representative or tournament operations administrator who reported the incident will provide his or her summary. Members of the sport or games committee will have an opportunity to ask questions following the summaries from each party. The chair of the sport or games committee may stop the discussion at his or her discretion during the period of questions.

7. After the period for questions is complete or stopped, the committee will deliberate in private with non-voting NCAA staff members present, if requested by the committee chair.

8. Individuals participating in the hearing will be informed of the right to appeal the decision of the sport or games committee. All appeals will be heard by the respective divisional appeals subcommittees.

9. If the sport or games committee determines there was an act of misconduct, it will then determine penalties, if any are to be issued -- a range of which is set forth in NCAA Bylaw 31.1.10. In issuing penalties, the sport or games committee will take into account, among other factors, precedent from past findings of misconduct and/or associated penalties.

DRAFT

10. The chair of the sport or games committee will notify the offending director of athletics of the findings and any penalties as soon as possible. A letter will be sent to the director of athletics and president/chancellor confirming the findings, actions and any penalties imposed within 24 hours.

11. If the reprimand or sanctions are to be made public, the director of athletics from the institution at issue will receive notice of the public reprimand in writing prior to distribution to the media outlets. Coordination and writing of any press releases will be made in collaboration between the NCAA office of public and media relations (PMR), legal staff and the sport or games committee.

12. Following the issuance of the committee's decision, the following steps must be followed:

    a. The action should be documented in the NCAA national office misconduct database.

    b. Inform the appropriate championships committee divisional governance staff of the action taken and penalty levied.

    c. Any press release regarding the matter should be prepared in collaboration with the NCAA legal staff and PMR staff.

DRAFT

ATTACHMENT B

Misconduct Administrative Hearing Procedures – Post NCAA Championship

The following steps will be followed no later than 30 days following the championship event.

Notify the applicable director of athletics (in writing) that the institution's team, coaches, student-athlete(s) and/or other institutional representative may be in violation of the misconduct bylaw and request an institutional response as to the events surrounding the incident. (ALLOW 30 DAYS FOR A RESPONSE)

In specific instances, it may be appropriate to communicate with the institution's conference commissioner to provide background so he or she can assist the institution, if requested.

1. Request information from all parties with first person knowledge that may provide an understanding of circumstances and events surrounding the incident. This might include requesting information from other teams, coaches, officials, committee members and event staff at the site. (ALLOW THE SAME 30 DAYS FOR A RESPONSE)

2. The sport committee will review Bylaws 31.02.4 and 31.1.10 and evaluate the information gathered about the possible act(s) of misconduct. The sport committee will provide the relevant individual(s)/institutional representative(s) with an opportunity to participate in the discussion by teleconference.

3. If the institution or impacted individuals would like to participate in a teleconference, the chair of the sports committee will present the committee's position, the institution or impacted individuals will present their position(s) and finally the chair will provide the other committee members with an opportunity to ask questions.

4. Once the information and facts have been presented to the sports committee, the sports committee is responsible for determining if misconduct has occurred. The chair of the sport committee shall lead the committee's private deliberations on the matter and, in consultation with the full committee, render a final decision regarding whether misconduct occurred.

5. If a finding of misconduct is made, the sport committee in considering penalties will review, among other factors, the history of similar findings of misconduct and associated penalties.

6. Following the sport committee meeting and deliberations, the NCAA staff liaison shall inform the applicable director of athletics or his or her designee of one of the following outcomes in writing:

    a. The committee reviewed the information and found no grounds for a finding of misconduct;

    b. The committee reviewed the information and found that the student-athlete(s), coach(es) and/or other institutional representative(s) were in violation of Bylaw 31.02.4. The committee will identify in writing the specific acts of misconduct that were found, the penalty(ies) associated with the finding and the appellate process; or

    c. That no decision has been reached, the reasons why no decision has been reached and the anticipated timeline for when a decision will be reached.

7. If the sports committee finds that misconduct has occurred, the institution or impacted individual(s) will have 30 days to appeal in writing.

DRAFT

8. If the institution or impacted individual(s) notifies the National Office that no appeal is forthcoming or if no response is received from the institution within 30 days, the committee will assess the penalties as indicated.

   If there is an appeal, the information regarding the misconduct will be forwarded to the appropriate appellate body hearing the appeal. (Division I - Administrative Committee of the Championships/Sports Management Cabinet; Division II - a committee comprised of two DII Management Council members and two Championships Committee members and the chair of the Championships Committee; and Division III - the Championships Committee).

9. The governing body hearing the appeal shall proceed in accordance with the procedures for appeal further set forth herein.

The NCAA shall have the right, in its sole discretion, to periodically review and/or amend/revise this policy.

DRAFT

ATTACHMENT C

Appeal Process

Procedures for an Appeal Decision after a Finding of Misconduct

A misconduct determination by a sport or games committee may be appealed by the member institution (on its own or on behalf of its student-athlete) within 30 days of receiving written notice in the following instances:

1. It is asserted that the misconduct determination by the sport or games committee is clearly contrary to the evidence presented.

2. It is asserted that the actions in question do not constitute misconduct as defined in NCAA Bylaw 31.02.4.

3. It is asserted that the sport or games committee did not follow its policies and procedures in reaching its determination and that procedural error significantly impacted the outcome of the original hearing.

- The director of athletics must submit a written notice of appeal to the governing championship committee. The appeal must include which of the above three instances the institution believes exists to support the appeal. In addition the appeal should explain the circumstances and in particular provide information to support the appeal.

In considering an appeal, the divisional appeals sub-committees shall determine in its sole discretion whether to convene a conference call, in-person meeting, or meeting in another format for the institution to present its appeal or whether the matter will be judged based upon the written submission. The subcommittee shall consider only the evidence that was presented to the sport or games committee during the original hearing. If it is asserted that new information exists that would have materially impacted the original finding, the divisional appeals sub-committees will determine whether the new information was reasonably obtainable at the time of the original hearing. If the new material information was not readily available, the divisional appeals sub-committees will send the case back to the sport or games committee for reconsideration.

If more than one individual is involved, each individual's circumstances will be considered independently. In instances that involve a team that has committed an act of misconduct, the issue will take the team as a whole into account, not each individual. This is at the discretion of the sport or games committee in finding the misconduct charge.

Those in attendance in person or via teleconference at the hearing may include the director of athletics from the relevant institution, the individual(s) alleged to have committed misconduct, and an additional representative if requested by the director of athletics , staff liaison(s) to the committee, the committee chair or designated committee representative (speaking on behalf of the committee) , NCAA legal counsel and additional NCAA staff if the chair of governing championships committee so requests.

A person designated by the director of athletics to be included as a representative of the institution or impacted individual(s) must be identified at least seven business days prior to the scheduled appeal. The names of all to be involved in the meeting/teleconference will be shared with all parties participating in the appeal.

The sport or games committee/NCAA staff and the appealing institution/impacted individuals shall have the right to submit materials to the governing championships committee for consideration in connection with the appeal, no later than seven business days prior to the scheduled appeal. All such materials will be distributed at least three days before the hearing to all relevant parties.

DRAFT

Conduct of the Appeal Proceedings

1. The chair of the governing championships committee will open the hearing by identifying all individuals participating in the appeal and will have 20 minutes to summarize the findings and penalties that are being appealed.

2. The chair shall also inform the institution and/or individual(s) appealing that once a decision regarding the appeal is made by the governing championships committee that decision is final and that no additional avenues for appeal exist within the governance process.

3. The institution or individual(s) appealing will have 20 minutes to present their case.

4. There will be a period at the end of the hearing for members of the governing championships committee to ask questions. The chair of the governing championships committee may stop the discussion at his or her discretion once an appropriate amount of time has lapsed for questions from the committee.

5. After the period for questions has concluded, the governing championships committee will deliberate in private with non-voting NCAA staff members present if requested by the committee chair.

6. If the governing championships committee upholds the finding of misconduct, then it must also consider the appropriateness of the penalties related thereto. The governing championships committee may uphold or reduce the penalties, but it may not increase the penalties. If the governing championships committee rejects the finding of misconduct, then the finding will be overturned along with the penalties.

7. As soon as possible, the chair of the governing championships committee will send a letter to the involved parties specifying the administrative committee's ruling and changes in penalties, if any.

8. If the reprimand or sanctions are to be made public, involved institutions will receive notice of the public reprimand in writing prior to distribution to the media outlets. Coordination and writing of any press releases will be made in collaboration with the NCAA public and media relations (PMR) staff and the NCAA legal staff if deemed necessary.

9. Following a final decision by the administrative committee, the following steps must be followed:

10. The action should be documented in the national office misconduct database.

11. Inform the appropriate championships committee of the final action and penalty levied.

12. Any press release regarding the matter should be prepared in collaboration with the NCAA legal staff and PMR office. This press release will also be distributed to the championships divisional director, the divisional governance VP and any other NCAA staff member who should be informed prior to release to the public.

13. Before any such press release is distributed (if applicable), forward a copy to the director of athletics at the involved institution and the chair of the sport or games committee.

DRAFT

Championships: Failure to Adhere to Policies & Procedures

Policies & Procedures	Penalty
Administrator not attending (Division II)	Financial penalty*
Bench area violations	Public reprimand, financial penalty*
Failure to fulfill media obligations	Private letter of reprimand, financial penalty*
Late declarations/entry forms/line-up forms	Financial penalty*
Late or failure to attend required teleconference/meeting	Private letter of reprimand, withhold per diem, financial penalty*
Late payment on tickets	Private letter of reprimand
Logo Violation	Private letter of reprimand, inform institution of self-report, send list of violations to enforcement, financial penalty*
Missing packet pick-up	Financial penalty*
National Anthem Protocol	Private letter or reprimand
Numbered Jerseys at Open Practices	Private letter of reprimand, financial penalty*
Use of drugs, alcohol and tobacco	Public reprimand, withhold per diem
Videotaping violations	Private letter of reprimand
Violation of band, cheerleader or mascot policies	Private letter of reprimand

***Fines:**

A. $100 per team or $50 per individual up to $600 maximum for failure to adhere to public procedures for the submission of regular-season results, availability questionnaires and/or entry forms;

B. Cancellation of all or a portion of the association's travel guarantee, or all or a portion of the institution's share of revenue distribution for failure to adhere to published managerial and administrative policies and procedures;

C. Cancellation of all or a portion of the honorarium for hosting an NCAA championship for failure to submit the financial report within 60 days after competition.

DRAFT

Championships: Misconduct

Misconduct	Penalty
Damage to facilities, hotel	Restitution, private letter of reprimand
Ejection of student-athlete (fighting, etc.)	Suspension of game, public reprimand, withhold per diem and travel
Foul or abusive language	Private letter of reprimand
Inappropriate actions toward officials, scorer's table, host, committee personnel	Private letter of reprimand
Inappropriate behavior during drug testing	Private letter of reprimand, withhold per diem
Misuse of Credentials	Private letter of reprimand
Theft of NCAA signage	Private letter of reprimand, withhold per diem
Unsportsmanlike Conduct- General	Private letter of reprimand, withhold per diem
Unsportsmanlike Conduct toward officials	Public reprimand, withhold per diem
Unsportsmanlike Conduct regarding selection/seeding/bracketing of championship	Private letter of reprimand, withhold per diem

DRAFT

Administrative Policies Related to Submission of Entries for Championships

Championship	Policy	Violation	*	Penalty				Appealable[1]
				Indiv	Team	Max	Notes	
All	Institutional Eligibility requirements: Sep 15, Dec 1, Mar 1	Missed Deadline	*				Ineligibility	Yes
Cross Country	Entry form submission	Missed Deadline		$ 100			Letter to AD	Yes
Fencing	Entry form submission	Missed Deadline			$ 500			
	Individual results	Missed Deadline		$ 50		$ 300		
	Selection scores	Missed Deadline		$ 50	$ 100	$ 300		
Golf	Registration	Missed Deadline			$ 100			
	Golfstat	Missed Deadline			$ 100			
	Results	Missed Deadline			$ 100			
Skiing	Team Info	Failure to submit			$ 50			
Swimming	Rosters	Missed Deadline		$ 50	$ 300			Yes
	Results	Missed Deadline		$ 50	$ 300			Yes
	Results	Incomplete		TBD			Amt not specificed	Yes
	Entry	Missed Deadline	*	$ 300			Possible ineligibility	Yes
Tennis	Results	Missed Deadline	*				Possible ineligibility	Yes
	Line up Forms	Missed Deadline			$ 600		Second - not selected	Yes
	Competition Line up	Less than 30 min			$ 600			
	Improper Line up Changes	Within 10 min			$ 600			
	Results/Line up Procedure	Failure	*	$ 50	$ 100	$ 300	Possible ineligibility	Yes
	Line up challenged	Overturned			$ 300			
Indoor Track and Field	Declarations	Missed Deadline	*		$ 300		Second - ineligible	Yes
	Results	Missed Deadline					Fine of 25 to 100	Yes
		Incorrect Info	*				Disqualification	Yes
	Final Notice Illness/Injury	Missed Deadline			$ 300			Yes
Outdoor Track and Field	Declarations	Missed Deadline			$ 300			Yes
	Results	Missed Deadline					Fine of 25 to 100	Yes
		Incorrect	*				Possible disqualification	Yes
	Failure to Participate		*				Barred from competition.	Yes
	Scratch from Prelim	Missed Deadline	*				Elimination from competition	Yes
	Final notice of Scratches	Missed Deadline			$ 300			Yes
Wrestling	Entry	Missed Deadline		$ 50	$ 300		Paid prior to competition	Yes
	Season Record Form	Missed Deadline		$ 50	$ 300		Paid prior to competition	Yes

***** The penalties noted have a direct impact on the student-athlete.

[1]Appeal goes to the sport committee. If longer than 48 hours from the championship, the appeal also may be made to the Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet.

From 2011-12 NCAA Division I Manual

31.1.11 Failure to Adhere to Policies and Procedures.

31.1.11.1 Financial Penalties. A governing sports committee may assess a financial penalty against an institution for failure of any of its representatives to adhere to the policies and procedures governing championships administration, subject to review by and appeal to the Championships/Sports Management Cabinet. The institution may be assessed: *(Revised: 11/1/07 effective 8/1/08)*

(a) One hundred dollars per team or $50 per individual, up to a $600 maximum penalty, for failure to adhere to published procedures for the submission of regular-season results, availability questionnaires and/or entry forms; *(Revised: 10/29/09)*

(b) One hundred dollars, cancellation of all or a portion of the Association's travel guarantee, or all or a portion of the institution's share of revenue distribution for failure to adhere to published managerial and administrative policies and procedures; *(Revised: 5/7/90)*

(c) Cancellation of all or a portion of the honorarium for hosting an NCAA championship for failure to submit the financial report within 60 days following the competition, as specified in Bylaw 31.4.1.1; or

(d) Financial or other penalties different from (a), (b) and (c) above, but only if they have prior approval of the Championships/Sports Management Cabinet. *(Revised: 5/7/90, 11/1/07 effective 8/1/08)*

31.1.11.2 Late-Entry Fines. Institutions shall not be charged entry fees for teams or student-athletes competing in NCAA championships, but governing sports committees may establish late-entry fines, subject to the approval of the Championships/Sports Management Cabinet. *(Revised: 11/1/07 effective 8/1/08)*

31.1.1.2 Appeal of Decisions of Sports Committees. An appeal of a decision of a governing sports committee, or a subcommittee designated by it, concerning questions of individual or institutional eligibility or the conduct of a championship will not be considered by the Championships/Sports Management Cabinet at any time during the championship or 48 hours immediately preceding the beginning of the championship. During such period, the governing sports committee, or a subcommittee designated by it, shall be the final authority in acting upon appeals concerning the conduct of the championship, subject to the provisions of Bylaw 31.2 regarding institutional and individual eligibility questions. *(Revised: 11/1/07 effective 8/1/08)*

31.1.2 Games Committee. The governing sports committee shall appoint a games committee to supervise actively the conduct of each championship session. The games committee conducting any NCAA championship shall limit participation to eligible student-athletes and may limit the number of entries or reject any application for entry in any event in order that the competition shall best promote the welfare and interest of the sport involved.

31.2.1.2 Deadline. The institutional eligibility requirements for entry into NCAA championships (see Bylaw 18.4.2) must be met by the following dates [in addition to the deadline for the academic reporting form required for Division I set forth in Bylaw 18.4.2.2-(c)]:

(a) September 15 for fall championships;

(b) December 1 for winter championships; and

(c) March 1 for spring championships.

31.2.1.2.1 Compliance with Deadline. Any dues check or approved form required shall be received in the national office by the applicable date or must have been postmarked not later than seven days prior to the applicable date.

31.2.1.3 Deadline Waivers. Institutions that fail to meet a deadline for institutional eligibility in NCAA championships may appeal to the Championships/Sports Management Cabinet for a waiver. If the appeal is granted, the institution may be restored to eligibility for NCAA championships. *(Revised: 11/1/07 effective 8/1/08)*

31.2.1.3.1 Penalty for Additional Waiver. An institution that fails to meet a deadline again may be granted a waiver only on payment of a penalty of $150 for the second offense and $300 for each offense thereafter during the five-year period preceding the last offense. On approval of such waiver and receipt of the institution's check in the national office, the institution may compete in NCAA championships, provided it is otherwise eligible. *(Revised: 1/11/07 effective 8/1/08)*

Possible Considerations.

1. Consistency.

a. Can there be consistency of fines/penalties among and or across championships?

b. Should there be?

2. Process/Procedures.

a. Create more consistency

b. Notification process consistent and reliable

c. Collection of fines/penalties; including time requirement for eligibility for participation

d. Documentation of fines/penalties

3. Fines/Penalties.

a. Integrity of the championship

b. Efficient preparation of the championship

4. Consequences.

a. Are they fair and reasonable?

b. Is the purpose to deter cheating or attempts to gain an unfair competitive advantage?

c. Is the purpose to allow for reasonable preparation and management of the event?

d. What is or is not working?

[Note: The cabinet has taken the position that student-athletes should not be negatively impacted by an institution's negligence in fulfilling its administrative responsibilities.]

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL COMMITTEE JANUARY 11-12, 2012, MEETING

ACTION ITEMS.

- **None.**

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Review of November 8-10, 2012, Meeting Report. The NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Committee reviewed and accepted the report from its fall meeting.

2. 2012 Championship.

a. Officiating update. John W. Adams, national coordinator of men's basketball officials, reported on the general state of officiating for the 2011-2012 season. Doug Fullerton led the discussion regarding the sportsmanship plan offered by the Men's College Basketball Officiating, LLC.

b. Preliminary round ticket sales update. The committee received an update on preliminary-round ticket sales and a description of the various marketing initiatives put in place for the 2012 Championship.

c. Schedule through Final Four. The committee reviewed its meeting and conference call schedule through the 2012 Men's Final Four.

3. Selection Preparation.

a. Explanation of polls in the ranking summary. The NCAA staff provided an explanation of the various polls included in the composite ranking summary.

b. Transparency efforts. NCAA staff reported on the various NCAA and Turner/CBS initiatives which will be in place prior to Selection Sunday in an attempt to further increase transparency in the selection, seeding, and bracketing process.

c. Team sheets. The staff described the various components of the team sheets.

d. Selection show. The staff reviewed initial plans submitted by Turner/CBS for the inaugural post-selection show. The committee requested additional description/information of the post-selection show as it becomes available.

e. Bracketing scenarios. Alternate brackets - using 2011 data - were provided as an informational item. The committee members were asked to review the alternate scenarios and be prepared to discuss in detail during its June meeting.

f. Selection weekend talking points. Talking points regarding the selection weekend process were presented to the committee.

g. First and fourth quadrant assignments. The committee received its first and fourth quadrant assignments. Specific duties and expectations regarding these assignments were reviewed.

h. Conference monitoring reports. The committee spent the majority of the meeting reviewing the conference monitoring reports.

4. 75th Anniversary Update. The committee received a status report on the planning for the 75th Anniversary from Rod Davis, consultant to the NCAA.

5. Association Matters.

a. Committee composition. The current and future composition of the committee was reviewed. Gender and ethnicity of the committee will continue to be reviewed and serve as a priority for future appointments.

b. Site selection. Staff reported on the ongoing efforts by the championships and alliances department to streamline the site selection documents and processes. A proposed preliminary-round timeline (selecting sites for 2014 and 2015) will be presented to the committee at its June meeting.

6. Future Meeting Schedule. The committee reviewed the future meeting schedule.

7. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Committee Chair: *Jeffrey Hathaway, Big East Conference*
Staff Liaison(s): *Greg Shaheen, Interim Executive Vice President of Championships and Alliances*
Jeanne Boyd, Managing Director of Championships and Alliances, Operations

January 11-12, 2012	
Attendees Scott Barnes, Utah State University Mike Bobinski, Xavier University Joe Castiglione, University of Oklahoma Doug Fullerton, Big Sky Conference Lynn Hickey, University of Texas at San Antonio Steve Orsini, Southern Methodist University Ron Wellman, Wake Forest University Jamie Zaninovich, West Coast Conference	Absentees Joe Alleva, Louisiana State University
Other Participants John W. Adams, Rod Davis, Elisa Halpin, Byron Hatch, Greg Weitekamp, David Worlock	

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I WOMEN'S BASKETBALL COMMITTEE MARCH 30, 2012, MEETING

ACTION ITEMS.

- **None.**

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **March 9-12, 2012, Meeting Report.** The NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Committee approved the March 9-12, 2012, meeting report as submitted.

2. **2011-12 NCAA Women's Basketball Rules Survey.** The Women's Basketball Committee was provided the rules survey currently being completed. Tina Krah noted any rules proposals or recommendations should be submitted to the Playing Rules Administration Staff for review by the NCAA Women's Basketball Rules Committee.

3. **2012 Women's Final Four.** The Women's Basketball Committee discussed and reviewed the Women's Final Four schedule of events as it related to their responsibilities, transportation movements and seating assignments.

4. **Women's Basketball Coaches Association (WBCA) National Convention.** The Women's Basketball Committee reviewed the WBCA National Convention schedule and noted functions that would be attended by specific individuals.

5. **Preparation for Meeting with Division I Women's Basketball Conference Captains.** The Women's Basketball Committee reviewed their participation in the Conference Captains meeting.

6. **ESPN championship ratings report.** The Women's Basketball Committee reviewed and discussed the NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Championship ratings report provided by ESPN.

7. **Officiating assignments.** Ms. Krah reviewed the 10 officials selected to work the 2012 Women's Final Four.

8. Review of preliminary-round sites. The Women's Basketball Committee reviewed the attendance reports for the preliminary rounds. Additionally, the Women's Basketball Committee reviewed and discussed reports denoting failure to comply with tournament policies. Each report was reviewed and specific, individual actions were taken on each incident.

9. Future meetings. The Women's Basketball Committee reviewed the future meetings schedule and noted the next in-person meeting would occur at the end of June.

Committee Chair: Greg Christopher, Bowling Green State University, Mid-American Conference
Staff Liaisons: Meredith Cleaver, Championships and Alliances
Rachel Kay, Championships and Alliances
Tina Krah, Championships and Alliances
Michelle Perry, Championships and Alliances

March 30, 2012	
Attendees	**Absentees**
Sybil Blalock, Mercer University	
Shonna Brown, America East Conference	
Greg Christopher, Bowling Green State University	
Chris Dawson, Pacific-12 Conference	
Heather Gores, Gonzaga University	
Dru Hancock, Big 12 Conference	
Carolayne Henry, Mountain West Conference	
Brian Mackin, University of Alabama-Birmingham	
Kathy Meehan, St. John's University	
M. Dianne Murphy, Columbia University	
Other Participants	

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I FIELD HOCKEY COMMITTEE JANUARY 25-27, 2012, MEETING

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

a. Chair.

(1) Recommendation. That Jill LaPoint, executive associate athletics director at Providence College, chair the committee.

(2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.

(3) Rationale. Ms. LaPoint has served for a number of years as the sport administrator for the field hockey program at Providence. As a result of her daily campus administrative duties and her leadership role for the sport within the Big East Conference, she has gained a comprehensive understanding of the issues specific to the sport of field hockey.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

b. Automatic Qualification.

(1) Recommendation. That the following five conferences be approved for automatic qualification for the 2012 championship: Atlantic Coast Conference, Big East Conference, Big Ten Conference, Colonial Athletic Association and the America East Conference. The play-in games will be the Patriot League at the Ivy League, the Mid-American Conference at the Northern Pacific Field Hockey Conference and the Northeast Conference at the Atlantic 10 Conference.

(2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.

(3) Rationale. The recommendations are based on the final Rating Percentage Index for 2011.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Combined championships.** The Division I, II and III committees reviewed and approved a combined field hockey championship in concept for 2013 at Old Dominion University and the United States Field Hockey Training Center in Virginia Beach, Virginia. The National Field Hockey Coaches Association (NFHCA) and its members are supportive of the proposal. A letter of support is attached from the NFHCA. Old Dominion University was approved as a site for the Division I field hockey championship in June 2010, and Division II and Division III have both received approval from their championship committees in regards to participation at the combined championship site. Additionally, the dates and format of the Division I portion will not be affected by the inclusion of Division II and Division III. The Division I field hockey committee feels strongly that this opportunity will further the sport of field hockey. The next steps include the field hockey championship managers outlining a schedule of events and further planning with the various groups involved.

2. **First/Second Round Conference Match-ups.** With the adoption of proposal 2010-108 within Bylaw 31.1.3.2.5 this past fall, the committee feels an unintended consequence of avoiding first- and second-round conference match-ups creates an unfair advantage for the stronger conferences. The committee feels avoiding first-round conference match-ups is necessary, but adding the second-round avoidance considerably alters the integrity of a 16 team bracket as compared to a larger bracket. The committee would like to continue discussion after the one year legislative moratorium expires and ask for relief of second-round conference match-ups for the sport of field hockey that would be effective for the 2014 championship.

Committee Chair: Cathy O' Donnell, Kent State University, Mid-American Conference
Staff Liaison: Mary Berdo, Championships and Alliances

January 25-27, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Beth Anders, Old Dominion University	
Tracey Fuchs, Northwestern University	
Jill LaPoint, Providence College	
Cathy O'Donnell, Kent State University	
Pam Stuper, Yale University	
Karin Torchia, Rider University	

April 26, 2012

To Whom It May Concern:

The purpose of this letter is to formally express the National Field Hockey Coaches Association's (NFHCA) support of the concept of holding the Division I, Division II and Division III NCAA Field Hockey Championships at one site in November of 2013.

The Collegiate Membership of the NFHCA discussed this idea during its January 2012 meetings and voted in favor of the joint championship concept. The NFHCA believes that a joint championship will provide the NCAA and the field hockey community with an excellent opportunity to showcase the sport as well as showcase the outstanding student-athletes who participate in Division I, Division II and Division III Field Hockey. A joint championship will provide the field hockey community with a unifying event during which time coaches from all three divisions can exchange ideas and network. Our hope is that the joint championship will become a "must see" field hockey event in the United States that will benefit our sport at the national and at the international levels.

The NFHCA plans to fully support this concept by holding its Annual Convention in conjunction with the NCAA Championships in November of 2013. We have chosen to move the date of our marquee event in an effort to support the NCAA's efforts and to encourage attendance at the Championships. The NFHCA also plans to hold its annual Senior Games and a Coaches Clinic targeting area high school coaches during Championship Weekend.

Please do not hesitate to contact the NFHCA Office should you have any questions or need any additional information.

Sincerely,

Becca Main

Becca Main
NFHCA President

Jennifer J. Goodrich

Jennifer J. Goodrich
NFHCA Executive Director

cc: Peel Hawthorne, NFHCA Division I Group Representative
Gloria O'Connor, NFHCA Division II Group Representative
Beth Gottung, NFHCA Division III Group Representative

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP COMMITTEE FEBRUARY 21, 2012, MEETING

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

a. Bracket expansion.

(1) Recommendation. That the Division I football championship bracket be expanded from 20 to 24 teams using a traditional balanced bracket format, with the top eight teams being seeded and receiving a first-round bye.

(2) Effective Date. The 2013-14 academic year.

(3) Rationale. Football is the only Division I championship in which all eligible and applicant conferences do not receive automatic qualification (AQ) or access through a play-in. Currently, eleven conferences apply for an AQ, with only 10 AQs provided for in the 20-team bracket.

In October, President Mark Emmert and the NCAA Division I Board of Directors established an FCS Working Group and charged it with, among other things, developing options for expanding access to the FCS championship from 20 teams to up to 24 teams. Over the course of the last several months, the working group conducted multiple conference calls, provided a status report to the FCS community in January in conjunction with the championship game and received input from FCS head coaches as well as the NCAA Division I Football Championship Committee.

The working group and the Football Championship Committee believe that this bracket model most closely adheres to four primary goals: (1) most effectively determine the best team in FCS football – the national champion; (2) provide equitable and fair championship participation opportunities by all interested FCS institutions and conferences; (3) provides a high-quality championship experience for participating student-athletes, institutions and their fans; and (4) ensures a fiscally reasonable bracket and championship for the Association and participating teams.

Additionally, this recommended bracket model has the following merits:

(a) It allows for host-protection for top seeds while still offering flexibility in other pairings using geographic proximity.

(b) All eight teams receiving a first round bye would be seeded; which is more logical than limiting seeds to the current championship policy of 25 percent (only six teams).

(c) It is more fiscally reasonable than a model seeding all 24 teams and has more national competitive integrity than a regionalized bracket (akin to Division II).

Other championship bracket models considered, but not advanced by the working group include the following:

(a) Seed All 24 Teams. This model is the most expensive option; realistically, it is very difficult to make fair/accurate seed decisions for all 24 teams; no conference-protection in the first round; less incentive for hosts to make competitive bids (revenues/expenses).

(b) Regional Bracket. This model (competition within four regions until semifinals) makes it difficult (if not impossible) to protect conference matchups in the first round; region-to-region competitive imbalances adversely impacting teams during selections and in-championship advancement; imbalances in the number of teams in each region.

(c) Final Four. Advancing all four semifinal teams to one championship site would generate a significant increase in cost; create potential field condition issues on natural grass surfaces; likely poor semifinal attendance compared to on-campus semifinals; negative schedule/calendar implications.

(d) Pre-Determined Semifinal Sites. While this allows for the more advanced planning operationally, it may be difficult to sell tickets outside of the local markets of participating teams; increased expenses/decreased revenue for semifinal games; taking some of the most compelling and highest rated championship football off campuses and out of local markets.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. $503,880 in additional championship deficit net receipts, for a total estimated deficit the first year of expansion of $1,056,839.

The model seeding all 24 teams has an estimated budget impact of $707,830 in additional championship deficit net receipts and the regional bracket has an estimated budget impact of $432,480 in additional championship deficit net receipts. Also, the 2010-11 championship (the first year using a 20-team bracket) operated at a net receipt deficit of $552,959.

The funds to support this initiative will not be sourced from the current Division I championships budget, as managed by the cabinet. Rather, the budget will be approved by the NCAA Executive Committee as part of its broader review of the entire Association budget. Preliminary budget approval for this initiative was given by the NCAA Executive Committee Finance Subcommittee in April. Final approval by the Executive Committee is expected in August.

Finally, the cabinet is being asked to determine if the increase in male championship participation opportunities requires any increase in female participation opportunities. If so, funds have been budgeted through the Executive Committee to support such an increase.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. The expanded bracket provides for an addition of four teams (240 student-athletes) to participate in the championship. The expanded bracket also ensures that all eligible conferences applying for championship automatic qualification can receive an AQ (presently only 10 of the 11 applicant conferences receive an AQ).

b. Automatic qualification.

(1) Recommendation. That the following 10 conferences receive automatic qualification (AQ) for the 2012 NCAA Division I Football Championship: Big Sky Conference, Big South Conference, Colonial Athletic Association, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference, Missouri Valley Football Conference, Northeast Conference, Ohio Valley Conference, The Patriot League, Southern Conference and Southland Conference.

(2) Effective Date. The 2012-13 academic year.

(3) Rationale. The same 10 conferences that received automatic qualification for the 2011 championship were again selected for AQ by the committee.

The Football Championship Committee also received a request for automatic qualification from the Pioneer Football League (PFL). While the PFL satisfies the eligibility requirements for automatic qualification, the committee agreed that the PFL did not merit one of the ten 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.

As the PFL was eligible for but was not awarded an AQ, the Football Championship Committee agreed to continue the policy that provides earned access for non AQ conferences. Earned access for non AQ conferences has been in place for the championships since 2008.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

c. Appointment of committee chair.

(1) Recommendation. The Football Championship Committee recommends Charlie Cobb, director of athletics at Appalachian State University, be appointed as the chair of the Division I Football Championship Committee.

(2) Effective Date. Effective immediately.

(3) Rationale. Mr. Cobb is entering his fourth year on the football committee. During that time he has served as a preliminary round site rep and been a valuable member of the committee. He brings a unique perspective to the Football Championship Committee as he has been the AD of an institution that regularly participates in the championship.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Pre-Championship Meeting. In response to a misconduct issue during the championship this year, the Football Championship Committee discussed the requirement for head coaches and athletics directors to attend the pre-championship meeting during each round of the championship. The Football Championship Committee agreed to maintain this requirement.

2. Championships Host Site. The Frisco, Texas local organizing committee has requested an extension to their current host agreement which is set to expire after the completion of the 2012 Championship. NCAA staff and the Football Championship Committee will engage in additional discussions regarding this request over the coming months.

3. **Bracket Expansion**. At the direction of President Emmert, the Football Championship Committee continued to discuss the format options for expansion of the championship bracket to 24 teams. The Football Championship Committee is supportive of a 24-team bracket, whereby the top 8 teams are seeded (akin to traditional NCAA championship bracket/format).

4. **Instant Replay**. The Football Championship Committee expressed a desire to increase the use of video instant replay to all rounds of the 2012 FCS Football Championship should the football championship budget be able to absorb the additional costs without an overall budget increase.

During the 2011 championship the average instant replay expenses per site was $6,785. Using this average, it would cost an additional $81,420 to provide instant replay during all rounds (i.e., 12 additional games).

Committee Chair: *Jim O'Day, University of Montana, Big Sky Conference*
Staff Liaison(s): *Damani Leech, Championships and Alliances*
Dennis Poppe, Championships and Alliances
Chad Tolliver, Championships and Alliances

February 21, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Jeff Barber, Liberty University	
Jeff Bourne, James Madison University	
Derek Carter, Delaware State University	
Charles Cobb, Appalachian State University	
Craig Coleman, Robert Morris University	
Robert Hill, Stephen F. Austin State University	
Jim O'Day, University of Montana, *chair*	
David Roach, Colgate University	
Mark Sandy, Eastern Kentucky University	
Ron Strollo, Youngstown State University	
Tim Wabler, University of Dayton	
Other Participants Damani Leech, NCAA; J.D. Hamilton, NCAA; Dennis Poppe, NCAA; and Chad Tolliver, NCAA, Bess Barnes, ESPN; Tom Burnett, Southland Conference; Jim Gandy, City of Frisco; Henry Hill, City of Frisco; Tom LaBeau, ESPN; David Lovell, NCAA; Mayor Maher Maso, City of Frisco; Marla Roe, City of Frisco; Nich Shaffer, FC Dallas Stadium; Carol Stiff, ESPN; John Vassallo, ESPN; and John Wagner, Hunt Sports Group also joined portions of the meeting either in person or via teleconference.	

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I MEN'S GOLF COMMITTEE APRIL 25, 2012, TELECONFERENCE

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- **None.**

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

- **Per Diem Expenses for NCAA Preliminary Round Competition.** The NCAA Division I Men's Golf Committee reviewed and supported a budgetary proposal that will be presented to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet during its June 2012 in-person meeting. Specifically, the proposal will recommend phasing in preliminary round competition per diem expenses during the next three-year budget cycle for the "individual/team" sports of men's and women's golf, men's and women's tennis, and men's and women's track and field. The committee believes the proposal will provide some financial relief to those teams/individuals that qualify for regional round competition in the sport of men's golf.

Committee Chair: Bubba Cunningham, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Staff Liaison: Donnie Wagner, Championships and Alliances, Operations

April 25, 2012	
ATTENDEES	ABSENTEES
Mike Carter, Oral Roberts University	
Bubba Cunningham, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	
Javan Hedlund, Mountain West Conference	
John Kennaday, San Jose State University	
Larry Mays, Georgia Southern University	
Norwood Teageu, Virginia Commonwealth University	

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I WOMEN'S GOLF COMMITTEE APRIL 13, 2012, TELECONFERENCE

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- **None.**

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

- **Per Diem Expenses for NCAA Preliminary Round Competition.** The NCAA Division I Women's Golf Committee reviewed and supported a budgetary proposal that will be presented to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet during its June 2012 in-person meeting. Specifically, the proposal will recommend phasing in preliminary round competition per diem expenses during the next three-year budget cycle for the "individual/team" sports of men's and women's golf, men's and women's tennis, and men's and women's track and field. In expressing their support for the plan, the committee noted that the budgetary proposal, as presented, strives to be financially prudent but still provide some relief to participating institutions in the affected "individual/team" sports who currently do not receive NCAA reimbursement for their preliminary round competition.

Committee Chair: Velvet Milkman, Murray State University, Ohio Valley Conference
Staff Liaison: Carol A. Reep, Championships and Alliances, Operations

April 13, 2012	
ATTENDEES	ABSENTEES
Carol Blackmar, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi	
Melissa (Lissa) Bradford, Belmont University	
Sammie Chergo, University of Denver	
Lisa Kelleher, University of Nevada, Las Vegas	
Velvet Milkman, Murray State University, chair	
Theresa Becker, University of Kansas	
Other Participants Carol Reep Ebony Strong	

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I MEN'S SOCCER COMMITTEE FEBRUARY 20-22, 2012, MEETING

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

a. Officiating.

(1) Recommendation. That effective with the 2012 championship, the criteria for selecting officials for all NCAA Division I men's soccer postseason matches shall require an official to have officiated a minimum of six NCAA Division I men's soccer matches in the current season or have officiated a minimum of 10 NCAA Division I men's soccer matches over the past two years with a minimum of three in the current season. In order to be considered for a particular position (i.e., referee or assistant referee), an official must have officiated the minimum number of games in the respective position to meet the requirement.

(2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.

(3) Rationale. Members of the NCAA Division I Men's Soccer Committee, along with seven Division I conference administrators with soccer oversight, convened via multiple teleconferences over the past several months to discuss the state of men's soccer officiating as directed by the NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet. As a result of the teleconferences, the two groups agreed on the following principles/matters, which were used to develop the recommended criteria:

(a) A commitment to Division I men's soccer is paramount and there should be a minimum number of Division I men's games required for an official to be eligible to work in the NCAA tournament.

(b) As an integral part of the input to be considered in the selection of officials, the conferences shall forward recommendations of officials to the committee by September 30 each year, with an opportunity to update those recommendations not later than October 31 each year.

(c) In selecting officials, experience and ability as a referee and as an assistant referee should be considered separately. Recommend increasing from six to seven the number of officials that are selected to the Men's College Cup to ensure the best qualified officials are present and available to meet this objective.

(d) NCAA assignors shall communicate with conference assignors regarding officials to be selected for assignment to tournament games. Regional teleconferences to be conducted to discuss "real-time" data on *potential* officials.

(e) Alternate officials must be qualified and meet established criteria.

(f) In order for an official to be considered for selection, such official must be recommended by at least one conference.

Additionally, all 22 conferences were provided with an opportunity to provide input via a survey. [Attachment]

The two groups decided it was in the best interest of men's soccer to create the "either/or" criterion as a means to cast the broadest net and capture the greatest number of qualified officials for consideration as a referee or assistant referee. Although the emphasis will be to select officials committed to the game of NCAA Division I men's soccer, it is worth noting that with the expansion of Major League Soccer (MLS), establishing a requirement with an extremely large number of collegiate games in a given year may be counterproductive in terms of getting the best qualified officials. Likewise, as the assistant referee position becomes more technical, it is important that the individuals assigned in this role have specific experience as an assistant referee.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

b. Additional Official at Final Site.

(1) Recommendation. That the number of officials on site at the 2012 NCAA Men's College Cup be increased from six to seven.

(2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.

(3) Rationale. The committee believes that the addition of one official provides flexibility in selecting the best available officials based on

assigned officiating roles and is supported by the Division I conference administrators surveyed.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. The $2,380 required to fund this request can be absorbed through existing dollars that are in the current budget, without needing to request additional funding ($1,580 for transportation, per diem and hotel, plus $800 game fee).

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

c. 2012 Automatic Qualifiers.

(1) Recommendation. That the following conferences receive automatic qualification for the 2012 NCAA Division I Men's Soccer Championship: America East Conference; Atlantic 10 Conference; Atlantic Coast Conference; Atlantic Sun Conference; Big East Conference; Big South Conference; Big Ten Conference; Big West Conference; Colonial Athletic Association; Conference USA; Horizon League; The Ivy League; Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference; Mid-American Conference; Missouri Valley Conference; Mountain Pacific Sports Federation; Northeast Conference; Pac-12 Conference; Patriot League; Southern Conference; The Summit League and West Coast Conference.

(2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.

(3) Rationale. All eligible conferences are being recommended.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

d. Appointment of Committee Chair.

(1) Recommendation. That William Wnek, assistant director of athletics for compliance at Loyola University Maryland, serve as the committee chair.

(2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.

(3) Rationale. Mr. Wnek has served on the committee for two years and has demonstrated sound leadership qualities. His experience as a long-time assistant soccer coach and student-athlete strongly qualify him for the position. In addition, he has the support of the committee.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEM.

Misconducts. The committee issued several misconducts for unsportsmanlike behavior and verbal abuse of officials by student-athletes and assistant coaches during the 2011 NCAA Division I Men's Soccer Championship. The offending institutions included the University of California, Santa Barbara; Loyola University Chicago; St. John's University (New York); and the University of South Carolina, Columbia. Penalties included public reprimands, withholding of per diem and transportation expenses, fines and postseason tournament suspensions.

In addition, two institutions were sanctioned for failure to follow championships policies and procedures as they relate to neutrality, security/crowd control and the prevention of fans accessing the field postgame. Private reprimands were issued.

Committee Chair: Al Albert, College of William and Mary, Colonial Athletic Association
Staff Liaison: D'Ann Keller, Championships and Alliances, Operations

February 20-22, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Al Albert, College of William and Mary	
John Bluem, The Ohio State University	
Tom Buning, Southern Methodist University	
Kurt Esser, University of New Mexico	
John Kerr, Duke University	
Diane O'Brien, University of California, Santa Barbara	
Ray Reid, University of Connecticut	
Richard Regan Jr., College of the Holy Cross	
Ken Weiner, University of California, Los Angeles	
William Wnek, Loyola University Maryland	
Other Participants Rob Kehoe, National Soccer Coaches Association of America D'Ann Keller, NCAA Jeff Williams, NCAA	

2012 NCAA Division I Men's Soccer Officiating Survey

Results as of: 5/10/2012

1. As part of the initial discussions, it was agreed that there must be a commitment to the college game as evidenced by a minimum number of games worked in NCAA Division I men's soccer. Please choose from the options below, what you believe the minimum number of game requirement should be for both Referees and Assistant Referees:

Answer		Response	%
Six games in the current season.		8	47%
Ten games over the most recent two years, with a minimum of three in the current year.		7	41%
No preference, agree with either of the above.		2	12%
Total		17	100%

2. Do you believe the requirements listed in #1 above should be:

Answer		Response	%
More stringent. Please specify:		5	29%
Less stringent. Please specify:		2	12%
No preference		10	59%
Total		17	100%

More stringent. Please specify:	Less stringent. Please specify:
10 games over 2 years, with 6 the current season	I'm good with the 10/3 concept. Point is to have some measure of commitment (e.g. 10 over 2 years, 3 in current year) to avoid using someone who didn't even ref a game, but maintain flexibility to include those known to have commitment to college game but may not meet min. game threshold for variety of reasons.
6 is ok but we'd be fine with up to 10.	We might need to make exceptions for quality officials who primarily work with the MLS/FIFA. They might not officiate up to six NCAA matches per year but that should not prohibit them from working NCAA post-season matches if they are the best available.
I would say at least 50% of a season or 10 games in the most recent season.	
The MAAC feels that officials selected for the championship should work as many college games as possible during the season. Six is a relatively easy number to reach, championship officials should be required to work more games.	
with regards to the 10 / 3	

3. It also was agreed that a further requirement for referees (as opposed to assistant referees) is that a certain minimum number of required games as referenced in "#1" above must be worked as a referee. The options being considered are:

Answer		Response	%
At least 50%		4	24%
At least 75%		7	41%
An actual number should be required. Please specify:		6	35%
Total		17	100%

An actual number should be required. Please specify: **(Note: No adaptations or edits were made to the following respondents' comments.)**
Keep consistent with the min. number--e.g., 3 games as ref in current year, 10 games as ref in previous 2 years.
If they have to work 6 games, all 6 should be as a referee.
10 games to ensure they have sufficient recent experience
all
The officials that work the championship should have the majority of their work during the season in the same role that they will fulfill at the championship. 75% is fine, but it should be a minimum of 5-6.
5

4. Do you believe the requirements listed in above should be:

Answer		Response	%
More stringent. Please specify:		6	40%
Less stringent. Please specify:		2	13%
No preference		7	47%
Total		15	100%

More stringent. Please specify:	Less stringent. Please specify:
For center officials, they need to have worked a minimum number of matches in that capacity	A two to one ratio of games as the center referee (as opposed to the AR) makes sense to me.
higher percentage	
Not more stringent than what's listed, but again, with the 10/3 concept, that should be	
100%	
It all depends on what the minimum number of games required is. If the minimum is only 6 games, and 75% must be in the middle, then that's only 5 games in the middle. There should be a minimum requirement, regardless of percentage.	
In order to qualify to be a referee, I think an individual should work at minimum 5 games as the middle during the current season. I am not as worried about the ratio of middle vs. AR games that they have worked, as I am the number of games as a middle that they have worked.	

5. Do you believe that the minimum number of games should be the same for Referees as compared to Assistant Referees?

Answer		Response	%
Yes		15	88%
No, please specify:		2	12%
Total		17	100%

No, please specify: **(Note: No adaptations or edits were made to the following respondents' comments.)**
Assistant Referees need to have worked in that capacity in a given season, but their center experience should also be taken into account.
I do not believe ARs need to work as many games as the head referee as the individuals who are vying for the head referee spots.

6. Would you support increasing the number of officials brought to the Men's College Cup (currently six officials work the MCC) by at least one official in order to assign the most qualified officials based on experience at each position – referee vs. assistant referee?

Answer		Response	%
Yes		16	94%
No		1	6%
Total		17	100%

7. In the selection of officials for NCAA postseason games, please rank the following in order of importance with "1" being the most important. (Drag options to place them in the order of your preference)

Answer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Responses
National Coordinator for NCAA Soccer Recommendations	5	0	4	2	3	2	1	0	17
Regional Advisors for NCAA Soccer Recommendations	1	9	2	2	2	1	0	0	17
Conference Office Recommendations	4	3	4	3	2	1	0	0	17
Coaches Evaluations	0	0	2	2	7	5	1	0	17
Experience officiating NCAA Division I men's soccer matches	7	4	2	3	1	0	0	0	17
Experience officiating professional matches (i.e., MLS)	0	1	2	3	1	6	2	2	17
Experience officiating other NCAA soccer matches (DII/III men's soccer matches)	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	5	17
Experience officiating other NCAA soccer matches (DI women's soccer matches)	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	10	17
Total	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	-

8. Please indicate which of the following are ways that your conference provides education and training for men's soccer officials:

Answer		Response	%
Camps		8	47%
Online video clips		6	35%
Weekly updates/newsletters		2	12%
Teleconferences		1	6%
In-person evaluations at regular season conference games		12	71%
Coaches evaluations		15	88%
Other, please specify:		4	24%

Other, please specify: **(Note: No adaptations or edits were made to the following respondents' comments.)**
Our assignors (TISOA) do some of the above (minus teleconferences).
Clinics through NISOA; in person evaluations through NISOA
Clinics
Game DVDs

9. Please provide any comments you may have regarding NCAA soccer officiating.

[Note: No adaptations or edits were made to the following respondents' comments.]

The Pac-12 uses a NISOA assigner for men's soccer so training and evaluation is provided through them. MLS officials who work only a limited number of college games each year may be the best qualified for the actual game, although they may lack knowledge of NCAA administrative procedures. Also the assistant referee position has become more technical, so it is important that AR's who are assigned have experience there, not just as the center referee. Also with the MLS expanding, the most qualified center referees may take MLS games rather than college games, so to have a requirement that they work a large number of college games in a given year may be counterproductive in terms of getting the best possible officials.

Let's not over-react to a single bad incident. Good to have minimum commitment to D-I men's game, but keep flexibility to make sure quality refs aren't excluded based on bureaucratic rule. Use conference assigners to avoid avoidable volatile combinations in postseason assignments. Assign based on competence/experience in the given role (e.g., assign good ARs as ARs).

Heading in positive direction; need to increase number of referees attending college cup - four refs, 5-6 ARs

Challenging to rank the items in order of importance, especially once the two or three most important items were set in theory, coaches' evaluations would be a good barometer, but I question whether those evaluations are being completed on a consistent basis. Also, it s great to have officials with experiences at many levels, but for the DI men's soccer championship matches, those experiences aren't nearly as important as DI men's soccer experience.

I would love to see the NCAA provide more resources towards training all soccer officials. Baseball primarily, and soon softball and volleyball have made some great strides in creating a central hub of conference assignors and officials. I would like to see soccer adopt this model so that training can be consistent from conference to conference, which can only benefit the NCAA for postseason as well. Hosting clinics, teleconferences and maintaining a training website are tangible recommendations that I would make to help grow a program of this kind. Thank you for your efforts to make soccer officiating better for the college game!

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I WOMEN'S SOCCER COMMITTEE JANUARY 29-31, 2012, MEETING

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

a. 2013 Automatic Qualifiers.

(1) Recommendation. That the following conferences receive automatic qualification for the 2012 NCAA Division I Women's Soccer Championship: America East Conference, Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC), Atlantic Sun Conference, Atlantic 10 Conference, Big East Conference, Big Ten Conference, Big 12 Conference, Big Sky Conference, Big South Conference, Big West Conference, Colonial Athletic Association, Conference USA, Horizon League, Ivy Group, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference, Mid-American Conference, Missouri Valley Conference, Mountain West Conference, Northeast Conference, Ohio Valley Conference, Pacific-12 Conference, Patriot League, Southeastern Conference, Southern Conference, Southland Conference, Southwestern Athletic Conference, The Summit League, Sun Belt Conference, West Coast Conference and Western Athletic Conference.

(2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.

(3) Rationale. All eligible conferences are being recommended.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

b. Appointment of Committee Chair.

(1) Recommendation. That Matt Wolfert, associate director of athletics at Ball State University, serve as the committee chair.

(2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.

(3) Rationale. Mr. Wolfert has served on the committee for three years and has demonstrated sound leadership qualities. His 22 years of athletics administration experience as well as supervision of Ball State

University's soccer program qualify him for the position. In addition, he has the support of the committee.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEM.

1. **Webcast Preliminary Rounds.** The committee encourages all hosting institutions to provide live stat/webcasting capabilities through NCAA.com. Institutions planning to do either of these, must do all games at the site and not just the host team.

2. **Game Times for Preliminary Rounds**. The committee adjusted start times for preliminary rounds on Friday from 4 p.m. to 2 p.m. local time so institutions that do not have lights could host a single game on Friday (Saturday and Sunday start times are noon local time).

Committee Chair: Meredith Jenkins, Auburn University, Southeastern Conference
Staff Liaison: Sharon Cessna, Championships and Alliances, Operations

January 29-31, 2012	
Attendees Vicky Chun, Colgate University Mike Friesen, San Diego State University Beth Goetz, Butler University Hadrian Greenwood, University of San Diego David Hansen, University of Central Florida Tim Hickman, University of Missouri, Columbia Meredith Jenkins, Auburn University Julie Orlowski, Stetson University Mike Parsons, West Virginia University Matt Wolfert, Ball State University	Absentees
Other Participants Sharon Cessna, NCAA	

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I MEN'S AND WOMEN'S SWIMMING AND DIVING COMMITTEE

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- **Participant numbers for the swimming and diving championships.**

(1) Recommendation. That the swimming and diving committee be invited to submit a formal recommendation to increase the participant numbers for the men's and women's championships.

(2) Effective Date. The committee would begin reviewing the possible increase in participant numbers immediately, with the understanding that the formal recommendation would not be reviewed until the next budget cycle.

(3) Rationale. There is continued concern in the sport of Division I swimming and diving about the participant numbers and access ratio for the championships. Typically, due to current field size limits, the number of student-athletes selected for the individual swimming events is not significantly more than the number of scoring positions for those events (16). Furthermore, the number of relays selected is, at most, the exact number of scoring events for relays (16). The committee is currently reviewing the process for selections to determine the best way to fill the fields for the events, but it is impossible to increase the quality of competition in the individual events without sacrificing competition in the relay events, and vice versa. Increasing the participant numbers would enhance the quality of competition for individual events as well as for the team competition and would result in a more exciting meet.

The committee would like to review the access ratio for all Division I championships and the potential impact that increasing the participant numbers would have on the swimming and diving championships specifically.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. The committee understands that an increase in participant numbers would have an impact on the budget and therefore any

changes would not be reviewed until the next budget cycle. The budget impact would be included in the formal recommendation.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. The additional participant numbers will provide more opportunities for deserving student-athletes and will enhance the team and individual competition at the championships.

Committee Chair: *Joe Fischer, University of Vermont, American East Conference*
Staff Liaison(s): *Katie Holmes; Championships and Alliances*

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I MEN'S AND WOMEN'S TENNIS COMMITTEE MARCH 14, 2012, TELECONFERENCE

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- **None.**

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Per Diem Expenses for NCAA Preliminary Round Competition. The NCAA Division I Men's and Women's Tennis Committee reviewed and supported a budgetary proposal that will be presented to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet during their June 2012 in-person meeting. Specifically, the proposal will recommend phasing in preliminary round competition per diem expenses during the next three-year budget cycle for the "individual/team" sports of men's and women's golf, men's and women's tennis, and men's and women's track and field. The Men's and Women's Tennis Committee supports the phasing plan as it will provide some financial relief to institutions participating in NCAA competition. The Men's and Women's Tennis Committee feels that being able to alleviate some of the cost to institutions will enhance the championship experience for those participants.

Committee Chair: *Cathy Beene, Georgia Southern University, Southern Conference*
Staff Liaison(s): *Mary Berdo, Championships and Alliances, Operations*
Kristin W. Fasbender, Championships and Alliances, Operations

March 14, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Mary Ann Austin, University of Missouri	Tim Cass, University of New Mexico
Cathy Beene, Georgia Southern University	Callie Hubbell, Conference USA
Tad Berkowitz, University of Arizona	
Jeff Conyers, Southern University	
Alex Dorato, Yale University	
D.J. Gurule, Gonzaga University	
Sachine Kirtane, University of Northern Iowa	
Karin Lee, Ball State University	
Dawn Turner, Big South Conference	
Terry Ann Zawacki-Woods, Virginia Tech University	
Other Participants Mary Berdo, NCAA, Ashley Dunigan, NCAA, Kristin Fasbender, NCAA, Paula Wustrack, NCAA	

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I TRACK AND FIELD COMMITTEE MARCH 7-10, 2012, MEETING

***KEY ITEM*.**

- **Indoor Track and Field – Championships Format.** The NCAA Division I Track and Field Committee proposes a selections model and championships format that would be simple and straightforward for coaches, student-athletes, and fans to understand. The proposed model standardizes event sizes by eliminating the participant cap. The explanation of rationale and other key proposal items (e.g., effective date, budget impact, etc.) is provided within the Nonlegislative Action Item.

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- **Indoor Track and Field – Championships Format**.

(1) Recommendation. That the format for the NCAA Division I Men's and Women's Indoor Track and Field Championships allow for a fixed field size of 16 in individual events and 12 in relay events. The recommendation would eliminate the participant cap of 568 (284 per gender) as a driver of field size.

(2) Effective Date. 2012-13 academic year.

(3) Rationale. A format with fixed field sizes would generate a simplified meet structure for student-athletes, coaches, fans, and meet management with no financial impact and create greater transparency in the selection process. With these goals in mind, the committee proposes a consistent and improved championships structure that places a cap on the number of competitors in each event, rather than a cap on the overall number of competitors in the meet. A similar format exists within the current outdoor track and field championships. The U.S. Track and Field and Cross Country Coaches Association (USTFCCCA) Executive Committee – a representative body of the coaches association – supports the proposed change.

Currently, 284 student-athletes per gender are selected to the championships with no regard to establishing fixed field sizes per event. With 15 individual and 2 relay events, the total number of participant opportunities fluctuates each year as a result of the current selections process and the number of athletes competing in multiple events. Consequently, the field size and number of heats/flights varies by event, gender, and championship year. The committee proposes a fixed event field size with 16 entries per individual event and 12 entries per relay event, resulting in 336 participation opportunities for each gender. The fixed field sizes eliminate the undesirable variability of total competitors from one event to the next while maintaining the fundamentals of the meet structure (i.e. the championships could still be conducted over the course of two days).

While both genders have an equal opportunity to participate, the actual number of competitors per gender would be influenced by the number of student-athletes entered in more than one event. Based on the habit of competitors participating in more than one event (commonly known as "doubling") and recognizing that females historically qualify to "double" at a higher rate than males, the likely result is that the number of female participants will be less than the number of males. Data from 2009 to 2012 indicate that approximately 272 student-athletes will take up the 336 women's opportunities and 289 student-athletes will take up the 336 men's opportunities. Furthermore, "doubling" has translated to an average of just under 16 competitors for men's individual events and 17 for women's events; relay events for both genders have averaged 12 entries.

The proposed format has a number of specific advantages, including the following:

<u>Elimination of automatic qualifying standards</u>: When automatic standards are too soft, a large number of automatic qualifiers in one or more events negatively affect the number of positions available in other events. The experience of the 2009 indoor track and field championships demonstrated that, when an unexpectedly large number of men's distance medley relays qualified automatically, the number of positions available in individual events is significantly impacted. In the case of 2009, events were limited to 14, the lowest in the last six years.

<u>Elimination of adding to the fields based on ties in qualifying marks</u>: The current practice of adding multiple athletes to an event based on ties impacts the number of positions available in other events. For example, for the 2011 indoor championship, four women tied for the last spot in the 60 meter and two or more tied in other events. As a result, totals for the

remaining individual events were limited. As with the outdoor track and field championships format, ties among declared competitors would be broken to determine the field for each event.

Elimination of filling the fields based on event strength: In the existing selections process, the committee determines a priority order of the events to identify the events that will receive an additional entry if the maximum field size (i.e. the participant cap) allows it. Consideration is given to such factors as strength and depth of field, number of athletes competing in more than one event, number of automatic qualifiers, and comparison to the fields in previous years. Each year the list changes and, as a result, heat sizes vary and individuals are left out. Unless a coach is on the selections committee, it is difficult for a coach to explain why one event has 18 competitors and another has 15. By standardizing the field sizes, the selections process would create transparency and each event would have the same number of positions available from year to year in any one event, regardless of performance trends.

Standardization: In the current model, a 17th individual or an odd number of relay teams alter the way in which the championship is conducted and can unfairly affect the advancement procedure. With a change to fixed field sizes, from year to year, coaches and competitors would be able to rely on a consistent and understandable number of heats/flights in each event and a more consistent overall meet schedule.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. The change to fixed field sizes would require no increase in funding support. Based on historical participation rates, the committee expects 272 women and 289 men to compete at the championships, less than the 568 currently allowed by the participant cap.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. The committee is committed to identifying ways to improve the championship and advance the sport as a whole by creating fairness to athletes, standardization of the fields, and a fan friendly environment. The advantages gained through implementation of this change, most significantly the simplified and easily understood selections procedure and advancement procedures, will directly and positively impact student-atheltes and can be put into place for the 2013 championship season without concern.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **2012 Regional Cross Country.** The committee agreed to support site selection for the following 2012 regional cross country championships – all sites have been approved by the Administrative Committee of the Championships and Sports Management Cabinet:

   - Mountain Region: Fort Collins, Colorado; Colorado State University, host
   - South Region: Tallahassee Florida; Florida State University, host
   - Southeast Region: Charlotte, North Carolina; University of North Carolina, Charlotte, host

   Five other regional sites for the 2012 championship season have already been determined. The committee will continue work to identify a viable host for the Northeast region.

2. **Challenges to Qualifying Performances.** In response to challenges to qualifying performances received during the indoor season, the committee initiated a review of policy related to the challenge process for both indoor and outdoor track and field. Much of the committee's discussion concerned its ability to monitor violations of competition rules and to differentiate violations that develop based on the decision-making of meet management or the lack of oversight by competition officials. The committee took no action, but agreed to continue the discussion at its June in-person meeting.

3. **Outdoor Track and Field Championships.** The committee agreed on final modifications to the competition schedule of events for each of the two preliminary round sites as well as the finals site. After final consultation with the hosts, the schedules will be posted to NCAA.org and NCAA.com, or the host-developed website in the case of the preliminary round competitions.

4. **Meeting with USTFCCCA Representatives.** The committee met with representatives of the USTFCCCA concerning several topics and agreed to conduct follow-up discussion as needed.

   With respect to cross country, the following topics were discussed: 1) to modify the entry timeline for regional competition; 2) to add a second videoboard to enhance the championships presentation at the finals site; and 3) to consider appointing a subcommittee to offer constructive ideas to improve the production of the championships live broadcast via webstream.

Concerning track and field, the following topics were discussed: 1) to change the indoor championships format to allow for fixed field sizes (refer to the Nonlegislative Action Item); 2) to seek funding for institutions participating in outdoor preliminary round competition as well as additional funding for preliminary round hosts; 3) to focus on strategies to position the outdoor track and field championships (finals) for a live television broadcast; and 4) to consider areas of improvement for the current outdoor format.

5. Other Business. In other business, the committee discussed the concept of creating separation in the outdoor track and field schedule based on gender. Specifically, the concept proposes that two of the four days of competition be comprised of only men's events while the alternate two days have the women's events. The committee took no action.

Committee Chair: Todd Patulski, Baylor University, Big 12 Conference
Staff Liaison: Liz Turner Suscha, Championships and Alliances

March 7-10, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Gregg Gensel, Utah State University	John McNichols, Indiana State University
Maisha Kelly, Bucknell University	Gina Sperry, University of Rhode Island
Stan Kerr, Eastern Washington University	
Phil Olson, Stephen F. Austin State University	
Todd Patulski, Baylor University	
Marc Ryan, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	
Susan Seaton, University of Cincinnati	
Bill Walton, James Madison University	
Willie Randolph, Central Michigan University	
Cinnamon Sheffield, University of North Texas	
Other Participants Ashley Dunigan, NCAA Ron Mann, University of Louisville Sam Seemes, USTFCCCA Liz Turner Suscha, NCAA	

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I TRACK AND FIELD COMMITTEE APRIL 11, 2012, TELECONFERENCE

***KEY ITEM*.**

- **Per Diem Funding for Preliminary Round Competition.** The NCAA Division I Track and Field Committee reviewed and unanimously supported a budgetary proposal that will be presented to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet during their June 2012 in-person meeting.

***ACTION ITEM*.**

- **None.**

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. **Review of Report from March In-Person Meeting.** The committee reviewed the report of its meetings held in conjunction with the indoor track and field championships. Specific attention was given to the action item concerning a change to the indoor track and field championships format that will be presented to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Mangaement Cabinet (the Cabinet) in June 2012.

2. **Per Diem Expenses for NCAA Preliminary Round Competition**. The committee reviewed and unanimously supported a budgetary proposal that will be presented to the the Cabinet during its upcoming meeting. Specifically, the proposal will recommend phasing in preliminary round competition per diem expenses during the next three-year budget cycle for the individual-team sports of men's and women's golf, men's and women's tennis, and men's and women's outdoor track and field. In expressing its support for the plan, the committee noted that the budgetary proposal, as presented, strives to be financially prudent and provides some baseline support to participating institutions in the affected individual-team sports that currently do not receive NCAA reimbursement for preliminary round competition.

3. **Indoor Track and Field Championships Recap.** In anticipation of an upcoming post-championships review with host personnel at Boise State University, the committee offered several observations concerning the execution of the championships.

4. **Other Business.** The committee discussed various general matters, including a review of the April rules report and corresponding U.S. Track and Field and Cross Country Coaches Association position document, plans and agenda items for the June 2012 annual meeting, and logisitics for the upcoming outdoor track and field championships.

Committee Chair: Todd Patulski, Baylor University, Big 12 Conference
Staff Liaison: Liz Turner Suscha, Championships and Alliances

April 11, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Gregg Gensel, Utah State University	
Maisha Kelly, Bucknell University	
Stan Kerr, Eastern Washington University	
John McNichols, Indiana State University	
Phil Olson, Stephen F. Austin State University	
Todd Patulski, Baylor University	
Marc Ryan, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	
Susan Seaton, University of Cincinnati	
Gina Sperry, University of Rhode Island	
Bill Walton, James Madison University	
Willie Randolph, Central Michigan University	
Cinnamon Sheffield, University of North Texas	
Other Participants Tom Douple, The Summit League Ashley Dunigan, NCAA Liz Turner Suscha, NCAA	

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I TRACK AND FIELD COMMITTEE APRIL 25, 2012, TELECONFERENCE

ACTION ITEM.

- **None.**

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Waiver Request to Extend Outdoor Track and Field Qualifying Window.** The NCAA Division I Track and Field Committee denied the request from Conference USA to extend the 2012 outdoor track and field qualifying window by one day to Monday, May 14. The committee acknowledged the variety of logistical challenges facing the conference, including the significant challenge in securing viable hotel accommodations in the host city. However, an extension of the qualifying window would violate the principles of the qualifying process, chiefly the goal of limiting competitive advantage, and materially affect the timeline for declarations and selections for the membership as a whole. As a result, the conference must modify its existing schedule to conclude on Sunday, May 13 in order for all of the performance marks to be eligible for championship selection consideration. If the schedule is not modified, the committee will only accept performance marks through the conclusion of competition on Sunday, May 13.

2. **East Preliminary Championships Competition – Schedule of Events**. The committee discussed the concern of using a discus cage that does not meet NCAA rules specifications, specifically a requirement to have an eight to nine meter opening, for competition at the 2012 East Preliminary Championships Competition. The committee agreed to revise the schedule of events to conduct the hammer and the discus competition out of the alternative cage. With a concern of waning daylight as result of the changes, the committee and NCAA staff will work with host personnel at the University of North Florida to revise the schedule, including associated requests to secure temporary lighting for the competition area and expand the officiating crew to ensure the efficient and timely conduct of the events.

3. **Final Championships Competition – Schedule of Events**. The committee agreed to several revisions to the schedule of events for the championships. The revisions are necessary due to the addition of live television coverage on the final day of the championships and will be confirmed with host personnel at Drake University. News of the schedule changes, including those for the East Preliminary site, will be communicated to the membership via the NCAA Championships monthly newsletter, reposting of the online schedules, and with the help of the U.S. Track and Field and Cross Country Coaches Association.

4. Other Business. The committee discussed upcoming key dates for committee business and championships attendance. In addition, several ideas were offered as agenda topics for the committee's annual meeting scheduled to take place in June 2012.

Committee Chair: Todd Patulski, Baylor University, Big 12 Conference
Staff Liaison: Liz Turner Suscha, Championships and Alliances

April 25, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Gregg Gensel, Utah State University	Cinnamon Sheffield, University of North Texas
Maisha Kelly, Bucknell University	
Stan Kerr, Eastern Washington University	
John McNichols, Indiana State University	
Phil Olson, Stephen F. Austin State University	
Todd Patulski, Baylor University	
Marc Ryan, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	
Susan Seaton, University of Cincinnati	
Gina Sperry, University of Rhode Island	
Bill Walton, James Madison University	
Willie Randolph, Central Michigan University	
Other Participants Ashley Dunigan, NCAA Bob Podkaminer, NCAA Secretary-Rules Editor Liz Turner Suscha, NCAA	

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL COMMITTEE FEBRUARY 15-17, 2012, MEETING

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

a. Bench size.

(1) Recommendation. That effective with the 2012 Championship the bench size be increased from 22 to 24.

(2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.

(3) Rationale. Feedback from the evaluations at the last two championships indicates that institutions are traveling with additional student-athletes over the squad size. Currently these student-athletes are not able to sit on their bench, but rather sit in the stands while their team is competing at the final site. The NCAA Division I Women's Volleyball Committee feels that if institutions are paying for these student-athletes to attend the championship, then in order to provide them with a memorable experience, it would be appropriate for them to join their team on the bench. These student-athletes are not eligible to compete at the championship site as the squad size is 15. The travel party is 22. Currently other NCAA championships (i.e., men's lacrosse, softball, women's soccer and women's lacrosse) already allow for a bench size that is larger than the official travel party and squad size.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. Institutions would cover the expense if they choose to bring additional student-athletes.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. As previously mentioned, the Women's Volleyball Committee has received complaints from institutions and student-athletes who are forced to sit in the stands during competition. In order to give student-athletes a positive experience at the final site, increasing the bench size to accommodate two additional student-athletes assists in resolving this issue. Currently, other championships do have bench sizes larger than their travel parties.

b. Automatic qualification.

(1) Recommendation. That the following 31 conferences sponsoring women's volleyball be awarded automatic qualification into the 2012 championships:

America East Conference, Atlantic Coast Conference, Atlantic Sun Conference, Atlantic 10 Conference, Big East Conference, Big Sky Conference, Big South Conference, Big Ten Conference, Big 12 Conference, Big West Conference, Colonial Athletic Association, Conference USA, Horizon League, The Ivy Group, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference, Mid-American Conference, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference, Missouri Valley Conference, Mountain West Conference, Northeast Conference, Ohio Valley Conference, Pacific-12 Conference, Patriot League, Southeastern Conference, Southern Conference, Southland Conference, Southwestern Athletic Conference, The Summit League, Sun Belt Conference, West Coast Conference and Western Athletic Conference.

(2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.

(3) Rationale. The recommendations are based on the final Rating Percentage Index for 2011 and all eligible conferences are being recommended.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Removal of Sunday Hosting Option. The Women's Volleyball Committee is removing Saturday/Sunday as a hosting option during the first- and second- round competition. The two options for potential hosts will be Thursday/Friday or Friday/Saturday. During the past two bid cycles, hosts have not chosen the Saturday/Sunday option. Therefore, the Women's Volleyball Committee felt it is not a choice that is necessary to offer. Additionally, the Women's Volleyball Committee felt that the Sunday option created a disadvantage to teams that may have to play that day, as the regional rounds all begin the following Thursday. It also makes the concession for those institutions that are not allowed to play Sunday.

2. Selection Resources. The Women's Volleyball Committee has had much discussion the last couple of years with the American Volleyball Coaches Association (AVCA) head coaches committee regarding the selection criteria. The Women's Volleyball Committee acknowledges the use of other polls and rankings as a resource during selections. These in no way super cede the current selection criteria, but rather provide the Women's Volleyball Committee additional resources during selections. The Women's Volleyball Committee will still make their decisions based on the selection criteria that are outlined in the pre-championship manual.

Committee Chair: Diane Turnham, Middle Tennessee State University, Sun Belt Conference
Staff Liaison(s): Kristin Fasbender, Championships and Alliances
Mary Berdo, Championships and Alliances

February 15-17, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Beatrice Crane-Banford, Marshall University	
Jana Doggett, Utah State University	
Jennie Gilbert, Miami University	
Keith Gill, American University	
Mary Hill, South Carolina State University	
Colleen Lim, West Coast Conference	
Jim Marchiony, University of Kansas	
Nona Richardson, University of California, Davis	
Diane Turnham, Middle Tennessee State University	
Barbara Walker, Wake Forest University	
Other Participants: Kristin W. Fasbender, Mary Berdo, Jennifer Rackley, NCAA Kathy DeBoer, American Volleyball Coaches Association Kevin Hambly, University of Illinois Anne Kordes, University of Louisville Rob Patrick, University of Tennessee Joan Powell, National Coordinator of Volleyball Officials	

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I MEN'S WATER POLO COMMITTEE JANUARY 18, 2012, MEETING

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

a. 2012 Automatic Qualifiers.

(1) Recommendation. That the following conferences receive automatic qualification (AQ) for the 2012 National Collegiate Men's Water Polo Championship: Collegiate Water Polo Association, Mountain Pacific Sports Federation and Western Water Polo Association.

(2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.

(3) Rationale. All eligible conferences are being recommended.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEM.

- **RPI Pilot Program.** At its annual meeting the NCAA Division I Men's Water Polo Committee reviewed the current selection criteria and recommended that a Rating Percentage Index (RPI) be developed and tested as a potential selection criterion in future years. In the past, the committee has relied on a manual grid prepared by the former secretary-rules editor, which contained all selection criteria about the top teams. The committee believes the RPI will provide objective data important to the selection process. NCAA staff will prepare all RPI reports. The reports will not be shared with the committee until postseason, when the committee will evaluate the effectiveness of the RPI as a selection criterion.

Committee Chair: Matt Glovaski, Iona College, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference
Staff Liaison: Connie Israel, Championships and Alliances, Operations

January 18, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Kirk Everist, University of California, Berkeley	
Marc Hunt, University of California, Irvine	
Felix Mercado, Brown University	
Betsy Mitchell, California Institute of Technology	
Other Participants Bob Corb, National Coordinator of Officials Brian Streeter, Secretary-Rules Editor	

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I WOMEN'S WATER POLO COMMITTEE MARCH 27, 2012, TELECONFERENCE

KEY ITEM.

2013 Site Change. The NCAA Division I Women's Water Polo Committee has been formally notified by the University of Southern California that it will not be able to host the 2013 National Collegiate Women's Water Polo Championship due to the complete renovation of its aquatics facility. The Women's Water Polo Committee will re-open the bid process for hosting the 2013 Championship in the next several months and then plans to submit the new site to the Cabinet for approval at the 2012 September meeting.

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- **None.**

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

- **None.**

Committee Chair: Matt Anderson, University of Michigan, Big Ten Conference
Staff Liaison: Connie Israel, Championships and Alliances, Operations

March 27, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Jenny Bramer, San Diego State University	
Cindy Rote, University of Hawaii, Manoa	
Don Sherman, Gannon University	
Thomas Whittemore, University of Redlands	
Other Participants Bob Corb, National Coordinator of Officials, Brian Streeter, Secretary-Rules Editor	

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I WRESTLING COMMITTEE APRIL 9-12, 2012, MEETING

***KEY ITEMS*.**

1. Change of Format. The NCAA Division I Wrestling Committee seeks to separate the team portion from the individual championships portion of the NCAA Division I Wrestling Championships.

2. Selection Criteria. The Wrestling Committee seeks to alter the bronze selection criteria by placing a priority order on the criterion.

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Items.

a. Tournament format change.

(1) Recommendation. That the cabinet support the further evaluation and development of a team component of the NCAA Division I Wrestling Championships, which would be a separate event from the individual component.

(2) Effective Date. September 1, 2013 (for 2014 championships).

(3) Rationale. The NCAA Wrestling Championships have sold out for the last three consecutive years; had record attendance of more than 112,000 last year; is profitable as a sport for the NCAA; has the second most Facebook 'likes' and followers in the NCAA of more than 170,000; and is a valued broadcast property for ESPN.

Even amid these formidable statistics, the state of intercollegiate wrestling is one requiring change to ensure a viable future for the sport. Currently, 77 institutions sponsor at the Division I level.

The notion to separate the team championship from the individual championships is a strategic one which provides for the following objectives.

a. Make the sport more relevant throughout the calendar year.

b. Better position the sport within the academic year.

c. Place a priority on dual competition.

d. Provide more opportunities for collegiate wrestlers.

The proposed format allows for the following:

Year (TBD).

January.

- Third weekend – selection of 16 teams, including nine, in today's terms, automatic qualifiers.

- Fourth weekend – dual competition on campus (eight sites with two teams each paid for by institutions.)

February.

- Second weekend – eight teams advance to finals site.

- Last weekend – traditional conference tournaments.

March.

- Second weekend – NCAA Individual Championships.

The proposed format shortens the traditional season by one week and also moves the individual championships away from NCAA Division I Basketball Championship. No other changes are anticipated in the selection, format or general timing of the individual championships.

In our current construct, the team champion is determined by a function of individual performances and resulting points awarded for those performances. The points are then summed and the team with the most points at the end of the three day competition is the national team champion.

In the new model, the team championships provide for 16 teams to be selected with 12 student-athletes each (192 opportunities) and a travel party of 16. Of the 16, automatic qualifiers would be selected based on

our current bylaws. The remaining positions would then be selected based on new criteria, including the use of a team RPI.

The top eight seeds would then host another team on campus with all revenues and expenses being absorbed by the two competing institutions. The eight advancing institutions would then gather for a three day, eight mat competition, likely in a venue strategically selected with seating for 12,000 to 16,000 people. Team A would wrestle Team B and so forth as they advance through the bracket with all teams remaining all three days so as to create an exciting environment throughout the tournament.

The results of the team portion of the championships would not count toward the selection criteria for individual qualification. This ensures a fair and equitable consideration for all 77 institutions that sponsor wrestling.

In the Wrestling Committee's estimation, the individual championship will always be the more desirable of the two competitions for the general public, as well as provide the most opportunity for the 77 institutions and 330 student-athletes to compete. The team component, however, strengthens the whole sport and allows an institution to be more competitive in a team approach rather than as a function of individual performances throughout the tournament. The strategy and requirements are different for a dual competition as compared to an individual competition.

Additionally, this approach condenses the season at least one week for all institutions, as well as places a priority in scheduling in the regular season on dual competition, which hopefully aids in the growth and popularity on campus.

The NWCA (coaches' association) is very supportive of this concept and, in fact, actually runs a similar event currently to aid in obtaining the same objectives as noted above. While the proposed format will require two additional days of missed class time as compared to the NWCA National Duals Championship, the priority placed on this level of competition as demonstrated by being an NCAA Championship, will be another incentive for the sport of wrestling to continue to improve its APR. Fewer institutions, however, will participate in the team portion of the proposed model as compared to those that participate in the NWCA event.

The Wrestling Committee does not believe the addition of a second event will negatively impact the individual championships. The second event provides the much desired excitement and energy around a sport that has limited opportunities for consumption.

It is important to note that the current construct of the individual portion of the championship will remain unchanged. This includes the 330 participants, selection criteria and qualifying structure.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact - Draft.

Revenue.

11,000 people x $100/ticket	$1,100,000

Expenses (finals site).

Per Diem	$134,400
Travel	$ 67,200
Event Operations	$300,000
Operations	$200,000
Total Expenses:	$701,600
Net:	**$398,400**

[Note: It is believed the revenue numbers are conservative in nature and this event could sell out a 13,000 seat arena. Additionally, the initial expense numbers do not include any negotiated efforts to realize savings or an increase in revenue.]

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. The change in approach with the addition of a second event provides an unparalleled opportunity for the student-athletes in this sport. This allows for expanded coverage of the sport and hopefully returns on campus for the increased priority on dual competition. Further, the change shortens the season for the student-athletes.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

a. Prioritize bronze selection criteria.

(1) Recommendation. That the existing bronze selection criteria be placed in priority order to aid in the selection of at-large student-athletes.

(2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.

(3) Rationale. To increase transparency and provide a more consistent approach in selecting the four at-large positions within each field of 33, the Wrestling Committee seeks to prioritize the bronze criteria. Please note, the criteria have not been modified, but rather a priority listing of the criteria is sought.

Bronze criteria.

-Head-to-head competition
-Qualifying event placement
-Quality wins (wins against the 29 in the pre-allocation)
-Results against common opponents
-Winning percentage
-RPI
-Coaches' rank
-Number of matches contested at that weight class

Proposed priority.

1A. Quality wins (wins against the 29 in the pre-allocation)
1B. Head-to-head competition

The rest of the above criteria would then be evaluated equally.

This approach allows a segmentation of the data and full body of work by the student-athletes under consideration for the at-large positions.

Additionally, this approach works to provide the most competitive field of 33 in the national championships.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

b. Approval of automatic qualifying conferences.

(1) Recommendation. That the following conferences be afforded automatic qualifying status to the 2013 NCAA Division I Wrestling Championships:

Atlantic Coast Conference
Big Ten Conference
Colonial Athletic Association
Eastern Intercollegiate Wrestling Association
Eastern Wrestling League
Mid-American Conference
Pacific-12 Conference
Southern Conference
West Regional

(2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.

(3) Rationale. The conferences listed meet the requirements of the automatic qualifying bylaw.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. The provision ensures participation in the 2013 Championships by the nine conferences.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Health/Safety Report.** David Klossner, NCAA director of health and safety, joined for this portion of the meeting and presented to the Wrestling Committee. Additional data was shared about the sport and he suggested the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports would welcome an invitation to participate at the NWCA Convention in August.

2. **Rules Report.** Ron Beaschler, NCAA wrestling secretary rules editor, provided several updates; however, since it is a non-rule change year many of the topics raised were tabled. The following points of emphasis were noted and to be added to the annual video.

a. Backing out of the circle.

b. Starting position.

c. Stalling.

d. Weigh-in procedures and attire.

e. How to request an error review.

Additionally, a subcommittee consisting of members from all three divisions was formed to develop a pilot program using mat-side video replay.

3. **NWCA Report.** Mike Moyer, Executive Director, and Pat Tocci, Chief Operating Officer, shared several updates around the 82nd anniversary of the NWCA. Additional topics included the importance of the coaches' academy, APR and visibility of the sport. Mr. Moyer also provided an update regarding the NWCA Duals Championship.

4. **Officials' Report.** Pat McCormick, NCAA national coordinator of officials, provided a general update, as well as shared the plan he worked to create in conjunction with NCAA staff. The plan allows for the use of Arbiter Sports for identifying, registering and training officials, as well as the evaluation, selection and assignment of officials in the same academic year for the respective divisional championships.

5. **Medical Liaison Report.** Jim Thornton, NCAA wrestling athletic training liaison, reiterated the importance of concussion management plans and will work with NCAA staff to ensure hosts are prepared for the respective divisional championships.

6. **2012 Championships Review.** Dave Martin, Division I chair, Tom Gioglio, Division II chair, and Jeff Swenson, Division III chair, provided feedback from the respective divisional championships.

7. **Scoring/Bracketing/Video Software Contract.** The Wrestling Committee was in agreement to extend the contract with the NWCA for two years per the provision in the agreement.

8. **Ticket Policy.** The Wrestling Committee reviewed the institutional ticket policy and created a revised approach where all institutions sponsoring Division I wrestling will have some access to seats in the lower bowl. A different fixed number will be available to institutions placing 1-10; 11-20; 21-30; etc. in the preceding year's tournament and the balance of the requests will be fulfilled elsewhere in the arena.

9. **Operations.** The Wrestling Committee reviewed the operations of the tournament noting the successes, challenges and future enhancements.

10. **Future Bid Specifications.** Jeff Jarnecke, NCAA associate director of championships, informed the committee of the probable timeline for distributing bid specifications for the 2015 and 2016 NCAA Division I Wrestling Championships.

11. **NWCA Convention.** The Wrestling Committee plans to engage the coaches at the NWCA Convention in August with the following topics.

a. Rules session.

b. Divisional breakouts.

c. Health and safety.

d. Marketing resources.

12. **National Statistics.** The Wrestling Committee affirmed their position on the national statistics program and plans for its continued tracking.

13. **Seeding of the Bracket.** The Wrestling Committee plans to use ‘quality wins’ as a starting point when seeding the bracket in 2013.

14. **Other Business.** NCAA staff reminded the Wrestling Committee that beginning September 1, 2012 a separate rules committee will exist for the sport of wrestling. As such, the joint divisional Wrestling Committee will cease to exist and each division will be solely responsible for the organization and execution of each divisional championship.

15. **Future Meeting Dates.** The Wrestling Committee agreed to meet April 10-12, 2013, in Indianapolis.

Committee Chair: *Dave Martin, Oklahoma State University, Big 12 Conference*
Staff Liaison(s): *Mary Berdo, Jeff Jarnecke, NCAA Championships and Alliances*

April 9-12, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Ron Beaschler, Ohio Northern University	none
Jason Borrelli, Stanford University	
Brad Bruhn, SUNY at Cortland	
Dax Charles, Colorado State University - Pueblo	
Gary Franke, Washington and Lee University	
Tom Gioglio, East Stroudsburg University	
Mike Kirk, University of Central Oklahoma	
Andy Noel, Cornell University	
Dave Martin, Oklahoma State University	
Pat McCormick, National Coordinator of Officials	
Tom Minkel, Michigan State University	
Doug Peters, Minnesota State University Moorhead	
Deborah Polca, Old Dominion University	
Dick Simmons, Cornell College	
Jeff Swenson, Augsburg College	
Gary Taylor, Rider University	
Jim Thornton, Clarion University	
Other Participants John Baldwin, NCAA; Mary Berdo, NCAA; Leslie Cagle, NCAA; Laurie Cannon, NCAA; Anthony Holman, NCAA; Jeff Jarnecke, NCAA; David Klossner, NCAA; Mike Moyer; NWCA; Teresa Smith, NCAA; Pat Tocci, NWCA	

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL ISSUES COMMITTEE
JUNE 4, 2012, TELECONFERENCE

ACTION ITEMS.

- **None.**

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. New Legislation Impacting Division I Men's Basketball. The NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Issues Committee engaged in a discussion of the new Division I men's basketball recruiting model, on-campus evaluations of prospective student-athletes and summer access to entering and enrolled student-athletes. The Men's Basketball Issues Committee offered the following comments:

a. There were some logistical issues with the April nonscholastic events that should be addressed prior to next year, including delayed admission to observe event activities due to registration procedures, commingling of prospective student-athletes and coaches outside the venue prior to the 6 p.m. start time and contests beginning after 10 p.m.

b. Academic year recruiting opportunities should be evaluated to determine if attendance at nonscholastic activities during April should be excluded from the current 130 recruiting days.

c. Consideration should be given to relaxing communication restrictions with scholastic coaches attending certified events.

d. On-campus evaluations have received considerable support among the mid-major conferences. Among concerns noted have been cost of additional insurance coverage, recruiting equity and the inability of more than four enrolled student-athletes to participate in such activities with the prospective student-athlete after April 15.

e. There was unanimous support for the increased access between coaches and players during the summer vacation period.

2. **Preseason Practice Model.** The Men's Basketball Issues Committee expressed support for the adoption of NCAA Division I Proposal Nos. 2011-84-A and 2011-85, which in men's basketball, would specify that an institution shall not commence on-court practice sessions prior to the date that is 40 days prior to the institution's first regular season contest and would limit the institution to no more than 30 days of countable athletically related activities prior to its first regular season contest. Jim Haney, executive director for the National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC) reported that in a survey of Division I coaches (approximately 250 respondents), over 70 percent supported the change that would mirror the preseason practice model that currently exists in Division I women's basketball. NCAA staff noted that the NCAA Division I Legislative Council tabled the proposals at its April meeting but could act on them at its October meeting; however, the proposals would not become effective until the 2013 season.

3. **Sanctioned Summer Leagues.** The Men's Basketball Issues Committee did not recommend any changes to the current regulations governing enrolled student-athletes participating in sanctioned summer leagues during the summer vacation period.

4. **NCAA Men's Basketball Rules Committee Meeting Update.** The Men's Basketball Issues Committee received a report from the recent Men's Basketball Rules Committee, which focused on recommendations being forwarded for consideration to the NCAA Playing Rules Oversight Panel in the area of playing surface requirements and block/charge calls and continued clarification of officiating guidelines governing bench decorum. The Men's Basketball Issues Committee offered the following comments:

   a. Policies for enforcement of the playing surface requirements need to be developed and administered effectively so as to avoid placing game officials in a difficult position of weighing the potential negative ramifications of cancelling/delaying of a contest versus the potential health and safety risks of the participants.

   b. Greater emphasis also should be placed on the conduct of game officials and behavior that escalates inappropriate bench decorum.

5. **Professional Draft Withdrawal Deadline.** The Men's Basketball Issues Committee noted confusion resulting from the discrepancy in the date for enrolled student-athletes to remove their names from the NBA draft and the actual date for entering the NBA draft,

noting that the current NCAA rule does not preclude a student-athlete from entering the draft after the day before the first day of the spring National Letter of Intent signing period. The Men's Basketball Issues Committee directed Mr. Jim Haney to discuss this matter further with the Division I men's basketball coaches to determine if future adjustments to the current NCAA rule are warranted.

6. **Transfer Issues.** The Men's Basketball Issues Committee engaged in a discussion regarding the significant number of Division I men's basketball student-athletes who seek transfers from the institution in which they originally enrolled. The Men's Basketball Issues Committee supported the establishment of an ad hoc group, with appropriate representation from the coaching community, academic community and student-athletes to develop appropriate solutions that respect the decisions and opportunities for student-athletes who seek a transfer, but at the same time are supportive of the investments and commitments colleges and universities have made in these young men. The Men's Basketball Issues Committee further noted that recent changes in the Division I men's basketball recruiting model to provide earlier and increased access to prospective student-athletes as well as increased summer access between coaches and players should facilitate more sound recruiting decisions and promote relationship building, thus resulting in an improved retention rate in men's basketball.

Committee Chair: *Mitch Barnhart, University of Kentucky, Southeastern Conference*
Staff Liaison(s): *Stephen A. Mallonee; Academic and Membership Affairs*
Byron Hatch; Championships and Alliances
Franklin Smith; Enforcement

June 4, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Whit Babcock, University of Cincinnati, Big East Conference	Tim Cass, University of New Mexico, Mountain West Conference
Mitch Barnhart, University of Kentucky, Southeastern Conference	Mark Hollis, Michigan State University, Big Ten Conference
Barry Collier, Butler University, Horizon League	Floyd Kerr, Morgan State University, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference
James Dickey, University of Houston, Conference USA	
Jim Haney, NABC	

Sandra Hatfield Clubb, Drake University, Missouri Valley Conference	
Robert Lineburg, Radford University, Big South Conference	
Dave Loos, Austin Peay State University, Ohio Valley Conference	
Rob Mullens, University of Oregon, Pac-12 Conference	
Rob Spear, University of Idaho, Western Athletic Conference	
Jon Steinbrecher, Mid-American Conference	
Ted Woodward, University of Maine, Orono, America East Conference	
Other Participants Byron Hatch, NCAA Steve Mallonee, NCAA Ritchie McKay, University of Virginia, Atlantic Coast Conference Franklin Smith, NCAA	

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I WOMEN'S BASKETBALL ISSUES COMMITTEE FEBRUARY 15, 2012, TELECONFERENCE

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- **None.**

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. Women's Basketball Recruiting Model.

a. NCAA Division I Leadership Council Review of Women's Basketball Recruiting Model. The NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Issues Committee was informed that the NCAA Division I Leadership Council supported its request and agreed to conduct a comprehensive review of the women's basketball recruiting model much like what was recently undertaken in men's basketball.

b. Review of Women's Basketball Recruiting Model Concepts. The committee reviewed a number of concepts [e.g., April and July recruiting periods, timing of off-campus contacts, communications with prospective student-athletes (telephone calls, texting, written correspondence), official visits] under consideration for the women's basketball recruiting model. In its review, the committee was mindful of recently tabled recruiting legislation as well as the work of the NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model – Rules relative to NCAA Division I Bylaw 13.

2. Men's Basketball Recruiting Model. The committee was informed of the NCAA Division I Board of Directors' action to approve the following recommendations from the Leadership Council regarding men's basketball recruiting and access to student-athletes:

a. That institutional staff members be permitted to conduct or supervise summer athletics activities in accordance with specified requirements (i.e., enrollment in summer school, meeting opt-out academic benchmarks).

b. That on-campus evaluations of prospective student-athletes be permitted under specified conditions.

3. Report on NCAA Presidential Retreat Initiatives. The committee received an update regarding the ongoing work of the Rules Working Group and the NCAA Working Group

on Collegiate Model - Enforcement. The committee was informed that in an effort to reach out to the membership for feedback, the working groups have posted information regarding their work on the membership side of the NCAA website. The committee members were encouraged to review the posted information and to offer their feedback.

Committee Chair: *Muffet McGraw, University of Notre Dame*
Staff liaisons: *Jacqueline Campbell, Division I governance*
Lynn Holzman, academic and membership affairs
Tina Krah, championships and alliances
Michelle Perry, championships and alliances

NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Issues Committee February 15, 2012 Teleconference	
ATTENDEES	**ABSENTEES**
Beth Bass, Women's Basketball Coaches Association	Donayle Canada, Mid-American Conference
Ken Bothof, University of Wisconsin, Green Bay	Anya Covington, University of Wisconsin, Madison
Barbie Breedlove, East Tennessee State University	Teresa Kuehn-Gould, University of California, Berkeley
Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, The Ivy League	
Brian Giorgis, Marist College	
Susan Hagens, University of Vermont	
Cindy Hartmann, Duke University	
Carolayne Henry, Mountain West Conference	
Connie Hurlbut, Western Athletic Conference	
Muffet McGraw, University of Notre Dame, chair	
Janice Ruggiero, University of New Mexico	
Mary Taylor-Cowles, Western Kentucky University	
Coquese Washington, Pennsylvania State University	
Annette Watts, Jacksonville University	
Carla Williams, University of Georgia	
Other Participants: Jacqueline Campbell, Lynn Holzman, Tina Krah, Michelle Perry	

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I WOMEN'S BASKETBALL ISSUES COMMITTEE
MAY 22, 2012, TELECONFERENCE

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- **Chair.**

(1) Recommendation. The NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Issues Committee recommends that Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Deputy Executive Director, of the Ivy League be approved to serve as chair.

(2) Effective Date. September 1, 2012.

(3) Rationale. Ms. Campbell-McGovern is a proven leader in the membership. In her short tenure on the Women's Basketball Issues Committee she has shown her ability to be an excellent chair and a person the Women's Basketball Issues Committee strongly recommends.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Presidential Retreat Initiatives.

a. The Women's Basketball Issues Committee was reminded of the work completed to date by the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance and several of the Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Working Groups (i.e., NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model - Student-Athlete Well-Being, NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model - Resource Allocation). It was noted that the concept of a miscellaneous expense allowance continues to be supported by the NCAA Division I Board of Directors.

The Rules Working Group has circulated to the membership and various constituent groups, three possible options for this type of educational expense allowance. The Rules Working Group will evaluate the feedback prior to making a final recommendation to the Board. The Resource Allocation Working Group essentially has completed its work, with the issues of the appropriate number of contests/competition in each sport and non coaching personnel limitations being referred to the Rules Working Group in its examination of NCAA Bylaws 17 (Playing And Practice Seasons) and 11 (Athletics Personnel).

b. The Women's Basketball Issues Committee received an update on the Enforcement Working Group's progress with creating a multi-level NCAA rules violation structure, an enhanced penalty structure for NCAA rules infractions and re-establishing a sense of shared responsibility among the interested individuals and entities in intercollegiate athletics. The Women's Basketball Issues Committee was informed of the working group's intent to create greater accountability for head coaches in the infractions process.

c. The Women's Basketball Issues Committee received an update on the Rules Working Group's charge, progress and timeline. Highlights included a review of the different opportunities for feedback on specific concepts and how the membership, conferences and coaches associations are being engaged in feedback efforts. A few specific concepts in recruiting were noted (e.g., eliminating restrictions on modes of communication with prospective student-athletes, establishing one communication trigger date, recruiting materials) and how those discussions may impact the NCAA Division I Leadership Council Women's Basketball Recruiting Subcommittee. The anticipated timeline and issues associated with the review of Bylaw 17 (Playing and Practice Seasons), such as maximum contest limitations, was also reviewed.

2. NCAA Division I Leadership Council Women's Basketball Recruiting Subcommittee.

- The Women's Basketball Issues Committee received the listing of the members serving on the subcommittee along with the anticipated timeline.

  The concepts of the women's basketball recruiting model were reviewed and the Women's Basketball Issues Committee recommended that an off campus contact for juniors be added as a discussion concept to the model. Information regarding the recruiting model has been shared with all conferences and feedback will be reviewed by the subcommittee in preparation for a report to the Leadership Council for its October meeting.

Committee Chair: *Muffet McGraw, University of Notre Dame, Big East Conference*
Staff Liaison(s): *Jacqueline Campbell, Division I governance*
Lynn Holzman, academic and membership affairs
Tina Krah, championships and alliances
Michelle Perry; championships and alliances

May 22, 2012, Teleconference	
Participants	Absentees
Ken Bothof, University of Wisconsin, Green Bay	Anya Covington, University of Wisconsin, Madison
Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, The Ivy League	Brian Giorgis, Marist College
Donayle Canada, Mid-American Conference	Teresa Kuehn-Gould, University of California, Berkley
Susan Hagens, University of Vermont	
Cindy Hartmann, Duke University	
Carolayne Henry, Mountain West Conference	
Muffet McGraw, University of Notre Dame	
Shannon Reynolds, WBCA	
Janice Ruggiero, University of New Mexico	
Coquese Washington, Pennsylvania State University	
Annette Watts, Jacksonville State University	
Carla Williams, University of Georgia	
Jacqueline Campbell, Division I governance	
Lynn Holzman, academic and membership affairs	
Tina Krah, championships and alliances	
Michelle Perry; championships and alliances	

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I FOOTBALL ISSUES COMMITTEE FEBRUARY 22, 2012, MEETING

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- **None.**

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Bowl Eligibility Waivers. The Football Issues Committee (FIC) received three waiver requests from institutions seeking relief from the FCS opponent financial aid requirement per NCAA Bylaw 18.7.2.2.1. The committee approved one request (Oklahoma State) and denied two requests (Mississippi State and Georgia Tech).

2. Presidential Retreat Working Groups. NCAA staff provided updates on the work of the Presidential Retreat Working Groups, with particular emphasis on the efforts of the working group reviewing potential amendments to and reduction in volume of the NCAA Division I Manual.

3. Enforcement and Player-Agent Issues. The FIC met with Julie Roe-Lach and Bill Benjamin from the NCAA Enforcement staff, who provided updates on new football enforcement efforts. Rachel Newman-Baker also met with the committee to provide them with updates on player-agent issues.

4. Concussion Management. The FIC received a report from the NCAA health and safety staff regarding the latest data on concussions in football practices and games.

5. Football Student-Athlete Behavior. The FIC was informed of plans for an NCAA Violence Prevention Summit in early April. Also, the AFCA is researching its coaching membership regarding the most pressing social issues in football currently and will develop ways to review and address them through the AFCA.

Committee Chair: *Nick Carparelli, Jr.; Big East Conference*
Staff Liaison(s): *Damani Leech; Championships and Alliances*
Dennis Poppe; Championships and Alliances
Chad Tolliver; Championships and Alliances

Wednesday, February 22, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Barry Alvarez, University of Wisconsin – Madison	David Cutcliffe, Duke University
Jeff Barber, Liberty University	Anthony Jones, Alabama A&M University
Jeff Bourne, James Madison University	
Nick Carparelli, Jr., Big East Conference	
Derek Carter, Delaware State University	
Joe Castiglione, University of Oklahoma – *via telephone*	
Charles Cobb, Appalachian State University	
Richard Giannini, University of Southern Mississippi	
Brett Gilliland, Mountain West Conference	
Dave Heeke, Central Michigan University	
Robert Hill, Stephen F. Austin State University	
Chris Massaro, Middle Tennessee State University	
Jim O'Day, University of Montana	
David Roach, Colgate University	
Mark Sandy, Eastern Kentucky University	
Ray Tellier, Columbia University – Barnard College	
Ron Strollo, Youngstown State University	
Tim Wabler, University of Dayton	
Mark Womack, Southeastern Conference	
Bruce Van De Velde, Louisiana Tech University	
Other Participants Rachel Newman-Baker, NCAA; Bill Benjamin, NCAA; David Klossner, NCAA; Julie Roe Lach, NCAA; Damani Leech, NCAA; Dennis Poppe, NCAA; Kris Richardson, NCAA; and Chad Tolliver, NCAA	

REPORT OF THE NCAA COMMITTEE ON COMPETITIVE SAFEGUARDS AND MEDICAL ASPECTS OF SPORTS EXCERPT FROM THE JUNE 12-14, 2012, MEETING

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

- **Football.**

  - **Three-hour recovery period.** In the interest of providing consistent safeguards for student-athletes, the NCAA Committee On Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects Of Sports reaffirms its position that NCAA Division I require at least three continuous hours of designated recovery time between ANY sessions occurring in a calendar day for football practices and walk-throughs during the preseason including the segment subsequent to the five-day acclimatization period. This recovery period is important to allow student-athletes to dissipate and reduce body heat, eat food for energy, rehydrate and prepare the body for the next session. The impact of this legislation would ensure student-athletes receive minimal recovery from the cumulative effects of on-field and physical activities, especially in the heat.

    Recovery periods were part of the original 2003 football model. Dehydration has been shown to influence player safety as well as decrease exercise performance. Participation in strenuous activities while incurring environmental stress with additional equipment and/or clothing has also been proven to increase the risk of Exertional Heat Illness (EHI) occurrence in football. Although deaths from football drills have been reduced, risk exists and is greatest throughout the preseason period, not just the first five days. Research supports heat acclimatization extending over a 14 day period therefore risk extends beyond the five days with additive effects of the environment, physical activity and equipment playing a role. Staying diligent on the prevention of heat illness is important as they still occur during the preseason period.

    Recovery periods are a best practice as cited in the NCAA Sports Medicine Handbook guideline "Preseason Preparation". An institution should ensure student-athletes have continuous recovery time (i.e., three hours) between multiple practice sessions on the same calendar day.

    The NCAA has funded research studies in football to evaluate the impact of heat, hydration and equipment on football student-athletes which support a recovery period between sessions:

    (a) From 1988–2004, the NCAA Injury Surveillance reported 1,687 EHI occurrences (resulting in time loss injuries for athletes) during fall football practices, 98 percent during the preseason.

(b) Most recently, data from 2009-2012 from the NCAA Injury Surveillance reported over 1700 EHI annual occurrences during football practices.

(c) In Press at Journal of Athletic Training. 2012. A study that collected four years of data from 2004-2007 from 60 distinct colleges and universities participating in NCAA Division I and III football:

(1) "The first 14 days of the pre-season period had the highest rate of EHI with the greatest risk on practice days 1,2,3,7, and 10 with a gradual decline to day 14."

(2) "High intensive practice that generally starts the football season places greater demands on the physiological system causing the higher EHI rates compared to other times in the season."

(d) Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research. 2006. 20(3):463-70. Heat acclimatization and hydration status of American football players during initial summer workouts.

(e) American Journal of Sports Medicine. 2005. Jun:33(6):843-51. Hydration status in college football players during consecutive days of twice-a-day preseason practices

Other scientific references relevant to football student-athletes and the preseason period include but are not limited to (there are 35 just in the new 2012 publication coming out):

(f) Journal of Athletic Training. 2010. 45(2):117-27. The American football uniform: uncompensable heat stress and hyperthermic exhaustion.

- Their results revealed that the addition of a full football uniform (helmet, shoulder pads and pants) or a partial uniform (pants only without shoulder pads or helmet) exhibited greater physiological strain which resulted in decreased exercise capacities relative to those who exercised without a uniform.

(g) Journal of Athletic Training. 2010. 45(2):136-46. Thermoregulatory responses and hydration practices in heat-acclimatized adolescents during preseason high school football.

(h) Journal of Athletic Training. 2006. 41(3): 332–336. EHI and Environmental Conditions during a Single Football Season in the Southeast.

(i) International Journal of Sports Nutrition and Exercise Metabolism. 2005. 15(6):641-52. Sweat and sodium losses in NCAA football players: a precursor to heat cramps?

(j) Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise. 2003. 35(5):832-7. Thermal insulation and evaporative resistance of football uniforms.

(k) National Athletic Trainers' Association Inter-Association Task Force on EHI – A Consensus Statement. 2003.

Committee Chair: *Jeffrey Anderson, University of Connecticut*

Staff Liaison(s): *Mary Wilfert, Student-Athlete Affairs – Health and Safety*
David Klossner, Student-Athlete Affairs – Health and Safety
Latrice Sales, Student-Athlete Affairs – Health and Safety

REPORT OF THE NCAA OLYMPIC SPORTS LIAISON COMMITTEE FEBRUARY 29, 2012, TELECONFERENCE

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- **None.**

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Welcome. In the absence of the chair, Dan Calandro and David Roach, welcomed the committee and opened the meeting.

2. Committee Roster and Term Expirations and Confirmation of New Committee Chair. The NCAA Olympic Sports Liaison Committee reviewed the committee roster, noting that Bradley-Doppes and Keisha Dunlap will rotate off of the committee September 1, 2012. The committee agreed that Mr. Roach would serve as the next committee chair, effective September 1, 2012. In addition, United States Olympic Committee (USOC) representative to the committee, Chris Vadala, has taken a new position with USA Volleyball; a replacement has not yet been determined by the USOC.

3. December 2011 Teleconference Minutes. The committee approved the December 2011 teleconference minutes as submitted.

4. Update from NCAA Olympic Sports Liaison Committee Strategic Planning Subcommittee. NCAA staff provided an update on behalf of the strategic planning subcommittee. The subcommittee has convened on two occasions to review the committee's initial feedback on the strategic plan generated at the September 2011 in-person meeting and to evaluate the relevancy of the existing goals. In addition, the subcommittee has reviewed the results of the survey issued to the committee members and captured the following themes to reflect priority areas for committee work:

a. Express support for collaborative strategies to support and sustain Olympic sports on campus;

b. Evaluate student-athlete experience and associated pressures that may collide with Olympic training; and

c. Develop strategies to promote best practices for leveraging Olympic sports assets (e.g., coaches, facilities, etc.).

The committee agreed that perspective from national governing bodies (NGBs) could provide additional insight to reformulating the goals of the strategic plan. The subcommittee will continue its work and plan to provide a report to the full committee again during the September 2012 in-person meeting.

5. Update from NGB/OSLC/USOC Task Force. Mr. Calandro provided an update on behalf of the NGB/OSLC/USOC task force. Specifically, the committee reviewed the summary of nine project initiatives, several of which are moving along well. The review generated some discussion around the evolving concept of an Olympic sport web page housed within www.NCAA.org; it was noted that there is understanding on the part of the USOC that there will be content related to international student-athletes once the page is established. The committee will receive another update during its teleconference later this Spring.

6. Update Regarding Training Expenses – Discussion with USOC and NGBs. Mr. Calandro provided an update regarding the topic of training expenses. Preliminary work has been done to understand current practices of NGBs to monitor and account for training expenses offered to student-athletes. The work indicates that NGBs practice varying degrees of oversight when administering funds. As a first step, the USOC has agreed to develop a template for NGBs to use when administering funds.

7. Legislative Update. The committee received an update on the status of legislation that it proposed as part of the 2012 legislative process. Specifically, the proposal intended to include the World University Championships in all bylaws that apply to the World University Games (NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2011-26) was adopted, while the proposal to permit an institution to provide actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete to participate in not more than two national team tryout competition events (NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2011-80A) was tabled until the Division I Legislative Council's April 2012 meeting, pending the work of the Presidential Retreat Working Groups.

8. Future Committee Meetings. The committee discussed its upcoming meeting schedule, including tentative dates for a May teleconference and September in-person meeting.

9. Other Business. No other business was discussed.

Committee Chair: Peg Bradley-Doppes, University of Denver, Sun Belt Conference
Staff Liaisons: Dan Calandro, Academic and Membership Affairs
Alex Smith, Academic and Membership Affairs
Liz Turner Suscha, Championships and Alliances

Teleconference, February 29, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Curtis Coleman, University of Southern Maine	Peg Bradley-Doppes, University of Denver
Raynoid Dedeaux, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	Robert Guzman, Texas A&M University-Kingsville
Keisha Dunlap, Conference USA	
Venera Flores-Stafford, Midwestern State University	
Kathleen Heitzman, Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	
Fredina Ingold, Pennsylvania State University, Altoona	
Zak Ivkovic, City University of New York Athletic Conference	
Earl Koberlein, Stanford University	
Elizabeth Rabb, Wofford College	
David Roach, Colgate University	
Ky Snyder, University of San Diego	
Jessica Stacy, University of Hawaii, Manoa	
Other Participants	
Dan Calandro, NCAA	
Liz Turner Suscha, NCAA	

REPORT OF THE NCAA PLAYING RULES OVERSIGHT PANEL

***KEY ITEMS*.**

- The Panel has held two conference calls since their annual meeting at Convention.

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- **None.**

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

- **Action Taken by Panel.** Since the annual meeting held in January at the Convention, the Panel has had conference calls in February and April. Approval was given to reports, rules proposals, rules modifications and language for the directive to playing rules committees for review of all rules relating to a) game environment and sportsmanship; and b) appeal/protest/forfeit procedures.

  1. The football report, which included several safety-related changes in the non-rules-making year of the two-year cycle, was approved.

  2. Playing rules proposals were approved for bowling, soccer, women's volleyball, and water polo.

  3. Approval was given for field hockey modifications.

  4. The draft memorandum to each rules committee was given approval. The directive asks for a review of rules for potential enhancement in the areas of game environment and sportsmanship; appeals, protests and forfeits; and the impact of technology.

Committee Chair: Ted Gumbart, Atlantic Sun Conference
Staff Liaisons: Ty Halpin, Championships and Alliances – Playing Rules and Officiating
Rachel Seewald, Championships and Alliances – Playing Rules and Officiating
Teresa Smith, Championships and Alliances – Playing Rules and Officiating

February 21, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Shelley Appelbaum, Michigan State University	Jim Fiore, Stony Brook University
Kristy Bayer, Arkansas Tech University	Stuart Robinson, SUNY New Paltz
Tom Byrnes, Capital Athletic Conference Inc.	
Jim Fallis, Northern Arizona University	
Dick Hack, State University of New York Maritime	
Erin Lind, Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
Noreen Morris, Northeast Conference	
Alan Patterson, Conference Carolinas	
Larry Scott, Pacific-12 Conference	

April 17, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Shelley Appelbaum, Michigan State University	Jim Fallis, Northern Arizona University
Kristy Bayer, Arkansas Tech University	Jim Fiore, Stony Brook University
Tom Byrnes, Capital Athletic Conference Inc.	Stuart Robinson, SUNY New Paltz
Ted Gumbart, Atlantic Sun Conference	
Dick Hack, State University of New York Maritime	
Erin Lind, Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	
Noreen Morris, Northeast Conference	
Alan Patterson, Conference Carolinas	
Larry Scott, Pacific-12 Conference	

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Referred to the
NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-83	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- BASEBALL -- MAXIMUM NUMBER OF CONTESTS -- 52	Legislative Council Final Consideration	West Coast Conference	August 1, 2012	In baseball, to reduce, from 56 to 52, the limitation on the maximum number of contests with outside competition.
2011-85	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- MEN'S BASKETBALL -- PRESEASON PRACTICE -- ON-COURT PRACTICE -- 30 DAYS OF COUNTABLE ACTIVITIES WITHIN 40 DAYS PRIOR TO FIRST CONTEST	Legislative Council Final Consideration	Big South Conference	August 1, 2012	In men's basketball, to specify that an institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions prior to 5 p.m. on the date that is 40 days prior to the date of the institution's first regular-season contest; further, to specify that an institution shall not engage in more than 30 days of countable athletically related activities prior to its first regular-season contest.
2011-86	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- WOMEN'S BASKETBALL -- FIRST PERMISSIBLE CONTEST DATE -- TUESDAY BEFORE THE SECOND FRIDAY OF NOVEMBER	Defeated - Final	Southeastern Conference	August 1, 2012	In women's basketball, to specify that an institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in women's basketball prior to the Tuesday before the second Friday of November.
2011-87	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- FOOTBALL -- NUMBER OF CONTESTS -- ANNUAL EXEMPTIONS -- COLLEGE FOOTBALL INVITATIONAL	Not Moved - Final	Sun Belt Conference	Immediate	In football, to specify that one contest played in a college football invitational event is exempt from the maximum number of football contests, as specified.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Referred to the
NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-88	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- GOLF -- PRESEASON PRACTICE AND FIRST DATE OF COMPETITION -- EXCEPTION -- TOPY CUP	Adopted - Final	Big West Conference	August 1, 2012	In golf, to specify that an institution selected to participate in the Topy Cup may commence practice sessions five days before the practice round of the event and that the institution may participate in the competition before the legislated date for the first date of competition.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Sponsored by the
NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-26	AMATEURISM, RECRUITING, ELIGIBILITY AND AWARDS, BENEFITS AND EXPENSES -- WORLD UNIVERSITY CHAMPIONSHIPS	Adopted - Final	NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee)	Immediate	To include the World University Championships in all bylaws that apply to the World University Games.
2011-27	AMATEURISM AND EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS -- FINANCIAL DONATIONS AND ADVERTISING AND SPONSORSHIP OF INTERCOLLEGIATE EVENTS -- PROFESSIONAL SPORTS ORGANIZATIONS	Adopted - Final	NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet	Immediate	To specify that a professional sports organization may serve as a financial sponsor of an intercollegiate competition event, including regular season and postseason events, provided the organization is not publicly identified as such; and that a professional sports organization may serve as a financial sponsor of an activity or promotion that is ancillary to the competition event and may be publicly identified as such; further, to eliminate the prohibition on professional sports organizations or personnel as acceptable advertisers in conjunction with NCAA championships.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Sponsored by the
NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-80-A	AWARDS, BENEFITS AND EXPENSES -- EXPENSES PROVIDED BY THE INSTITUTION FOR PRACTICE AND COMPETITION -- NATIONAL TEAM TRYOUTS -- NOT MORE THAN TWO EVENTS	Rendered Moot - Final	NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee)	August 1, 2012	To permit an institution to provide actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete to participate in not more than two national team tryout competition events, including events from which participants are selected for another tier of tryout competition or events from which final selections are made for the national team that will participate in the Olympic Games, Pan American Games, World Championships, World Cup or World University Games.
2011-80-B	AWARDS, BENEFITS AND EXPENSES -- EXPENSES PROVIDED BY THE INSTITUTION FOR PRACTICE AND COMPETITION -- NATIONAL TEAM TRYOUTS -- NOT MORE THAN TWO EVENTS -- IMMEDIATE EFFECTIVE DATE	Adopted, 60-Day Override Period	NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet	Immediate	To permit an institution to provide actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete to participate in not more than two national team tryout competition events, including events from which participants are selected for another tier of tryout competition or events from which final selections are made for the national team that will participate in the Olympic Games, Pan American Games, World Championships, World Cup or World University Games.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Sponsored by the
NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-84-A	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- MEN'S BASKETBALL -- PRESEASON PRACTICE -- ON-COURT PRACTICE -- ELIMINATION OF 5 P.M. START TIME ON FIRST PERMISSIBLE PRACTICE DATE	Legislative Council Final Consideration	NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet (Women's Basketball Issues Committee)	August 1, 2012	In men's basketball, to eliminate the 5 p.m. start time on the first permissible practice date.
2011-84-B	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- WOMEN'S BASKETBALL -- PRESEASON PRACTICE -- ON-COURT PRACTICE -- ELIMINATION OF 5 P.M. START TIME ON FIRST PERMISSIBLE PRACTICE DATE	Adopted - Final	NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet (Women's Basketball Issues Committee)	August 1, 2012	In women's basketball, to eliminate the 5 p.m. start time on the first permissible practice date.
2011-89	COMMITTEES -- ASSOCIATION-WIDE COMMITTEES -- RULES COMMITTEES WITHOUT CHAMPIONSHIPS ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES -- SWIMMING AND DIVING, TRACK AND FIELD AND WRESTLING	Adopted - Final	NCAA Division I Championships and Sports Management Cabinet (Men's and Women's Swimming and Diving Committee, Men's and Women's Track and Field Committee, and Wrestling Committee)	August 1, 2012	To establish a separate Men's and Women's Swimming and Diving Rules Committee, a separate Men's and Women's Track and Field Rules Committee and a separate Wrestling Rules Committee without championships administration responsibilities, as specified; further, to establish a Division I Men's and Women's Swimming and Diving Committee, a Division I Men's and Women's Track and Field Committee and a Division I Wrestling Committee, as specified.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Sponsored by the
NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-91	EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS -- DAY OF COMPETITION -- NOON START TIME -- EXCEPTION -- MEN'S GOLF CHAMPIONSHIPS	Adopted - Final	NCAA Division I Championship/Sports Management Cabinet (Men's Golf Committee)	Immediate	In men's golf, to specify that in instances in which the final day of the men's golf championships occurs on a Sunday, competition may begin prior to noon.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Referred to a Committee Reporting to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-12	PERSONNEL -- DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS -- GRADUATE ASSISTANT COACH -- BASKETBALL	Legislative Council Final Consideration	Big East Conference	August 1, 2012	In basketball, to permit an institution to employ one graduate assistant coach.
2011-13	PERSONNEL -- DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS -- GRADUATE ASSISTANT COACH -- BOWL SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL -- NO PREVIOUS FOOTBALL BOWL SUBDIVISION OR PROFESSIONAL COACHING EXPERIENCE	Legislative Council Final Consideration	Big East Conference	Immediate	In bowl subdivision football, to specify that a graduate assistant coach must have either received his or her first baccalaureate degree or have exhausted athletics eligibility (whichever occurs later) within the previous seven years; or the individual must not have not previously served as a coach (either on a salaried or volunteer basis) at a Football Bowl Subdivision institution or in a professional football league.
2011-14	PERSONNEL -- DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS -- GRADUATE ASSISTANT COACH -- BOWL SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL -- NO PREVIOUS COLLEGIATE OR PROFESSIONAL COACHING EXPERIENCE	Legislative Council Final Consideration	Pac-12 Conference, Big Ten Conference and Mid-American Conference	August 1, 2012	In bowl subdivision football, to specify that a graduate assistant coach shall have no previous professional or collegiate football coaching experience as a head or assistant coach.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Referred to a Committee Reporting to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-16	PERSONNEL -- DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS -- UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT ASSISTANT COACH -- EXCEPTION -- NONPARTICIPANT -- FOOTBALL	Legislative Council Final Consideration	Southern Conference	Immediate	In football, to specify that an individual who has neither engaged in intercollegiate football competition for the certifying institution nor engaged in other countable athletically related activities in intercollegiate football beyond a 14-consecutive-day period at the certifying institution may serve as an undergraduate student assistant coach, provided the individual meets the remaining criteria applicable to an undergraduate student assistant coach, as specified; further, to specify that an individual who serves as a undergraduate assistant coach pursuant to the exception shall forfeit any remaining eligibility in football at the certifying institution.
2011-19	PERSONNEL -- LIMITATIONS ON NUMBER OF OFF-CAMPUS RECRUITERS AT ANY ONE TIME -- FOOTBALL -- EXCEPTION -- SPRING EVALUATION PERIOD	Legislative Council Final Consideration	Southeastern Conference	Immediate	In bowl subdivision football, to specify that all nine assistant coaches may evaluate prospective student-athletes at any one time during the spring evaluation period; further, in championship subdivision football, to specify that all 11 coaches may evaluate prospective student-athletes at any one time during the spring evaluation period.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Referred to a Committee Reporting to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-20	PERSONNEL -- LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER AND DUTIES OF COACHES -- OFF-CAMPUS RECRUITING -- WOMEN'S BASKETBALL -- NONSCHOLASTIC EVENTS DURING SPRING EVALUATION PERIOD	Legislative Council Final Consideration	Big East Conference	August 1, 2012	In women's basketball, to specify that four coaches may evaluate prospective student-athletes at any one time at nonscholastic events during the spring evaluation period.
2011-21	PERSONNEL -- LIMITATIONS ON NUMBER OF OFF-CAMPUS RECRUITERS AT ANY ONE TIME -- EXCEPTION -- FOOTBALL -- CONTACT PERIOD	Legislative Council Final Consideration	Big East Conference and Big 12 Conference	August 1, 2012	In football, to specify that during a contact period, a replaced coach is not required to return to the institution's campus before engaging in additional recruiting activities, provided not more than seven coaches engage in off-campus recruiting activities each day.
2011-22	PERSONNEL -- BENCH PERSONNEL RESTRICTION -- MEN'S BASKETBALL	Legislative Council Final Consideration	West Coast Conference	August 1, 2012	In men's basketball, to specify that during a contest against outside competition, there shall be a limit of 17 individuals who may occupy the team bench, not including student-athletes who are actively engaged in the competition.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Referred to a Committee Reporting to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-25	AMATEURISM -- EXCEPTIONS TO AMATEURISM RULE -- PRIZE MONEY PRIOR TO FULL-TIME COLLEGIATE ENROLLMENT -- TENNIS -- $10,000 PER YEAR	Adopted, 60-Day Override Period	NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet	Immediate	In tennis, to specify that, prior to full-time collegiate enrollment, an individual may accept prize money based on his or her place finish or performance in open athletics events, not to exceed $10,000 per calendar year; further, to specify that once the individual has reached the $10,000 limit, he or she may receive additional prize money on a per-event basis, provided such prize money does not exceed his or her actual and necessary expenses for participation in the event.
2011-33	RECRUITING -- CONTACTS AND EVALUATIONS -- RECRUITING PERSON DAYS -- WOMEN'S BASKETBALL, WOMEN'S SAND VOLLEYBALL AND WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL	Legislative Council Final Consideration	NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	August 1, 2012	In women's basketball, women's sand volleyball and women's volleyball, to eliminate the limitation on the number of evaluations per prospective student-athlete.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Referred to a Committee Reporting to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-43	RECRUITING AND FINANCIAL AID -- LETTER-OF-INTENT PROGRAMS, FINANCIAL AID AGREEMENTS -- LETTER OF INTENT RESTRICTION -- LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF SIGNINGS -- BOWL SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL	Adopted - Final	Southeastern Conference	August 1, 2012	In bowl subdivision football, to specify that there shall be an annual signing limit of 25 on the number of prospective student-athletes who may sign a National Letter of Intent or institutional offer of financial aid from December 1 through May 31; further to specify that a prospective student-athlete who signs a National Letter of Intent or an institutional offer of financial aid and becomes an initial counter for the same academic year in which the signing occurred (e.g., midyear enrollee) shall not count toward the annual limit on signings.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Referred to a Committee Reporting to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-46-FBS	RECRUITING -- TRYOUTS -- NONSCHOLASTIC PRACTICE OR COMPETITION AND NONINSTITUTIONAL CAMPS OR CLINICS -- BOWL SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL	Adopted - Final	Southeastern Conference	Immediate; a contract signed before August 15, 2011 may be honored.	In bowl subdivision football, to specify that an institution [including any institutional department (e.g., athletics, recreational/intramural)] shall not host, sponsor or conduct a nonscholastic football practice or competition (e.g., seven-on-seven events) in which football prospective student-athletes participate on its campus or at an off-campus facility regularly used by the institution for practice and/or competition by any of the institution's sport programs; further, to limit the use of institutional facilities for noninstitutional camps or clinics that include prospect-aged participants to June and July.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Referred to a Committee Reporting to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-46-FCS	RECRUITING -- TRYOUTS -- NONSCHOLASTIC PRACTICE OR COMPETITION AND NONINSTITUTIONAL CAMPS OR CLINICS -- CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL	Cabinet / Committee Legislation Recommendation	Southeastern Conference	Immediate; a contract signed before August 15, 2011 may be honored.	In championship subdivision football, to specify that an institution [including any institutional department (e.g., athletics, recreational/intramural)] shall not host, sponsor or conduct a nonscholastic football practice or competition (e.g., seven-on-seven events) in which football prospective student-athletes participate on its campus or at an off-campus facility regularly used by the institution for practice and/or competition by any of the institution's sport programs; further, to limit the use of institutional facilities for noninstitutional camps or clinics that include prospect-aged participants to June, July and August.
2011-47	RECRUITING -- TRYOUTS -- LOCAL SPORTS CLUBS -- FOOTBALL	Legislative Council Final Consideration	Southeastern Conference	Immediate	In football, to prohibit a coach or a noncoaching staff member with football-specific responsibilities from being involved in any capacity in a football club that includes prospective student-athletes.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Referred to a Committee Reporting to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-49	RECRUITING -- SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS -- EMPLOYMENT AT CAMP OR CLINIC -- ATHLETICS STAFF MEMBERS -- NONINSTITUTIONAL, PRIVATELY OWNED CAMPS OR CLINICS -- BOWL SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL -- HEAD COACH EXCEPTION -- CHARITABLE OR NONPROFIT CAMP OR CLINIC	Legislative Council Final Consideration	Mid-American Conference	Immediate	In bowl subdivision football, to specify that an institution's head coach may participate as a volunteer (e.g. counselor, guest lecturer, consultant) on one day in June or July outside the designated two periods of 15 consecutive days at a charitable or nonprofit camp or clinic, as specified.
2011-50	RECRUITING -- USE OF RECRUITING FUNDS -- RECRUITING OR SCOUTING SERVICES -- CRITERIA FOR SUBSCRIPTION	Adopted - Final	Big East Conference, Conference USA and Mountain West Conference	Immediate	In sports other than basketball and football, to specify that an institution may subscribe to a recruiting or scouting service involving prospective student-athletes, provided the service is made available to all institutions desiring to subscribe and at the same fee rate for all subscribers; further, to specify that an institution is permitted to subscribe to a service that provides scholastic and/or nonscholastic video. In basketball and football, to eliminate the restriction on subscribing to a service that includes access to nonscholastic video.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Referred to a Committee Reporting to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-52	RECRUITING -- USE OF RECRUITING FUNDS -- RECRUITING OR SCOUTING SERVICES -- CRITERIA FOR SUBSCRIPTION -- NCAA APPROVAL -- BASKETBALL AND FOOTBALL	Adopted - Final	Southeastern Conference	Immediate for implementation of the approval process; June 1, 2012 for application of legislation.	In basketball and football, to specify that an institution shall not subscribe to a recruiting or scouting service unless the service has been approved by the NCAA pursuant to an annual approval process.
2011-54	RECRUITING -- RECRUITING CALENDARS -- WOMEN'S BASKETBALL -- JULY EVALUATION AND DEAD PERIODS	Adopted, 60-Day Override Period	Atlantic Coast Conference	August 1, 2012	In women's basketball, to specify that during the time period of July 6-31, the recruiting calendar shall consist of, consecutively, a seven-day evaluation period, a 10-day dead period, a seven-day evaluation period and a two-day dead period.
2011-55	RECRUITING -- RECRUITING CALENDARS -- BOWL SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL -- EARLY JANUARY DEAD PERIOD	Legislative Council Final Consideration	NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	August 1, 2012	In bowl subdivision football, to revise the recruiting calendar to specify that January 4 through the Sunday during the week of the annual convention of the American Football Coaches Association shall be a dead period.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Referred to a Committee Reporting to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-56	RECRUITING -- RECRUITING-PERSON DAYS AND RECRUITING CALENDAR -- FENCING	Legislative Council Final Consideration	NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	August 1, 2012	In fencing, to establish recruiting-person days and a recruiting calendar, as specified.
2011-57	RECRUITING -- RECRUITING-PERSON DAYS AND RECRUITING CALENDAR -- FIELD HOCKEY	Legislative Council Final Consideration	NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	August 1, 2012	In field hockey, to establish recruiting-person days and a recruiting calendar, as specified.
2011-58	RECRUITING -- RECRUITING CALENDARS -- WOMEN'S GYMNASTICS	Legislative Council Final Consideration	NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	August 1, 2012	In women's gymnastics, to establish a recruiting calendar, as specified.
2011-59	RECRUITING -- RECRUITING CALENDARS -- MEN'S ICE HOCKEY	Withdrawn - Final	NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	September 1, 2012	In men's ice hockey, to establish a recruiting calendar, as specified.
2011-60	RECRUITING -- RECRUITING CALENDARS -- WRESTLING	Legislative Council Final Consideration	NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	August 1, 2012	In wrestling, to establish a recruiting calendar, as specified.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Referred to a Committee Reporting to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-61	RECRUITING -- BASKETBALL EVENT CERTIFICATION -- WOMEN'S BASKETBALL -- NO EMPLOYMENT OF CURRENT STUDENT-ATHLETES	Legislative Council Final Consideration	Atlantic Coast Conference	Immediate	In women's basketball, to specify that a certified event shall not employ (either on a salaried or a volunteer basis) a current women's basketball student-athlete.
2011-64	ELIGIBILITY -- SEASONS OF COMPETITION: FIVE-YEAR RULE -- FIVE SEASONS OF ELIGIBILITY -- FOOTBALL	Defeated - Final	Colonial Athletic Association	August 1, 2012; applies to any student-athlete with eligibility remaining.	In football, to specify that a student-athlete shall not engage in more than five seasons of intercollegiate competition and may only engage in a fifth season at an institution at which the student-athlete previously used a season of competition.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Referred to a Committee Reporting to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-66	ELIGIBILITY -- SEASONS OF COMPETITION -- MINIMUM AMOUNT OF COMPETITION -- EXCEPTION -- NONCHAMPIONSHIP SEGMENT COMPETITION -- SOFTBALL	Legislative Council Final Consideration	Big 12 Conference	Immediate; applies retroactively to any student-athlete with eligibility remaining.	In softball, to permit a student-athlete to compete in an institution's non-championship segment without using a season of competition, as specified.
2011-68	ELIGIBILITY -- PROGRESS-TOWARD-DEGREE REQUIREMENTS -- ELIGIBILITY FOR COMPETITION -- FULFILLMENT OF CREDIT-HOUR REQUIREMENTS -- ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS -- FOOTBALL -- EXCEPTION -- TEAM ACADEMIC PROGRESS RATE	Defeated - Final	Big East Conference	August 1, 2012	In football, to specify that a student-athlete shall not be subject to the eligibility penalty for failure to successfully complete at least nine-semester hours or eight-quarter hours of academic credit during the fall term and earn the Academic Progress Rate eligibility point for the fall term, provided the institution's Academic Progress Rate for football is 965 or higher as of the first day of classes of the fall term in which the penalty would otherwise apply.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Referred to a Committee Reporting to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-71	ELIGIBILITY -- TRANSFER REGULATIONS -- FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS -- ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION -- WOMEN'S ICE HOCKEY	Legislative Council Final Consideration	Big Ten Conference	August 1, 2012; applicable to student-athletes who enroll full time at the certifying institution in a regular academic term as transfer students on or after August 1, 2012.	To specify that the one-time transfer exception to the four-year transfer residence requirement shall not be applicable to student-athletes in women's ice hockey.
2011-72	ELIGIBILITY -- OUTSIDE COMPETITION -- EXCEPTION -- USA FENCING NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIPS	Adopted - Final	The Ivy League	Immediate	In fencing, to specify that a student-athlete may compete during the academic year as a member of a USA Fencing member club team at the USA Fencing National Championships.
2011-73	FINANCIAL AID AND AWARDS, BENEFITS AND EXPENSES -- TRAINING-TABLE MEALS -- ONE MEAL PER DAY -- STUDENT-ATHLETES NOT RECEIVING FULL BOARD -- FOOTBALL	Legislative Council Final Consideration	Big East Conference	August 1, 2012	In bowl subdivision football, to permit an institution to provide one training-table meal per day to a student-athlete who does not receive athletically related financial aid; further, in championship subdivision football, to permit an institution to provide one training-table meal per day to

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Referred to a Committee Reporting to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
					a student-athlete who does not receive athletically related financial aid that covers the full cost of board; finally, to specify that the provision of the one training-table meal per day to such a student-athlete shall not be considered financial aid.
2011-75	FINANCIAL AID -- SUMMER FINANCIAL AID -- PRIOR TO INITIAL FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT -- FOOTBALL -- COUNTER FOR THE ENSUING ACADEMIC YEAR	Adopted - Final	Southeastern Conference	Immediate	In football, to specify that a prospective student-athlete who receives athletically related financial aid during a summer term prior to initial full-time enrollment at the certifying institution shall be an initial and overall counter for the ensuing academic year.

2011-12 Legislative Proposals Referred to a Committee Reporting to the NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2011-77	FINANCIAL AID -- MAXIMUM INSTITUTIONAL GRANT-IN-AID LIMITATIONS BY SPORT -- BASEBALL LIMITATIONS -- MINIMUM EQUIVALENCY VALUE -- EXCEPTION -- FINAL YEAR OF ELIGIBILITY AND NOT PREVIOUSLY AIDED	Adopted, 60-Day Override Period	Big South Conference and Southern Conference	August 1, 2012	In baseball, to specify that an institution may provide less than 25 percent of an equivalency to a student-athlete, provided the student-athlete is in the final year of eligibility and has not previously received athletically related financial aid in baseball.

Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model Working Group – Enforcement

Why do this?

- Culture of winning versus integrity.
  - Risk-reward analysis.
- Increase in third-party interference and influence.
- Public and membership distrust of the NCAA's ability to police itself.

Why do this?

- Violations:
  - Current violation structure lacks flexibility.
- Process:
  - Cases take too long and lack transparency.
  - Committee on Infractions' (COI's) workload unreasonable.
- Penalties:
  - Approach to penalties not understood, predictable or strong.
  - More emphasis on head coach responsibility.
- Expectations of shared responsibility unclear.

How we do this…

- Establish multi-level violation structure.
- Overhaul process.
- Develop penalty guidelines.
- Define shared responsibility.

Multi-level Violation Structure

- **Four proposed levels:**
  - Level I: Severe major (e.g., academic fraud).
  - Level II: Major (e.g., coaching limitations).
  - Level III: Secondary (e.g., limited early contact).
  - Level IV: Limited (e.g., recruiting correspondence).
- **Remaining Issues:**
  - Refine definitions.
  - More examples needed in report - creating resource library.

Modified Process

- Expanded Committee on Infractions (24).
- Use of 6- to 7-person panels of COI to hear Level I and II cases.
- Inclusion of current/former presidents, current/former directors of athletics and former coaches.
- Redesigned allegations; reference to evidence supporting charges.
- More streamlined approach to processing Level II cases.
- Traditional approach to Level III cases (secondary).
- Conference review of Level IV cases.
- **Remaining Issue:**
  - Implementation plan for additional COI members.

Penalty Structure

- Use of penalty guidelines for Level I and II cases.
- Use of core penalties:
  - Postseason bans, recruiting restrictions, fines, scholarship restrictions, meaningful probation and show cause orders.
- Aggravating and mitigating circumstances affect severity of penalties.
- Ranges of penalties.
  - Greater predictability and consistency.
- **Remaining Issues**:
  - Better understanding of how mitigating and aggravating factors apply.
  - Creating resource library with detailed analysis of last two years of cases.

Penalty Structure

LEVEL I	LEVEL II
Significant Aggravation	
Aggravation	Aggravation
Standard	Standard
Mitigation	Mitigation
Significant Mitigation	

Head Coach Responsibility

- If violations occur in coach's program, presumption of coach responsibility.
  - Results in head coach control violation (Bylaw 11.1.2.1).
  - Head coach suspended from 10 to 100 percent of the season.
- Level III (secondary) violations in football, men's and women's basketball.
  - Designated list of intentional Level III violations (serious secondary).
  - Head coach suspended from a contest when staff member commits violation.

President and Athletics Director Accountability

- **Findings of Lack of Institutional Control**.
  - President's name listed on public infractions report.
  - Athletics director's name listed on public infractions report.
  - Head coach's name listed on public infractions report.

- **Failure to Monitor**.
  - Athletics director's name listed on public infractions report.

Level I Case Example

- Assistant coach involves agent to recruit prospect; benefits provided by agent and coach knew.
  - Enforcement staff conducts investigation; issues allegations.
  - COI panel hears case; makes findings; decides what aggravation and mitigation exist.
  - COI panel applies penalty guidelines to coach and institution; issues decision in 4 weeks.
    - Standard Level I for institution.
    - Aggravation Level I for assistant coach.
    - Standard Level I for head coach for violating Bylaw 11.1.2.1.

Level I Case Example: Penalties Analysis

– Standard Level I for institution.

- Postseason ban: 1 to 2 years.
- Fine: 1 to 3% of total budget for basketball program.
- Scholarship reduction: 12.5 to 25%.
- Recruiting restrictions on program: 12.5 to 25%.
- Probation: 2 to 6 years.
  - Aggravation Level I for assistant coach.
    - 5- to 10-year show cause order; restriction on all athletics duties.
  - Standard Level I for head coach for violating 11.1.2.1
    - 20 to 50% suspension from season.

Effective Date and Implementation

- Adoption August 2012.
- Effective date August 2013.
- **Remaining issues**:
  - Impact on violations committed after August 1, 2012.
  - Impact on pending cases.
  - Plan for phasing in new COI members and panels.

Shared Responsibility and The Cooperative Principle

– **The Cooperative Principle**.

- Defining common expectations for all involved in major (Level I or II) infractions matters.
- Roles and responsibilities of institutions, conferences, at-risk coaches and enforcement staff.

2012 Timeline and Next Steps

- January 12: General concepts reported to Board.
- January 30: Working group provided preliminary report to membership.
- February to March: Input from membership and others.
- April 10: Working group revised proposals based on feedback.
- April 26: Interim report to Board and membership. Supportive of recommendations.
- May to June: Continued outreach - conference meetings; seminars.
- July: Working group will revise proposals as needed.

- August 2**:** Division I Board of Directors meeting. A majority of Enforcement Working Group recommendations have August 2013 effective date but some (e.g. amended rationale of Bylaw 11.1.2.1) have an August 2012 effective date.
- August –TBD: Enforcement Working Group continues to refine, resolve and educate the membership regarding the implementation of recommendations approved/ adopted by the Board.

NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model - Rules
Timeline and Items of Focus Overview

Time Period and Key Dates	Items of Focus
Now through April 20, 2012	Outreach with membership to collect feedback on Commitments and concepts. Specific items: • Commitments. • NCAA Bylaw 11 (athletics personnel). • Bylaw 13 (recruiting). • Bylaw 16 (awards, benefits and expenses).
April 12, 2012 (10 to 11:30 a.m.) NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model - Rules Teleconference	• Provide summary of feedback received on Commitments, Bylaws 11 (athletics personnel), 13 (recruiting) and 16 (awards, benefits and expenses). • Review initial draft of concepts for Bylaws 12 (amateurism) and 14 (eligibility). • Review initial action plans for Bylaws 15 (financial aid) and 17 (playing and practice seasons).
April 26, 2012 NCAA Division I Board of Directors Meeting	*Progress report; no legislative action anticipated.*
May 3, 2012 (9:30 to 11 a.m.) Rules Working Group Teleconference	• Key insights on Commitments, Bylaws 11 (athletics personnel), 13 (recruiting) and 16 (awards, benefits and expenses): • Finalize concepts to be sent to membership for feedback on Bylaws 12 (amateurism) and 14 (eligibility). • Update on academic fraud and incentives.
May 7 through June 22, 2012 • Conference Meetings • Governance Meetings • NCAA Regional Rules Seminars	Additional outreach on concepts in Bylaws 11 (athletics personnel), 13 (recruiting) and 16 (awards, benefits and expenses) that require additional discussion. Outreach with membership to collect feedback on: • Bylaw 12 (amateurism). • Bylaw 14 (eligibility).
July 12-13, 2012 Rules Working Group Meeting	• Review re-written bylaws and draft legislative proposals related to Bylaws 11 (athletics personnel), 13 (recruiting) and 16 (awards, benefits and expenses). • Key insights on Bylaws 12 (amateurism) and 14 (eligibility) and other items sent to the membership for feedback. • Finalize plans for Bylaws 15 (financial aid) and 17 (playing and practice seasons) reviews after receiving cabinet input.
August 2, 2012 NCAA Division I Board of Directors Meeting	*Progress report; no legislative action anticipated.*
Fall Governance Meetings	Continued outreach and communication.
**October 30 Board of Directors Meeting* *OR* *January 19, 2013 Board of Directors Meeting*	*Legislative action anticipated on Rules Working Group recommendations for Commitments and Bylaws 11 (athletics personnel), 12 (amateurism), 13 (recruiting), 14 (eligibility) and 16 (awards, benefits and expenses).*
TBD Board of Directors Meeting	*Legislative action anticipated on Bylaws 15 (financial aid) and 17 (playing and practice seasons).*

**Fall/winter Rules Working Group meeting to review re-written bylaws and draft legislative proposals related to Bylaws 12 (amateurism) and 14 (eligibility).*

James Barker knows what success will look like.

If his team achieves its goals, the chair of the Collegiate Model: Rules working group said that Division I members will no longer be forced to follow insignificant, unenforceable rules designed to create an unattainable level playing field. Every rule will be attached to a tenet of Division I or a principle of the overall Association.

Everyone in college sports – from the president down to the prospect – will know what behavior is expected, what behavior is unacceptable and what the consequences will be for stepping outside those lines.

“The goal is not to create a Wild West with no rules,” said the Clemson president, “nor is it to build a regulatory structure that will allow the Division I Manual to expand so much that five years from now, you won’t be able to recognize that we’ve done any work at all.

“The group is creating a structure that will allow the members to connect every single rule back to a core Division I belief and, ultimately, the values of the NCAA as a whole.”

Barker knows the task is herculean. Creating a Manual that emphasizes broader themes, acknowledges the vast diversity within the division and eliminates nonessential areas of regulation is difficult. It is completely different from anything that has been tried before, and the Division I membership is waiting to see what emerges. While the group initially hoped to be finished this spring, the timeline has been extended in a nod to the complexity of the assignment and the need to fully vet proposed changes with the membership.

If a new rules structure like the one under consideration is adopted, Division I regulations will be less prescriptive and will encourage an environment of shared responsibility. In some cases, it will be quite different from the current rule book, which dictates things such as appropriate recruiting modes and what kind of academic and career counseling support can be given to student-athletes. In the new version, the responsibility would be shared among the individual, the institution, the conference office and the NCAA national office. In many cases, institutions would have discretion to do what they believe is necessary for the educational and personal well-being of student-athletes.

Barker said the working group is building a new administrative culture that would allow compliance administrators to get out of the weeds of daily tasks, such as policing communication with recruits. Instead, they would have more time to pay attention to the most important rules that really impact the values of Division I.

“People will do things at a higher level because our new rules structure freed them up to do it,” Barker said. “For example, compliance people might be able to say, ‘Now I’m getting to know the young men my basketball coach is recruiting, finding out if they are a good fit for our institution, instead of spending hours counting how many times he calls them.’ We don’t need to decide what books a student-athlete needs or tell people how many coaches can be off-campus

recruiting at one time."

Barker believes the new structure also will allow institutions to decide independently how to use their resources.

Clemson's James Barker explains the efforts of the rules working group.

"We will help define what the division cares about as a whole," he said. "Then it will be up to you to decide who you recruit, how you spend your time and how you spend your money to help your school and your student-athletes.

"We've built an entire structure on our campuses around the rule book. We're really going to shake that up and shift the focus to campuses."

That kind of freedom will be unfamiliar for administrators and compliance professionals who have relied on the Manual and NCAA staff to be the definitive answer. Barker acknowledges a new regulatory culture will present challenges, but he said the benefits will far outweigh the uncertainty. Keeping the rules simple and focused on the values is vital to ultimate success, he said.

To keep the membership at large involved in the discussion, the working group has created a website to present its work – both high level (defining the Division I commitments) and more technical (actual versions of bylaws, old and with proposed changes). Eventually, the site will present ideas for a new approach for considering legislative changes in Division I, which could include a two-year overlapping rules cycle and more rigorous review of potential legislation's tie to the Association's values and division's commitments.

The group will be transparent. In addition to the website, the NCAA staff has already done presentations to various outside groups and will continue gathering feedback for the rules group during open dialogue sessions at the spring Regional Rules Seminars. The goal is to thoroughly vet each concept with the membership before presenting it to the presidents for adoption.

Barker said that while a consensus among Division I members may not be possible on all points, he believes the membership can recognize that the work is necessary, valuable and significant.

The group is seeking feedback from any members who care to comment and is willing to make changes in early proposals if the membership has clear, significant objections. That feedback will be carefully considered as the group moves closer to presenting the Board of Directors with its proposals for a new regulatory structure.

"Progress is being made, but everything is still under discussion," Barker said. "This is a work that it still under construction, and we won't present it to the Board for approval until it's complete. Part of that construction is feedback from the membership, and we intend to pay close attention to what they are saying."

NCAA WORKING GROUP ON THE COLLEGIATE MODEL – RULES
PROPOSED CHANGES TO NCAA CONSTITUTION (ART. 2)

As part of this Working Group's charge, it is necessary to review certain provisions of the NCAA Constitution. Specifically, Article 2 of the Constitution is entitled "Principles for Conduct of Intercollegiate Athletics" and describes 16 different Principles "to which the members are committed." Constitution 2.01.[1] Some of those Principles address matters not strictly within the purview of this Working Group. These include Principles 2.3 (Gender Equity), 2.4 (Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct), 2.6 (Nondiscrimination) and 2.7 (Diversity within Governance Structures). While those provisions are addressed below (see new Commitments 2.4 and 2.9), the focus of this Group is on provisions most directly related to Articles 11-17.

Provisions in Article 2 outline broad commitments of the Association. They are designed to articulate the priorities and set the overall direction for the Association, as expressed by member institutions. They are intentionally broad, as implementing detail is provided in supporting and specific bylaws. All bylaws in the Manual, and all future legislation, should advance one or more of these provisions. Thus, there is a thread that runs from the broad commitments in Article 2, through the general provisions of each Article and into every bylaw ultimately adopted by the membership.

The proposed revisions that follow generally use current language from Article 2 as a starting point. Recommended changes are designed to (1) more accurately capture the fundamental principles of the Collegiate Model, (2) update arguably obsolete language, and (3) streamline and simplify provisions in Article 2. The revisions are also designed to reduce confusing overlap of common terms presently used in the Manual. For example and for purposes of discussion, "principles" in Article 2 could be called "commitments" and references to "rules," "regulations," or "rules and regulations" could be replaced with a simple reference to "bylaws."

In addition to language changes, this recommendation removes several stand-alone sections of Article 2 for purposes of discussion. These include Constitution 2.12 (Eligibility), 2.13 (Financial Aid), 2.14 (Playing and Practice Seasons) and 2.15 (Postseason Competition). While these items clearly support the Collegiate Model, they do not necessarily require individual constitutional provisions because each is addressed by other commitments. Notes about how these provisions fit within Article 2 follow related commitments.

Specific questions regarding individual commitments are embedded in the recommendations below. In addition, general questions to consider include the following:

1. Are there additional commitments that should be included in the NCAA Constitution?

[1] Citations are to numbers and titles appearing in the 2011-12 Division I Manual.

CONFIDENTIAL
ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE
ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT

2. Should these commitments be reworded to be more specific or less specific?

3. Are these commitments understandable and consistent with the Collegiate Model?

4. Are any of these commitments unique to Division I, or are they all Association-wide?

In conclusion, reasonable minds can and do differ about the NCAA's enduring values and how they should be articulated. These draft proposals are designed to encourage productive feedback about furthering the Collegiate Model of athletics. Accordingly, further debate and analysis will be important.

CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE 2

Elements of the Collegiate Model

2.1 ENACTMENT OF BYLAWS

Bylaws enacted by the Association's members governing the conduct of intercollegiate athletics shall be designed to advance the Collegiate Model, foster competition in amateur athletics and promote the Association's enduring values set forth in this Constitution. In some instances, a careful balancing of these values may be necessary to help achieve the purposes of the Association.

[*Note: This provision is derived from current Constitution 2.01 (General Principle).*]

- *Does this make sufficiently clear that subsequent bylaw proposals need to support the NCAA's most basic principles and commitments?*

2.2 THE COMMITMENT TO AMATEURISM

Member institutions shall conduct their athletics programs for students who participate as a part of their educational experience, thus maintaining a line of demarcation between student-athletes who choose to participate in the Collegiate Model from athletes competing in the professional model.

[*Note: This provision updates and clarifies Constitution 2.9 (Amateurism). It is designed to clearly state the membership's dedication to amateur competition, while allowing flexibility for implementing definitions and bylaws. It is also broad enough to capture portions of Constitution 2.13 (Financial Aid) and, when combined with other commitments, would allow that provision to be removed as a stand-alone section in Article 2.*]

- *Are there specific subjects that should be added here in support of amateurism?*

2.3 THE COMMITMENT TO FAIR COMPETITION

Alternative 1:

Bylaws of the Association shall be designed to promote the opportunity for institutions and eligible student-athletes to engage in fair competition. Member institutions shall abide by uniform bylaws in areas impacting athletics competition including but not limited to personnel, eligibility and amateurism, recruiting, financial aid, the length of playing and practice seasons and the number of institutional competitions per sport. However, bylaws shall not be designed to foreclose advantages that may arise from an institution's decisions regarding allocation of resources or from advantages or disadvantages that may arise from geographical location.

Alternative 2:

The member institutions are committed to the principle of competitive fairness. Competitive fairness requires that student-athletes compete against their peers. This requires that all member institutions compete within the framework of the collegiate model of athletics where athletic competition is an integral part of the student-athlete's effort to acquire a degree in higher education. Competitive fairness suggests that the framework for the student's experience should be one in which academic pursuit is expected and reinforced, where the student-athletes are competing against amateurs like themselves rather than against professionals, and where the rules of the game as well as rules relating to recruitment, eligibility, financial aid and benefits, and conduct do not impose burdens on any team or individual that are not imposed on all teams or individuals. Competitive fairness does not support rules or regulations that prevent or reduce the advantages that arise from a student-athlete's level of talent or an institution's financial or other natural advantages.

[*Note: These alternatives are designed to update and clarify Constitution 2.10 (Competitive Equity). They are also designed to capture portions of Constitution 2.12 (Eligibility), 2.13 (Financial Aid), 2.14 (Playing and Practice Seasons) and perhaps 2.15 (Postseason Competitions) and 2.9 (Amateurism).*]

1. *Feedback on the scope of "fair competition" and the level of specificity to include in this provision would be helpful.*

2. *Please also provide feedback on whether this provision should include the proposed language clarifying that "fair competition" does not mean removing all advantages that may inure to a member institution based on its resources or other factors.*

2.4 THE COMMITMENT TO INTEGRITY AND SPORTSMANSHIP

It is the responsibility of each member institution to conduct its athletics programs and manage its representatives and student-athletes in a manner that promotes the ideals of higher education and the integrity of intercollegiate athletics. Member institutions are committed to encouraging behavior that advances the interests of the Association, its membership and the Collegiate Model. All individuals associated with intercollegiate athletics programs and events should adhere to such fundamental values as respect, fairness, civility, honesty and responsibility. These values should be manifest not only in athletics participation, but also in the broad spectrum of activities affecting the athletics programs.

[*Note: This would represent a new addition to Article 2, derived in part from Constitution 2.4 (Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct).*]

- *Please provide feedback on whether this language captures the overall concepts of integrity and sportsmanship and, if not, what should be added.*

2.5 THE COMMITMENT TO INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL AND COMPLIANCE

It is the responsibility of each member institution to monitor and control its athletics programs, its representatives and its student-athletes to assure compliance with the Constitution and bylaws of the Association. It is also the responsibility of each member institution to report all instances of noncompliance to the Association and cooperate with the Association's enforcement efforts. Upon a finding of one or more violations, an institution shall be subject to such disciplinary and corrective actions as may be recommended by the Association on behalf of the entire membership.

[*Note: This contains elements of Constitution 2.1 (Institutional Control and Responsibility) and 2.8 (Rules Compliance).*]

- *Please provide feedback on whether this provision makes clear the general responsibility of member institutions to comply with applicable bylaws, and to cooperate in related investigations.*

2.6 THE COMMITMENT TO STUDENT-ATHLETE WELL-BEING

Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be conducted in a manner designed to enhance the well-being of student-athletes who choose to participate and to prevent undue commercial or other influences that may interfere with their scholastic, athletics or related interests. It is the responsibility of each member institution to establish and maintain an environment in which student-athletes' activities, in all sports, are conducted as an integral part of the educational experience. Each member institution should also provide an environment that fosters fairness, sportsmanship, honesty and positive relationships between student-athletes and representatives of the institution.

[*Note: Portions of this language are borrowed from current Constitution 2.2 (Student-Athlete Well-Being) and 2.11 (Recruiting). The provision is also designed to capture portions of Constitution 2.14 (Playing and Practice Seasons) and 2.15 (Postseason Competition) and, when combined with other commitments, would allow those to be removed as stand-alone provisions in Article 2.*]

- *Please provide feedback about whether the first sentence fits better in this section or in the Commitment to Amateurism.*

2.7 THE COMMITMENT TO SOUND ACADEMIC STANDARDS

Standards of the Association governing participation in intercollegiate athletics, including postseason competition, shall be designed to assure proper emphasis on educational objectives and the academic success of student-athletes who choose to participate at a member institution. Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be maintained as a vital component of the educational program, and student-athletes shall be an integral part of the student body. Each member institution's admission and academic standards for student-athletes shall be consistent with the standards adopted by the institution for the student body in general.

[*Note: This language contains elements found in Constitution 2.5 (Sound Academic Standards) and 2.12 (Eligibility). It is broad enough to cover initial and continuing eligibility standards that are tied directly to academic readiness and performance. Other eligibility standards (such as rules about seasons of competition, transfers, outside competition and certain promotional activities) can fall within the Commitment to Fair Competition.*]

- *Please provide feedback on whether additional educational goals should be included in this provision.*

2.8 THE COMMITMENT TO RESPONSIBLE RECRUITING STANDARDS

Recruiting bylaws shall be designed to promote informed decisions and balance the interests of prospective student-athletes, their educational institutions and the Association's member institutions.

[*Note: This provision is largely subsumed by the Commitments to Fair Competition and Student-Athlete Well-Being. However, it is included as a stand-alone section here given its importance to the membership and the importance of balancing different interests.*]

- *Please provide feedback on whether this should remain a stand-alone provision or, alternatively, whether additional detail is warranted.*

2.9 THE COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

The Association shall promote an atmosphere of respect for and sensitivity to the dignity of every person. The Association should not adopt bylaws that would prevent member institutions from promoting diversity or from complying with applicable laws, ordinances or policies regarding civil rights.

2.9.1 Nondiscrimination. It is the policy of the Association to refrain from discrimination with respect to its educational programs, activities and employment policies, including on the basis of age, color, disability, gender, national origin, race, religion, creed, sexual orientation, genetic information or any other classification protected by federal law. It is the responsibility of each member institution to comply with applicable laws regarding nondiscrimination and to determine independently its own nondiscrimination policies.

2.9.2 Governance Diversity. The Association shall promote diversity of representation within its governance structure. This includes assuring diverse membership in Association-wide bodies, each divisional governing body and their supporting committees, cabinets, councils and other groups.

[*Note: This language combines provisions currently located in Constitution 2.3 (Gender Equity), 2.6 (Nondiscrimination) and 2.7 (Diversity Within Governance Structures). This provision is not specifically within the purview of this Working Group. These provisions are included to demonstrate how Article 2 might look upon completion.*]

- *Please provide feedback on whether these provisions adequately address the NCAA's commitment to diversity and inclusion.*

Please click the following button to attach this form to an email: **rulesworkinggroup@ncaa.org**

NCAA DIVISION I WORKING GROUP ON COLLEGIATE MODEL -- RULES

Short Discussion Reminders and Guidelines

Rules Working Group

- Charge: Review and amend the NCAA Division I Manual to reduce the volume of the unenforceable and inconsequential rules that fail to support our enduring values and place emphasis on the most strategically important.
  - The group will also recommend processes and procedures that ensures new legislation aligns and addresses our enduring values.

Commitment to Fair Competition

- Bylaws of the Association shall be designed to promote the opportunity for institutions and eligible student-athletes to engage in fair competition. The concept of fair competition requires that all member institutions compete within the framework of the collegiate model of athletics where athletics competition is an integral part of the student-athlete's effort to acquire a degree in higher education. Areas to be regulated include but are not limited to personnel, eligibility and amateurism, recruiting, financial aid, the length of playing and practice seasons and the number of institutional competitions per sport. Fair competition does not support rules or regulations that prevent or reduce the advantages that arise from a student-athlete's level of talent or an institution's financial or other natural advantages.

Operating Bylaws -- Discussion Points

- Is the bylaw meaningful and of consequence?
  - Is it an issue that merits a national regulation or can it simply be addressed by institutions or conferences?
  - Does it support one or more commitments?
  - Is the rule necessary?

Operating Bylaws -- Discussion Points

- Is the bylaw enforceable?
  - Does the rule present significant challenges either in monitoring compliance or proving violations ?
- Does the bylaw further student-athlete success?
  - Academic and/or athletics success.
- What challenges or consequences may arise as a result of the change?